BEFORE THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION
CLAIM NO. H407145

ANEISHA PORCHIA,
EMPLOYEE **CLAIMANT**

SILVER OAKS HEALTH & REHAB,
EMPLOYER **RESPONDENT**

ARKANSAS SELF-INSURANCE TRUST/CCMSI,
CARRIER/TPA **RESPONDENT**

OPINION FILED AUGUST 14, 2026
GRANTING RESPONDENTS' MOTION TO DISMISS WITHOUT PREJUDICE

Hearing conducted on Thursday, August 13, 2026, before the Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission (the Commission), Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Mike Pickens, in El Dorado, Union County, Arkansas.

The claimant, Ms. Aneisha Porchia, pro se, of Magnolia, Columbia County, Arkansas, failed and/or refused to appear at the hearing.

The respondents were represented by the Honorable Melissa Wood, Worley, Wood & Parrish, P.A., Little Rock, Pulaski County, Arkansas.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A hearing was conducted on August 13, 2026, to determine whether this claim should be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to ***Ark. Code Ann.*** § 11-9-702(a)(4) (2025 Lexis Replacement) and 11 ***CAR*** Section 25-110(d) (2025 ***Code of AR Regulations***), formerly cited as Commission Rule 099.13 (2025 Lexis Repl.).

This claim was the subject of a hearing and opinion filed March 17, 2026, in which the ALJ found the claimant had failed to meet her burden of proof in demonstrating she was entitled to additional medical treatment in the form of additional physical therapy (PT) and/or other unspecified treatment. I hereby take judicial notice of this opinion and its findings of fact and conclusions of law. The claimant never filed an appeal of this opinion to the Full Commission.

Therefore, the March 17, 2026, opinion is now final and the ALJ's finding concerning the additional medical treatment issue is *res judicata* and constitutes the law of the case.

After the claimant's appeal time to the Full Commission ran, on April 22, 2026, the respondents filed with the Commission a motion to dismiss this claim without prejudice for lack of prosecution (MTD). (Respondents' Exhibit 1 at 6-7). The claimant objected to the respondents MTD and, consequently, the Commission scheduled a hearing on the MTD. The claimant was provided due and legal notice of both the respondents' MTD as well as the date, time, and place of the subject hearing, and she appeared in person at the hearing to object to the respondents' MTD. (Commission Exhibit 1; RX1 at 8-10; Reporter's Hearing Transcript).

At the subject hearing the claimant testified she now is working with Armtec Defense Technologies in Camden, Arkansas. Armtec is a federal government contracted employer who manufacturers munitions for the United States Department of War. She testified she is able to perform her job duties; that she has not returned to see a doctor and that she is not taking any prescription medications. She also testified that since she has been working with Armtec for more than 90 days she now has health insurance through her employer-sponsored plan with Armtec should she require any additional medical treatment. (Reporter's Hearing Transcript).

The record herein consists of the hearing transcript and any and all exhibits contained therein or attached thereto.

DISCUSSION

Consistent with ***Ark. Code Ann.***§ 11-9-702(a)(4) (2025 Lexis Replacement), as well as our court of appeals' ruling in *Dillard vs. Benton County Sheriff's Office*, 87 Ark. App. 379, 192 S.W.3d 287 (Ark. App. 2004), the Commission scheduled and conducted a hearing on the respondents' MTD filed April 22, 2026. Rather than recite a detailed analysis of the record, suffice

it to say the preponderance of the evidence introduced at the hearing and contained in the record conclusively reveals the claimant has failed and/or refused to either actively prosecute her claim or to request a hearing on any specific issue within the last six (6) months. Indeed, there appear to be no additional issues to be litigated in this claim.

Therefore, after a thorough consideration of the issues at bar, the applicable law as applied to the facts of this claim, and other relevant matters of record including the representations of credible counsel, I hereby make the following:

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The Commission has jurisdiction of this claim.

2. After having received due and legal notice of both the respondents' MTD without prejudice filed with the Commission on April 22, 2026, as well as due and legal notice of the date, time, and place of the subject hearing, the claimant objected to the respondents' MTD and appeared in person at the subject hearing.

3. The claimant failed to appeal the ALJ's March 17, 2026, opinion to the Full Commission, thereby rendering the issue addressed therein now to be *res judicata* and to constitute the law of the case. Thereafter, the claimant has not requested a hearing on any specific issue(s) within the last six (6) months nor has she taken any steps to either raise or prosecute any issue(s) in this claim. Indeed, there appear to be no issues left to be litigated in this claim.

4. Therefore, the preponderance of the evidence compels the decision the respondents' MTD without prejudice filed April 22, 2026, should be and hereby is GRANTED; and this claim is dismissed without prejudice to its refiling pursuant to the deadlines prescribed by ***Ark. Code Ann.*** Section 11-9-702(a) and (b) and 11 ***CAR*** Section 25-110(d) (2025 ***Code of AR Regulations***), formerly cited as Commission Rule 099.13.

If they have not already done so, the respondents hereby are ordered to pay the court reporter's invoice immediately upon their receipt thereof.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

_____
Mike Pickens
Administrative Law Judge

MP/mp

MP/mp