

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Supreme Court

RECEIVED

DEC - 5 2014

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

S.C. Supreme Court

---

Lower Court Case No. 1002925

---

Appellate Case No. 2014-001691

---

Neal Beckman, Employee,.....Respondent,

v.

Sysco Columbia, LLC, Employer, and  
Gallagher Bassett Services, Inc., Carrier,.....Petitioners.

---

BRIEF OF PETITIONERS

---

Kathryn Fiehrer Walton  
Bar No. 75639  
Attorney for Petitioners  
Wood Law Group, LLC  
P.O. Box 20550  
Charleston, SC 29413  
(843) 577-5732

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....ii

STATEMENT OF ISSUES ON APPEAL.....1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....2

ARGUMENT

The Court of Appeals misapplied the standard of review and erred in reversing  
the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission's permanent disability  
award.....7

CONCLUSION.....13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

*Beckman v. Sysco Columbia, LLC*, 408 S.C. 501, 759 S.E.2d 750 (Ct. App. 2014).....7, 8, 11

*Fox v. Newberry County Memorial Hospital*, 319 S.C. 278, 280, 461 S.E.2d 392, 394 (1995).....12

*Hoxit v. Michelin Tire Corporation*, 304 S.C. 461, 405 S.E.2d 407 (1991).....9

*Lark v. Bilo, Inc.*, 276 S.C. 130, 276 S.E.2d 304 (1981).....8, 9

*Moore v. City of Easley*, 322 S.C. 455, 472 S.E.2d 626 (1996).....12

*Pratt v. Morris Roofing, Inc.*, 357 S.C. 619, 622, 594 S.E.2d 272, 274 (2004).....8

*Wigfall v. Tideland Utilities, Inc.*, 354 S.C. 100, 106-107, 580 S.E.2d 100, 103 (2003).....10, 11

Statutes

S.C. Code Ann. §42-1-40 (1976, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Ann. §42-1-130 (1976, as amended).....5

S.C. Code Ann. §42-1-140 (1976, as amended).....5

S.C. Code Ann. §42-1-160 (1976, as amended).....5

S.C. Code Ann. §42-9-10 (1976, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Ann. §42-9-20 (1976, as amended).....2, 6, 7, 8

S.C. Code Ann. §42-9-30 (1976, as amended).....2, 5, 6, 7, 10

S.C. Code Ann. §42-9-210 (1976, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Ann. §42-9-260 (1976, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Ann. §42-15-60 (1976, as amended).....5

Regulations

S.C. Code Reg. 67-501 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-502 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-503 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-504 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-505 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-506 (1990, as amended).....2, 6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-507 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-508 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-509 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-510 (1990, as amended).....6

S.C. Code Reg. 67-1605 (1990, as amended).....6

STATEMENT OF ISSUE ON APPEAL

1. The Petitioners assert that the Court of Appeals misapplied the standard of review and erred in concluding that there is not substantial evidence in the record to support the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission's Decision and Order dated December 5, 2012.

## STATEMENT OF THE CASE

The Respondent, Neal Beckman, was employed as a delivery driver with Sysco Columbia, LLC when he was involved in an admitted accident arising out of and in the course of his employment on March 25, 2010. Following the accident, Sysco Columbia, LLC and Gallagher Bassett Services, Inc. (hereinafter "Petitioners") provided the Claimant authorized medical care and treatment primarily with Dr. Timothy Zgleszewski. The Respondent also underwent a surgical evaluation with Dr. Scott Boyd. A Hearing was held before the single Commissioner in Summerville, South Carolina on April 26, 2012 to address the issues set forth in the Petitioners' Form 21 pursuant to S.C. Code Regulation 67-506 based on their position that the Respondent reached maximum medical improvement. The Petitioners asserted that the Respondent reached a level of maximum medical improvement on May 2, 2011 per Dr. Zgleszewski's medical note or alternatively by February 27, 2012 per Dr. Scott Boyd's medical note. The Petitioners further asserted that the Respondent should be awarded permanent disability benefits pursuant to S.C. Code §42-9-30 for loss of use of his back. The Respondent argued that any permanency award should be based on a loss of earnings capacity under S.C. Code §42-9-20 due to his assertion that he had additional body parts affected by his back injury.

