Cite as 2011 Ark. App. 690

## ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION IV No. CA11-510

Opinion Delivered November 9, 2011

UAMS and PUBLIC EMPLOYEE CLAIMS DIVISION

**APPELLANTS** 

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION [NO. F909423]

V.

LOIS JOHNSON

**APPELLEE** 

**AFFIRMED** 

## WAYMOND M. BROWN, Judge

Appellants, UAMS and its carrier Public Employee Claims Division, appeal the award of benefits to appellee Lois Johnson in her claim regarding a compensable right-shoulder injury that happened on or about June 18, 2009. The administrative law judge (ALJ) found that Johnson failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that she suffered a compensable injury while working for UAMS as an R.N. Johnson appealed to the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission (Commission), which by a two-to-one vote reversed the ALJ's decision. Appellants appeal to this court, contending that the award of benefits is not supported by substantial evidence. We affirm.

In appeals involving claims for workers' compensation, we view the evidence in the light most favorable to the Commission's decision and affirm the decision if it is supported by

## Cite as 2011 Ark. App. 690

substantial evidence.<sup>1</sup> Substantial evidence exists if reasonable minds could reach the Commission's conclusion.<sup>2</sup> The issue is not whether the appellate court might have reached a different result from the Commission; if reasonable minds could reach the result found by the Commission, the appellate court must affirm.<sup>3</sup>

Appellants contend that there was no substantial evidence that Johnson suffered a compensable injury on or about June 18, 2009. Appellants have failed to cite any authority in support of their argument that the Commission erred by finding that Johnson suffered a compensable injury. This court may refuse to consider an argument where appellant fails to cite any legal authority, and the failure to cite authority or make a convincing argument is a sufficient reason for affirmance.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, we affirm.

Affirmed.

HART and GRUBER, JJ., agree.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Galloway v. Tyson Foods, Inc., 2010 Ark. App. 610, 378 S.W.3d 210.

 $<sup>^{2}</sup>Id.$ 

 $<sup>^{3}</sup>Id.$ 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>See Jewell v. Fletcher, 2010 Ark. 195, 377 S.W.3d 176 (citing Middleton v. Lockhart, 344 Ark. 572, 43 S.W.3d 113 (2001)).