

## LAW REVIEW 26001

January 2026

### Understanding Medical Professionals' Role in VA Disability Adjudication: Independent Medical Examinations, Independent Medical Opinions, and C&P Examinations

By Bradley W. Hennings<sup>1</sup> and Robert Chisholm<sup>2</sup>

#### 11.0—Veterans' claims.

##### I. Introduction

VA disability benefits law is distinctive in American administrative law. It is non-adversarial in theory, guided by a statutory duty to assist, and governed by a uniquely claimant-friendly standard of proof. Yet in practice, the system relies heavily on medical determinations that often resemble adversarial expert testimony. At the center of many denials, remands, and reversals lies a single question: **which medical opinion does VA find most persuasive, and why?**

---

<sup>1</sup> BA 1997 George Washington University, MS 2001 Stevens Institute of Technology, JD 2006 Rutgers University School of Law. Mr. Hennings joined Chisholm Chisholm & Kilpatrick as an attorney in January 2018 and currently serves as a Partner in the firm. His practice focuses on the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) and the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims. Immediately prior to joining CCK Law, Mr. Hennings served as a Veterans Law Judge at the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Board of Veterans' Appeals (BVA). Mr. Hennings' full biography may be found at [cck-law.com/lawyers/bradley-w-hennings](http://cck-law.com/lawyers/bradley-w-hennings). To learn more about CCK Law, the largest and most respected veterans law firm in the U.S., visit [cck-law.com](http://cck-law.com).

<sup>2</sup> BA 1984 Boston College, JD 1988 Boston University School of Law. Mr. Chisholm is a Founding Partner of Chisholm Chisholm & Kilpatrick, the largest veterans law firm in the U.S. His law practice focuses on representing disabled veterans in the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims and before the Department of Veterans Affairs. As a veterans lawyer, Mr. Chisholm has been representing disabled veterans since 1990. During his extensive career, he has successfully represented veterans before the Board of Veterans Appeals, Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. Mr. Chisholm is a founding member of the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims Bar Association and served as President of that organization for the year 2002-2003. Mr. Chisholm served as the President of the National Organization of Veterans' Advocates from 1999 to 2004. In 2016, the United States Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (CAVC) awarded Mr. Chisholm the Hart T. Mankin Distinguished Service Award in recognition of his 25 years of outstanding service to the Court. Mr. Chisholm has served as appellant's lead counsel in over 7,500 cases before the CAVC. His full biography may be found at [cck-law.com/lawyers/robert-v-chisholm](http://cck-law.com/lawyers/robert-v-chisholm). To learn more about CCK Law, the largest and most respected veterans law firm in the U.S., visit [cck-law.com](http://cck-law.com).

VA adjudicators routinely weigh:

1. VA-generated Compensation and Pension (C&P) examinations;
2. Privately obtained Independent Medical Examinations (IMEs); and
3. Privately obtained Independent Medical Opinions (IMOs).

Although all three constitute competent medical evidence when properly prepared, they differ significantly in origin, purpose, and practical effect. Confusion over these differences persists among veterans, advocates, and even adjudicators. This article clarifies those distinctions and situates them within governing statutes, regulations, and case law.

## **II. The Central Role of Medical Evidence in VA Claims**

VA may not substitute its own medical judgment for that of a competent medical professional. See *Colvin v. Derwinski*, 1 Vet. App. 171 (1991). Accordingly, medical examinations and opinions often determine:

- Service connection (direct, secondary, or by aggravation)
- Disability ratings and staged ratings
- Entitlement to total disability based on individual unemployability
- Effective dates

Under 38 C.F.R. § 3.159(a)(1), competent medical evidence includes evidence provided by a person qualified through education, training, or experience to offer medical diagnoses, statements, or opinions. The regulation does not privilege VA examiners over private clinicians.

Nonetheless, in practice, VA frequently assigns greater probative weight to C&P examinations unless effectively rebutted.

### **III. VA Compensation and Pension Examinations**

#### **A. Purpose and Legal Basis**

C&P examinations are ordered by VA pursuant to its duty to assist under 38 U.S.C. § 5103A. They are intended to provide medical findings and opinions necessary for VA to decide a claim.

#### **B. Structural Characteristics**

C&P examinations typically:

- Are conducted by VA staff clinicians or contracted examiners
- Follow Disability Benefits Questionnaires or internal templates
- Address specific questions posed by VA adjudicators

Although VA often describes these examinations as neutral fact-finding tools, they are constrained by time limits, templates, and institutional incentives favoring efficiency.

#### **C. Common Deficiencies**

Judicial precedent reflects recurring problems with C&P examinations, including:

- Failure to address favorable lay evidence (*Dalton v. Nicholson*, 21 Vet. App. 23 (2007))
- Conclusory or unexplained negative nexus opinions (*Stefl v. Nicholson*, 21 Vet. App. 120 (2007))

- Reliance on inaccurate factual premises (*Reonal v. Brown*, 5 Vet. App. 458 (1993))
- Improper emphasis on lack of in-service documentation (*Buchanan v. Nicholson*, 451 F.3d 1331 (Fed. Cir. 2006))

Despite these flaws, C&P examinations frequently form the foundation of VA denials.

## **IV. Independent Medical Examinations**

### **A. Definition and Scope**

An Independent Medical Examination is a **private, non-VA clinical examination** of a veteran, typically conducted for the purpose of generating an expert medical opinion relevant to a VA claim or appeal.

