

**THIS OPINION HAS NO PRECEDENTIAL VALUE. IT SHOULD NOT BE
CITED OR RELIED ON AS PRECEDENT IN ANY PROCEEDING
EXCEPT AS PROVIDED BY RULE 268(d)(2), SCACR.**

**THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Court of Appeals**

James Osment, Appellant,

v.

The Timken Company and Phoenix Insurance Company,
Respondents.

Appellate Case No. 2015-000808

Appeal From The Workers' Compensation Commission

Unpublished Opinion No. 2017-UP-001
Heard December 7, 2016 – Filed January 4, 2017

AFFIRMED

John David Hawkins, Charles Logan Rollins, II, and
George Randall Taylor, all of The Hawkins Law Firm, of
Spartanburg, for Appellant.

J. South Lewis, II, of Willson Jones Carter & Baxley,
P.A., of Greenville, for Respondents.

LOCKEMY, C.J.: James Osment appeals the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission Appellate Panel order, arguing the Appellate Panel erred in finding (1) he did not sustain a compensable injury to his back or right hip as a result of his work-related right knee injury and (2) he sustained only 60%

permanent partial disability to his right knee as a result of his work-related injury. We affirm pursuant to Rule 220(b), SCACR, and the following authorities: *Frame v. Resort Servs. Inc.*, 357 S.C. 520, 527, 593 S.E.2d 491, 494 (Ct. App. 2004) ("The substantial evidence rule of the Administrative Procedures Act governs the standard of review in a [w]orkers' [c]ompensation decision."); *Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. S.C. Second Injury Fund*, 363 S.C. 612, 620, 611 S.E.2d 297, 300 (Ct. App. 2005) ("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."); *Shealy v. Aiken Cty.*, 341 S.C. 448, 455, 535 S.E.2d 438, 442 (2000) (holding the Appellate Panel is the ultimate fact finder, and the final determination of witness credibility and the weight to be accorded evidence is reserved to the Appellate Panel); *Olson v. S.C. Dep't of Health & Env'tl. Control*, 379 S.C. 57, 63, 663 S.E.2d 497, 501 (Ct. App. 2008) ("The mere possibility of drawing two inconsistent conclusions from the evidence does not prevent a finding from being supported by substantial evidence.").

AFFIRMED.

LOCKEMY, C.J., and KONDUROS and MCDONALD, JJ., concur.