

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

CLAIM NO. F706057

PAMELA MUMPHREY	CLAIMANT
RHEEM MANUFACTURING CO.	RESPONDENT
OLD REPUBLIC INS. CO. INSURANCE CARRIER	RESPONDENT

OPINION FILED DECEMBER 27, 2007

Hearing before ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE ELIZABETH DANIELSON in Fort Smith, Sebastian County, Arkansas.

Claimant represented by EDDIE H. WALKER, JR., Attorney, Fort Smith, Arkansas.

Respondent represented by DIANE GRAHAM, Attorney, Fort Smith, Arkansas.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A hearing was held on November 15, 2007, in Fort Smith, Arkansas.

A pre-hearing conference was held in this claim, and as a result a pre-hearing order was entered in the claim on September 5, 2007. This pre-hearing order set forth the stipulations offered by the parties, the issues to litigate and the contentions thereto.

The following stipulations were submitted by the parties and are hereby accepted:

1. The Arkansas workers' Compensation Commission has jurisdiction of this claim.

2. On May 18, 2007, the relationship of employee-employer-carrier existed between the parties.

3. The claimant is entitled to a compensation rate of \$407 for temporary total disability and \$305 for permanent partial disability.

By agreement of the parties the issues to litigate are limited to the following:

1. Compensability of the claimant's injury to her low back on May 18, 2007.
2. Claimant's entitlement to related medical.
3. Temporary total disability from May 23, 2007, to a date to be determined.
4. Attorney's fees.
5. Lack of notice until June 7, 2007.
6. Respondents right to a credit pursuant to Ark. Code Ann. §11-9-411 as an alternative issue if claim is found to be compensable.

In regard to the foregoing issues the claimant contends that she sustained an injury on or about May 18, 2007, arising out of and in the course of her employment. The claimant contends that she is entitled to temporary total disability benefits from May 23, 2007, until a date yet to be determined and reasonably necessary medical treatment. The claimant contends that her attorney is entitled to an appropriate attorney's fee.

In regard to the foregoing issues the respondents contend that the claimant did not sustain work related injuries in August 2005 and May 18, 2007. Claimant first reported these alleged injuries to the employer on June 7, 2007. She filled out a Form N on June 7, 2007, describing the cause of injury. According to claimant's family doctor, Dr. Dillard, she has been treating claimant for low back pain and right leg pain since 2003. An MRI ordered in July

2005 revealed a small herniated disc. Respondents raise the defenses of lack of notice and statute of limitations. Respondents contend that claimant's condition is not the result of injuries at Rheem and is not the major cause of the need for treatment or disability. Alternatively, respondents contend that claimant sustained a subsequent injury off the job (a motor vehicle accident) on June 14, 2007, which has caused her present condition and need for treatment thereafter. Further, claimant has received short term disability benefits from Rheem since May 23, 2007, and Rheem's group health insurance carrier has paid for medical treatment. Respondents claim a credit, therefore, in the event that becomes applicable. Respondents will supplement this response after obtaining relevant medical records.

The documentary evidence submitted in this matter consists of the Commission's pre-hearing ordered marked Commission's Exhibit No. 1. The claimant submitted medical records marked Claimant's Exhibit No. 1 and Claimant's Exhibit No. 2. The respondents submitted medical records marked Respondents' Exhibit No. 1 and non medical marked Respondents' Exhibit No. 2. All these exhibits were admitted without objection.

It was agreed at the hearing that the record would be left open for the deposition of Ashley Owens within a thirty-day period of time. By letter dated November 19, 2007, which is in the file the respondents notified the Commission that the evidentiary deposition of Ms. Owens would not be necessary.

## DISCUSSION

The claimant testified that on May 18, 2007, she had come to work for the respondent at 2:00. The claimant stated that she started work on press 93 and worked on this press until shortly after her first break which was a little before 6:00. The claimant testified that a little before 6:00 she began working on press 20 and that press 20 makes large parts. The claimant stated that she continued to work on press 20 until the end of her shift at 10:30. The claimant testified that the parts made on press 20 are a little bit shorter than six feet and would weigh approximately eight to nine pounds each. The claimant testified that she and another employee would lift the part up, turn them to the side, and then place them in a stack on a big pallet. The claimant estimated that approximately fifty-two parts would go on a pallet and once the pallet is full they would then have to wrap it in plastic wrap. The claimant guesstimated that she would handle approximately one hundred parts per hour. The claimant testified that once the pallet is full and wrapped the forklift driver is called and he comes and brings another pallet. The claimant agreed that during the wrapping process stretching and reaching is required. The claimant testified that it is her opinion that the constant lifting that she was having to do and the repetitive nature of her work has caused her back problems. The claimant testified that she also had to make sure the parts were laying on the die secure because if they were not they would mess up. The claimant explained that once the part is on the gage she would have to come back and hit the