### **B. Evidentiary Function**

An IME often addresses:

- Current diagnosis
- Severity and functional limitations
- Medical nexus or aggravation

Unlike many C&P examinations, IMEs are not constrained by VA templates and can be tailored to the precise legal issues in dispute.

### **C. Strengths and Limitations**

#### **Strengths**

- Detailed clinical evaluation
- Examiner selected for relevant specialty

- Ability to directly rebut VA findings

## **Limitations**

- Cost borne by the veteran
- VA scrutiny regarding perceived “advocacy bias”
- No automatic presumption of credibility

VA may not discount an IME merely because it was obtained by the claimant. The probative value depends on reasoning, not origin. *Nieves-Rodriguez v. Peake*, 22 Vet. App. 295 (2008).

## **V. Independent Medical Opinions**

### **A. Definition and Distinction from IMEs**

An Independent Medical Opinion is a **records-based written medical opinion** provided by a qualified private clinician, often without a physical examination of the veteran. IMOs typically review service records, post-service medical records, and lay statements.

### **B. Legal Acceptance of Records-Based Opinions**

The Court has explicitly rejected the notion that a medical opinion is inadequate solely because it is based on records review rather than in-person examination. *Nieves-Rodriguez*, 22 Vet. App. at 304.

### **C. Strategic Utility**

IMOs are particularly effective in:

- Nexus disputes
- Secondary service connection and aggravation claims

- Appeals under evidentiary-restricted lanes

A well-reasoned IMO can outweigh a cursory or flawed C&P examination.

## VI. Comparative Analysis

<b>Factor</b>	<b>C&amp;P Examination</b>	<b>IME</b>	<b>IMO</b>
<b>Ordered by VA</b>	Yes	No	No
<b>Conducted by VA or contractor</b>	Yes	No	No
<b>Physical examination</b>	Yes	Yes	Often no
<b>Tailored to legal theory</b>	Rarely	Yes	Yes
<b>Cost to veteran</b>	No	Yes	Yes
<b>Common evidentiary weight</b>	High (default)	High if well-reasoned	High if well-reasoned

## VII. Evidentiary Weight and Judicial Oversight

VA is required to analyze the credibility and probative value of all medical evidence and provide adequate reasons or bases for favoring one opinion over another. 38 U.S.C. § 7104(d)(1). Courts have

repeatedly vacated Board decisions that mechanically favored C&P examinations over private IMEs or IMO's without meaningful analysis.

## **VIII. Policy and Practice Implications**

### **A. For Veterans and Advocates**

The comparative framework suggests that IMEs and IMO's are not merely supplemental evidence but often essential tools for correcting systemic deficiencies in VA examinations.

### **B. For VA Adjudicators**

Overreliance on C&P examinations undermines the non-adversarial intent of the system and increases remands and reversals.

### **C. For the System as a Whole**

The persistence of inadequate VA examinations raises structural questions about training, incentives, and quality control within the C&P examination system.

## **IX. Conclusion**

IMEs, IMO's, and C&P examinations are all lawful and potentially probative forms of medical evidence in VA disability adjudication. However, they are not functionally equivalent. While C&P examinations dominate initial adjudications, independent medical evidence frequently determines outcomes on appeal. VA law requires that all medical opinions be judged by their reasoning, factual accuracy, and explanatory power, not by their institutional origin. A system that meaningfully honors that principle would better fulfill the veteran-friendly promise of the statutory scheme.

## **Please Join or Support ROA**

This article is one of 2,000-plus “Law Review” articles available at [www.roa.org/lawcenter](http://www.roa.org/lawcenter). The Reserve Officers Association, now doing business as the Reserve Organization of America (ROA), initiated this column in 1997. New articles are added each month.

ROA is more than a century old—it was established on 10/1/1922 by a group of veterans of “The Great War,” as World War I was then known. One of those veterans was Captain Harry S. Truman. As President, in 1950, he signed our congressional charter. Under that charter, our mission is to advocate for the implementation of policies that provide for adequate national security. For more than a century, we have argued that the Reserve Components, including the National Guard, are a cost-effective way to meet our nation’s defense needs.

Through these articles, and by other means, including amicus curiae (“friend of the court”) briefs that we file in the Supreme Court and other courts, we educate service members, military spouses, attorneys, judges, employers, DOL investigators, ESGR volunteers, congressional and state legislative staffers, and others about the legal rights of service members and about how to exercise and enforce those rights. We provide information to service members, without regard to whether they are members of ROA, but please understand that ROA members, through their dues and contributions, pay the costs of providing this service and all the other great services that ROA provides.

If you are now serving or have ever served in any one of our nation’s eight uniformed services, you are eligible for membership in ROA, and a one-year membership only costs \$20 or \$450 for a life membership. Enlisted personnel as well as officers are eligible for full membership,

and eligibility applies to those who are serving or have served in the Active Component, the National Guard, or the Reserve.

If you are eligible for ROA membership, please join. You can join on-line at [www.roa.org](http://www.roa.org) or call ROA at 800-809-9448.

If you are not eligible to join, please contribute financially, to help us keep up and expand this effort on behalf of those who serve. Please contribute on-line at [www.roa.org](http://www.roa.org) or mail a contribution to: Reserve Organization of America 1 Constitution Ave. NE Washington, DC 20002