

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In the Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Appellate Case No: 2012-205569

Loretta Springs,Petitioner,
Clemson University and State Accident Fund.....Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Paul C. Rathke, Esquire (SCB#: 6990)
The Joel Bieber Firm
201 East North Street
Greenville, SC 29601
864-370-9300
Prathke@joelbieber.com
Attorney for Petitioner

Reginald Gay, Esquire
McNair Law Firm
P.O. Box 4086
Anderson, SC 29622
Attorney for Respondent

RECEIVED

APR 26 2013

S.C. SUPREME COURT

INDEX

Certificate of Counsel 1

Questions Presented 1

Statement of the Case 1

Arguments 3

1. The Court of Appeals erroneously affirmed the Workers' Compensation Commission decision because it overlooked or misapprehended the standard used by the hearing Commissioner in denying the compensability of the mental injury and its symptoms as "more related" to the childhood abuse 5

Conclusion 7

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

Counsel for petitioner certifies that the Petition for Rehearing was made and finally ruled on by the Court of Appeals on March 27, 2013.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. **Did the Court of Appeals err in failing to address and follow the precedence and established law found in Anderson v. Baptist Medical Center, 343 S.C. 487, 541 S.E. 2d 526 (2001).**
2. **Did the Workers' Compensation Commission misapply South Carolina law when it found the Appellant's mental injury was aggravated by the work injury but still found it not compensable because it was "more related" to childhood abuse.**

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On March 27, 2013, the Court of Appeals issued an opinion affirming the decision of the Workers' Compensation Commission which affirmed the Decision and Order of the Single Commissioner.

The Appellate Panel cited Bartley v. Allendale Cnty. Sch. Dist., 392 S.C. 300, 306, 709 W.E.2d 619, 622 (2011) for the proposition that the Court of Appeals must affirm the findings of fact made by the Petitioner Panel if they are supported by substantial evidence. The Court of Appeals did not address the arguments made in the appeal by the Petitioner.

The Petitioner maintains she suffered work related injuries from an accident occurring on October 12, 2007 when she fell from a golf cart hitting her head and injuring her neck, back, and hip. The Petitioner contends she sustained a physical brain injury and injuries to her head, her back, her coccyx, her left lower extremity related to nerve damage, her ears, her nose, her

tongue, her olfactory nerve, anxiety, depression, and psychological overlay. These mental injuries are severe and manifest as dissociative identity disorder.

The Respondents admitted injuries to the coccyx, hip, and head. The Respondents maintained the Petitioner suffered a minor closed head injury (concussion) which subsequently healed. The Respondents specifically denied physical brain damage. The Respondents contended the Petitioner's current psychological condition and need for counseling is primarily related to her past post-traumatic stress disorder as a result of childhood abuse resulting in dissociative identity disorder (multiple personalities).

A hearing in this matter was held before Commissioner Avery B. Wilkerson, Jr. The hearing was set on the Form 50. Commissioner Wilkerson took evidence on the claim and issued a Decision and Order filed April 11, 2011. Both sides subsequently and timely filed Requests for Review by the Appellate Panel of the South Carolina Workers' Compensation Commission asserting numerous errors on the part of Commissioner Wilkerson. (Form 30 of Claimant, pp. 32-34), Form 30 of Defendants.)

The issues heard by the Commission on August 15, 2011. (Claimant/Petitioner's Brief, pp. 35-46), Defendants'/Respondents' Brief). The Appellate Panel Decision and Order dated November 16, 2011 affirmed the decision of the Hearing with the following Award:

The Claimant is entitled to 10 weeks of permanent disability to her coccyx and 15 weeks of permanent disability to her back, representing five (5%) percent disability to her back, totaling 25 weeks. Based on the Claimant's compensation rate of \$289.95, this totals \$7,248.75.

The Claimant sustained a minor closed head injury which subsequently healed and has not suffered permanent physical brain damage as contemplated under S.C. Code Ann. §42-9-10.

The Claimant currently suffers from at least five (5) different personalities as a result of her dissociative identity disorder stemming from post-traumatic stress disorder from childhood abuse. The Claimant's memory problems and other psychological conditions are more related to her childhood abuse than as a direct result of her work injury. Accordingly, the Claimant is not entitled to any permanent disability for the closed head injury.

The Claimant is entitled to additional medical care and treatment which would tend to lessen her period of disability. At the current time, this would include the counseling by Dr. Kriegel as his counseling is for both pain and her PTSD.

The Claimant is to be referred to vocational rehabilitation, and the Defendants will be responsible for the cost.

The Claimant timely filed a Notice of Appeal from this Order.

ARGUMENT

This case presents a novel issue in as much as the hearing commissioner seems to have relied on a standard not found in the SC Workers' Compensation Act or in South Carolina case law.

The issue of a new standard of compensability is of considerable importance to the workers' compensation bar. This new standard used by the Commissioner and affirmed without discussion by both the full commission and the S.C. Court of Appeals is whether an aggravation of a pre-existing condition can still be held not compensable if it is "more related" to the pre-existing cause and not the work injury.

Certiorari should be granted because this is a novel question of law. Furthermore, the decision of the Commissioner, as affirmed, directly conflicts with this Court's prior decision in Anderson v. Baptist Medical Ctr., 343 S.C. 487, 541 S.E. 2d 526 (2001).

Current state of the Law

The Act addresses the standard for the compensability of the aggravation of mental injuries in S.C. Code Ann. §42-1-160 (D):

(D) Stress, mental injuries, and mental illness alleged to have been aggravated by a work-related physical injury may not be found compensable unless the aggravation is:

(1) admitted by the employer/carrier;

(2) noted in a medical record of an authorized physician that, in the physician's opinion, the condition is at least in part causally-related or connected to the injury or accident, whether or not the physician refers the employee for treatment of the condition;

(3) found to be causally-related or connected to the accident or injury after evaluation by an authorized psychologist or psychiatrist; or

(4) noted in a medical record or report of the employee's physician as causally-related or connected to the injury or accident.

In the Anderson opinion, this Court definitely explained the compensability of an aggravation of a pre-existing mental injury and held, while reversing the workers compensation Commission, that the psychological treatment was compensable after a work injury aggravated a pre-existing psychological problem even where the Claimant was already treating for the problem before the work injury in question. The Court found that the only substantial evidence was that the work injury made her condition worse.

THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
In The Supreme Court

APPEAL FROM THE SOUTH CAROLINA COURT OF APPEALS

Appellate Case No: 2012-205569

Loretta Springs,Petitioner,
Clemson University and State Accident Fund.....Respondent.

PROOF OF SERVICE

I certify that I have served the Petition for a Writ of Certiorari and Appendix on Clemson University and State Accident Fund by depositing a copy of it in the United States Mail, postage prepaid, on April 25, 2013, addressed to their attorney of record, Reginald M. Gay, McNair Law Firm, P.O. Box 4086, Anderson, SC 29622.

April 25, 2013



Paul C. Rathke, Esquire (SCB#: 6990)
The Joel Bieber Firm
201 East North Street
Greenville, SC 29601
864-370-9300
Attorney for Appellant

RECEIVED

APR 26 2013

S.C. SUPREME COURT