

COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA

Present: Judges Petty, Chafin and Senior Judge Annunziata

MEDELA, INC. AND
ARROWOOD INDEMNITY COMPANY
AS SUCCESSOR IN INTEREST TO
FIRE & CASUALTY INSURANCE
CO. OF CONNECTICUT

v. Record No. 1086-14-4

KELLY ANTEKEIER

MEMORANDUM OPINION*
PER CURIAM
OCTOBER 7, 2014

FROM THE VIRGINIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

(Jessica A. Gorman; Kalbaugh, Pfund & Messersmith, on brief), for appellants.

(James E. Swiger, on brief), for appellee.

Medela, Inc. and Arrowood Indemnity Company, as successor in interest to Fire & Insurance Co. of Connecticut, its insurer, (collectively “employer”) appeal from a May 14, 2014 opinion of the Workers’ Compensation Commission (“commission”). The commission affirmed a deputy commissioner’s opinion finding employer responsible for certain necessary medical treatment causally related to Kelly Antekeier’s December 13, 1999 industrial accident. On appeal, employer contends the commission erred by (1) “affirming that the claimant’s ongoing treatment with trigger point injections, and the requested Botox therapy, is reasonable, necessary, and causally related to the work related accident of December 13, 1999,” (2) “holding that the claimant’s requested total right knee replacement surgery was causally related to the industrial accident,” and (3) “holding that the claimant’s left knee injury and accident which took place on

* Pursuant to Code § 17.1-413, this opinion is not designated for publication.

or about April 21, 2013, is a compensable consequence to the work accident of December 13, 1999.”

Upon reviewing the record and the parties’ briefs, we conclude that this appeal is without merit. Accordingly, we summarily affirm the commission’s decision. Rule 5A:27. We affirm for the reasons stated by the commission in its final opinion. See Antekeier v. Medela, Inc., JCN 2035580 (May 14, 2014). We dispense with oral argument and summarily affirm because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the Court and argument would not aid the decisional process. See Code § 17.1-403; Rule 5A:27.

Affirmed.