Following the Hearing, the single Commissioner issued her Decision and Order, wherein she set forth the following Findings of Fact:

1. Claimant injured his low back in an admitted accident on March 25, 2010.
2. Claimant alleges that his admitted injury also affects his buttocks, legs, right foot, and right SI joint.
3. Claimant is 45 years of age (testimony of Claimant).
4. Claimant is a high school graduate. He attended one year of technical college when he studied to be an architectural engineer (testimony of Claimant; Claimant's APA #7, page 81; Defendants' APA #19, page 179).

5. Claimant's IQ is "high average" per Defendants' vocational expert. Claimant's vocational expert states that Claimant's word reading is the grade equivalent of 12.9, his sentence comprehension is the equivalent of 12.9, and his math computation is the equivalent of 12.9. Claimant enjoys reading books and magazines relating to guns (Defendants' APA #19, page 182; Claimant's APA #7, page 81).
6. Claimant's employment history includes work (a) as a stevedore (foreman) on container ships, (b) as a delivery driver for Coke and a beer distributor, and (c) in auto body repair (testimony of Claimant; Defendants' APA #19, pages 179-180; Claimant's APA #7, pages 81-82).
7. Claimant's job with Employer was delivery driver of food and restaurant supplies. This job is considered heavy (testimony of Claimant; Claimant's APA #7, page 81; Defendants' APA #19, page 175; Claimant's APA #10).
8. Claimant is a six-year employee (testimony of Claimant).
9. The objective evidence is interpreted by the authorized treating physician as showing "shallow protrusions, but no significant nerve root compromise" (Defendants' APA #12, page 106; *See also* Claimant's APA #4; Defendants' APA #16).
10. There is no objective evidence of radiculopathy. The authorized treating physician diagnoses radiculitis based upon Claimant's subjective complaints. At one point (post discectomy on April 2011), Claimant reported no leg pain at all (Defendants' APA #14, pages 110 and 115).
11. The Claimant also underwent an EMG/NCS study that revealed normal results with no objective evidence of radiculopathy.
12. I was not persuaded by Claimant's testimony regarding the alleged nine-day episode, including his (a) having to drag his left foot/leg behind him, and (b) description of having the posture/gait of a "mummy" (testimony of Claimant; Claimant's APA #11, containing a photograph of Claimant).
13. Because of his work-related injury, Claimant underwent injections, physical therapy, and a percutaneous discectomy (Claimant's APA #5, page 46).
14. Claimant reached maximum medical improvement on February 27, 2012 (Defendants' APA #12, page 106).
15. The authorized treating physician assigned a 15% combined impairment rating for the back and SI joint. Defendants' IME assigned an 8%

impairment rating (Claimant's APA #5, page 73; Defendants' APA #14, page 108; Defendants' APA #12, page 106; Claimant's APA #8, page 86).

16. My observations of Claimant's sitting tolerance at the hearing are very different than those noted by Claimant's vocational expert, as I noted no difficulties during the hour-long hearing. Claimant told Defendants' vocational expert that he attends church "every Sunday", but told his own vocational expert that is "unable to attend church due to his sitting intolerance" of greater than 30 minutes (observations of the undersigned; Claimant's APA #7, pages 79-80; Cf. Defendants' APA #19, page 181).
17. Claimant works out at Gold's Gym five days each week, and has lost approximately 40 lbs. since the date of the accident (testimony of Claimant; Defendants' surveillance video; Defendants' APA #19, page 181).
18. Claimant's statement to his vocational expert that he is socially withdrawn and can no longer tolerate being in crowds is inconsistent with his ability/desire to work out at Gold's Gym five days a week (Claimant's APA #7, page 80).
19. Claimant is able to drive (testimony of Claimant; Defendants' surveillance video).
20. Claimant is able to engage in his hobby of woodworking (testimony of Claimant).
21. Claimant takes no medication on a daily basis. No prescriptions have been written for Claimant within a year's time prior to the date of the hearing (testimony of Claimant).
22. Claimant showed "good" effort in his FCE, and the test results were considered valid by the evaluator (Defendants' APA #12, pages 106 and 111).
23. The restrictions from the FCE limit Claimant to medium duty work, and preclude him from returning to any of his pre-accident jobs (Claimant's APA #5, page 73; Defendants' APA #14, pages 108 and 111; Claimant's APA #6).
24. I give greater weight to the conclusions of Defendants' vocational expert. I base this finding on my review of the medical evidence and on my observations of Claimant at the hearing (Claimant's APA #7; Defendants' APA #19).

