

# ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION IV

No. CA09-197

LORLIE FINLEY

APPELLANT

V.

PERENNIAL HEALTHCARE  
COMMERCE & INDUSTRY INS. CO.  
APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered SEPTEMBER 2, 2009

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION  
[NO. F613829]

AFFIRMED

---

**RITA W. GRUBER, Judge**

Lorlie Finley appeals from the decision of the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission finding that she failed to prove that she was entitled to additional medical treatment and to additional temporary total disability benefits. She contends that the Commission's decision is not supported by substantial evidence. We find no error and affirm.

Appellant was working as a certified nursing assistant for appellee Perennial Healthcare when she sustained an admittedly compensable low-back injury on December 15, 2006, after she slipped and fell while helping a resident take a shower. She was provided workers' compensation benefits, including temporary total disability benefits through February 12, 2007, and medical benefits for medical treatment through December 19, 2007.

Appellant filed a claim with the Commission requesting additional medical treatment and additional temporary total disability benefits. After a hearing, in a lengthy opinion, the Administrative Law Judge explained in detail why he found that appellant had failed to meet

her burden of proof. He denied her request for additional medical treatment from three doctors, finding that they were not authorized treating physicians from December 15, 2006, through February 12, 2007, and that any treatment by them after that date was not causally related to her compensable injury. The ALJ also denied her claim for additional temporary total disability benefits after February 12, 2007, finding that she had reached the end of her healing period on that date. The Commission affirmed the ALJ's decision and adopted all of its findings and conclusions.

When reviewing the sufficiency of the evidence to support a decision of the Workers' Compensation Commission, we view the evidence and all reasonable inferences deducible therefrom in the light most favorable to the Commission's findings and will affirm if the Commission's decision is supported by substantial evidence. *Singleton v. City of Pine Bluff*, 97 Ark. App. 59, 244 S.W.3d 709 (2006). Substantial evidence is such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *Id.* Where, as here, the Commission has denied a claim because of the claimant's failure to meet his burden of proof, the substantial-evidence standard of review requires that we affirm if the Commission's opinion displays a substantial basis for the denial of relief. *Parson v. Ark. Methodist Hosp.*, 103 Ark. App. 178, 287 S.W.3d 645 (2008).

The Commission based its decision on a medical opinion that appellant reached maximum medical improvement as of February 12, 2007, and medical records showing that appellant had suffered from back problems for years before the incident in this case. From our review, we conclude that the Commission's decision more than adequately explains its

Cite as 2009 Ark. App. 555

decision and displays a substantial basis for the denial of relief. *Parson, supra*. Therefore we affirm the Commission's decision by this memorandum opinion pursuant to our per curiam *In re: Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985). *See also* Ark. Sup. Ct. R. 5-2(e).

Affirmed.

ROBBINS and BROWN, JJ., agree.