

APPEAL NO. 022723
FILED DECEMBER 18, 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 October 4, 2002. The hearing officer determined that the respondent (claimant) is entitled to supplemental income benefits (SIBs) for the 22nd compensable quarter. The appellant (carrier) contends that this decision is incorrect as a matter of law and against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence. The appeal file contains no response from the claimant.

DECISION

Affirmed.

Section 408.142(a) and Tex. W.C. Comm'n, 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 130.102 (Rule 130.102) provide that an injured employee who has an impairment rating of 15% or greater and who has not commuted any impairment income benefits is entitled to SIBs if, during the qualifying period, the claimant has earned less than 80% of the employee's preinjury wage as a direct result of the impairment from the compensable injury and has made a good faith effort to obtain employment commensurate with the employee's ability to work. Rule 130.102(d)(4) states that the "good faith" criterion will be met if the employee:

has been unable to perform any type of work in any capacity, has provided a narrative report from a doctor which specifically explains how the injury causes a total inability to work, and no other records show that the injured employee is able to return to work[.]

Whether the claimant satisfied the good faith criterion for SIBs entitlement was a factual question for the hearing officer. Section 410.165(a) provides that the contested case hearing officer, as finder of fact, is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence as well as of the weight and credibility that is to be given the evidence. It was for the hearing officer, as trier of fact, to resolve the inconsistencies and conflicts in the evidence. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701, 702 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). The reports of Dr. P support the hearing officer's determination that the functional capacity evaluation performed in November 2001, does not constitute a record showing that the claimant had an ability to work during the qualifying period in question. Additionally, Dr. P's commentary on the claimant's recent medical condition and his inability to work are consistent with the medical opinions found in the narratives that the hearing officer relied upon in determining that the claimant is entitled to SIBs. Nothing in our review of the record indicates that the hearing officer's decision is so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong and unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986).

The decision and order of the hearing is affirmed.

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

Chris Cowan
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Elaine M. Chaney
Appeals Judge

Susan M. Kelley
Appeals Judge