

APPEAL NO. 012403
FILED NOVEMBER 27, 2001

This case returns following our remand in Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 011586, decided August 16, 2001, where we remanded the case for the required carrier information. That information was placed in the record and forwarded to the respondent (claimant). No hearing on remand was held, and the hearing officer issued a decision that only detailed the hearing officer's efforts to comply with the remand and to include the required carrier information in the record. Thus, it is apparent that the hearing officer intended to reissue her prior decision and order without modification. The hearing officer determined that the claimant sustained an injury to his bilateral shoulders and low back in addition to his neck and head on _____. The appellant (carrier) appeals that determination on sufficiency grounds. The appeal file does not contain a response from the claimant.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant sustained compensable injuries to his bilateral shoulders and low back in addition to his neck and head on _____. That issue presented a question of fact for the hearing officer. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence. Section 410.165(a); Texas Employers Ins. Ass'n v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). There was conflicting evidence on the issue of whether the claimant injured both shoulders and his low back in the compensable motor vehicle accident of _____. It was for the hearing officer, as the trier of fact, to resolve the conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence and to determine what facts had been established. Garza v. Commercial Ins. Co., 508 S.W.2d 701 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). Sufficient evidence supports the challenged determination and nothing in our review of the record reveals that the hearing officer's extent-of-injury determination is so contrary to the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. As such, no sound basis exists for us to reverse that determination on appeal. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

The hearing officer's decision and order are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY
800 BRAZOS, SUITE 750
COMMODORE 1
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701.**

Elaine M. Chaney
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Gary L. Kilgore
Appeals Judge

Michael B. McShane
Appeals Judge