button to make the machine go down to form the part. The claimant testified that once the part is formed you have to go back and bring the part up, making sure it does not hit the die and put any scratches on the part. The claimant testified then she and the other employee would flip the part over, put it on the pallet, and they did this continuously. The claimant stated that the work is hard on her body because she was always having to turn it, flip it, and she was always moving back and forth to wrap the pallet which is repetitive. The claimant testified that she also had to do the stretching during the wrapping and she had to be fast because the respondent wanted so many an hour. The claimant agreed that the respondent has a production rate which is expected to be met.

The claimant testified that she has different jobs every day and again testified that on May 18, 2007, she began her shift working on press 93. The claimant testified that this press makes smaller parts. The claimant testified that these parts were so small she could pick it up with one hand but it had four different steps in its process. The claimant testified that she would pick the part up off one die, put it on another die, then take it to the third die, and then to a fourth die before it was put in a stack. The claimant testified that this was a much lighter job.

The claimant testified that it was around her lunch break which was at 7:30 that she noticed that her back was sore and when she returned to her job after her break her back just continued to get worse. The claimant remembers that this was on a Friday and at the end of her shift she did not report her problem to anyone in a

supervisory capacity. The claimant testified that she did not report it because she had a habit of dealing with her pain. The claimant testified that she was off for the weekend but returned to work on Monday. The claimant testified that she did not report her problem to anyone on Monday because she was in hopes that it would get better but it did not. The claimant testified that she went to her own doctor on Wednesday, May 23, and reported to him that her problems began while she was lifting parts at work on the previous Friday. The claimant again testified that when she has aches and pains or anything going on with her body she always goes to her family doctor first.

The claimant testified that she has had back problems prior to May 18, 2007. The claimant testified that she recalls in 2003 going to her doctor and complaining of low back and leg pain for which she was prescribed inflammation medicine. The claimant testified that she did not undergo an MRI at that time. The claimant testified that she did undergo an MRI in 2005 and subsequently was seen by a neurosurgeon, Dr. Michael Standefer. The claimant agreed that she became aware that she had some problem with her disc in 2005. The claimant agreed that the last time she was seen by a doctor prior to May 23, 2007, was in December 2006 for problems with her back. The claimant agreed that between December 2006 and May 2007 she continued to work for the respondent doing her regular duties. The claimant testified that the work she was doing for the respondent between December 2006 and May 2007 were the same type duties she was performing on May 18, 2007,

indicating that she worked with a variety of different sizes of parts and was involved with lifting, bending, and twisting. The claimant testified that her job also required doing paperwork and standing for the duration of her shift on concrete. The claimant agreed that the problems with her back were not enough to cause her to go back to the doctor until May 23, 2007. The claimant explained that on the morning of May 23 she had gone to the bathroom and sat down. The claimant testified that she was in bad pain when she was going to the bathroom and it was like her back locked up and she could not get up. The claimant agreed that her back was already hurting when she went to the bathroom and had just continued from when it had started on May 18, 2007. The claimant testified that she was unable to get up off the toilet so she called her husband to help her up. The claimant testified that her husband helped her back to bed and she stayed there until she thought the doctor's office would be open. The claimant testified that she filed a workers' compensation claim with the respondent on June 7, 2007, because she had filed for short term disability and had been denied. The claimant explained that the reason she did not file for workers' comp before she filed for short term disability was because she had gone from her home to the doctor rather than from work to the doctor. The claimant testified that after being called by the short term disability people and what they represented to her in terms of what is in the medical records, she went ahead and filed for workers' comp. The claimant testified that on the day she filled out workers' compensation papers she

does not recall being seen by the company doctor, Dr. Greg Lloyd. The claimant testified that she did visit with Mr. Todd Allen the supervisor in the press department who filled out a report. The claimant agreed that if she was seen by Dr. Lloyd on June 7, 2007, she would have reported to him the same thing that she reported to Dr. Dillard.

