

Proof of Workplace Injury Not Required for Workers' Compensation Retaliation Claim in Ohio

By **Patrick O. Peters** and **James M. Stone**

July 26, 2016

Proof of a workplace injury is not required to state a *prima facie* claim of retaliatory discharge under Ohio's workers' compensation statute, the Ohio Supreme Court has ruled, resolving a split among the Ohio Courts of Appeal. *Onderko v. Sierra Lobo, Inc.*, Slip Opinion No. 2016-Ohio-5027 (July 21, 2016).

Background

The plaintiff, Michael Onderko, was an engineering tech with Sierra Lobo, Inc., when he suffered an injury to his knee and was prescribed prescription pain medications to aid in his recovery. After Onderko's request for light duty work was denied, he filed a workers' compensation claim.

The parties disputed whether the injury occurred at work, and when Onderko's claim was eventually denied by the Ohio Bureau of Workers' Compensation on the grounds

Meet the Authors



Patrick O. Peters

Principal
Cleveland

216-750-4338

Patrick.Peters@jacksonlewis.com

that the injury did not occur in the course of his employment, he did not appeal the decision as he had already returned to work.

Onderko was fired on December 12, 2012, for filing a deceptive workers' compensation claim. He subsequently filed a complaint alleging retaliatory discharge under Ohio's workers' compensation statute (R.C. 4123.90).

The trial court granted summary judgment to the employer on the grounds that Onderko had not suffered a workplace injury. The Sixth District Court of Appeals reversed, holding that a workplace injury was not required to state a claim of workers' compensation retaliation.

Workplace Injury Not Required

The Ohio Supreme Court affirmed the Sixth District's decision. The Court held that the plain language of the statute requires only that an employee file a workers' compensation claim or institute, pursue, or testify in a workers' compensation proceeding, but does not require an actual workplace injury.

R.C. 4123.90 states:

No employer shall discharge, demote, reassign, or take any punitive action against any employee because the employee filed a claim or instituted, pursued or testified in any proceedings under the workers' compensation act for an injury or occupational disease which occurred in the course of and arising out of his employment with that employer.

The Court reasoned that requiring an employee to prove he or she had suffered a workplace injury undermined the basic purpose of the workers' compensation statute: to allow employees to exercise their rights without fear of retribution. Interpreting the statute in a manner that may leave employers free to discipline any employee who brought an unsuccessful workers' compensation claim, the Court said, may produce a chilling effect on employees.

Thus, the Court made clear that the *prima facie* case of a claim for retaliatory discharge requires only that a plaintiff prove that he or she was discharged, reassigned, demoted, or otherwise disciplined in retaliation for filing a workers' compensation claim or instituting, pursuing, or testifying in a workers' compensation proceeding.

As proof of a workplace injury is not required under the statute, the Court also rejected



James M. Stone

Office Managing Principal
Cleveland

216-750-4307
StoneJ@jacksonlewis.com

the employer's argument that failure to appeal the denial of workers' compensation benefits foreclosed a plaintiff's retaliation suit.

In response to the dissent's concerns that the Court's decision will encourage fraudulent workers' compensation claims, the five-judge majority stated that employees who bring false claims or make misleading statements in an attempt to receive workers' compensation benefits are subject to criminal penalties under Ohio law.

Following *Onderko*, employers should proceed with caution when disciplining an employee who has filed a workers' compensation claim, even if the claim was unsuccessful, unless the employer has other, independent justification for taking disciplinary action.

Please contact Jackson Lewis if you have any questions about *Onderko* and other workplace laws.

©2016 Jackson Lewis P.C. This Update is provided for informational purposes only. It is not intended as legal advice nor does it create an attorney/client relationship between Jackson Lewis and any readers or recipients. Readers should consult counsel of their own choosing to discuss how these matters relate to their individual circumstances. Reproduction in whole or in part is prohibited without the express written consent of Jackson Lewis.

This Update may be considered attorney advertising in some states. Furthermore, prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

Jackson Lewis P.C. represents management exclusively in workplace law and related litigation. Our attorneys are available to assist employers in their compliance efforts and to represent employers in matters before state and federal courts and administrative agencies. For more information, please contact the attorney(s) listed or the Jackson Lewis attorney with whom you regularly work.

Related Articles You May Like

July 27, 2016



Cleveland Law Allows Transgender Employees to Use Restroom Associated With Gender Identity

Companies in Cleveland, Ohio, now must permit transgender employees and patrons to use the bathrooms, showers, locker rooms, and dressing facilities associated with the individual's gender identity or expression. Cleveland Mayor Frank Jackson has signed legislation making it an unlawful discriminatory practice for places of... [Read More](#)

July 21, 2016



EEOC: Title VII Prohibits Employment Discrimination Based on Gender Identity, Sexual Orientation

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission has stated definitively that it interprets, and will enforce accordingly, the Civil Right Act's Title VII's prohibition on sex discrimination as encompassing employment discrimination based on gender identity and sexual orientation. Employers should review and update their policies... [Read More](#)

July 18, 2016



EEOC Burnishes Systemic Successes and Intentions

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Chair Jenny R. Yang has issued a report on the EEOC's Systemic Discrimination efforts over the last 10 years. The Report contains insights on the type of employer vulnerabilities the EEOC exploits and the agency's aims for growth in new areas. Big Picture Not only does the EEOC... [Read More](#)

Related Practices

**General
Employment
Litigation**



©2016 Jackson Lewis P.C. All rights reserved. Attorney Advertising. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. No client-lawyer relationship has been established by the posting or viewing of information on this website.

*Honolulu, Hawai'i is through an affiliation with Jackson Lewis P.C., a Law Corporation