NOTICE
This order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and may not be cited as precedent by any party except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

NOTICE
Decision filed 12/10/12. The text of this decision may be changed or corrected prior to the filing of a Petition for Rehearing or the disposition of the same.

2012 IL App (1st) 113522WC-U

NO. 1-11-3522WC

IN THE

APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS

FIRST DISTRICT

WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION DIVISION

LAURETTA GRADY,	)	Appeal from the
	)	Circuit Court of
Appellant,	)	Cook County.
	)	
v.	)	No. 11-L-50009-14
	)	
ILLINOIS WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION, (Aunt Martha's Youth Services),	)	Honorable
	)	Daniel T. Gillespie,
Appellee.	)	Judge, presiding.

JUSTICE STEWART delivered the judgment of the court.
Justices Hoffman, Hudson, Holdridge and Turner concurred in the judgment.

ORDER

¶ 1 The appellant, Lauretta Grady, the claimant in the underlying workers' compensation case, appeals from a decision of the circuit court of Cook County. The arbitrator issued a decision on January 13, 2010, finding that the claimant had been injured on December 21, 2000, in an accident that arose out of and in the course of her employment with Aunt Martha's Youth Service. The arbitrator awarded the claimant temporary total disability

payments in the amount of $588 per week for 98 3/7 weeks, from December 22, 2000, through November 11, 2002, and an additional award of $516.15 per week for 75 weeks based upon the finding that the claimant was disabled to the extent of 15% loss of use of the person as a whole pursuant to section 8(d)(2) of the Illinois Workers' Compensation Act. 820 ILCS 305/8(d)(2) (West 2010). On December 13, 2010, the Workers' Compensation Commission (Commission) affirmed and adopted the arbitrator's decision. On December 1, 2011, the circuit court of Cook County confirmed the Commission's decision, finding that the Commission's decision was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 2 On appeal to this court, the claimant argues that she is entitled to an award based on 100% permanent total disability and a "lifetime Rehabilitation award with no time or care limit," as well as back pay and other requests. The question of whether an employee is entitled to permanent total disability is a question of fact for the Commission to decide, and we will not disturb that finding unless it is against the manifest weight of the evidence. *Economy Packing Co. v. Illinois Workers' Compensation Comm'n*, 387 Ill. App. 3d 283, 293, 901 N.E.2d 915, 924 (2009). "For a finding of fact to be contrary to the manifest weight of the evidence, an opposite result must be clearly apparent." *Id.*

¶ 3 The Commission found "a consistent pattern from both the treating and examining physicians that there was no real objective medical explanation or cause for the [claimant's] subjective complaints." We have thoroughly reviewed the entire record. The record supports the Commission's ruling that the claimant is disabled to the extent of a 15% loss of use of the person as a whole, and an opposite conclusion is not clearly apparent.

¶ 4 It is the judgment of this court that the Commission's decision is not against the manifest weight of the evidence. Therefore, we affirm the order of the circuit court confirming the Commission's decision by summary order pursuant to Supreme Court Rule

23(c)(5), (8).

¶ 5 Affirmed.