The claimant testified that the reason there are two dates shown on her original workers' compensation claim is because back in 2005 when she underwent an MRI and was seen by Dr. Standefer physical therapy was recommended. The claimant testified that in 2005 she went to physical therapy for a couple of weeks and then was released to return to work by her doctor. The claimant testified that she found out about the disc in her back in 2005. The claimant agreed that Dr. Dillard is her primary physician and she is the one who the claimant has seen the most for her back. The claimant agreed that on May 23 Dr. Dillard took her off work and scheduled her an appointment with Dr. Capocelli. The claimant testified that she has been seen by Dr. Capocelli and he has not returned her to work. The claimant agreed that she has been off work since May 23, 2007.

The claimant testified that she was involved in a motor vehicle accident on June 14, 2007. The claimant testified that on June 14, 2007, she had just finished her therapy on her back and was in a turn lane with her signal light on. The claimant testified that the light turned green and she started to turn left and all of a sudden a truck hit her and knocked her two lanes into

a pole. The claimant testified that she went to the ER right after this motor vehicle accident. The claimant testified that at that time she was having complaints to her neck and was having a major headache as well as her arm had bruises on it and a knot on her head. The claimant testified that she had bruises on her chest and in her shoulder area due to her seatbelt. The claimant testified that Dr. Brackman is treating her for these problems. The claimant agreed that at the time of her motor vehicle accident when she was seen at the emergency room she had an increase in her low back discomfort. The claimant was asked if she had any new symptoms in her back and the claimant responded, "Yes, I had extra pain than before." The claimant testified that she did have different symptoms in her back in that her mid back was bothering her, noting that her work related injury is in her low back. The claimant testified that since her motor vehicle accident her lower back has been hurting and that her neck is to the point where she can hardly move it to the right because it bothers her so much. The claimant testified that she is also having bad migraine headaches. The claimant testified that Dr. Capocelli is not treating her neck problems he is just treating her low back problems. The claimant testified that when Dr. Dillard referred her to Dr. Capocelli she was having low back pain and pain in her right leg which he is still treating her for. The claimant testified that Dr. Brackman is treating her for her problems resulting from her motor vehicle accident.

On cross examination, the claimant testified that when she was seen by Dr. Dillard in 2003 for back pain and right leg pain she was given anti-inflammatories. The claimant further agreed that she continued to have problems with her low back and right leg after this period of time. The claimant testified that she was aware that in 2005 after Dr. Dillard had ordered an MRI this test revealed that she had a herniated disc in her low back. The claimant agreed that she was seen by Dr. Standefer at this time and physical therapy was ordered. The claimant testified that after she finished with her physical therapy sessions she continued to have back and right leg pain. The claimant testified that Dr. Dillard is a good doctor and that she would believe whatever was in her reports. The claimant agreed that on May 18, 2007, when she began work that day she was working on press 93 making small parts and was working with another woman. The claimant agreed that she has worked on press 93 prior to this date. The claimant agreed that after she transferred to press 20 the lady she had been working with on press 93 started helping her on press 20. The claimant again guessed that the parts on press 20 weighed approximately eight and a half to nine pounds and that when this part was picked up off the machine she and the other employee would work together. The claimant testified that their routine on press 20 was not always in sync. The claimant testified that both of them would lift the part because she could not take the part off the machine and put it on the pallet by herself. The claimant testified that when she saw Dr. Dillard on May 23 she reported to

the doctor that she was hurting on Friday not that it started on Friday. The claimant indicated that she has always hurt a little bit because she has always been achy. The claimant agreed that her back and right leg have hurt her basically since 2003. The claimant testified that she was feeling stiff and achy on Saturday and Sunday after May 18, 2007. The claimant agreed that she reported to Dr. Dillard that her back locked up that morning when she was trying to get off the toilet. The claimant agreed that she tried to file for FMLA in 2005 but did not have enough time in to draw this benefit. The claimant agreed that she did not report her discomfort on May 18, 2007, to the respondent nor did she make any kind of report on Monday or Tuesday when she reported to work for the respondent. The claimant testified that when she saw Dr. Dillard on May 23, a Wednesday, Dr. Dillard ordered an MRI and gave her an off work slip. The claimant agreed that at that time she went back to the respondent, gave them the off work slip, and filled out paperwork for FMLA and/or short term disability. The claimant agreed that her short term disability was denied and she then filed for workers' comp and it was denied so she then got her short term disability. The claimant agreed that she has drawn short term disability from May 30, 2007, to sometime in November. The claimant testified that she has filled out paperwork for long term disability but has not received it yet. The claimant testified that she first reported a work related injury to the respondent on June 7, 2007. The claimant was reminded that when she filed her workers' comp claim on June 7, 2007, she was sent to

