

APPEAL NO. 030341
FILED MARCH 27, 2003

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 January 22, 2003. With respect to the issues before him, the hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) did not sustain a compensable injury on _____, and that he did not have disability because he did not sustain a compensable injury. In his appeal, the claimant argues that the hearing officer's determinations are against the great weight of the evidence. In its response to the claimant's appeal, the respondent (carrier) urges affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant did not sustain a compensable injury on _____. The claimant had the burden of proof on that issue. Johnson v. Employers Reinsurance Corp., 351 S.W.2d 936 (Tex. Civ. App.-Texarkana 1961, no writ). The injury issue presented a question of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence and of its weight and credibility. Section 410.165(a). The hearing officer resolves the conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence and decides what facts the evidence has established. Texas Employers Ins. Ass'n v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). When reviewing a hearing officer's decision we will reverse such decision only if it is so contrary to the overwhelming weight of the evidence as to be clearly wrong and manifestly unjust. Pool v. Ford Motor Co., 715 S.W.2d 629 (Tex. 1986); Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986).

In this instance, there was conflicting evidence on the issue of whether the claimant's polyarthritis was work related. The hearing officer determined that the claimant "failed to prove that [the disease] originated out of his work activities." The hearing officer simply was not persuaded that the claimant sustained his burden of proving the causal connection between his condition and his work. The hearing officer was acting within his province as the fact finder in so finding. Nothing in our review of the record demonstrates that the challenged determination is so against the great weight of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust; therefore, no sound basis exists for us to reverse the injury determination on appeal. Pool, *supra*; Cain, *supra*.

The 1989 Act requires the existence of a compensable injury as a prerequisite to a finding of disability. Section 401.011(16). Because the claimant did not sustain a compensable injury, the hearing officer properly concluded that he did not have disability.

The hearing officer's decision and order are affirmed.

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

**CINDY GHALIBAF
7610 STEMMONS FREEWAY, SUITE 350
DALLAS, TEXAS 75247.**

Elaine M. Chaney
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Robert W. Potts
Appeals Judge

Roy L. Warren
Appeals Judge