

## Client Services Policy Manual

Policy Number: **EN-20**  
Subject: **Weighing Evidence**  
Chapter: **Entitlement**

---

### Policy Statement

Section 70(1) of the Workplace Health, Safety and Compensation Act, 2022 (the Act) states:

“An issue related to a worker’s entitlement to compensation shall be decided on a balance of probabilities and, where the evidence on each side of an issue is equally balanced, the issue shall be decided in favour of the worker.”

The standard of proof for decisions made under the Act is the balance of probabilities -- a degree of proof which is more probable than not.

Decision makers must assess and weigh all relevant evidence. Decisions shall be based on the weight assigned to the evidence by the decision maker. Weight is determined by making judgments about the credibility, nature and quality of that evidence. Decision makers must weigh conflicting evidence to determine whether it weighs for or against the issue. If the evidence weighs more in favour of one outcome, then that will determine the issue.

After the information gathering process is complete and if the evidence weighs more against a worker’s position than for it, the decision maker does not have to identify an alternative explanation.

If the decision maker concludes that the evidence for and against an issue is equally weighted, then the issue will be decided in favour of the worker. The decision maker will explain the rationale for finding the evidence to be equally weighted.

For the purposes of this section, the following definitions shall apply:

"Objective" means perceptible to the senses of another person or a readily observable result.

## Client Services Policy Manual

Policy Number: **EN-20**  
Subject: **Weighing Evidence**  
Chapter: **Entitlement**

---

“Subjective” means pertaining to or perceived only by the affected individual but not to the senses of another person or a result which is not readily observable.

The following general principles shall be applied by decision makers in situations where conflicting medical evidence must be weighed for the determination of entitlement:

- A statement by a lay witness on a medical question may be considered as evidence if it relates to matters recognizable by a lay person; but not if it relates to matters that can only be determined by a person with expertise in medical science.
- When addressing conflicting medical evidence, decision makers will not automatically prefer the medical evidence of one category of physicians or practitioners over that of another. Decision makers shall consider the following criteria in deciding what weight to give to such evidence:
  - The expertise of the individual providing the opinion;
  - The correctness of the facts relied upon by the provider of the opinion;
  - Any issues of bias or objectivity with the opinion;
  - Subjective versus objective medical evidence; and
  - The findings of any relevant scientific studies referenced by a qualified medical practitioner.
- Where the weight to be given to conflicting medical evidence cannot readily be determined by applying the above criteria, the decision maker may consult with a WorkplaceNL medical consultant to:

## Client Services Policy Manual

Policy Number: **EN-20**  
Subject: **Weighing Evidence**  
Chapter: **Entitlement**

---

- Determine whether all appropriate medical evidence has been obtained;
- Determine if further investigations and/or medical examinations are required; or
- Obtain an opinion regarding the weight of medical evidence.

### Merits and Justice

It is important to consider Policy EN-22 Merits and Justice when making a decision under this policy.

**Reference:** Workplace Health, Safety and Compensation Act, 2022, Sections 2(1)(v), 50, and 70  
Policy EN-22 Merits and Justice

### Amendment History

Original Effective Date	1987 10 29
Reviewed	2020 10 14

Next Review Date	2025 10 14
------------------	------------