

APPEAL NO. 032090
FILED SEPTEMBER 22, 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 July 14, 2003. The hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) is not entitled to supplemental income benefits (SIBs) for the 11th and 12th compensable quarters. The claimant appeals this decision. The respondent (carrier) urges affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

Section 408.142(a) outlines the requirements for SIBs eligibility as follows:

An employee is entitled to [SIBs] if on the expiration of the impairment income benefit [IIBs] period computed under Section 408.121(a)(1) the employee:

- (1) has an impairment rating of 15 percent or more as determined by this subtitle from the compensable injury;
- (2) has not returned to work or has returned to work earning less than 80 percent of the employee's average weekly wage as a direct result of the employee's impairment;
- (3) has not elected to commute a portion of the [IIBs] under Section 408.128; and
- (4) has attempted in good faith to obtain employment commensurate with the employee's ability to work.

Tex. W.C. Comm'n, 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 130.102(d)(4) (Rule 130.102(d)(4)), applicable in this case, 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 determination of 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 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)). The claimant argues that the report of the designated doctor, who was appointed pursuant to Rule 130.110 to determine the claimant's ability to return to work, is entitled to presumptive weight. However, the Texas Workers' Compensation Commission received this report after the 12th quarter qualifying period had ended, and, consequently, the report was not entitled to presumptive weight. See Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 020041-s, decided February 28, 2002. 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 are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **INSURANCE COMPANY OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA** 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:

Michael B. McShane
Appeals Panel
Manager/Judge

Edward Vilano
Appeals Judge