see the company doctor, Dr. Lloyd. The claimant testified that she would not disagree if the doctor said he saw her on that date but she does not remember it. The claimant agreed that the bulk of her medical treatment and tests have been paid by her group policy through the respondent. The claimant was again questioned about her motor vehicle accident on June 14, 2007. The claimant testified that subsequent to this motor vehicle accident she has been receiving treatment from Dr. Terry Brackman who is a pain management doctor. The claimant agreed that Dr. Brackman treats her with manipulation, popping parts of her body, and shots. The claimant agreed that after she was seen by Dr. Capocelli in July 2007 she has undergone some physical therapy which was unsuccessful and has had some injections in her back which were also not helpful. The claimant testified that the last time she had an appointment with Dr. Capocelli she was in fact seen by his nurse practitioner, Janet Canada, who has kept her off work and recommended that she undergo a functional capacity evaluation. The claimant testified that she told Ms. Canada at this visit that she was not able to return to work for the respondent because of the condition she was in. The claimant testified that Ms. Canada took her off work until after her functional capacity evaluation on December 4, 2007. The claimant was asked about her daily activities and the claimant indicated that she keeps her home with the help of her husband and child. The claimant testified that besides her three year old child and husband her husband's brother

also lives in the home. The claimant testified that her husband and her brother-in-law are both disabled.

On redirect examination, the claimant testified that she began to work for the respondent thirteen years prior to June 14, 2007. The claimant testified that after she was seen by Dr. Standefer on September 12, 2005, he did not put any restrictions on her as far as her back was concerned. The claimant agreed that Dr. Standefer released her to return to work.

The medical records set forth that the claimant was seen by Dr. Michael Standefer on September 12, 2005, for her back pain. Dr. Standefer notes that the claimant's MRI scan of her lumbar spine demonstrates degenerative change in the disc at L5 with mild disc bulging but there is no evidence of any overt disc protrusion and no evidence of any high grade channel stenosis. After a thorough neurological exam, Dr. Standefer recommended that the claimant undergo physical therapy and anti-inflammatory medications, noting that surgery is not indicated. Dr. Standefer released her from his care to return as needed. The claimant was seen by Dr. Carolyn Dillard on May 23, 2007, for complaints of back pain. The doctor's notes indicate that on Friday she was working with big parts, was tense all weekend, in pain all day yesterday, and locked up this morning when trying to get up off toilet. The claimant was assessed with having a herniated disc at L5-S1 with right leg pain. Medications were prescribed and the claimant was referred to a neurosurgeon. The claimant was also taken off work. The claimant underwent an MRI on May 29, 2007, of her lumbar spine.

This test revealed a small midline herniated disc at L5. The claimant was seen by Dr. Dillard again on May 30, 2007, where the doctor continued her off work until she is released by the neurosurgeon, Dr. Capocelli.

Todd Allen, the claimant's supervisor, filled out a supervisor's report of accident on June 7, 2007. The date of the accident sets forth that the first onset was in August 2005 and the second onset was on May 18, 2007, due to an injury to the claimant's back. This form indicates that the factors causing or leading to this event were lifting, bending, pulling, pushing, and moving back and forth. Both the claimant and Mr. Allen signed this form on June 7, 2007. The claimant was seen that day at the respondent's clinic where it is noted that the claimant reports that she has a herniated disc verified by an MRI on May 29. The claimant further reports that she began having back pain on Friday, May 18, 2007, and the pain continued but the claimant worked through May 22, 2007. The claimant stated that her back locked up while she was on her toilet at home. The claimant reports that she was seen by Dr. Dillard on May 23, 2007, and that the claimant was taken off work at that time by Dr. Dillard. The claimant reports that her back has been sensitive since she first hurt it on August 5, 2005, and that she saw Dr. Dillard at that time. The claimant reports that she was aware that she had a herniated disc and was sent to Dr. Standefer as well as underwent physical therapy. The claimant reports that she has always been sore since then.

