

APPEAL NO. 022541  
FILED NOVEMBER 14, 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 was held on September 12, 2002. The hearing officer resolved the disputed issue by deciding that the appellant (claimant) was not entitled to supplemental income benefits (SIBs) for the third quarter, from June 17, 2002, to September 15, 2002. The claimant appeals, arguing that the SIBs determination is against the great weight of the evidence. The respondent (carrier) responded, urging affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant did not satisfy the good faith requirement in the qualifying period for the third quarter of SIBs by either demonstrating that he had returned to work in a position relatively equal to his ability to work or by demonstrating that he made a good faith job search in the qualifying period. The hearing officer was not persuaded that the security officer job that the claimant worked during a month of the qualifying period was a position relatively equal to his ability to work such that it satisfied the requirements of Tex. W.C. Comm'n, 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 130.102(d)(1) (Rule 130.102(d)(1)). It was undisputed that the claimant did not look for work in every week of the qualifying period. Nothing in our review of the record reveals that the hearing officer's determination that the claimant did not meet the good faith requirement under either Rule 130.102(d)(1) or 130.102(e) is so against 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 disturb that determination, or the determination that the claimant is not entitled to SIBs for the third quarter, on appeal. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986). Although another fact finder could have drawn different inferences from the evidence in the record, which would have supported a different result, that does not provide a basis for us to disturb his decision on appeal. Salazar, et al. v. Hill, 551 S.W.2d 518 (Tex. Civ. App.-Corpus Christi 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

We affirm the decision and order of the hearing officer.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **CONTINENTAL CASUALTY COMPANY** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**CT CORPORATION  
350 NORTH ST. PAUL STREET  
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Margaret L. Turner  
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gary L. Kilgore  
Appeals Judge

\_\_\_\_\_  
Thomas A. Knapp  
Appeals Judge