

LAW REVIEW 25032

September 2025

***Chisholm v. Collins*: Reaffirming Due Process in the VA Claims System Through Flexible Form Interpretation**

By Bradley W. Hennings¹ and Robert Chisholm²

In *Chisholm v. Collins*³, the Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims (CAVC) issued a pivotal decision limiting the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) ability to rigidly enforce specific form usage when veterans seek to preserve effective dates by filing supplemental claims. This article examines the legal reasoning and practical consequences of the decision, which centers on whether a VA Form 21-8940 (TDIU application) can qualify as a supplemental claim even when not submitted on VA Form 20-0995. The court sided with Chisholm & Kilpatrick and supported a broader, pro-claimant reading of VA regulations, safeguarding veterans' rights to retroactive benefits.

¹ BA 1997 George Washington University, MS 2001 Stevens Institute of Technology, JD 2006 Rutgers University School of Law. Mr. Hennings joined 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. To learn more about CCK Law, the largest and most respected veterans law firm in the U.S., visit cck-law.com.

² BA 1984 Boston College, JD 1988 Boston University School of Law. Mr. Chisholm is a Founding Partner of 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. To learn more about CCK Law, the largest and most respected veterans law firm in the U.S., visit cck-law.com.

³ No. 22-7028, 2025 WL 799476 (Vet.App. Mar. 13, 2025).

I. Introduction

For veterans navigating the VA disability system, the distinction between new claims and supplemental claims can profoundly affect their retroactive benefits. “Continuous pursuit” of a claim preserves the “effective date” from which backpay will be calculated once a claim is approved.

Under current regulations, a veteran may continuously pursue a previously denied claim by filing a supplemental claim within one year of an unfavorable decision. However, VA has insisted that such supplemental claims be submitted only on a specific form—VA Form 20-0995.

The law firm of Chisholm Chisholm & Kilpatrick challenged this interpretation as overly rigid. The court agreed, holding that a veteran’s timely submission of a TDIU application (VA Form 21-8940), filed within a year of a prior denial, constituted a valid supplemental claim—even though it was not filed on the 20-0995. This clarification not only preserved the veteran’s earlier effective date but also enabled Chisholm Chisholm & Kilpatrick to receive fees for the representation, because attorneys are not permitted to charge fees for assisting with new claims.

II. Legal Background: Continuous Pursuit and the Role of Forms

Under the Appeals Modernization Act (AMA), a veteran may preserve their effective date by “continuously pursuing” a claim through a supplemental claim filed within one year of a decision. This system was designed to streamline appeals while safeguarding veterans’ rights. However, VA’s internal processing standards have sometimes prioritized form over substance.

In particular, VA regulations specify that supplemental claims must be filed on a form “prescribed by the Secretary.” VA has interpreted this

language to mean *only* the 20-0995 form qualifies. This interpretation places form compliance above procedural fairness, undermining the pro-veteran canon of construction traditionally applied in veterans law.

III. Case Facts: *Chisholm v. Collins*

Following a denial of increased ratings for several service-connected conditions, the veteran in this case submitted VA Form 21-8940—an official application for Total Disability based on Individual Unemployability (TDIU)—within one year of the denial. The form clearly referenced the same conditions underlying the denied claims.

Despite the clear continuity, VA treated the TDIU application as a *new* claim rather than a supplemental one. Consequently, it assigned a later effective date—cutting off years of potential retroactive compensation. Moreover, because the agency viewed the filing as a new claim, it denied the attorney's request for fees, asserting that attorneys cannot be compensated for filing initial claims.

The veteran's attorney appealed both the effective date determination and the denial of fees. While the appeal was pending, VA ultimately granted TDIU benefits back to 2013. However, it continued to maintain that the 8940 was not a supplemental claim, seeking to avoid attorney fee liability.

IV. The Court's Ruling: Substance Over Form

The CAVC disagreed with VA's interpretation. It ruled that the TDIU form submitted within one year of the prior denial did in fact qualify as a supplemental claim under 38 C.F.R. § 3.2501. The court emphasized that the regulation requires a claim to be filed on "a form prescribed by the Secretary," but does not restrict that requirement to a *single* form. The 8940, being a prescribed form designed to request increased compensation, met the regulatory standard.

In a key passage, the court warned that VA's formalism "cannot be used as a sword" to deny substantive rights. The veteran's intent was clear, and the timing undisputed. The filing advanced the same claim stream—an essential element in preserving effective dates.

Importantly, the court declined to hold that *all* 8940 forms should be treated as supplemental claims. Instead, it emphasized that each filing must be evaluated in the context of whether it clearly seeks to continue the pursuit of a previously denied issue.

V. Implications for Veterans and Advocates

The decision in *Chisholm v. Collins* carries several important implications:

1. **Effective Date Preservation:** Veterans who submit an appropriate VA form within one year of a denial may still preserve their earlier effective date, even if they use a form other than the 20-0995.
2. **Attorney Compensation:** Attorneys can be compensated for representation that contributes to favorable outcomes on previously denied claims—even if the veteran did not use the precise form VA prefers.
3. **Flexibility in Filing:** The ruling curbs VA's inclination to impose rigid procedural rules not supported by regulation or statute, reinforcing a pro-veteran interpretive standard.

It is critical to note that the decision does not create a blanket rule for all form usage. However, it affirms that VA's form requirements must be interpreted reasonably, and with sensitivity to the broader remedial purpose of veterans benefits law.

VI. Conclusion

Chisholm v. Collins is a clarifying and corrective decision. It reaffirms the principle that veterans law must be administered with fairness, not formalism. By allowing a TDIU application to serve as a valid supplemental claim in the appropriate context, the court restored both justice for the individual veteran and clarity for the broader veterans law community. The decision underscores the importance of assessing substance over form and ensures that regulatory interpretation does not become a barrier to benefits that veterans have rightfully earned.

Please Join or Support ROA

This article is one of 2,000-plus “Law Review” articles available at 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 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 or mail a contribution to: Reserve Organization of America 1 Constitution Ave. NE Washington, DC 20002