

COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA

Present: Judges McClanahan, Haley and Senior Judge Willis

FREDDIE STOKES

v. Record No. 2797-08-4

T.W. & COMPANY, INC. AND
WAUSAU INSURANCE COMPANY

MEMORANDUM OPINION*
PER CURIAM
MAY 19, 2009

FROM THE VIRGINIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

(Freddie Stokes, *pro se*, on brief).

(J. David Griffin; Winchester Law Group, P.C., on brief), for
appellees.

Freddie Stokes (claimant) appeals an October 21, 2008 decision of the Workers' Compensation Commission. He presents five questions (framed as statements) on appeal:

1. The deputy commissioner err[ed] in finding that the employer met the burden of proving that the claimant has been released to return to his pre-injury work at the time the employer filed [its] application for hearing.
2. The deputy commission err[ed] in finding that outstanding medical bills for Dr. Drakes and the Veteran[s] Administration Hospital should not be paid.
3. The deputy commissioner err[ed] in finding that medical slips written by [the] treating physician for "days unable to work, right foot injury" should not be paid.
4. The deputy commissioner err[ed] in finding that temporary total disability compensation should not be granted for claimant's right foot and back exacerbation of his work accident during the June 22, 2005 IME with Dr. Graynovsky.
5. The deputy commissioner err[ed] in finding that medical reports provided by Dr. Graynovsky and Dr. Salata were not stale and

* Pursuant to Code § 17.1-413, this opinion is not designated for publication.

ther[e]fore could not be use[d] as creditable reports in his decision, and Dr. Nwaneri[’s], the treating physician, report should have been [given] more creditability in this decision.

Pursuant to Rule 5A:21(b), appellees T.W. & Company, Inc. and Wausau Insurance Company (collectively “employer”) present an additional question: “May the commission sustain as facts finding that the claimant required no additional medical treatment for his original injury, yet require the employer to continue to pay for treatment that multiple independent doctors have declared unnecessary?”

We have reviewed the record and the commission’s opinion and find that this appeal is without merit. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the commission in its final opinion. See Freddie Stokes v. TW and Company, Inc., VWC File No. 215-87-55 (Oct. 21, 2008). We dispense with oral argument and summarily affirm because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the Court and argument would not aid the decisional process. See Code § 17.1-403; Rule 5A:27.

Affirmed.