

Cite as 2011 Ark. App. 741

## ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION I **No.** CA 11–645

Opinion Delivered November 30, 2011

KITCHEN DISTRIBUTORS & FIRSTCOMP INSURANCE COMPANY

**APPELLANTS** 

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION [NO. G002335]

V.

CHARLES GREENLEE

**APPELLEE** 

**AFFIRMED** 

## WAYMOND M. BROWN, Judge

This appeal arises from an April 22, 2011 decision by the Workers' Compensation Commission that the appellee, Charles Greenlee, is entitled to additional medical treatment and temporary total disability benefits for compensable injuries he sustained in a work-related accident on March 12, 2010. We find no error and affirm by memorandum opinion. 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



## Cite as 2011 Ark. App. 741

(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.<sup>1</sup>

This case falls squarely within categories (a) and (b). The ALJ authored an opinion that fully and adequately explains the basis for its decision, and the record contains a substantial quantum of evidence to support the award of benefits. The ALJ's decision, including all findings of fact and conclusions of law, was adopted by the full Commission, which has the duty of weighing and resolving conflicting medical evidence and determining the credibility of witnesses.<sup>2</sup> As substantial evidence supports the decision of the Commission, we affirm.

Affirmed.

WYNNE and ABRAMSON, JJ., agree.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>In re Memorandum Opinions, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985) (per curiam).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>See, e.g., Jeter v. B.R. McGinty Mechanical, 62 Ark. App. 53, 968 S.W.2d 645 (1998).