

APPEAL NO. 011304  
FILED JULY 16, 2001

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 May 15, 2001. With regard to the issues before him, the hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant herein) did not suffer a compensable injury on \_\_\_\_\_, and did not timely report his injury, without good cause for not doing so, relieving the respondent (carrier herein) of liability. The claimant appeals, contending that the evidence is contrary to the decision of the hearing officer. The carrier responds that the decision of the hearing officer is sufficiently supported by the evidence.

#### 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 claimant testified that he injured his back on \_\_\_\_\_, when a stool on which he was trying to sit slipped and he fell to the floor. The claimant contends that he believed his injury was trivial so he did not report it until November 27, 2000. The claimant first sought medical treatment for his injury on November 28, 2000. The claimant was laid off on October 23, 2000. The carrier argued that the claimant's assertion of injury was motivated by the fact that he was laid off.

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. Gee v. Liberty Mutual Fire Insurance Co., 765 S.W.2d 394 (Tex. 1989). 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 no injury contrary to the testimony of the claimant. 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.). We cannot say that the hearing officer was incorrect as a matter of law in finding that the claimant failed to meet this burden.

The 1989 Act generally requires that an injured employee or person acting on the employee's behalf notify the employer of the injury not later than 30 days after the injury occurred. Section 409.001. The 1989 Act provides that a determination by the Texas Workers' Compensation Commission that good cause exists for failure to provide notice of injury to an employer in a timely manner, or actual knowledge of the injury by the employer, can relieve the claimant of the requirement to report the injury. Section 409.002. The burden is on the claimant to prove the existence of notice of injury. Travelers Insurance Company v. Miller, 390 S.W.2d 284 (Tex. Civ. App.-El Paso 1965, no writ). To be effective, notice of injury needs to inform the employer of the general nature of the injury and the fact that it is job related. DeAnda v. Home Ins. Co., 618 S.W.2d 529, 533 (Tex. 1980). Thus, where the employer knew of a physical problem but was not informed it was job related, there was not notice of injury. Texas Employers' Insurance Association v. Mathes, 771 S.W.2d 225 (Tex. App.-El Paso 1989, writ denied). Also, the actual knowledge exception requires actual knowledge of an injury. Fairchild v. Insurance Company of North America, 610 S.W.2d 217, 220 (Tex. Civ. App.-Houston [1st Dist.] 1980, no writ). The burden is on the claimant to prove actual knowledge. Miller v. Texas Employers' Insurance Association, 488 S.W.2d 489 (Tex. Civ. App.-Beaumont 1972, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

We have held that good cause for failure to timely report an injury can be based upon the injured worker not believing the injury is serious and his initial assessment of the injury as being "trivial," but this belief must be based upon a reasonable or ordinarily prudent person standard. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 91030, decided October 30, 1991; Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93184, decided April 29, 1993; Baker v. Westchester Fire Insurance Co., 385 S.W.2d 447 (Tex. Civ. App.-Houston 1964, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Good cause exists for not giving notice until the injured worker realizes the seriousness of his injury. Baker, 385 S.W.2d at 449. However, it is the claimant's burden to prove the existence of good cause for failing to give the employer notice. Aetna Casualty & Surety Company v. Brown, 463 S.W.2d 473 (Tex. Civ. App.-Fort Worth 1971, writ ref'd n.r.e.). While the claimant did testify that he trivialized his injury, the hearing officer found that a person in the same or similar circumstances as the claimant would have reported an injury within 30 days. We cannot say that this fact finding was contrary to the overwhelming evidence.

The decision and order of the hearing officer are affirmed.

---

Gary L. Kilgore  
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

---

Susan M. Kelley  
Appeals Judge

---

Thomas A. Knapp  
Appeals Judge