

**ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS**

DIVISION IV  
No. CV-13-742

MARY RECTOR

APPELLANT

V.

HEALTHSOUTH and ESIS, INC.

APPELLEES

Opinion Delivered February 19, 2014

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION  
[NO. G107720]

AFFIRMED

---

**RHONDA K. WOOD, Judge**

Appellant, Mary Rector, appeals from an Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission decision denying her claim for additional medical treatment for her compensable lower-back injury. The Commission found that Rector did not meet her burden of proof. Rector argues that substantial evidence does not support the Commission's finding. We disagree and affirm.

On appeal, we review the evidence in the light most favorable to the Commission's findings and affirm if those findings are supported by substantial evidence. *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Brown*, 82 Ark. App. 600, 120 S.W.3d 153 (2003). Substantial evidence is relevant evidence that a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *Id.* The issue is not whether we might have reached a different result than the Commission, but whether reasonable minds could reach the Commission's decision. *Pulaski Cnty. Special*

*Sch. Dist. v. Tenner*, 2013 Ark. App. 569. The Commission determines the credibility of the witnesses, the weight to be given their testimony, and resolves conflicting medical evidence. *Richardson Waste, Inc. v. Corcoran*, 2010 Ark. App. 816, 379 S.W.3d 77.

We may issue memorandum opinions in any or all of the following cases:

- (a) Where the only substantial question involved is the sufficiency of the evidence;
- (b) Where the opinion, or findings of fact and conclusions of law, of the trial court or agency adequately explain the decision and we affirm;
- (c) Where the trial court or agency does not abuse its discretion and that is the only substantial issue involved; and
- (d) Where the disposition of the appeal is clearly controlled by a prior holding of this court or the Arkansas Supreme Court and we do not find that our holding should be changed or that the case should be certified to the supreme court.

*In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985). The only issue in this appeal is whether substantial evidence supports the Commission's decision. Further, the Commission's opinion, adopting the administrative law judge's findings, adequately explains the basis for denying Rector's claim. We therefore affirm by memorandum opinion.

Affirmed.

HARRISON and WHITEAKER, JJ., agree.

*Walker, Shock & Harp, PLLC*, by: *Eddie H. Walker, Jr.*, for appellant.

*Mayton, Newkirk & Jones*, by: *David C. Jones*, for appellees.