25. As to future medicals, Claimant is entitled to receive injections per the recommendation of the authorized treating physician, Dr. Zgleszewski. The surgical opinion by Dr. Scott Boyd suggests future medications although Claimant does not presently take any (Claimant's APA #5, page 73; Defendants' APA #14, page 108; Defendants' APA #8, page 86).
26. The Claimant has sustained a 35% permanent loss of use of the spine (encompassing Claimant's entire spine and including any alleged radiculitis) pursuant to §42-9-30(21).
27. I find that the greater weight of the evidence shows only the Claimant's back was affected by the March 25, 2010 admitted injury by accident.
28. Claimant is to receive his award in lump sum.
29. Claimant's request that Defendants provide him with a gym membership is denied. Claimant has worked out at gyms since he was 15 years of age, and worked out at Gold's Gym prior to the date of the injury (testimony of Claimant).
30. Claimant's average weekly wage is \$1,062.94, yielding a compensation rate of \$689.71.

(R.pp. 12-17).

As support for the aforementioned findings, the single Commissioner issued the following Rulings of Law:

1. Under §42-1-130, the Claimant was a covered employee, and under §42-1-140, the Employer was a covered Employer at the time in question.
2. Under §42-1-160, the Claimant sustained injuries to his low back only in an accident arising out of and in the course of his employment on March 25, 2010.
3. Under §42-15-60, the Defendants provided the Claimant proper and adequate medical care and treatment and the Claimant reached maximum medical improvement for his injuries sustained as a result of the March 25, 2010 accident by February 27, 2012. Further under §42-15-60, the Defendants shall be responsible for the causally related medical care and treatment which they authorized and which was incurred on or before February 27, 2012, the date of maximum medical improvement. Further under §42-15-60, the Defendants are responsible for the Claimant's injections per the recommendations of the authorized treating physician, Dr. Zgleszewski, and the Claimant's causally related future medications as

outlined by Dr. Scott Boyd as is necessary to lessen the Claimant's causally related disability resulting from the March 25, 2010 injury by accident.

4. Under §42-9-260 and Regulation 67-506, the Defendants are entitled to stop payment of temporary disability compensation and that shall be effective February 27, 2012, the date the Claimant reached maximum medical improvement.
5. Under §42-9-10, §42-9-20, §42-9-260, and Regulations 67-501 through 510, the Defendants have paid all temporary disability compensation for which they are liable and have no liability for any further temporary disability compensation.
6. Under §42-9-30(21), the Claimant sustained a 35% permanent loss of use to his back as a result of the accident on March 25, 2010.
7. Under §42-9-210, all temporary disability compensation paid to the Claimant for the period after February 27, 2012 constitutes payment towards the permanent partial disability award set forth herein and the Defendants are entitled to credit for all temporary disability compensation paid to the Claimant for the period after February 27, 2012 against liability for further compensation benefits awarded herein.
8. The Claimant is entitled to a lump sum payment pursuant to Regulations 67-1605(A) and 67-1605(E).
9. Under §42-1-40, the Claimant's average weekly wage is \$1,062.94 with a resulting weekly compensation rate of \$689.71.

(R.pp. 17-19).

From this Decision and Order, the Respondent timely filed a Form 30, Request for Full Commission Review. The Appellate Panel of the Workers' Compensation Commission affirmed the single Commissioner's Decision and Order in its entirety by Order dated December 5, 2012. (R.pp. 21-32). The Respondent appealed the December 5, 2012 Order of the Appellate Panel of the Workers' Compensation Commission to the Court of Appeals and oral arguments were held before the Court of Appeals on February 20, 2014. Thereafter the Court of Appeals issued Opinion No. 5205 on March 19, 2014 wherein the decision of the Appellate Panel of the

Workers' Compensation Commission was reversed and the matter was remanded to the Workers' Compensation Commission for an award pursuant to §42-9-20 of the South Carolina Code. On March 26, 2014, Petitioners filed a petition for rehearing with the Court of Appeals. On July 9, 2014, the petition for rehearing was denied; however, Opinion No. 5202 was withdrawn, substituted and refiled. *See Beckman v. Sysco Columbia, LLC*, 408 S.C. 501, 759 S.E.2d 750 (Ct. App. 2014). Thereafter Petitioners filed a petition for a writ of certiorari with this Honorable Court which was granted on November 6, 2014. Based on the following, Petitioners respectfully request that this Honorable Court reverse the decision of the Court of Appeals and reinstate the findings and award of the Appellate Panel of the Workers' Compensation Commission.

