

By Mr. Piro of Somerville, petition of Vincent J. Piro that provision be made for a medical examination of police officers of the Metropolitan District Commission who are injured in the line of duty. Public Service.

**The Commonwealth of Massachusetts**

In the Year One Thousand Nine Hundred and Eighty.

AN ACT RELATIVE TO FURTHER REGULATING LINE OF DUTY INJURIES TO METROPOLITAN DISTRICT POLICE OFFICERS.

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court assembled and by the authority of the same, as follows:*

1 Section 63A of chapter 92 is hereby amended by striking every-  
2 thing after the first sentence and inserting the following: —

3 Whenever the Commission denies an application in part or on  
4 the grounds that the applicant is not or no longer disabled the  
5 application shall be referred to a qualified medical doctor chosen  
6 by the Commission who shall examine the applicant and determine  
7 whether the said applicant is disabled. The determination of the  
8 doctor shall be binding upon the Commission. The Commission  
9 shall bear all expenses for the medical examination. In any matter  
10 so referred to a medical doctor the applicant shall receive his  
11 weekly salary while the matter is pending before the doctor pro-  
12 vided that no salary shall be received during the pendency if the  
13 applicant unreasonably delays submitting to the medical examina-  
14 tion.

15 Whenever the Commission denies an application in whole or in  
16 part, the Commission shall set forth in writing its reasons for such  
17 denial and cause a copy thereof to be delivered to the applicant. At  
18 any time within two years after the filing of an application as

19 aforesaid, an applicant aggrieved by any denial of his application  
20 or by the failure of the Commission to take final action thereon  
21 within six months from the filing thereof may petition the superior  
22 court in equity to determine whether the Commission has without  
23 good cause failed to take final action on such application or, in  
24 denying the application, in whole or part, has committed an error  
25 of law or has been arbitrary or capricious, or has abused its  
26 discretion, or otherwise has acted not in accordance with law.