

**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).

2026 IL App (3d) 250384WC-U

Order filed May 8, 2026

---

IN THE  
APPELLATE COURT OF ILLINOIS  
THIRD DISTRICT  
WORKERS' COMPENSATION COMMISSION DIVISION

---

PETROLEUM SERVICE GROUP, LLC,	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
	)	of the 12th Judicial Circuit,
	)	of Will County, Illinois
Appellant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Appeal No. 3-25-0384WC
	)	Circuit Nos. 2022 MR 404,
	)	2024 MR 394
	)	
ILLINOIS WORKERS' COMPENSATION	)	Honorable
COMMISSION, <i>et al.</i> , (Jason Fedro,	)	Brian Barrett,
Appellees.)	)	Judge, Presiding.

---

PRESIDING JUSTICE Holdridge delivered the judgment of the court.  
Justices Rochford, Mullen, Cavanagh, and Barberis concurred in the judgment.

**ORDER**

¶ 1 *Held:* The Commission's initial finding that the claimant failed to prove that he sustained a work-related accident was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 2 The claimant, Jason Fedro, filed an application for adjustment of claim under the Workers' Compensation Act (Act) (820 ILCS 305/1 *et seq.* (West 2018)), seeking benefits for a back injury he claimed to have sustained on October 23, 2019, while he was employed by respondent Petroleum Service Group, LLC (employer). After conducting a hearing, an arbitrator found that the claimant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he had sustained

a work-related accident. The arbitrator further found that the claimant had failed to prove that he had provided notice of the alleged work accident to the employer within 45 days, as required by section 6(c) of the Act (820 ILCS 305/6(c) (West 2018)). The arbitrator found all other issues raised by the claimant to be moot.

¶ 3 The claimant appealed the arbitrator's decision to the Illinois Workers' Compensation Commission (Commission). The Commission affirmed the arbitrator's finding that the claimant failed to prove that he had sustained a work-related accident. The Commission struck the arbitrator's finding and analysis on the issue of notice because it found that issue to be mooted by the Commission's finding that the claimant failed to prove a work-related accident. The Commission also struck a sentence from the arbitrator's decision and corrected some scrivener's errors. The Commission affirmed and adopted the arbitrator's decision as modified.

¶ 4 The claimant sought judicial review of the Commission's decision in the circuit court of Will County. The circuit court reversed the Commission's decision. The court held that the claimant had suffered an accident that arose out of and in the course of his employment. The court further held that claimant had given timely notice of the work accident to the employer. The court remanded the matter to the Commission to decide the remaining issues that had been raised by the claimant, including causation, average weekly wage, and temporary total disability (TTD).

¶ 5 On remand, the Commission found that the claimant had proven that his current conditions of ill-being are causally related to the October 23, 2019, work accident. It further determined the claimant's average weekly wage and awarded the claimant TTD and medical expenses.

¶ 6 The employer sought judicial review of the Commission’s decision in the circuit court of Will County. The circuit court confirmed the Commission’s decision. The employer filed a motion to reconsider, which the circuit court denied.

¶ 7 This appeal followed.

¶ 8 **BACKGROUND**

¶ 9 The claimant worked for the employer as a locomotive engineer and switchman. He was assigned to work at a railyard facility that the employer serviced for Ineos Styrolution (Ineos). His job duties included operating a locomotive and forklifts, spotting and switching railcars, loading and unloading railcars, and cleaning hopper cars. The work was physically demanding. It required frequent climbing of steep exterior locomotive stairs from uneven rock ballast and manipulating heavy equipment.

¶ 10 The claimant worked 12-hour shifts with a regular partner, Anthony Stein-Rojas (Anthony). During the relevant time period, the claimant and Anthony were working the night shift from 6:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m.

¶ 11 The claimant testified that on October 23, 2019, at approximately 9:15 p.m., he was walking upstairs on a locomotive when he felt a sharp, excruciating pain in his back. The pain radiated up his back and down his right leg. The claimant claimed that he had never felt similar pain before. He testified that, shortly after the incident, he told Anthony that he “tweaked” or pulled his back and felt sharp pain. The claimant continued working the remainder of his shift, but at a substantially reduced level of productivity. By the end of their shift, the claimant and Anthony had cleaned only three or four cars, while the average was typically eight to ten cars. While they normally would haul 8 to 24 cars filled with rubber per shift, the claimant hauled none that night and Anthony only hauled a small amount.

¶ 12 At the end of each shift, the employer's workers completed written shift reports documenting the work they had performed during their shift and the production levels achieved during the shift. The workers would give these reports to Ineos's on-site supervisor, and they would deliver a copy of the reports to their supervisor, Zach Huvila. The written forms had a space where the worker could note any concerns or problems that had occurred during the shift. The claimant testified that, in addition to completing the written shift report, he would inform the supervisors verbally of any problems or issues that had arisen during the shift.

