

**BEFORE THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION  
WCC NO. H110073**

<b>BARBARA ROTHCHILD, EMPLOYEE</b>	<b>CLAIMANT</b>
<b>GREAT DANE PLANTS, EMPLOYER</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>
<b>EVEREST PREMIER INS. CO., CARRIER</b>	<b>RESPONDENT</b>

**OPINION FILED NOVEMBER 1, 2022**

Hearing before Administrative Law Judge O. Milton Fine II on October 28, 2022, in Jonesboro, Craighead County, Arkansas.

Claimant, *pro se*, not appearing.

Respondents represented by Mr. Guy Alton Wade, Attorney at Law, Little Rock, Arkansas.

**I. BACKGROUND**

This matter comes before the Commission on a Motion to Dismiss by Respondents. A hearing on the motion was conducted on October 28, 2022, in Jonesboro, Arkansas. No testimony was taken in the case. Claimant, who according to Commission records is *pro se*, failed to appear at the hearing. Without objection, the Commission file on this claim has been incorporated herein in its entirety by reference. Admitted into evidence was Respondents' Exhibit 1, forms, pleadings and correspondence related to the claim, consisting of seven (7) numbered pages.

ROTHCHILD – H110073

The record reflects the following procedural history:

On December 30, 2021, a Form AR-1 was filed in this case, reflecting that Claimant purportedly sustained an injury to his shoulder(s) on November 18, 2021. Respondents have never filed a Form AR-2 in connection with this matter. At the hearing, however, Respondents represented through counsel that they have controverted the claim in its entirety. Claimant has not filed a Form AR-C.

On August 29, 2022, Respondents filed the instant Motion to Dismiss. Therein, they argued that over eight months had elapsed since they had propounded discovery to Claimant, with no response thereto. The Commission on August 30, 2022, wrote Claimant, asking for a response to the motion within twenty (20) days. The letter was sent via certified and first-class mail to the address for Claimant listed on the filings in the file. The certified letter was returned to the Commission, unclaimed, on October 5, 2022; but the first-class correspondence was not returned. Nonetheless, no response to the motion was forthcoming from Claimant.

On September 21, 2022, a hearing on the Motion to Dismiss was scheduled for October 28, 2022, at 10:30 a.m. at the Craighead County Courthouse in Jonesboro. The notice was sent to Claimant by first-class and certified mail at the same address as before. The United States Postal Service has no record concerning whether the certified letter was claimed; but regardless, the first-class letter was not returned. The evidence thus preponderates that Claimant received notice of the hearing.

ROTHCHILD – H110073

The hearing on the Motion to Dismiss proceeded as scheduled on October 28, 2022. Again, Claimant failed to appear. But Respondents appeared through counsel and argued for dismissal of the action under AWCC R. 099.13.

## **II. FINDINGS 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 Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission has jurisdiction over this matter.
2. No Form AR-C has ever been filed in connection with his matter.
3. No other document before the Commission in this matter constitutes an initial claim for benefits.
4. Respondents' Motion to Dismiss is denied because no claim exists to be subject to dismissal.

## **III. DISCUSSION**

AWCC 099.13 provides:

Upon meritorious application to the Commission from either party in an action pending before the Commission, requesting that the claim be dismissed for want of prosecution, the Commission may, upon reasonable notice to all parties, enter an order dismissing the claim for want of prosecution.

*See generally Johnson v. Triple T Foods*, 55 Ark. App. 83, 85, 929 S.W.2d 730 (1996). (Emphasis added) Under Ark. Code Ann. § 11-9-705(a)(3) (Repl. 2012), Respondents must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that dismissal

ROTHCHILD – H110073

should be granted. The standard “preponderance of the evidence” means the evidence having greater weight or convincing force. *Barre v. Hoffman*, 2009 Ark. 373, 326 S.W.3d 415; *Smith v. Magnet Cove Barium Corp.*, 212 Ark. 491, 206 S.W.2d 442 (1947).

As noted above, no Form AR-C has been filed in this case. That is the means for filing a “formal claim.” See *Yearwood v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 2003 AR Wrk. Comp. LEXIS 739, Claim No. F201311 (Full Commission Opinion filed June 17, 2003). See also *Sinclair v. Magnolia Hospital*, 1998 AR Wrk. Comp. LEXIS 786, Claim No. E703502 (Full Commission Opinion filed December 22, 1998)(a claim is “typically” filed *via* a Form AR-C). While a Form AR-1 was filed in this case, that does not suffice to instigate a claim. *Id.*

I recognize, however, that other means exist to file a claim for initial benefits other than a Form AR-C. In *Downing v. Univ. of Ark.*, 1999 AR Work. Comp. LEXIS 979, Claim No. E209360 (Full Commission Opinion filed March 16, 1999), the Commission stated:

While it appears that no court has addressed the minimum requirements under Arkansas law to state an adequate “petition for review”, in *Cook v. Southwestern Bell Telephone Company*, 21 Ark. App. 29, 727 S.W.2d 862 (1987) the Arkansas Court of Appeals discussed the minimum requirements necessary for correspondence to the Commission to constitute a claim for additional compensation for the purposes of tolling the applicable Statute of Limitations. In that case, the Court held that an attorney’s correspondence notifying the Commission that he has been employed to assist a claimant in connection with unpaid benefits is sufficient to state a claim for additional compensation where the correspondence also lists the claimant’s name, the employer’s name and the WCC file number. *Id.*, See also, *Garrett v. Sears Roebuck and Company*, 43 Ark. App.

ROTHCHILD – H110073

37, 858 S.W.2d 146 (1993). Moreover, we have interpreted *Cook* as requiring that correspondence intended as a claim for additional benefits (1) identify the claimant, (2) indicate that a compensable injury has occurred, and (3) convey the idea that compensation is expected.

(Citations omitted)

My review of the Commission's file discloses no document sufficient to constitute a filing of a claim for initial benefits under the factors cited above. Because no claim has been filed, it follows that there is no claim subject to dismissal per Respondents' motion. The Motion to Dismiss thus must be, and hereby is, denied.

### **CONCLUSION**

In accordance with the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth above, the Motion to Dismiss is hereby denied.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

---

O. MILTON FINE II  
Chief Administrative Law Judge