

APPEAL NO. 041367  
FILED JULY 27, 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 May 5, 2004, and May 12, 2004. With respect to the issues before her, the hearing officer determined that the respondent (claimant) sustained a compensable injury on \_\_\_\_\_, and that he had disability from September 19 through December 21, 2003. In its appeal, the appellant (carrier) argues that those determinations are against the great weight of the evidence. The appeal file does not contain a response to the carrier's appeal from the claimant.

DECISION

Affirmed.

The hearing officer did not err in determining that the claimant sustained a compensable injury on \_\_\_\_\_, and that he had disability from September 19 through December 21, 2003. Those issues presented questions 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). As the trier of fact, 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). The hearing officer was persuaded that the claimant sustained his burden of proof on both the injury and disability issues. The factors emphasized by the carrier in challenging those determinations on appeal are the same factors it emphasized at the hearing. The significance, if any, of those factors was a matter for the hearing officer in resolving the issue before her. Nothing in our review of the record reveals that the challenged determinations are so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Accordingly, no sound basis exists for us to reverse the injury and disability determinations on appeal. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175 (Tex. 1986). This is so even though another fact finder may well have drawn different inferences from the evidence and reached a different result. Salazar v. Hill, 551 S.W.2d 518 (Tex. Civ. App.-Corpus Christi 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.).

The hearing officer's decision and order are 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.**

---

Elaine M. Chaney  
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

---

Chris Cowan  
Appeals Judge

---

Gary L. Kilgore  
Appeals Judge