

APPEAL NO. 033345  
FILED FEBRUARY 9, 2004

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 November 24, 2003. The hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) did not sustain a compensable injury on \_\_\_\_\_, that the claimant did not have disability, and that the respondent (carrier) is relieved of liability under Section 409.002 because the claimant failed to timely report his alleged injury to his employer pursuant to Section 409.001. In his appeal, the claimant essentially argues that those determinations are against the great weight of the evidence. In its response to the claimant's appeal, the carrier urges affirmance.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant did not sustain a compensable injury on \_\_\_\_\_, and that he did not timely report his alleged injury to his employer. The claimant had the burden of proof on the injury and notice issues and they presented questions of fact for the hearing officer to resolve. Johnson v. Employers Reinsurance Corp., 351 S.W.2d 936 (Tex. Civ. App.-Texarkana 1961, no writ). 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). In this instance, the hearing officer simply did not believe the claimant's testimony and evidence tending to demonstrate that he was injured at work as he claimed and that he reported his injury to his employer within the 30-day period provided for doing so in Section 409.001. The hearing officer was acting within her province as the fact finder in so finding. Nothing in our review of the record demonstrates that the hearing officer's injury and notice determinations are 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 those determinations on appeal. Pool v. Ford Motor Co., 715 S.W.2d 629 (Tex. 1986); Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986).

The 1989 Act requires the existence of a compensable injury as a prerequisite to a finding of disability. Section 401.011(16). Because we have affirmed the hearing officer's determination that the claimant did not sustain a compensable injury, we likewise affirm the determination that he did not have disability.

The hearing officer's decision and order are affirmed.

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

**CT CORPORATION SYSTEM  
350 NORTH ST. PAUL STREET  
DALLAS, TEXAS 75201.**

---

Elaine M. Chaney  
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

---

Judy L. S. Barnes  
Appeals Judge

---

Gary L. Kilgore  
Appeals Judge