

APPEAL NO. 030659
FILED APRIL 30, 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 31, 2003. The hearing officer decided that the appellant's (claimant) horseplay was a producing cause of the claimed injury he sustained on _____, and, therefore, the respondent (carrier) is relieved of liability for compensation. The claimant appealed, submitting new evidence that horseplay did not occur, and the carrier responded, urging that the new evidence not be considered and the hearing officer's determinations be affirmed.

DECISION

Affirmed.

We first address the documents attached to the claimant's appeal, which were not admitted in evidence at the hearing. Documents submitted for the first time on appeal are generally not considered unless they constitute newly discovered evidence. See generally Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93111, decided March 29, 1993; Black v. Wills, 758 S.W.2d 809 (Tex. App.-Dallas 1988, no writ). In determining whether new evidence submitted with an appeal requires remand for further consideration, the Appeals Panel considers whether the evidence came to the knowledge of the party after the hearing, whether it is cumulative of other evidence of record, whether it was not offered at the hearing due to a lack of diligence, and whether it is so material that it would probably result in a different decision. See Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93536, decided August 12, 1993. Upon our review, we cannot agree that the evidence meets the requirements of newly discovered evidence, in that the claimant did not show that the new evidence submitted for the first time on appeal could not have been obtained prior to the hearing or that its inclusion in the record would probably result in a different decision. The evidence, therefore, does not meet the standard for newly discovered evidence and will not be considered on appeal.

The hearing officer did not err in making the complained-of determinations. The horseplay determination involved a question of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. The hearing officer is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence (Section 410.165(a)) and, as the trier of fact, resolves the conflicts and inconsistencies in the evidence including the medical evidence. Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). In view of the evidence presented, we cannot conclude that the hearing officer's determinations 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). Because the claimed injury is not compensable, the hearing officer correctly determined that the claimant did not have disability. Section 410.011(16).

We affirm the decision and order of the hearing officer.

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

**JOSEPH KELLEY-GRAY, PRESIDENT
6907 CAPITOL OF TEXAS HIGHWAY NORTH
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78755.**

Edward Vilano
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Gary L. Kilgore
Appeals Judge

Roy L. Warren
Appeals Judge