

TENNESSEE WORKERS' COMPENSATION APPEALS BOARD

Figueroa v. Amazon.com, Inc., et al.

Figueroa v. Amazon.com, Inc., 2026 TN WC App. 29 · No. 2025-30-4557 · Decided June 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The Tennessee Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board affirmed and remanded an order staying an expedited workers’ compensation award of temporary disability and medical benefits. The Board held that the employee did not preserve her challenge to the stay because the parties agreed to obtain a causation opinion from the authorized treating physician and she did not object to that procedure in the trial court.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Tennessee Workers' Compensation Appeals Board
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Meredith B. Weaver; Timothy W. Conner; Pele I. Godkin
JURISDICTION	Tennessee Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board
DECIDED	June 25, 2026
DOCKET	2025-30-4557
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Interlocutory appeal from an order of the Court of Workers' Compensation Claims granting the employer's motion to stay an earlier expedited-hearing order awarding temporary total disability and medical benefits and directing the parties to obtain a causation opinion from the authorized treating physician.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Factual findings are presumed correct unless the preponderance of the evidence is otherwise; credibility determinations based on live testimony receive considerable deference. The appellate court independently evaluates the weight and credibility of deposition-based expert testimony. Statutory and regulatory interpretation is reviewed de novo without a presumption of correctness.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published opinion
PARTIES	Eileen Figueroa v. Amazon.com, Inc., et al.

TOPICS

workers compensation

interlocutory appeal

preservation of error

appellate procedure

standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

workers' compensation

employment law

civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the trial court abused its discretion or otherwise erred by staying its prior expedited-hearing order awarding temporary total disability and medical benefits.
2. Whether Figueroa preserved for appellate review her challenge to the stay when she agreed at the status hearing to the process that resulted in the stay and did not object or seek reconsideration in the trial court.
3. Whether an expedited workers' compensation hearing order is subject to amendment, reversal, or revision before entry of a final compensation order.

HOLDINGS

1. An expedited hearing order is interlocutory, not final, and remains subject to amendment, reversal, or revision before entry of a final compensation order.
2. Figueroa did not preserve her challenge to the stay because she agreed to the process discussed at the status hearing, did not object that the agreement would suspend benefits, and did not move for reconsideration after the order was entered.
3. The trial court properly entered the stay order, and the order is affirmed.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In short, a party cannot agree to proceed in one manner then appeal an order memorializing that agreement.” (at 6)

“Finally, it is well-settled that issues cannot be raised for the first time on appeal.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Eileen Figueroa worked for Amazon as a picker and began experiencing back soreness after being transferred to a position requiring more bending. She later developed severe right-calf pain, reported her complaints to Amazon, and selected an employer-provided physician, but Amazon denied compensability based on alleged late notice. Figueroa obtained treatment from Dr. Luke Madigan, who diagnosed degenerative spondylolisthesis and recommended surgery; a later note from him stated that the condition was degenerative rather than a work injury. After an expedited hearing, the trial court awarded benefits and ordered further causation evaluation, then stayed that order after the parties agreed to send Dr. Madigan a questionnaire addressing her job duties, prior medical records, and causation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Figueroa alleged a gradual work-related back and calf injury and petitioned for workers' compensation benefits. After an expedited hearing, the trial court found she was likely to prevail on her claim, designated her selected physician as the authorized treating physician, ordered additional medical evaluation, and awarded ongoing temporary total disability benefits. The employer withdrew an appeal from that order after receiving a medical note questioning work causation and moved for reconsideration and a stay. Following a status conference at which the parties agreed to cooperate on a questionnaire for the physician, the trial court stayed its prior order. The Appeals Board affirmed the stay and remanded.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The case is remanded following affirmance of the stay order; the parties are to proceed with obtaining and filing Dr. Madigan's response to the causation questionnaire and advising the trial court whether they seek an opportunity to argue their positions.

CASES CITED

- *Madden v. Holland Grp. of Tenn., Inc.*, 277 S.W.3d 896, 898 (Tenn. 2009)
- *Edwards v. Peoplease, LLC*, No. W2024-01034-SC-R3-WC, 2025 Tenn. LEXIS 514, at *18 (Tenn. Dec. 22, 2025)
- *Mansell v. Bridgestone Firestone N. Am. Tire, LLC*, 417 S.W.3d 393, 399 (Tenn. 2013)
- *Smith v. The Newman Group, LLC*, No. 2015-08-0075, 2015 TN Wrk. Comp. App. Bd. LEXIS 30, at *9 (Tenn. Workers' Comp. App. Bd. Sep. 21, 2015)
- *Green v. Rogers Group*, No. 2016-04-0085, 2017 TN Wrk. Comp. App. Bd. LEXIS 34, at *4 (Tenn. Workers' Comp. App. Bd. May 22, 2017)
- *Long v. Hamilton-Ryker*, No. 2015-07-0023, 2015 TN Wrk. Comp. App. Bd. LEXIS 23, at *14-15 (Tenn. Workers' Comp. App. Bd. July 31, 2015)
- *Semich v. AT&T Services, Inc.*, No. 2021-06-0997, 2023 TN Wrk. Comp. App. Bd. LEXIS 28, at *13-14 (Tenn. Workers' Comp. App. Bd. June 8, 2023)