

APPEAL NO. 032094  
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 (CCH) was held on July 17, 2003. The hearing officer decided that the respondent (claimant) sustained a compensable injury in the form of an occupational disease on \_\_\_\_\_; and that the claimant has had disability resulting from a compensable injury from January 2, 2003, through the date of the CCH. The appellant (carrier) appeals those determinations, mostly on a sufficiency of the evidence basis, contending that the claimant's employment was not sufficiently repetitive to cause a repetitive trauma injury and that the claimant does not have disability. The claimant responds, urging affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The claimant worked as a Department Assistant I at a local community college. She started working as a part-time employee in July 24, 1997, and became full time in March 1, 1999. Her job duties mainly consisted of entering test data through a computer into the school database. The claimant testified that her hands began hurting on \_\_\_\_\_, and she went to the school nurse on that date and was advised to seek medical treatment. The claimant was diagnosed with bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome of her wrists and bilateral cubital tunnel syndrome of her elbows and was removed from work status on January 2, 2003. There was conflicting evidence presented regarding how many hours a day the claimant typed on the computer keyboard. There was considerable testimony from both the claimant and her supervisor regarding the specifics of her job. Whether the claimant's job was sufficiently repetitive to cause the claimed occupational disease and whether she had disability were questions of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. The treating doctor's opinion on causation supports the hearing officer's decision as well as the claimant's testimony. The hearing officer is the fact finder and is the sole judge of the weight and credibility of the evidence. Section 410.165(a). As the fact finder, the hearing officer was charged with the responsibility of determining what facts the evidence has established. Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). The hearing officer was acting within his province as the fact finder in resolving the disputed issues in favor of the claimant. Nothing in our review of the record reveals that the challenged determinations are so against the great weight 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 self-insured is **(SELF-INSURED)** and the name and address of its registered agent for service of process is

**RY  
(ADDRESS)  
(CITY), TEXAS, (ZIP CODE).**

---

Thomas A. Knapp  
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

---

Gary L. Kilgore  
Appeals Judge

---

Robert W. Potts  
Appeals Judge