

**BEFORE THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION
AWCC FILE № H501581**

TAIQUITHA ROBINS, EMPLOYEE

CLAIMANT

ARKANSAS BAPTIST COLLEGE, EMPLOYER

RESPONDENT

**BRIDGEFIELD CASUALTY INS. CO./SUMMIT CONSULTING,
CARRIER/TPA**

RESPONDENT

OPINION FILED 5 MARCH 2026

Heard before Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission ("the Commission")
Administrative Law Judge JayO. Howe on 7 January 2026 in Little Rock, Arkansas.

The *pro se* claimant failed to appear.

The Ryburn Law Firm, Mr. Zachary F. Ryburn, appeared for the respondents.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

A hearing on the respondents' Motion to Dismiss was held on this matter in Little Rock, Arkansas, on 7 January 2026. This case relates to an alleged workplace injury occurring on 3 January 2025. The record from the hearing consists of the transcript; Respondents' Exhibit № 1, their two-page Motion to Dismiss; and Commission's Exhibit № 1, two pages that included a Form AR-C filed by the claimant and a Postal Service delivery receipt from Commission correspondence with the claimant.

The record showed that the claimant filed a Form AR-C on 12 March 2025 alleging an injury on 3 January 2025. She stated an injury relating to stress in the workplace. The Form AR-C indicated that she was seeking temporary total disability and medical expenses. The claim was denied in its entirety by the respondents.

On 28 October 2025, the respondents requested that this claim be dismissed for the claimant's failure to prosecute his claim under the Commission Rule at 11 C.A.R. § 25-

110(d). They argued that the claim had been denied at its outset and that the claimant had made no effort to prosecute her case since the filing of the Form AR-C.

Notice of the respondents' motion was sent to the claimant, consistent with Commission practices, via First Class Mail and Certified Mail. Notice of a hearing on the respondents' motion was sent in the same manner. A Postal Service delivery receipt evidences that the claimant received the Commission's correspondence on 26 November 2025. The record does not reflect any responsive filings from the claimant; and she did not attend the hearing to object to the dismissal of this claim.

FINDINDGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After reviewing the record as a whole, I hereby make the following findings of fact and conclusions of law in accordance with Ark. Code Ann. § 11-9-704 (Repl. 2012):

1. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter.
2. The parties were provided with reasonable notice of the Motion to Dismiss and the hearing on the motion.
3. The evidence preponderates that the claimant has failed to prosecute his claim under 11 C.A.R. § 25-110(d).
4. The Motion to Dismiss is hereby granted; this claim is dismissed without prejudice under 11 C.A.R. § 25-110(d).

DISCUSSION

The respondents appeared on 7 January 2026 and presented their motion. As argued by the respondents at the hearing, 11 C.A.R. § 25-110(d) provides for a dismissal for failure to prosecute an action upon application by either party and reasonable notice. As noted above, notice of the respondents' motion and notice of the scheduling of the hearing was provided to the claimant.

The respondents argue that the claimant has failed to prosecute her claim. She has made no efforts in furtherance of the same since the filing of her Form AR-C. Additionally,

T. ROBINS- H501581

the claimant has not requested a hearing on any issue in her claim. No objection was filed to the respondents' motion to dismiss this claim; and the claimant did not appear at the hearing to resist the dismissal of her claim. Based on the evidence presented, a dismissal without prejudice is appropriate.

ORDER

The Motion to Dismiss is GRANTED, and this matter is DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

SO ORDERED.

JAYO. HOWE
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE