

APPEAL NO. 010155

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing was held on January 8, 2001. With regard to the issues before him, the hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) did not sustain a compensable injury on \_\_\_\_\_, and, consequently, the injury did not result in disability or extend to a urological problem.

DECISION

Affirmed.

A "compensable injury" means "an injury that arises out of and in the course and scope of employment for which compensation is payable under this subtitle." Section 401.011(10). The claimant had the burden to prove he was injured in the course and scope of his employment. Reed v. Aetna Casualty & Surety Co., 535 S.W.2d 377 (Tex. Civ. App.-Beaumont 1976, writ ref'd n.r.e.). In the present case, the hearing officer determined that the claimant did not sustain a compensable injury. The hearing officer is the trier of fact and is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence and of the weight and credibility to be given to the evidence. Section 410.165(a). Where there are conflicts in the evidence, the hearing officer resolves the conflicts and determines what facts the evidence has established. The Appeals Panel will not disturb the challenged factual findings of a hearing officer unless they are so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust and we do not find them to be so in this case. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986); In re King's Estate, 150 Tex. 662, 224 S.W.2d 660 (1951).

The decision and order of the hearing officer are affirmed.

---

Gary L. Kilgore  
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

---

Philip F. O'Neill  
Appeals Judge

---

Robert W. Potts  
Appeals Judge