A medical report dated June 22, 2007, indicates that the claimant reports that she has back pain in the left lower back area is worsening. The report sets forth that the claimant reports that her symptoms started two years ago but reinjured her back working on big parts on May 19, 2007. Upon examination it is noted that the claimant has paravertebral spasms bilateral lumbar. Medications were prescribed and it is noted that a return appointment was made. It is also noted that the claimant is seeing Dr. Capocelli and she should continue her physical therapy. The claimant was seen by Dr. Capocelli on July 11, 2007, for a consultation regarding her low back pain. Dr. Capocelli notes in the claimant's history that she began having difficulty with low back pain in May 2007 and subsequently was taken off work. The doctor notes that the claimant was involved in a severe motor vehicle accident on June 14 and as a result of this motor vehicle accident had severe bruising in her neck area and multiple bruises on her arm. The doctor notes that the claimant reports that she has been treated by Dr. Brackman for her neck problems which includes medication and physical therapy. The doctor notes that this motor vehicle accident also significantly exacerbated her low back difficulties. Dr. Capocelli writes that prior to the motor vehicle accident the claimant underwent an MRI which demonstrated degenerative disc disease as well as a central disc herniation at L5 without any significant channel or foraminal impingement. Dr. Capocelli writes that the claimant complains of pain radiating to the right posterolateral thigh to about the knee area and that this

pain is exacerbated by sitting for any length of time and certain movements. The doctor also notes that the claimant's sleep has been affected due to her back and neck problems. After examination, Dr. Capocelli assessed the claimant with having L5-S1 degenerative disease as well as central disc herniation and a cervical sprain. Dr. Capocelli recommended physical therapy and possible steroid injections but no operative intervention. Dr. Capocelli notes that the claimant should improve over time but that this will take a few months, noting that she is off work and he would recommend that she continue her off work status for the next several months and after two to three months they might consider returning her to work as to her low back problems. Dr. Capocelli notes that Dr. Brackman is managing her neck problems. Dr. Capocelli notes that the claimant does have a loss of range of motion that otherwise does not explain the pain or radicular symptomology. There is an off work slip signed by Dr. Capocelli dated July 11, 2007, noting that the claimant is to remain off work for three months until her follow up appointment on October 4, 2007. Dr. Carolyn Dillard writes on July 18, 2007, in response to the claimant's attorney's letter that she first saw the claimant with complaints of back pain on January 13, 2003, and then on October 31, 2003, while the claimant was pregnant, she complained of back pain with pain into her right leg. Dr. Dillard writes that the next visit was January 12, 2005, where the claimant reports the same complaints this time with reports of numbness. Dr. Dillard notes that she ordered x-rays and treated the claimant with pain

medications. The doctor writes that on July 25, 2005, the claimant was seen for complaints of pain in her right leg and low back after which time the doctor ordered an MRI which revealed a small central disc herniation at L5-S1 which contacts the S1 nerve root centrally. The claimant was referred to Dr. Michael Standefer and she was treated with physical therapy and no surgery was indicated. Dr. Dillard writes that there is no mention in her notes from July 25, 2005, of any work injury, therefore she cannot give an opinion of what might have caused the claimant's herniation. Dr. Dillard writes that the claimant was seen on May 23, 2007, complaining of severe lower back pain that she thought was caused by working for the respondent on May 18, 2007. Dr. Dillard noted that another MRI was ordered that showed a small central midline herniation at L5 and the claimant was referred to Dr. Capocelli, a neurosurgeon. Dr. Dillard concludes by writing that given the claimant's history of back pain and disc herniation, it is the doctor's opinion that the claimant's job duties for the respondent likely is the cause of her needing treatment on her back.

The claimant was seen at Dr. Capocelli's office by his physician's assistant, Janet Canada, on October 4, 2007. Ms. Canada notes that the claimant reports that the physical therapy has not relieved her symptoms nor did the epidural injections help. It is noted that the claimant remains off work and that she reports that because of the pain she cannot do any activity for more than fifteen to thirty minutes at a time. The claimant reports that her symptoms are exacerbated by prolonged sitting, standing, and

walking. After examination, the claimant was assessed with degenerative disease and a central disc herniation at L5-S1. Ms. Canada suggested that the claimant consider weight loss to decrease her symptoms and a functional capacity evaluation was recommended. Ms. Canada took the claimant off work until November, the date of her court hearing. There was an off work slip from Dr. Capocelli's office signed by Ms. Canada on October 4, 2007, keeping the claimant off work for two months until her follow up appointment.

