

**ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS**DIVISION I  
No. CA11-1309

DANIEL MURPHY

APPELLANT

V.

WEATHERFORD INTERNATIONAL  
and CHARTIS CLAIMS, INC.

APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered May 9, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION  
[No. F908673]

AFFIRMED

**LARRY D. VAUGHT, Chief Judge**

Appellant Daniel Murphy appeals from the September 15, 2011 decision of the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission finding that he failed to prove that he suffered a compensable back injury during the course of his employment with appellee Weatherford International. Specifically, he argues that the Commission's decision is not supported by substantial evidence. We find no error and issue this memorandum opinion affirming the Commission's decision. *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 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.* at 302, 700 S.W.2d at 63.

This case falls squarely within categories (a) and (b). The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) authored an opinion that fully and adequately explains the basis for its decision. The ALJ's decision, including all findings of fact and conclusions of law, was adopted by the Commission, which has the duty of weighing and resolving conflicting medical evidence and determining the credibility of witnesses. *Kitchen Distribs. v. Greenlee*, 2011 Ark. App. 741, at 2.

Further, the record contains a substantial quantum of evidence to support the denial of benefits. The medical records show instances where Murphy sought medical treatment for the purported injury, yet did not attribute his injury to a specific incident identifiable by the time and place of occurrence. Murphy testified that the pain began twenty minutes *after* the heavy lifting and none of his peers remembered any specific injury or claims of pain resulting therefrom. In fact, Murphy's supervisor testified that—based on how Murphy reported the injury—it was treated as a non-work-related injury using the company's Americans with Disability Act procedures.

It is the Commission's duty, not ours, to make credibility determinations, to weigh the evidence, and to resolve conflicts in the medical testimony and evidence. *Martin Charcoal, Inc. v. Britt*, 102 Ark. App. 252, 284 S.W.3d 91 (2008). We therefore affirm the Commission's decision by memorandum opinion pursuant to sections (a) and (b) of our per curiam, *In re*

*Memorandum Opinions, supra.*

Affirmed.

GLADWIN and WYNNE, JJ., agree.