

APPEAL NO. 041390
FILED AUGUST 3, 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 6, 2004. The hearing officer resolved the disputed issues by determining that the appellant (claimant) reached maximum medical improvement (MMI) on January 10, 2003, with a seven percent impairment rating (IR). The claimant appeals these determinations. The appeal file contains no response from the respondent (carrier).

DECISION

Affirmed.

Sections 408.122(c) and 408.125(c) provide that for injuries that occurred on or after June 17, 2001, where there is a dispute as to the date of MMI and the IR, the report of the Commission-selected designated doctor is entitled to presumptive weight unless it is contrary to the great weight of the other medical evidence. Tex. W.C. Comm'n, 28 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 130.6(i) (Rule 130.6(i)) provides that the designated doctor's response to a request for clarification is also considered to have presumptive weight, as it is part of the designated doctor's opinion. See *also*, Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 013042-s, decided January 17, 2002. Whether the great weight of the other medical evidence was contrary to the designated doctor's opinion was a factual question for the hearing officer to resolve. Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 93459, decided July 15, 1993. Section 410.165(a) provides that the hearing officer, as finder of fact, is the sole judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence as well as of the weight and credibility that is to be given to the evidence. It was for the hearing officer, as trier of fact, to resolve the inconsistencies and conflicts in the evidence. Garza v. Commercial Insurance Company of Newark, New Jersey, 508 S.W.2d 701, 702 (Tex. Civ. App.-Amarillo 1974, no writ). This is equally true regarding medical evidence. Texas Employers Insurance Association v. Campos, 666 S.W.2d 286, 290 (Tex. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1984, no writ). 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 and unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986).

The decision and order of the hearing officer are affirmed.

The true corporate name of the insurance carrier is **TRANSCONTINENTAL 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.**

Chris Cowan
Appeals Judge

CONCUR:

Veronica L. Ruberto
Appeals Judge

Edward Vilano
Appeals Judge