

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION III

No. CA09-275

JUDY CAMPBELL

APPELLANT

V.

DEPARTMENT OF WORKFORCE
EDUCATION and PUBLIC EMPLOYEE
CLAIMS DIVISION

APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered November 4, 2009

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS
WORKERS' COMPENSATION
COMMISSION
[NO. F600793]

AFFIRMED

WAYMOND M. BROWN, Judge

By opinion filed January 26, 2009, the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission found that Judy Campbell was not entitled to additional medical treatment or temporary-total-disability compensation for injuries suffered during the course and scope of her employment. She argues that the Commission's opinion is not supported by substantial evidence. Specifically, she contends that the Commission erred in relying on opinions other than those from her treating physicians. The only issue is the sufficiency of the evidence, and the Commission's decision adequately displays a substantial basis for the denial of relief. Accordingly, we affirm by memorandum opinion.

Campbell was involved in a motor-vehicle accident while in the course and scope of her employment with the Department of Workforce Education on January 12, 2006. She claimed



that she sustained injuries to her cervical and lumbar spine. Before the ALJ, the parties disputed the need for additional medical treatment for injuries to Campbell's cervical and lumbar spine as well as additional temporary-total disability. The ALJ awarded additional medical treatment and temporary-total disability, but the Commission reversed and denied benefits. The Commission found that Campbell had suffered a nonoperative surgical strain to her cervical spine, that she suffered no injury to her lumbar spine in the accident, and that none of the surgeries performed were related to her compensable injury. The Commission based its decision on the medical opinions of four doctors. In summary, the doctors concluded (1) that she did not need surgery for the injuries suffered in the motor-vehicle accident, (2) that she was over-medicating herself and exaggerating her symptoms, and (3) that there was no need for additional medical treatment for the injuries suffered in the accident.

Where 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 us to 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). Substantial evidence is evidence that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *Williams v. Prostaff Temps.*, 336 Ark. 510, 988 S.W.2d 1 (1999). From our review, we conclude that the Commission's decision more than adequately explains its 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).

Affirmed.

GRUBER and BAKER, JJ., agree.

Kenneth Buckner, for appellant.

Richard Smith, Public Employee Claims Div., Ark. Ins. Dep't, for appellee.