

Cite as 2010 Ark. App. 800

**ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS**DIVISION IV  
No. CA10-464ELIZABETH DANIELS  
APPELLANT  
V.LITTLE ROCK SCHOOL DISTRICT &  
ARKANSAS MUNICIPAL LEAGUE  
APPELLEES**Opinion Delivered** December 1, 2010APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION [F700216]

AFFIRMED

**DAVID M. GLOVER, Judge**

Appellant, Elizabeth Daniels, suffered a compensable injury on December 15, 2006, while working as a bus driver for appellee, Little Rock School District, and for which she received benefits. However, she later sought additional medical treatment and temporary-total disability benefits for her neck, which LRSD denied. Following a hearing, the ALJ concluded that she had failed to establish that her herniated C4-5 disc was causally related to the injuries she sustained when she fell from her bus on December 15, 2006, and consequently, that she was not entitled to additional medical treatment or an additional period of temporary-total disability. Daniels appealed to the full Commission, which affirmed and adopted the ALJ's findings of fact and conclusions of law. 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. 800

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.

*Id.*

This case falls within two of these categories, (a) and (b). Appellant's sole point of appeal challenges the Commission's conclusion that she did not prove a causal connection between her original injury and her subsequent need for additional treatment, including surgery, focusing her argument as follows: "[T]he Commission disregarded the only medical opinion discussing causation, along with all medical evidence thereto, that substantial evidence does not support the Commission's opinion, and therefore it must be reversed." To the contrary, in a well-developed, well-reasoned, and well-supported opinion, which was affirmed and adopted by the Commission, the ALJ addressed the medical opinion relied upon by appellant and explained why he gave it no weight. We find that the Commission's decision displays a substantial basis for the denial of relief and that its opinion adequately explains its decision to deny benefits. We therefore affirm.

Affirmed.

PITTMAN and GRUBER, JJ., agree.