

NOTE: This disposition is nonprecedential.

**United States Court of Appeals
for the Federal Circuit**

CYNTHIA A. TORREZ,
Claimant-Appellant

v.

**DENIS MCDONOUGH, SECRETARY OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS,**
Respondent-Appellee

2022-1909

Appeal from the United States Court of Appeals for
Veterans Claims in No. 20-7646, Judge Scott Laurer.

Decided: November 14, 2022

CYNTHIA A. TORREZ, San Antonio, TX, pro se.

ROBERT R. KIEPURA, Commercial Litigation Branch,
Civil Division, United States Department of Justice, Wash-
ington, DC, for respondent-appellee. Also represented by
BRIAN M. BOYNTON, CLAUDIA BURKE, PATRICIA M.
MCCARTHY; BRIAN D. GRIFFIN, ANDREW J. STEINBERG, Of-
fice of General Counsel, United States Department of Vet-
erans Affairs, Washington, DC.

Before REYNA, SCHALL, and CHEN, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

Mrs. Torrez appeals a decision of the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims that affirmed in part and vacated in part the Board of Veterans Appeals' October 6, 2020 determination on her late husband's claims for certain veteran's disability benefits. For the following reasons, we affirm the judgment of the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims that affirms in part the Board's determination and we decline to review the court's non-final order to vacate in part and remand.

BACKGROUND

Mr. Torrez served on active duty in the Air Force from June 1979 to May 1995. GApp'x 16.¹ One month after his separation from the Air Force, he sought service connection claims for various disabilities—including right and left ankle disabilities, bilateral hearing loss, a heart condition, a knee condition, tonsillitis, and seborrheic dermatitis. Resp. Br. 2–3. In September 1995, the Veterans Affairs (“VA”) regional office (“RO”) granted service connection claims with a non-compensable rating for a right ankle condition and bilateral knee tendinitis. *Id.*; GApp'x 24–26. The RO, however, denied service connection claims for: bilateral hearing loss for not being a present disability, tinnitus for missing an in-service connection, and a heart condition for being congenital. *Id.* at 3; GApp'x 18–19. The RO also denied service connection claims for an abnormal EKG, left ankle injury, tonsillitis, and seborrheic dermatitis as lacking evidence of current disability. Resp. Br. 3. Mr. Torrez did not appeal the decision and it became final.

¹ “GApp'x” refers to the appendix attached to the Government's Response Brief.

TORREZ v. MCDONOUGH

3

In January 2011, Mr. Torrez sought service connection claims for lung cancer, lumbar spine disability, hypertension, liver disability, peripheral neuropathy, gastrointestinal disability, mediastinal lymphadenopathy, disability of the blood-forming organs, reticuloendothelial disability, agranulocytosis, nasal disability, epistaxis, and hyperlipidemia (the “2011 claims”). Resp. Br. 3; GApp’x 20–21. He also attempted to reopen the denied claims and increase the disability rating for the granted service-connection conditions. Resp. Br. 3; GApp’x 18–19, 24. In April 2011, the RO requested additional information from Mr. Torrez. Resp. Br. 4. Mr. Torrez then underwent a knee and ankle examination and hearing loss examination by the VA where the examiner reported service-connected bilateral tinnitus. Resp. Br. 4; GApp’x 19, 29.

Mr. Torrez died in July 2011 from Stage 4 metastatic lung cancer with acute hypoxic respiratory failure. GApp’x 30. Mrs. Torrez sought accrued benefits and became the substitute appellant. Resp. Br. 4; GApp’x 16–17. Shortly thereafter, the RO had granted service connection claims for tinnitus with a 10% rating and a right ankle scar with a non-compensable rating; retained the non-compensable ratings for right ankle arthritis, hearing loss, and bilateral knee tendinitis (collectively, the “granted claims”); denied reopening previously denied claims; denied over a dozen other claims; and denied service connection claims for Mr. Torrez’s death. Resp. Br. 4–5; GApp’x 16–17, 24–26.

