

**STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA**

**SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS**

**PATRICIA J. HUTCHINSON,**  
**Claimant Below, Petitioner**

**FILED**  
December 19, 2013  
RORY L. PERRY II, CLERK  
SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS  
OF WEST VIRGINIA

**vs.) No. 12-0502** (BOR Appeal No. 2046658)  
(Claim No. 2010101227)

**SUMMERSVILLE MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,**  
**Employer Below, Respondent**

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Petitioner Patricia J. Hutchinson, by John Shumate Jr., her attorney, appeals the decision of the West Virginia Workers' Compensation Board of Review. Summersville Memorial Hospital, by Daniel Murdock, its attorney, filed a timely response.

This appeal arises from the Board of Review's Final Order dated April 11, 2012, in which the Board affirmed a November 9, 2011, Order of the Workers' Compensation Office of Judges. In its Order, the Office of Judges affirmed the claims administrator's July 20, 2011, decision denying Ms. Hutchinson's request for authorization for a neurosurgical evaluation. The Court has carefully reviewed the records, written arguments, and appendices contained in the briefs, and the case is mature for consideration.

This Court has considered the parties' briefs and the record on appeal. The facts and legal arguments are adequately presented, and the decisional process would not be significantly aided by oral argument. Upon consideration of the standard of review, the briefs, and the record presented, the Court finds no substantial question of law and no prejudicial error. For these reasons, a memorandum decision is appropriate under Rule 21 of the Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Ms. Hutchinson injured her lower back on July 29, 2009, while working with a patient. Following the injury, Ms. Hutchinson was treated by Dr. Wantz who noted that she has a history of chronic low back pain as well as a prior back injury. On August 4, 2009, Dr. Wantz diagnosed Ms. Hutchinson with sprains and strains of the sacroiliac and lumbosacral region. An August 31, 2009, MRI revealed foraminal stenosis, spinal stenosis, and nerve root compression. On January 28, 2010, Dr. Wantz stated that the August 31, 2009, MRI and an MRI performed in 2007 have similar findings. She diagnosed Ms. Hutchinson with a disc bulge in her lumbar spine and mild

to moderate spinal stenosis. On February 24, 2011, Dr. Wantz filed a diagnosis update form requesting that spinal stenosis and lumbar disc disease be added as compensable components of the claim. In the instant case, Dr. Wantz has requested authorization for a neurosurgical evaluation. On July 20, 2011, the claims administrator denied the request for authorization for a neurosurgical evaluation.

In its Order affirming the July 20, 2011, claims administrator's decision, the Office of Judges held that the need for a neurosurgical evaluation is not related to the compensable injury of July 29, 2009. Ms. Hutchinson disputes this finding and asserts, per the opinion of Dr. Wantz, that a neurosurgical evaluation is necessary for the treatment of the compensable injury of July 29, 2009.

The Office of Judges found that Ms. Hutchinson had widespread degenerative disease prior to the July 29, 2009, injury. The Office of Judges further found that Dr. Wantz is seeking a neurosurgical evaluation as a result of Ms. Hutchinson's spinal stenosis. The compensability of spinal stenosis was denied by this Court in Case Number 12-0485. As noted by the Office of Judges, because the request for a neurosurgical evaluation arises from the treatment of a non-compensable condition, it is unrelated to the compensable injury of July 29, 2009. The Board of Review affirmed the reasoning and conclusions of the Office of Judges in its decision of April 11, 2012. We agree with the reasoning and conclusions of the Board of Review.

For the foregoing reasons, we find that the decision of the Board of Review is not in clear violation of any constitutional or statutory provision, nor is it clearly the result of erroneous conclusions of law, nor is it based upon a material misstatement or mischaracterization of the evidentiary record. Therefore, the decision of the Board of Review is affirmed.

Affirmed.

**ISSUED: December 19, 2013**

**CONCURRED IN BY:**

Chief Justice Brent D. Benjamin

Justice Robin J. Davis

Justice Margaret L. Workman

Justice Menis E. Ketchum

Justice Allen H. Loughry II