BEFORE THE ARKANSAS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION
AWCC FILE № G804185

MELISSA WEBB, EMPLOYEE	**CLAIMANT**
IRONWOOD PHARMA. INC., EMPLOYER	**RESPONDENT**
TRAVELERS PROPERTY CASUALTY COMPANY OF NORTH AMERICA	**RESPONDENT**

OPINION FILED 21 JULY 2026

Heard before Arkansas Workers' Compensation Commission Administrative Law Judge JayO. Howe on 24 June 2026 in Little Rock, Arkansas.

The *pro se* claimant did not appear.

Friday, Eldredge & Clark, Mr. Guy Alton Wade, 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 24 June 2026. This case relates to accepted compensable injuries sustained on or about 4 June 2018. The hearing record consists of the transcript, which includes Respondents' Exhibit № 1 (22 pages of forms, filings, and correspondence in support of the respondents' motion) and Commission's Exhibit № 1 (a USPS delivery confirmation receipt and the Form AR-C filed on 20 April 2020).

On 27 April 2026, the respondents requested that this claim be dismissed for want of prosecution. They noted that the claimant had taken no recent action on her claim. Notice of the 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 also sent in the same manner. A Postal Service delivery receipt confirms delivery of the Commission's correspondence on 22 May 2026. 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.

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 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 her claim under 11 C.A.R. § 25-110(d).

4. The Motion to Dismiss is hereby granted; this claim for additional benefits is dismissed without prejudice under 11 C.A.R. § 25-110(d).

DISCUSSION

The respondents appeared on 24 June 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 stated above, the claimant did not respond to the Commission's correspondence; nor did she appear at the hearing to object to the dismissal of this claim. Based on my review of the evidence presented, a dismissal without prejudice is appropriate.

ORDER

Consistent with the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth above, the Motion to Dismiss is hereby GRANTED. This claim for additional benefits is dismissed without prejudice.

SO ORDERED.

_____

JAYO. HOWE
ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE