

COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA

Present: Judges McClanahan, Haley and Senior Judge Willis

INOVA FAIRFAX HOSPITAL,
INOVA HEALTH SYSTEM FOUNDATION, INC. AND
PMA MANAGEMENT CORPORATION

v. Record No. 2233-10-4

NEZHA ALAOUI

MEMORANDUM OPINION*
PER CURIAM
MARCH 8, 2011

FROM THE VIRGINIA WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

(Joshua M. Wulf; Angela F. Gibbs; Midkiff, Muncie & Ross, P.C.,
on brief), for appellants.

(Jin Kim; Chasen Boscolo, on brief), for appellee.

Inova Fairfax Hospital, Inova Health System Foundation, Inc. and PMA Management Corporation (collectively “employer”) appeal a decision of the Workers’ Compensation Commission. Employer asserts the commission erred in (1) finding claimant proved her disability, and specifically, the recurrence of post-traumatic headaches, was causally related to her February 12, 2008 workplace injury; (2) finding any disability and medical treatment since August 31, 2009, was causally related to claimant’s workplace injury; (3) relying on Dr. Rajesh K. Sethi’s medical opinions, diagnosis, and treatment to conclude claimant’s disability and medical treatment after August 31, 2009, were causally related to her workplace injury rather than relying on the medical opinion of Dr. John W. Cochran, who reached the opposite conclusion; (4) relying on Dr. Sethi’s medical conclusions when his reports failed to explain the recurrence of symptoms after an eight-month lapse in treatment for any symptoms; (5) failing to

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

deny the claim based on inconsistencies in claimant's testimony that suggested other possible causes of her headaches and the duration of symptoms; and (6) failing to deny the claim where all of claimant's objective tests have been normal and the finding of disability was based solely on claimant's subjective complaints. 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 Alaoui v. Inova Fairfax Hosp., VWC File No. 237-49-81 (Sept. 22, 2010). 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.