#### ARGUMENT

The Court of Appeals misapplied the standard of review and erred in reversing the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission's permanent disability award.

The Petitioners respectfully assert that in *Beckman v. Sysco Columbia, LLC*, 408 S.C. 501, 759 S.E.2d 750 (Ct. App. 2014), the Court of Appeals overlooked pertinent evidence in the record and substituted its own judgment for that of the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission (hereinafter "Commission") on the factual question of whether the Respondent had additional body parts affected by his admitted back injury. The Commission found that the Respondent sustained 35% permanent loss of use of the spine (encompassing Claimant's entire spine and including any alleged radiculitis) pursuant to S.C. Code §42-9-30(21). Although the Commission acknowledged that the Respondent alleged his admitted back injury also affected his buttocks, legs, right foot, and right SI joint, the Commission found that the greater weight of the evidence showed only the Respondent's back was affected by the March 25, 2010 injury by

accident. As such, the Commission awarded the Respondent substantial compensation for loss of use of his back and did not find that the Respondent was entitled to an award based on a loss of earnings capacity under S.C. Code §42-9-20. Following the Respondent's appeal, the Court of Appeals concluded "the Appellate Panel's order was clearly erroneous in view of the substantial evidence in the record that Beckman suffered from radiculopathy as a result of his back injury." *Id.* at 509, 754. The Petitioners hereby assert that the Court of Appeals erred by reviewing whether there was substantial evidence to support the Respondent's assertion that he had more than one body part affected by his back injury (and thus could proceed under the general disability statute, S.C. Code §42-9-20) as opposed to analyzing whether the Commission's findings were supported by substantial evidence.

In an appeal from the Commission, the Court may not substitute its judgment for that of the Commission as to the weight of the evidence on questions of fact, but may reverse where the decision is clearly erroneous in view of the record as a whole. *See Lark v. Bi-Lo*, 276 S.C. 130, 133-136, 276 S.E.2d 304, 306 (1981). A decision of the Commission must be affirmed if factual findings are supported by substantial evidence. *Id.* at 135, 306. Substantial evidence is not a mere scintilla of evidence, nor the evidence viewed blindly from one side of the case, but is evidence which, considering the record as a whole, would allow reasonable minds to reach the conclusion the administrative agency reached in order to justify its action. *Pratt v. Morris Roofing, Inc.*, 357 S.C. 619, 622, 594 S.E.2d 272, 274 (2004).

The Petitioners hereby submit that there is substantial evidence in the record which would allow a reasonable mind to reach the conclusion the Commission reached in the December 5, 2012 Decision and Order. As addressed in more detail herein below, the record includes three imaging reports showing the Respondent has mild degenerative disc disease with no significant

stenosis or frank impingement; the authorized physician's interpretation of the MRIs; a normal EMG/NCS of the Respondent's lower extremities; consistent normal physical exams of the lower extremities including a steady gait and normal strength throughout the course of medical treatment; video surveillance showing the Respondent's use of his lower extremities at Gold's Gym on the elliptical machine, Nautilus machines, and treadmill; as well as a surgical evaluation from Dr. Scott Boyd stating that he does not appreciate any significant nerve root compromise. (R.pp. 228-232, p. 188, p. 153, pp. 131-192, p. 249 and video, pp. 205-206). There are also findings made by the Commission regarding the credibility of the Respondent's testimony and the weight to be accorded specific evidence based on the record as a whole. (R.pp. 13-16). Therefore, the award of the Commission should not have been set aside as it is supported by substantial evidence. *Lark* at 136, 306.

The Petitioners concede that the Commission could have concluded that the Respondent had additional affected body parts as a result of the admitted March 25, 2010 back injury; however, the possibility of two different conclusions does not prohibit the Commission's decision from being supported by substantial evidence. *See Hoxit v. Michelin Tire Corp.*, 304 S.C. 461, 405 S.E.2d 407 (1991). The Respondent had subjective complaints of radicular pain during the course of his medical care with Dr. Zgleszewski: (R.pp. 138-192). As a result, Dr. Zgleszewski diagnosed the Respondent with "radiculitis not otherwise specified." The objective evidence, however, does not support that the Respondent's back injury affects additional body parts. Dr. Zgleszewski never referenced sensory or motor changes supporting radiculopathy. The "physical examination" and "lower extremity motor/sensory/dtr" sections of Dr. Zgleszewski's notes from April 19, 2010 through May 2, 2011 consistently state that the Respondent's gait and station is nonantalgic; he is able to raise up on his heels and toes; the

bilateral lower extremity motor examination is normal; the deep tendon reflexes of the bilateral patella and Achilles tendon are normal; and the bilateral lower extremity sensory examination is normal. (R.pp. 132, 139, 147, 153, 158, 164, 168, 176, 179, 183, 186, 189, 192). Dr. Zgleszewski also ordered an EMG/NCS and in reviewing the results stated that the Respondent did not have radiculopathy in either leg. (R.p. 153). At the visit prior to his release by Dr. Zgleszewski, the Respondent reported no leg pain and no pain radiating to his legs (R.p. 188).

