

APPEAL NO. 012612
FILED NOVEMBER 27, 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 was held on July 12, 2001. He determined that appellant (claimant) did not sustain an injury while in the course and scope of her employment on _____, or on _____, and that the compensable injury sustained by the claimant on _____, is not a producing cause of her right knee strain or medial meniscus tear after October 29, 2000. Claimant expressed disagreement with this decision and requested that a new decision be rendered finding that, with regard to case number (1), she sustained a compensable injury on _____, or, alternatively, that, with regard to case number (2), the compensable injury sustained in 1997, is a producing cause of the most recent problems with her right knee. Respondent, (carrier A), the carrier on _____, urged affirmance. Carrier A and respondent, (carrier B), who was the carrier on _____, responded that the Appeals Panel should affirm the decision and order. The Appeals Panel remanded the case the sole purpose of compliance with HB2600, amending Section 410.164, effective June 17, 2001, so that a registered agent statement could be obtained from carrier A which contained physical address of a registered agent for service of process in Texas. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 011924, decided September 20, 2001. As explained in Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 011845-S, decided September 11, 2001, the carrier is required to provide a physical address of a registered agent for service of process in Texas. Carrier A filed the registered agent information with a Texas address and the hearing officer issued a decision noting that the registered agent information had been filed. Claimant again appealed, citing the same grounds. Carrier A and carrier B responded that the decision and order should be affirmed.

DECISION

We affirm.

We have reviewed the complained-of determinations in both cases and conclude that the issues presented fact questions for the hearing officer. The hearing officer reviewed the record and decided what facts were established. We conclude that the hearing officer's determinations are not so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

The decision and order of the hearing officer are affirmed.

According to information provided after the remand, the true corporate name of Carrier A is **TRAVELERS INDEMNITY COMPANY OF CONNECTICUT** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**C. T. CORPORATION SYSTEMS
350 N. ST. PAUL STREET
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.**

According to information provided at the hearing, the true corporate name of carrier B is **AMERICAN HOME ASSURANCE 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.**

Judy L. S. Barnes
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Elaine M. Chaney
Appeals Judge

Gary L. Kilgore
Appeals Judge