

APPEAL NO. 012429  
FILED NOVEMBER 14, 2001

This case returns following our remand in Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 011664, decided August 29, 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's decision and order was reissued without modification. The hearing officer determined that the claimant sustained a compensable injury to her left shoulder on \_\_\_\_\_, and that she had resultant disability from June 6 to June 27, 2000. The appellant (self-insured) appeals both determinations on sufficiency grounds. The claimant responds and urges affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant sustained a compensable injury on \_\_\_\_\_, and that she had disability from June 6 to June 27, 2000. Those issues presented questions 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 sustained a compensable injury and whether she had disability. 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 hearing officer's determination that the claimant sustained a compensable injury at work on \_\_\_\_\_, and that she had disability from June 6 to June 27, 2000, specifically the claimant's testimony and the medical records from her treating doctor. Nothing in our review of the record reveals that the injury and disability determinations are 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 the challenged determinations 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 self-insured is **(SELF-INSURED)** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

---

Elaine M. Chaney  
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

---

Michael B. McShane  
Appeals Judge

---

Robert W. Potts  
Appeals Judge