

**NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION**

BEFORE THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

CLAIM NO. F605860

DORIS SCOTT,  
EMPLOYEE

CLAIMANT

POTLATCH FOREST PRODUCTS CORPORATION,  
SELF-INSURED EMPLOYER

RESPONDENT

MANAGEMENT CLAIM SOLUTIONS,  
TPA

RESPONDENT

OPINION FILED APRIL 5, 2011

Upon review before the FULL COMMISSION in Little Rock,  
Pulaski County, Arkansas.

Claimant appears Pro Se.

Respondent represented by the HONORABLE MICHAEL J.  
DENNIS, Attorney at Law, Pine Bluff, Arkansas.

Decision of Administrative Law Judge: Affirmed and  
Adopted.

OPINION AND ORDER

Claimant appeals an opinion and order of the  
Administrative Law Judge filed December 22, 2010. In  
said order, the Administrative Law Judge made the  
following findings of fact and conclusions of law:

1. The Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission has jurisdiction of this claim.
2. The employer/employee/carrier relationship existed on or about May 25, 2006, when the claimant sustained a compensable injury to her right foot.

3. The respondents paid some medical benefits, temporary total disability benefits and a permanent partial rating on the Claimant's right foot.
4. Based on an average weekly wage of \$1,174.78, the claimant would be entitled to a temporary total disability rate of \$488.00.
5. The claimant has failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that she suffered a compensable alleged left leg, right side, and back injury on May 25, 2006.
6. The claimant has failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the claimant's high blood pressure and hypertension was a compensable consequence of her 2006 injury.
7. The claimant has failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to additional medical treatment for alleged nerve damage to her right foot as a result of the May 25, 2006 injury.
8. The claimant has failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to medical treatment for her left leg, including an orthotic for her left shoe, as a result of the May 25, 2006 injury.
9. The claimant has failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to an additional impairment rating based on nerve damage to the foot as a result of the May 25, 2006 injury.
10. The claimant has failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that she is entitled to temporary total disability benefits for the period off work in 2009 as a result of the May 25, 2006 injury.

We have carefully conducted a de novo review of the entire record herein and it is our opinion that the

Administrative Law Judge's decision is supported by a preponderance of the credible evidence, correctly applies the law, and should be affirmed. Specifically, we find from a preponderance of the evidence that the findings of fact made by the Administrative Law Judge are correct and they are, therefore, adopted by the Full Commission.

Therefore we affirm and adopt the December 22, 2010 decision of the Administrative Law Judge, including all findings and conclusions therein, as the decision of the Full Commission on appeal.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

---

A. WATSON BELL, Chairman

---

KAREN H. MCKINNEY, Commissioner

Commissioner Hood concurs, in part, and dissents, in part.

**CONCURRING AND DISSENTING OPINION**

I must respectfully concur, in part, and dissent, in part, from the majority opinion. After a de novo review of the record, I find that the claimant does not have objective findings of a back injury. Also, I find that the medical records show that the claimant's

left leg injury most likely came from an incident separate from the May 25, 2006 right foot injury which is the subject matter of this claim. However, my review of the medical records indicates that Dr. Larry Nguyen has clearly and consistently recommended bilateral custom orthotics as reasonably necessary medical treatment for the claimant's compensable right foot injury, and I would award said treatment. I also find that respondent's denial of said orthotics could be a causative factor in the claimant's current need for right foot treatment and, therefore, I would award the claimant further reasonably necessary medical treatment with Dr. Nguyen, after she has been fitted for bilateral custom orthotics.

For the aforementioned reasons, I must respectfully concur, in part, and dissent, in part.

---

PHILIP A. HOOD, Commissioner