

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION IV
No. CA11-1143

DAVID P. HENSON

APPELLANT

V.

NATIONAL TRANSIT STAFFING,
INC., AND CHARTIS INSURANCE
COMPANY

APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered May 2, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS
WORKERS' COMPENSATION
COMMISSION [G006165]

AFFIRMED

DAVID M. GLOVER, Judge

David Henson appeals from the Workers' Compensation Commission's denial of his claims for additional medical care and for temporary-total disability benefits. He sustained compensable injuries to his left shoulder, right hip, right leg, and lower back. He was compensated for treatment from July 20, 2010, through September 10, 2010. He subsequently tried to establish that he had also sustained a compensable injury to his cervical spine, that he was entitled to additional medical treatment for his admittedly compensable injuries, and that he was entitled to temporary total-disability benefits from July 21, 2010, through a date yet to be determined.

Following a hearing on these claims, the ALJ concluded in a well-reasoned decision that Henson had failed to prove 1) that he had sustained a compensable injury to his cervical spine, 2) that he was entitled to additional medical treatment, and 3) that he was



Cite as 2012 Ark. App. 312

entitled to temporary total-disability benefits. The Commission affirmed and adopted the ALJ's decision, and this appeal followed. Henson challenges only the denial of additional medical treatment for his compensable injuries and the denial of temporary total-disability benefits.

Where, as here, the Commission denies claims because of the failure to show entitlement to benefits by a preponderance of the evidence, the substantial-evidence standard of review applicable to workers' compensation cases requires that we affirm if the Commission's opinion displays a substantial basis for denial of relief. *Engle v. Thompson Murray, Inc.*, 96 Ark. App. 200, 239 S.W.3d 561 (2006). Here, the Commission's opinion does display a substantial basis for the denial of Henson's claims. We therefore affirm by memorandum opinion, pursuant to sections (a) and (b), because the Commission's opinion displays a substantial basis for denial of Henson's claims and adequately explains its decision. *See In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985).

Affirmed.

HART and GRUBER, JJ., agree.

Walker, Shock & Harp, PLLC, by: *J. Randolph Shock*, for appellant.

Worley, Wood & Parrish, P.A., by: *Jarrod S. Parrish*, for appellees.