

ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION I  
No. CA 12-193

KEITH R. CROSBY

APPELLANT

V.

EATON CORPORATION, OLD  
REPUBLIC INSURANCE COMPANY,  
and DEATH & PERMANENT TOTAL  
DISABILITY TRUST FUND

APPELLEES

**Opinion Delivered** OCTOBER 10, 2012

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION, [NO. F505960]

**AFFIRMED**

---

**JOHN B. ROBBINS, Judge**

Appellant Keith Crosby appeals the denial of additional benefits for an admittedly compensable low-back injury he sustained on April 24, 2005, at work for appellee Eaton Corporation. On that date, Crosby was working in the shipping and handling area when he was pinned between heavy machinery and a concrete wall. An MRI showed bulging at three lumbar levels, a small herniation at L3-4, and degenerative changes at L4-5 and L5-S1. Crosby received conservative treatment from authorized treating physicians through March 2006. Crosby later filed a claim seeking (1) additional medical benefits to pay for treatment with Drs. Briggs and Lennard, (2) a permanent partial impairment rating and wage-loss benefits, and (3) a declaration that he is permanently and totally disabled. Crosby did not prevail before the administrative law judge (ALJ) or on de novo review before the Workers' Compensation Commission, which affirmed and adopted the ALJ's decision. Crosby appeals

to our court, contending that there is no substantial basis for the denial of relief on his claims for these additional benefits. We disagree and affirm.

We review decisions of the Workers' Compensation Commission to determine whether there is substantial evidence to support it. *Rice v. Georgia-Pacific Corp.*, 72 Ark. App. 149, 35 S.W.3d 328 (2000). We review the evidence and all reasonable inferences deducible therefrom in the light most favorable to the Commission's findings. *Geo Specialty Chem., Inc. v. Clingan*, 69 Ark. App. 369, 13 S.W.3d 218 (2000). It is the Commission's province to weigh the evidence and determine what is most credible. *Minn. Mining & Mfg. v. Baker*, 337 Ark. 94, 989 S.W.2d 151 (1999); *Buford v. Standard Gravel Co.*, 68 Ark. App. 162, 5 S.W.3d 478 (1999). The issue on appeal is not whether we would have reached a different result or whether the evidence would have supported a contrary conclusion; we will affirm if reasonable minds could reach the Commission's conclusion. *Sharp Cnty. Sheriff's Dep't v. Ozark Acres Improvement Dist.*, 75 Ark. App. 250, 57 S.W.3d 764 (2001).

Here, the findings of fact and conclusions of law contained in the forty-three page opinion issued by the ALJ, which was affirmed and adopted by the Commission, adequately explain the decision to deny appellant these additional benefits. We have determined that the ALJ's decision is in fact supported by substantial evidence. We, therefore, affirm by memorandum opinion pursuant to sections (a) and (b) of *In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985).

Affirmed.

PITTMAN and GLADWIN, JJ., agree.

*Frederick S. "Rick" Spencer*, for appellant.

*Frye Law Firm, P.A.*, by: *William C. Frye*, for appellees.