

Cite as 2010 Ark. App. 837

**ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS**

DIVISION III

No. CA10-769

CARL E. FELTUS

APPELLANT

V.

MAVERICK TUBE, LLC and  
CONSTITUTION STATE SERVICES

APPELLEES

**Opinion Delivered** December 15, 2010APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION  
[No. F902129]

AFFIRMED

**LARRY D. VAUGHT, Chief Judge**

Appellant Carl Feltus appeals from a decision of the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission denying and dismissing his claim for benefits following an alleged gradual-onset, carpal-tunnel injury incurred as a result of "repetitive hammering" during his employment with appellee Maverick Tube Corporation. Specifically, Feltus argues that the Commission's opinion was not supported by substantial evidence. We affirm by memorandum opinion. *See In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985).

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

Cite as 2010 Ark. App. 837

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.

This case falls squarely within category (b). The Commission authored a well-reasoned opinion, and the record contains a substantial quantum of evidence to support the denial of benefits. We are particularly satisfied with the Commission's reasoning that if one considers "the fact that [Feltus] was terminated by [Maverick] and did not report any problems until five months after the termination, even though he testified to the fact that he was having problems while working for [Maverick], we cannot conclude his problems are work related."

We therefore affirm by memorandum opinion pursuant to section (b) of our per curiam, *In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985).

Affirmed.

HART and GLOVER, JJ., agree.