

COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA

Present: Judges Alston, Decker and Senior Judge Coleman

MARIA ANGELA COOK

v. Record No. 0581-14-2

VOLVO OF FREDERICKSBURG AND
VIRGINIA COMMERCE GROUP
SELF-INSURANCE CORPORATION

MEMORANDUM OPINION*
PER CURIAM
SEPTEMBER 30, 2014

FROM THE VIRGINIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

(Maria Angela Cook, *pro se*, on briefs).

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

Maria Angela Cook, claimant, appeals a decision of the Workers' Compensation Commission finding that claimant failed to prove she developed neutropenia as a compensable consequence of her work accident. On appeal, claimant contends the commission erred by concluding "there is not a causal connection between [her] Workers' Compensation injury and the development of neutropenia." Claimant also asserts "the presentation of evidence of [her] medical history was inaccurate and it has caused the Full Commission to err[] in [its] judgment [of] her case" and she "provided evidence stating that she had reached maximum medical improvement for the scarring on her left thigh as instructed by [the deputy commissioner], but the Full Commission did not render judgment for the scarring." We have reviewed the record and the commission's opinion and find that this appeal is without merit. Accordingly, we affirm

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

for the reasons stated by the commission in its final opinion. See Cook v. Volvo of Fredericksburg, VWC File No. VA00000683021 (Feb. 27, 2014).

Concerning claimant's assignment of error addressing disability benefits for scarring on her left thigh, footnote one of the opinion of the commission provides:

The claimant also sought permanent partial disability benefits for scarring on her left thigh. Because there was no medical evidence that the claimant had reached maximum medical improvement, the Deputy Commissioner noted that the Commission would retain "jurisdiction over the permanency issue until it is ripe for adjudication, if at all."

Id. at 2 n1.

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.

We deny employer's motions to dismiss the appeal, strike the opening brief, and strike claimant's appendix designation.

Affirmed.