

**QUESTION 15 THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION SHOULD GO IN BLUEBOOK V  
OR IN SOFTEST ANSWER SCREEN 15**

Patrick is an employee of a large Michigan manufacturer, ABC Company. ABC owns a parking lot across the street from its main place of business. ABC permits its employees to park free in the lot when they are going to and coming from work.

On February 24, 2015, Patrick parked his car in ABC's parking lot shortly before his starting time. While legally crossing the public street on a direct route to the workplace, Patrick neglected to notice an oncoming car. The car struck Patrick injuring his ribs and hip.

Patrick recovered somewhat from his injury within two months, but he had ongoing restrictions precluding repetitive bending and twisting. Patrick's regular job for ABC required repetitive bending and twisting, so ABC offered to return Patrick to work at a sit-down job within his physical restrictions.

Patrick accepted the offer, but after performing the sit-down job for three weeks, found it unchallenging and boring. Reflecting his disinterest in the job, Patrick repeatedly arrived late for work and accumulated many unexcused absences over the next two months. Following several warnings to Patrick about his tardiness and absenteeism, ABC terminated him in accord with regular company policy, a policy that was known to Patrick.

Patrick now seeks workers' compensation benefits for his injury. Answer only the following two questions applying Michigan workers' compensation law:

1. Is Patrick's injury crossing the street an injury covered by Michigan's workers' compensation statute? Why or why not? Explain your answer.

2. Would Patrick's post-injury conduct impact his workers' compensation claim? If so, why? If not, why not?

**\*\*\*\*\*THE ANSWER TO THIS QUESTION SHOULD GO IN BLUEBOOK V\*\*\*\*\*  
OR IN SOFTEST ANSWER SCREEN 15**