Mrs. Torrez filed a notice of disagreement with the April 2013 rating decision, alleging clear and unmistakable error (“CUE”). Resp. Br. at 5. In June 2015, the Board of Veterans Appeals (“Board”) found CUE in the September 1995 rating decision and granted service connection claims for left ear hearing loss but found no CUE in the decision for the right ear hearing loss, tinnitus, left ankle injury, tonsillitis, seborrheic dermatitis, systolic heart murmur, and sinus bradycardia with primacy AV block. Resp. Br. 5;

GApp'x 17–19. The Board remanded the remaining claims on appeal for further development of the record. *Id.*

The case returned to the Board and, in May 2018, the Board again remanded the claims on appeal because the agency of original jurisdiction (“AOJ”) failed to comply with the Board’s June 2015 instructions. Resp. Br. 5; GApp’x 8. The Board’s 2018 decision, however, omitted the allergic rhinitis claim without explanation. GApp’x 8. The AOJ then issued a supplemental statement of the case (“SSOC”) in March 2020 that, too, failed to address the allergic rhinitis claim. *Id.* That month, a VA medical expert offered several opinions on Mr. Torrez’s conditions, ultimately finding that the diagnoses were “less likely than not” related to any in-service illness and that his service-connected conditions of the 2011 claims and psoriasis, seborrheic dermatitis, liver condition did not substantially contribute to his death. Resp. Br. 6; GApp’x 22, 30.

The Board then issued a decision on October 6, 2020, denying Mrs. Torrez’s service connection claims for: heart disability, a left ankle disability, tonsillitis, seborrheic dermatitis, right ear hearing loss, lung cancer, a lumbar spine disability, peripheral neuropathy, hypertension, “a liver disability, to include lesions,” a gastrointestinal disability, mediastinal lymphadenopathy, a “blood forming organ” disability, a reticuloendothelial disability, agranulocytosis, a nasal disability, to include epistaxis, a disability manifested by hyperlipidemia, allergic rhinitis, and the cause of the veteran’s death. GApp’x 1. Finally, the Board denied Mrs. Torrez’s request to increase rating claims for the granted claims. *Id.*

Mrs. Torrez appealed the Board’s decision to the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (“Veterans Court”). Before the Veterans Court, the Secretary made several concessions. The Secretary conceded that the Board did not address materially favorable evidence and failed to support both its refusal to open the heart disability claim and its

TORREZ v. MCDONOUGH

5

denial of service connection claims for the 2011 claims and allergic rhinitis. Resp. Br. 7; GApp'x 2.

The court accepted these concessions and remanded those claims to the Board, noting that the Board should consider whether the other disabilities were compensable medically unexplained chronic illnesses under 38 C.F.R. § 3.317. GApp'x 2. The court also found that the AOJ failed to issue a SSOC with respect to allergic rhinitis and ordered the Board to “remand that claim before readjudicating it.” *Id.* Finally, because Mrs. Torrez’s service connection claim for Mr. Torrez’s cause of death is inextricably intertwined with the other claims, that was remanded as well. *Id.* The court affirmed the remainder of the Board’s decision—the denial of the request to reopen service connection claims for a left ankle injury, tonsillitis, seborrheic dermatitis, and right ear hearing loss, and increased rating claims for the granted claims. *Id.* at 2–3. Mrs. Torrez filed this appeal. We have jurisdiction under 38 U.S.C. § 7292.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Our authority over Veterans Court decisions is limited. We review the Veterans Court’s legal determinations de novo. *Blubaugh v. McDonald*, 773 F.3d 1310, 1312 (Fed. Cir. 2014). We do not have authority to engage in fact finding. 38 U.S.C. § 7292(d)(1). We must affirm the Veterans Court unless the decision is “(A) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; (B) contrary to constitutional right, power, privilege, or immunity; (C) in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority, or limitations, or in violation of a statutory right; or (D) without observance of procedure required by law.” *Id.*

DISCUSSION

On appeal, Mrs. Torrez argues for a higher disability rating for several conditions and asserts that the “VA will pay 100% compensation.” Reply Br. 10–11. Mrs. Torrez

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.