

Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease

Suite 2100 • Atrium Two • 221 E. Fourth Street • Post Office Box 0236 • Cincinnati, Ohio 45201-0236 • Telephone (513) 421-8777 • Telecopier (513) 421-0107

Arthur I. Vorys
1956-1933
Lowry R. Sater
1967-1933
Augustus T. Seymour
1973-1926
Edward L. Pease
1973-1924

In Columbus
52 East Gay Street
Post Office Box 1008
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008

Telephone (614) 464-6400
Telecopier (614) 464-6350
Rapifax (614) 464-6453
Telex 241348
Cable VORYSATER

In Washington
Suite 1111
1828 L Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036-5104

Telephone (202) 822-8200
Telecopier (202) 835-0699
Telex 440093

In Cleveland
2100 One Cleveland Center
1375 East Ninth Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1724

Telephone (216) 621-7091
Telecopier (216) 621-8366

RECEIVED
AUG 12 1986
Corp., Risk Mgmt.

August 7, 1986

Mr. Anthony J. Colangelo
Workers' Compensation Claims Examiner
The Sherwin-Williams Company
101 Prospect Avenue, N.W.
Cleveland, Ohio 44115-1075

REDACTED

Re: Claimant: [REDACTED]
Claim No. 888596-22

Dear Tony:

I wish to confirm my attendance at the Workers' Compensation hearing held in Hamilton, Ohio on July 1, 1986. The claimant was present with his attorney, Dennis Miller. All three members of the Dayton Regional Board were in attendance.

As you know, the issue at this hearing was the claimant's appeal from the disallowance of the claim by the District Hearing Officer. Rather than submit an extensive report on this lengthy hearing, I would like to direct you to our letter written on March 13, 1986 to Hearing Officer Fatora which summarizes the arguments I advanced at this hearing. Mr. Miller presented essentially the same arguments he had advanced in his letter to Mr. Fatora dated March 24, 1986.

It may be of interest to you that the claimant changed his testimony at this hearing. For example, he testified that he did not have chest pains until after his chemical exposures in 1983 and 1984. I was able to rebut the claimant's testimony by way of Dr. Ford's records which indicate that the claimant has had angina which needed treatment as early as 1976. Mr. Miller's main focus at this hearing was Dr. Fowler's report which he vigorously argued in support of the allowance of the angina "condition". In response, I stated that there was absolutely no evidence that the "symptom" of chest pain was in any way substantially aggravated by the chemical exposure in 1984. I also pointed out to the Regional Board members that the angina