

Cite as 2010 Ark. App. 568

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALSDIVISION II
No. CA10-200PULASKI COUNTY SPECIAL
SCHOOL DISTRICT & RISK
MANAGEMENT RESOURCES
APPELLANTS

V.

CAROLYN JACKSON & SECOND
INJURY FUND
APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered September 1, 2010

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS
WORKERS' COMPENSATION
COMMISSION [F704526]

AFFIRMED

DAVID M. GLOVER, Judge

Appellee, Carolyn Jackson, suffered a compensable injury to her right lower extremity after falling at work. There is no issue with respect to her right-leg injuries. However, she also sought benefits for injuries to her left lower extremity, which she claimed arose from the same fall. Appellants, Pulaski County Special School District and Risk Management Resources, took the position that any problems with appellee's left leg were not caused by the fall at work and denied her claim. Following a hearing, the Administrative Law Judge concluded that appellee had proven compensability of her left-leg injuries and awarded medical benefits and a seven-percent impairment rating for a scheduled injury to the left knee. The ALJ's opinion was affirmed and adopted by the Commission, and this appeal followed. We affirm the Commission by memorandum opinion. See *In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985).

Cite as 2010 Ark. App. 568

Appellants contend that the Commission's decision is not supported by substantial evidence, arguing that appellee failed to report a left-knee injury to her employer; that she failed to mention any work-related left-knee problem to a treating physician for over a year after her fall; that the orthopedist did not state that the objective findings concerning the left knee were associated with the work injury nor that the impairment rating was due to the fall; that the orthopedist was not informed that appellee had prior left-knee complaints and treatment; and, that at the time of the hearing, appellee's only complaints were about her feet and ankles, not her left knee.

Memorandum opinions may be issued in any or all of the following cases:

- (a) Where the only substantial question involved is the sufficiency of the evidence;
- (b) Where the opinion, or findings of fact and conclusions of law, of the trial court or agency adequately explain the decision and we affirm;
- (c) Where the trial court or agency does not abuse its discretion and that is the only substantial issue involved; and
- (d) Where the disposition of the appeal is clearly controlled by a prior holding of this court or the Arkansas Supreme Court and we do not find that our holding should be changed or that the case should be certified to the supreme court.

In re Memorandum Opinions, supra. The case at bar fits within the first two categories. The only issue before us involves the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the Commission's decision, and the Commission has adequately explained its decision. We therefore issue this memorandum opinion, holding that the Commission's decision is supported by substantial evidence and is therefore affirmed.

Cite as 2010 Ark. App. 568

Affirmed.

HART and HENRY, JJ., agree.