Posted as a Service of Www.InsideWorkersCompNY.com

State of New York Www.InsideWorkersCompNY.com

Supreme Court, Appellate Division

Third Judicial Department

Decided and Entered: February 23, 2012

512435

In the Matter of the Claim of DARYL E. ECCLES,

Respondent,

AFFIRMED Board's reversal of the Law Judge, by finding the injury was in the course of employment.

 $\mathbf{v}$ 

TRUCK-LITE, INC., et al.,
Appellants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

WORKERS' COMPENSATION BOARD, Respondent.

Calendar Date: January 6, 2012

Before: Mercure, Acting P.J., Spain, Kavanagh, Stein and

Egan Jr., JJ.

\_\_\_\_\_

Hamberger & Weiss, Buffalo (Kristin M. Machelor of counsel), for appellants.

Eric T. Schneiderman, Attorney General, New York City (Iris A. Steel of counsel), for Workers' Compensation Board, respondent.

\_\_\_\_

Spain, J.

Appeal from a decision of the Workers' Compensation Board, filed September 9, 2010, which ruled that claimant sustained an accidental injury in the course of his employment and awarded workers' compensation benefits.

Claimant sustained injuries to his head when he fell from his chair while at work. Claimant thereafter sought workers' compensation benefits. The employer and its workers'

-2-

512435

compensation carrier controverted the claim, arguing that the accident occurred as a result of a non-work-related medical condition. The Workers' Compensation Board determined that claimant's accident and injuries were not due to his preexisting diabetic condition and awarded benefits. The employer and its carrier now appeal.

The record in this case clearly presents conflicting evidence regarding the cause of claimant's fall. Board's decision reflects that it considered all of the conflicting evidence and, ultimately, credited that which indicated that claimant did not have a hypoglycemic episode precipitating his fall and injury, and concluded that the presumption of compensability pursuant to Workers' Compensation Law § 21 had not been rebutted. Inasmuch as the Board is vested with the exclusive authority to evaluate witness credibility and to credit the opinion of one medical expert over that of another, we will not disturb its decision despite the existence of evidence that would support a contrary result (see Matter of Pappas v State Univ. of N.Y. at Binghamton, 53 AD3d 941, 943 [2008]; Matter of Scalzo v St. Joseph's Hosp., 297 AD2d 883, 884 Similarly, we will not disturb the Board's implicit [2002]). credibility determination leading to a rejection of the argument by the employer and its carrier that the claim should be denied based upon a violation of Workers' Compensation Law § 114-a (see Matter of Dory v New York State Elec. & Gas Corp., 64 AD3d 848, 848 [2009]; Matter of Potter v Curtis Lbr. Co., Inc., 10 AD3d 819, 820 [2004]).

Mercure, Acting P.J., Kavanagh, Stein and Egan Jr., JJ., concur.

-3-

512435

ORDERED that the decision is affirmed, without costs.

ENTER:

Robert D. Mayberger Clerk of the Court