In addition to the EMG/NCS, several MRIs were performed. The diagnostic studies reveal that the Respondent has mild degenerative disc disease without impingement or nerve root compromise. (R.pp. 129 - 130, 228 - 229). These diagnostics were interpreted by Dr. Boyd, a spine surgeon, and he opined that there is no nerve root compromise which would be evidence to explain the Respondent's radicular complaints. (R.pp. 205-206). According to Dr. Boyd, the Respondent appeared to have normal power in his lower extremities and a steady gait. (R.p. 205). Additionally, the Respondent's lower extremity physical capabilities while using an elliptical machine, treadmill and weights at Gold's Gym were captured on surveillance and do not reveal any motor deficiencies to support the alleged radiculopathy. (R. 249 and CD video). In fact, the Respondent credits his exercise routine for his 40 pound weight loss since the date of accident. (R.p. 72, lines 18-19). The Respondent also confirmed that there was no medical treatment requested and no medications were prescribed for over the year prior to the single Commissioner hearing on April 26, 2012. (R.p. 99, lines 3 - 25).

The Petitioners assert that this is not a situation where the Respondent's disability is far greater than the scheduled compensation provided under S.C. Code §42-9-30. As discussed in *Wigfall v. Tideland Utilities, Inc.*, 354 S.C. 100, 580 S.E.2d 100 (2003), two or more injuries occurring together may have a far greater disabling effect than the arithmetical total of the

scheduled allowance. *Id.* at 106-107, 103. In this matter, the Respondent had an admitted injury to his back but the MRIs, EMG/NCS, motor and sensory exams, spine surgeon interpretation and eye-witness accounts do not support that more than the Respondent's back is affected by his admitted injury. The Respondent is able to perform his hobbies of woodworking and fishing; work full time in a medium duty capacity; exercise daily without the assistance of medications; and perform housework such as sweeping, dusting, vacuuming, washing dishes and laundry. (R.pp. 213, 206; p. 101, lines 6-17).

In discussing the evidence in the record to support that the Respondent suffered from radiculopathy, the Court of Appeals cited the report from Dr. Boyd's surgical evaluation on February 27, 2012. *Beckman* at 509, 754. The decision states that Dr. Boyd noted the Respondent suffered pain that radiated into his left leg and he had numbness around his foot. *Id.* The report of Dr. Boyd actually states that the Respondent "describes his pain pattern as that most predominantly of low back pain. His pain does occasionally radiate down into his left leg and he states that he has some numbness around his foot." The Petitioners hereby submit that Dr. Boyd summarized the Respondent's subjective complaints reported to him but Dr. Boyd did not conclude or diagnose the Respondent with radiculopathy or radiculitis. (R.p. 205). Further, Dr. Boyd's surgical evaluation states that he does not appreciate any significant nerve root compromise which would explain the Respondent's alleged radicular complaints. (R.p. 206). Dr. Boyd does not discuss any additional affected body parts in addition to the low back throughout his impressions and plan. (R.p. 206). Dr. Boyd only discussed objective evidence of a muscular spasm in the lumbar spine. (R.p. 206). Dr. Boyd further opined that the Respondent is not a surgical candidate, assigned an 8% impairment of the back, agreed that the Respondent

could perform medium physical duty work for an 8-hour day and indicated in the future the Respondent may only benefit from pain medication and muscle relaxers. (R.p. 206).

The single Commissioner made findings (which were adopted by the Commission) regarding observations of the Respondent's sitting tolerance being inconsistent with evidence submitted by the Respondent. (R.p. 15). The Commission's Finding of Fact No. 12 also states the Commission was not persuaded by the Respondent's testimony regarding an alleged nine-day episode of having to drag his left foot/leg behind him and having the posture/gait of a mummy. (R.p. 14). As the Commission has the best opportunity to review such evidence, the weight of this evidence is reserved for the Commission. *See Fox v. Newberry County Memorial Hospital*, 319 S.C. 278, 280, 461 S.E.2d 392, 394 (1995) (The duty to determine facts is placed solely on the Commission and the reviewing court has no authority to determine factual issues).


