

APPEAL NO. 001673

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing (CCH) was held on June 20, 2000. The issues at the CCH were injury and disability. The hearing officer found that the respondent (claimant herein) suffered a compensable injury on _____, and had disability beginning on February 14, 2000, and continuing through the date of the CCH. The appellant (self-insured herein) files a request for review arguing that the hearing officer's decision was contrary to the evidence. The claimant responds that there was sufficient evidence to support the decision of the hearing officer.

DECISION

Finding sufficient evidence to support the decision of the hearing officer and no reversible error in the record, we affirm the decision and order of the hearing officer.

The hearing officer summarizes the evidence in his decision and we adopt his rendition of the evidence. We will only briefly touch on the evidence germane to the appeal. This includes testimony by the claimant that while working for the self-insured as a nurse, he was working long shifts that required a great deal of walking. The claimant testified that while walking at work on _____, he pivoted his left foot and felt pain in it. There was medical evidence supporting the claimant's contention that he injured his foot on the job as well as contrary medical evidence.

The question of whether an injury occurred is one of fact. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93854, decided November 9, 1993; Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93449, decided July 21, 1993. Section 410.165(a) provides that the contested case hearing officer, as finder of fact, is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence as well as of the weight and credibility that is to be given the evidence. It was for the hearing officer, as trier of fact, to resolve the inconsistencies and conflicts in the evidence. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701, 702 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). This is equally true regarding medical evidence. Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286, 290 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). The trier of fact may believe all, part, or none of the testimony of any witness. Taylor v. Lewis, 553 S.W.2d 153, 161 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Aetna Insurance Co. v. English, 204 S.W.2d 850 (Tex. Civ. App.-Fort Worth 1947, no writ). An appeals level body is not a fact finder and does not normally pass upon the credibility of witnesses or substitute its own judgment for that of the trier of fact, even if the evidence would support a different result. National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania v. Soto, 819 S.W.2d 619, 620 (Tex. App.-El Paso 1991, writ denied). When reviewing a hearing officer's decision for factual sufficiency of the evidence we should reverse such decision only if it is so contrary to the overwhelming weight of the evidence as to be clearly wrong and unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986); Pool v. Ford Motor Co., 715 S.W.2d 629, 635 (Tex. 1986).

A finding of injury may be based upon the testimony of the claimant alone. Houston Independent School District v. Harrison, 744 S.W.2d 298, 299 (Tex. App.-Houston [1st Dist.] 1987, no writ). However, as an interested party, the claimant's testimony only raises an issue of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. Escamilla v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, 499 S.W.2d 758 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1973, no writ). In the present case, the hearing officer found an injury and this was supported by the testimony of the claimant as well as medical evidence. While the self-insured points to contrary medical evidence, it was the province of the hearing officer to resolve the conflicts in the evidence. We also note we have distinguished cases of injury based upon mere walking from those where there is a twisting involved.

Disability is a question of fact to be determined by the hearing officer and may be based on the testimony of the claimant alone. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93560, decided August 19, 1993. Here, the disability determination of the hearing officer was supported by both the testimony of the claimant and the medical evidence.

We affirm the decision and order of the hearing officer.

Gary L. Kilgore
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Tommy W. Lueders
Appeals Judge

CONCUR IN THE RESULT:

Thomas A. Knapp
Appeals Judge