¶ 13 The claimant testified that he wrote a shift report at the conclusion of his October 23-24, 2019, shift. In the report, he noted his reduced productivity during the shift. He stated that he gave the report to the Ineos on-site shift supervisor and apologized for his lack of productivity. The claimant testified that he was unable to give Huvila a copy of the report that morning because Huvila was not at work. The employer did not produce the claimant's shift report during the arbitration hearing.

¶ 14 At the end of their night shifts, the employer's workers would inform the workers arriving for the day shift what had happened that night and what work to expect during their shift. The employees who worked the day shift immediately after the claimant's shift on October 24, 2019, were Jose Hernandez and Jason Wheatley. The claimant testified that, when Hernandez and Wheatley arrived to relieve the claimant and Anthony on the morning of October 24, 2019, the claimant told Hernandez that he did not know exactly what he did, but that he hurt his back and was not able to get the normal number of cars cleaned or rubber hauled.

¶ 15 The claimant then went home, took over-the-counter pain medication, and slept. He returned to work on the evening of October 24, 2019, for his overnight shift. The claimant and Anthony worked their shift but accomplished very little. The claimant testified that, when the

day shift workers arrived the following morning, he told them that he was still suffering but he did what he could. The claimant documented his lack of productivity in his October 25, 2019, shift report.

¶ 16 The claimant delivered his shift report to Huvila that morning. The claimant testified that he told Huvila about the injury he sustained at work on October 23, 2019. Specifically, the claimant testified that he told Huvila that he had been going up the locomotive steps when he felt a pull in his back that got worse and worse. He denied telling Huvila that his injury was due to sciatica. The claimant advised Huvila that he would have told him about his injury the day before if Huvila had been at work. The claimant was not scheduled to work again until the following Monday, October 28, 2019. Huvila told the claimant to rest over the weekend and to seek medical care if his symptoms got worse. Huvila recommended that the claimant see Huvila's father-in-law, who was a chiropractor.

¶ 17 October 28, 2019, the claimant called the employer and said that he would not be able to work due to his back injury. A few hours later, the claimant went to Advanced Urgent Care in Orland Park, where he saw Dr. Mohamad Alzein. Dr. Alzein's treatment record indicates that the claimant reported experiencing "hard" back pain radiating to the right hip and leg and numbness in the right foot. The record further states that "[t]he patient reports while at work on Thursday he felt a sharp pain to the right buttock. The patient states by the end of the shift he was barely able to walk." Dr. Alzein diagnosed acute right-sided sciatica and radiculopathy and ordered a lumbar MRI. Dr. Alzein prescribed medication and held the claimant off work pending MRI review and follow-up.

¶ 18 The MRI was performed on November 4, 2019. It showed disc herniations at L4/5 and L5/S1 causing foraminal and spinal stenosis. The following day, Dr. Alzein prescribed physical

therapy and referred the claimant to Dr. Nitin Malhotra, a pain management specialist at Expert Pain Physicians in Orland Park.

¶ 19 The claimant saw Dr. Nitin Malhotra on November 11, 2019. Dr. Malhotra's treatment record states: "Onset of pain is 10/24/19. First such event, no inciting event. [Claimant] is currently off work due to pain (Locomotive engineer – mainly standing/walking)." Dr. Malhotra diagnosed low back pain and radiculopathy on the lumbar region. He also diagnosed spondylosis in the lumbar region, which is an age-related degeneration of the spine's joints, discs, and vertebra. Dr. Malhotra recommended that the claimant remain off work and undergo epidural injections.

¶ 20 The claimant returned to Dr. Malhotra on November 14, 2019, to receive the first steroid injection. Dr. Malhotra's treatment record of that visit repeats his diagnoses of low back pain, lumbar radiculopathy, and "other intervertebral disc degeneration" in the lumbar region.

¶ 21 The claimant followed up with Dr. Malhotra on November 25, 2019. Dr. Malhotra's record of that visit repeats the initial history of injury reported by the claimant, stating "[o]nset of pain is 10/24/19. First such event, no inciting event." The claimant received a second injection on November 27, 2019.

¶ 22 The claimant followed up with Dr. Malhotra on December 11, 2019. Dr. Malhotra's record of that visit again notes that the claimant's pain began on October 24, 2019, and that there was no inciting event. The claimant reported experiencing some relief from the first injection but no significant relief from the second injection. Dr. Malhotra referred the claimant to an orthopedic surgeon.