Based on the evidence as a whole, the Petitioners hereby submit that the factual findings of the Commission are supported by substantial evidence and therefore the Commission's decision should be affirmed. The Commission based its findings on objective evidence as opposed to the diagnosis of radiculitis by a pain management physician based on the Respondent's subjective complaints. Although there may be conflicting evidence as to whether the Respondent's back injury had an effect on another body part, when the evidence is conflicting over a factual issue, the findings of the Commission are conclusive. The mere fact that a reasonable mind could have concluded that the Respondent had more than one affected body part does not prevent the Commission's findings from being supported by substantial evidence. *Moore v. City of Easley*, 322 S.C. 455, 472 S.E.2d 626 (1996). Therefore, the Petitioners assert that the Court of Appeals misapplied the standard of review and erred in

reversing the Commission's permanent disability award and remanding the matter to the Commission for further proceedings.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioners respectfully request that the Court reverse the Court of Appeals' decision and affirm the findings and award of the Commission.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By:   
Kathryn Fiehrer Walton  
Attorney for Petitioners  
Wood Law Group, LLC  
P.O. Box 20550  
Charleston, SC 29413  
(843) 577-5732

December 2, 2014

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM SOUTH CAROLINA  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

RECEIVED

DEC 5 2014

S.C. Supreme Court

Lower Court Case No. 1002925

Appellate Case No. 2014-001691

Neal Beckman, Employee,.....Respondent,

v.

Sysco Columbia, LLC, Employer, and  
Gallagher Bassett Services, Inc., Carrier,.....Petitioners.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Brief of the Petitioners by depositing a copy in the United States mail, postage pre-paid, on December 2, 2014 addressed to the following:

Frederick W. Riesen, Jr.  
Attorney for Respondent  
3660 West Montague Avenue  
North Charleston, SC 29418

Stephen Benjamin Samuels  
Attorney for Respondent  
1320 Richland Street  
Columbia, SC 29201

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings  
P.O. Box 11629  
Columbia, SC 29211

Ms. Amy Bracy, Judicial Director  
South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission  
P.O. Box 1715  
Columbia, SC 29202-1715

RECEIVED

DEC 5 2014

S.C. Supreme Court

By: Kathryn Fiehrer Walton  
Kathryn Fiehrer Walton  
Bar No. 75639  
Attorney for Petitioners  
Wood Law Group, LLC  
P.O. Box 20550  
Charleston, SC 29413  
(843) 577-5732

WOOD LAW GROUP, LLC  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
ONE WESLEY DRIVE  
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29407  
(843) 577-5732 FAX (843) 577-4326

J. HUBERT WOOD, III

KATHRYN F. WALTON  
MATTHEW J. FULTZ

REPLY TO  
P.O. Box 20550  
CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA 29413

December 2, 2014

The Honorable Daniel Shearouse  
Clerk, South Carolina Supreme Court  
P.O. Box 11330  
Columbia, SC 29211

RECEIVED

DEC 5 2014

S.C. Supreme Court

Re: Neal Beckman v. Sysco Columbia, LLC  
W.C.C. File No.: 1002925  
Carrier File No.: 011924-107312-WC-01  
Our File No.: 32.64  
Case No.: 2014-001691

Dear Mr. Shearouse:

I represent Petitioners Sysco Columbia, LLC and Gallagher Basset Services, Inc. in the above named matter. Please find enclosed for filing the original and fifteen (15) copies of the Brief of the Petitioners along with thirteen (13) additional copies of the Appendix. I have also enclosed a pre-paid return envelope for your use in returning one (1) clocked copy of the Brief of the Petitioners to my office.

By copy of this letter, I am serving all interested parties with a copy of the Brief of the Petitioners. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,



Kathryn Fiehrer Walton

KFW/ws  
Enclosure

cc: Ms. Roberta Williams (w/ partial att.) (Via E-Mail Only)  
Fred W. Riesen, Jr., Esquire (w/ partial enc.)  
Stephen W. Samuels, Esquire (w/ partial enc.)

Mr. Daniel Shearouse  
December 2, 2014  
Page 2

The Honorable Jenny Abbott Kitchings (w/ partial enc.)  
Ms. Amy Bracy (w/ partial enc.)