

**BEFORE THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION**

**CLAIM NO. H401589**

**BECKY L. KEETER, EMPLOYEE**

**CLAIMANT**

**CLAY MAXEY CHEVROLET CADILLAC,  
EMPLOYER**

**RESPONDENT**

**CENTRAL ARK. AUTO DEALERS SIF/  
RISK MANAGEMENT RESOURCES,  
INSURANCE CARRIER/TPA**

**RESPONDENT**

**OPINION AND ORDER FILED NOVEMBER 26, 2025**

**The Hearing before Administrative Law Judge James D. Kennedy in Mountain Home, Arkansas, was held on October 19, 2025.**

**Claimant waived her appearance.**

**Respondents were represented by Melissa Wood, of Little Rock, Arkansas.**

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

A hearing was held in the above styled matter on the 19<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2025, in Mountain Home, Arkansas, on Respondent's Motion to Dismiss for failure to prosecute pursuant to 11 CAR 25-110(d), previously known as Rule 099.13 of the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission. The claimant was represented by Dan Wren of Little Rock, Arkansas, who waived Claimant's appearance by a Response to the Motion to Dismiss filed on November 12, 2025, that provided that the Respondents have agreed to provided additional medical treatment for the Claimant, and that consequently, the Claimant has no objection to the Dismissal of the AR-C. The Respondents were represented by Melissa Wood of Little Rock, Arkansas.

Previously, a full hearing had been held in this matter on December 18, 2024, and an Opinion had been filed on February 5, 2025, which provided that the Claimant had suffered a compensable injury to her back, but had failed to satisfy the required burden of proof to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that she was entitled to temporary total disability and that the issue of “termination of cause” was not barred by collateral estoppel. The opinion was adopted by the Full Commission on July 2, 2025. The Motion to Dismiss was filed on November 12, 2025, and contended that the Claimant’s lower back injury sustained on September 1, 2023, was accepted as compensable, and that all appropriate benefits were being paid. Pursuant to 11 CAR 25–110(d), which provides that upon application by either party for a dismissal for failure to prosecute, the Commission may, after reasonable notice to all parties, enter an order dismissing the claim. The Claimant, through her attorney, filed a response to the Motion to Dismiss stating that she had no objection to the dismissal of the AR-C.

After proper notice and a response by the Claimant stating that she had no objection to the dismissal of the AR-C, and after waiving her appearance, a hearing was held on November 19, 2025, in Mountain Home Arkansas. The Respondents were represented by Melissa Wood at the hearing, who requested that the matter be dismissed pursuant to 11 C.A.R. 110(d) of the rules of the Arkansas Workers’ Compensation Commission.

**ORDER**

Pursuant to the above statement of the case, documents entered into the record, and statements by the Attorney for the Respondents, there is no alternative but to grant

the Motion to Dismiss without prejudice pursuant to 11 C.A.R. 25-110(d) of the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission.

---

JAMES D. KENNEDY  
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE