

APPEAL NO. 030345
FILED MARCH 20, 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 16, 2003. The hearing officer determined that the respondent (claimant) sustained a compensable injury on _____, and had resulting disability from June 26 through October 1, 2002. The appellant (carrier) appeals these determinations and asserts that the hearing officer erred in excluding two of its exhibits. The claimant urges affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

Regarding the exclusion of Carrier's Exhibit Nos. 10 and 11 for lack of timely exchange, we have frequently held that to obtain reversal of a judgment based upon the hearing officer's abuse of discretion in the admission or exclusion of evidence, an appellant must first show that the admission or exclusion was in fact an abuse of discretion, and also that the error was reasonably calculated to cause and probably did cause the rendition of an improper judgment. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 92241, decided July 24, 1992; see *also Hernandez v. Hernandez*, 611 S.W.2d 732 (Tex. Civ. App.-San Antonio 1981, no writ). It has also been held that reversible error is not ordinarily shown in connection with rulings on questions of evidence unless the whole case turns on the particular evidence admitted or excluded. *Atlantic Mut. Ins. Co. v. Middleman*, 661 S.W.2d 182 (Tex. App.-San Antonio 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.). We find no abuse of discretion in the hearing officer's application of the exchange of evidence rules. Furthermore, we note that the excluded exhibits, consisting of a peer review report and curriculum vitae of the doctor who prepared the report, would not have necessitated the rendition of a different decision had they been admitted by the hearing officer.

Whether the claimant sustained a compensable injury and had disability were factual questions for the hearing officer to resolve. Injury and disability determinations can be established by the claimant's testimony alone, if believed by the hearing officer. *Gee v. Liberty Mut. Fire Ins. Co.*, 765 S.W.2d 394 (Tex. 1989). The hearing officer is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence. Section 410.165(a). As the finder of fact, the hearing officer resolves the conflicts in the evidence and determines what facts have been established from the evidence presented. 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 or manifestly unjust. *Cain v. Bain*, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

The hearing officer's decision and order is affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier 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.**

Chris Cowan
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Thomas A. Knapp
Appeals Judge

Edward Vilano
Appeals Judge