After a complete review of this entire matter, I find that the claimant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she sustained an exacerbation to a pre-existing condition on May 18, 2007, while working for the respondent. The claimant has testified and the medical records verify that in 2005 she was diagnosed with a herniated disc at L5-S1 and has had continued back problems since that time although she was able to work. An MRI taken after May 18, 2007, reveals no new findings of injury. The claimant has testified that her back problems became more intense on May 18, 2007, but that she continued to work for the respondent through May 22, 2007, with no report of injury. The claimant has testified that she went to her own private physician without notice to the respondent on May 23, 2007, and at that time was taken off work by Dr. Dillard. The claimant has testified and the evidence sets forth that the claimant reported a work related injury to her back on June 7, 2007, after she had attempted to apply for short term disability benefits and was denied due to a report of a work related injury. The claimant has testified and the medical records

set forth that she was involved in a motor vehicle accident on June 14, 2007, after which she had an exacerbation or increase in her low back symptoms as well as developed cervical problems for which she is being treated for by Dr. Brackman. The indication from the claimant is that this motor vehicle accident was very severe resulting in property damage as well as the deployment of her air bags and causing her to have neck problems as well as increased low back problems. I find, therefore, that the claimant has had a exacerbation of her low back pain as a result of her work on May 18, 2007, however no report of injury was made until June 7, 2007, therefore no benefits should be paid to that date. I further find that there was an independent intervening cause in the form of a motor vehicle accident which the claimant was involved in on June 14, 2007, which again exacerbated the claimant's low back problems and, therefore, superceded any problems which developed as a result of her work activities for the respondent. The respondents should pay temporary total disability to this claimant from June 7, 2007, to June 14, 2007, as well as any medical treatment which she received for her back during this period of time.

#### FINDINGS & CONCLUSIONS

1. The Arkansas workers' Compensation Commission has jurisdiction of this claim.
2. On May 18, 2007, the relationship of employee-employer-carrier existed between the parties.

3. The claimant is entitled to a compensation rate of \$407 for temporary total disability and \$305 for permanent partial disability.

4. The claimant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she sustained an exacerbation to her pre-existing low back problems on May 18, 2007, while working for the respondent. See discussion above.

5. The claimant did not report any work related injury to the respondent until June 7, 2007, therefore no benefits shall be paid to this claimant for her back problems prior to June 7, 2007.

6. The claimant was involved in a severe motor vehicle accident on June 14, 2007, injuring her cervical spine as well as exacerbating her low back problems. I find that this motor vehicle accident was an independent intervening cause and now supercedes any low back problems which the claimant was previously experiencing. No benefits for the claimant's low back problems should be paid to the claimant subsequent to June 14, 2007.

7. The claimant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to temporary total disability from June 7, 2007, to June 14, 2007. See discussion above.

8. The respondents should pay for all reasonable and necessary medical treatment for this claimant's low back problems from June 7, 2007, to June 14, 2007.

9. The respondents have controverted this claim in its entirety.

10. The claimant's attorney is entitled to the maximum statutory attorney's fee based on the benefits awarded herein.

ORDER

The claimant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that she sustained a temporary exacerbation of a pre-existing back problem on May 18, 2007.

The claimant did not report this injury to the respondent until June 7, 2007, therefore no benefits will be due this claimant prior to that date. The claimant experienced an independent intervening cause in the form of a motor vehicle accident on June 14, 2007, therefore the respondents will not be responsible for any benefits subsequent to that date.

The respondents should pay temporary total disability to this claimant from June 7, 2007, to June 14, 2007.

The respondents shall pay for all medical treatment for this claimant's low back problems from June 7, 2007, to June 14, 2007.

The respondents shall pay to the claimant's attorney the maximum statutory attorney's fee on the additional benefits awarded herein, with one half of said attorney's fee to be paid by the respondents in addition to such benefits and one half of said attorney's fee to be withheld by the respondents from such benefits.

All benefits herein awarded which have heretofore accrued are payable in a lump sum without discount.

This award shall bear the maximum legal rate of interest until paid.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

---

ELIZABETH DANIELSON  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE