

APPEAL NO. 021127
FILED JUNE 6, 2002

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). A contested case hearing began on April 3, 2002, with (hearing officer) presiding as hearing officer, and continued on April 5, 2002. The hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) did not sustain a compensable injury on _____, and did not have disability. The claimant appeals, arguing that the evidence was sufficient to meet his burden of proof. The respondent (carrier) replies, urging affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

Whether the claimant sustained a compensable injury and had disability are factual questions for the hearing officer to resolve. The hearing officer, as finder of fact, is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence as well as the weight and credibility that is to be given to the evidence. Section 410.165(a). It is for the hearing officer to resolve the inconsistencies and conflicts in the evidence. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). 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. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986). We have reviewed the matters complained of on appeal and conclude that the hearing officer's decision is supported by sufficient evidence.

We affirm the decision and order of the hearing officer.

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

**MR. RUSSELL R. OLIVER, PRESIDENT
221 WEST 6TH STREET
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78701.**

Michael B. McShane
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Thomas A. Knapp
Appeals Judge

Philip F. O'Neill
Appeals Judge