

## ARKANSAS COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION II  
No. CA09-877

VERONICA MURRAY

APPELLANT

V.

STANT MANUFACTURING  
GALLAGHER BASSETT SERVICES

APPELLEES

**Opinion Delivered** APRIL 7, 2010

APPEAL FROM THE ARKANSAS  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION  
COMMISSION  
[NO. F608616]

AFFIRMED

---

**ROBERT J. GLADWIN, Judge**

Appellant Veronica Murray appeals a decision of the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission finding that she is not entitled to additional medical treatment. For reversal, appellant contends that the Commission erred in finding that additional medical services were not reasonable and necessary for the treatment of her compensable injury. Substantial evidence supports the Commission's decision; therefore, we affirm.

In reviewing decisions from the Commission, we view the evidence and all reasonable inferences deducible therefrom in the light most favorable to the Commission's findings, and we affirm if the decision is supported by substantial evidence. *Whitlach v. Southland Land & Dev.*, 84 Ark. App. 399, 141 S.W.3d 916 (2004). Substantial evidence is that relevant evidence that reasonable minds might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. *K II Constr. Co. v. Crabtree*, 78 Ark. App. 222, 79 S.W.3d 414 (2002). The issue is not whether we might

have reached a different result or whether the evidence would have supported a contrary finding; if reasonable minds could reach the Commission's conclusion, we must affirm its decision. *Geo Specialty Chem., Inc. v. Clingan*, 69 Ark. App. 369, 13 S.W.3d 218 (2000).

Arkansas Code Annotated section 11-9-508(a) (Supp. 2009) requires an employer to provide an injured employee such medical services "as may be reasonably necessary in connection with the injury received by the employee." The employee has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that medical treatment is reasonable and necessary. *Stone v. Dollar Gen. Stores*, 91 Ark. App. 260, 209 S.W.3d 445 (2005). What constitutes reasonable and necessary medical treatment is a question of fact to be determined by the Commission. *Bohannon v. Walmart Stores, Inc.*, 102 Ark. App. 37, 279 S.W.3d 502 (2008).

Because the only question on appeal is the sufficiency of the evidence and because the Commission's opinion adequately explains the decision, we affirm by memorandum opinion. *In re Memorandum Opinions*, 16 Ark. App. 301, 700 S.W.2d 63 (1985).

Affirmed.

KINARD and GLOVER, JJ., agree.