

STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA
SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS

Tara Lockwood Gibson,
Claimant Below, Petitioner

v.) **No. 24-721** (JCN: 2018018986)
 (ICA No. 24-ICA-160)

Greenbrier Valley Medical Center,
Employer Below, Respondent

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Petitioner Tara Lockwood Gibson appeals the October 1, 2024, memorandum decision of the Intermediate Court of Appeals (“ICA”). *See Gibson v. Greenbrier Valley Med. Ctr.*, No. 24-ICA-160, 2024 WL 4362511 (W. Va. Ct. App. Oct. 1, 2024) (memorandum decision). Respondent Greenbrier Valley Medical Center filed a timely response.¹ The issue on appeal is whether the ICA erred in affirming the March 14, 2024, order by the Workers’ Compensation Board of Review, which affirmed the June 17, 2021, claim administrator’s order granting a 0% permanent partial disability award due to post-concussion syndrome and post-concussion headaches.

On appeal, the claimant argues that the ICA’s decision is clearly wrong in light of the substantial evidence in the record as a whole showing that the claimant sustained more than a 0% whole person impairment due to the compensable injury. The claimant alleges that the Board of Review disregarded the bulk of the evidence in the record, which consistently supports claimant’s testimony that she suffers from constant headaches, dizziness, brain fog, and other symptoms directly due to her compensable post-concussion syndrome and post-concussion headaches. The claimant contends that Bruce A. Guberman, M.D., was the only evaluator to find a ratable impairment acknowledging the claimant’s ongoing symptoms due to the compensable injury, and he properly assessed the claimant with 10% whole person impairment. The employer asserts that the claimant’s argument is refuted by the substantial evidence of record because the opinions of Drs. Prasadarao B. Mukkamala, M.D., and Mohammed Ranavaya, M.D., indicated that the claimant has 0% permanent partial disability based upon normal neurological findings. As such, the employer argues that the ICA’s decision should be affirmed.

This Court reviews questions of law de novo, while we accord deference to the Board of Review’s findings of fact unless the findings are clearly wrong. Syl. Pt. 3, *Duff v. Kanawha Cnty.*

¹ The petitioner is represented by counsel Reginald D. Henry and Lori J. Withrow, and the respondent is represented by counsel Mark J. Grigoraci.

Comm’n, 250 W. Va. 510, 905 S.E.2d 528 (2024). Upon consideration of the record and briefs, we find no reversible error and therefore summarily affirm. *See* W. Va. R. App. P. 21(c).

Affirmed.

ISSUED: July 28, 2025

CONCURRED IN BY:

Chief Justice William R. Wooton

Justice C. Haley Bunn

Justice Charles S. Trump IV

Justice Tim Armstead not participating.