¶ 23 On December 24, 2019, the claimant saw Dr. Gurpal Pannu, an orthopedic spine surgeon. Dr. Pannu recommended that the claimant undergo a right-sided L5-S1 microdiscectomy.

¶ 24 The claimant saw Dr. Malhotra five times in 2020. Dr. Malhotra's treatment records of the first three of those visits (January 9, January 24, and February 24) all note that the claimant's back pain had "no inciting event."

¶ 25 On February 11, 2020, the claimant was examined by Dr. Cary Templin, an orthopedic surgeon who served as the employer's independent medical examiner (IME). The claimant reported to Dr. Templin that, upon ascending steps on a locomotive at work, he developed severe right gluteal pain which worsened as the night went on and extended into his right leg. Dr. Templin opined that, based on the history of injury reported by the claimant, the claimant's disc herniation was causally related to the alleged work accident and that the claimant's symptoms were consistent with the objective findings. Dr. Templin noted there was significant degeneration at L5/S1, and that the claimant's obesity was a contributor to this. Noting that the claimant reported little to no relief with injections, Dr. Templin recommended either a far lateral decompression surgery for the right L5 nerve root, or a lumbar fusion with resection of the facet joint to decompress.

¶ 26 The claimant returned to Dr. Malhotra on February 24, 2020. Dr. Malhotra's record of that visit indicates that orthopedic surgery had been recommended "pending medical clearance/litigation/IME."

¶ 27 Beginning on March 23, 2020, the history of the claimant's injury reported in Dr. Malhotra's medical records changed. Dr. Malhotra's records now stated: "Onset of pain is 10/24/19. First such event. [The claimant] reports pain in relation to working where he was doing inspection in the railyard and suffered pains while going up the second step and noted a sharp onset of pain which caused him to stumble down the first step." The March 23, 2020, record

further notes that the claimant's IME had recommended fusion surgery, and that the claimant's surgery date was delayed "pending medical clearance/litigation/covid pandemic."

¶ 28 Thereafter, the claimant underwent multiple surgical procedures, including a lumbar laminectomy and an anterior lumbar interbody fusion. The parties do not dispute that the claimant's lumbar condition was serious, required extensive medical treatment, and significantly impaired his ability to perform heavy physical work after October 2019.

¶ 29 During the arbitration hearing, Huvila testified on behalf of the employer. Huvila stated that he spoke with the claimant on the morning of October 25, 2019. Huvila noticed that the claimant was limping and asked him if he was OK. The claimant responded, "yes." Huvila testified that he asked the claimant whether his condition was work related, and the claimant responded "no, nothing like that." According to Huvila, the claimant stated that his condition was due to his sciatica. Huvila told the claimant to get some rest over the ensuing weekend and to consider seeing Huvila's father-in-law, who was a chiropractor. Huvila testified that, although the claimant stopped working after the week of October 25, 2019, the claimant never informed Huvila that he had injured himself at work.

¶ 30 Huvila further testified that, at the time he spoke with the claimant on October 25, 2019, the employer had a policy regarding the reporting of workplace accidents. The policy required employees to report all work-related injuries to their direct supervisor and to the Ineos supervisor. An injured employee was also required to draft an incident report when a supervisor asked him to do so. Huvila stated that, after an employee reports an injury to his supervisor, the injury would be run up the chain of command, an incident report and a drug test would be obtained, and the injured worker would be sent to the employer's company clinic. Huvila

testified that the claimant was trained in the employer's policies regarding workplace safety and the reporting of workplace injuries.

¶ 31 Huvila stated that, if the claimant had told Huvila that he had sustained a work injury, Huvila would have contacted his supervisor, Shawn Youngquist, who would have called his own supervisor, Fred Tackett. Huvila would have also contacted HSC manager, Robert Franks, and asked the claimant to provide a statement, after which they would have filled out a form to advise the company that the claimant had sustained a work injury. In addition, the claimant would have been referred for a drug test at the company clinic.

¶ 32 Hernandez also testified. On October 24, 2019, Hernandez was on the day shift that followed the claimant's overnight shift. Hernandez testified that, when he spoke to the claimant during the shift change that morning, the claimant told Hernandez that he had hurt himself and did not get certain things done throughout the night. However, Hernandez could not recall exactly when the claimant told him this, and he could not recall where the claimant had injured his back.

¶ 33 Hernandez further testified that the employees were required to report a work-related injury on the same day it occurs. This included providing a statement of the incident to the shift supervisor.

¶ 34 The claimant testified that, although he knew that he was required to notify his supervisors of any injuries or safety issues, he did not receive any training regarding filling out accident reports. The claimant further stated that Huvila did not ask him to fill out an accident report when the claimant informed Huvila about the work accident.

¶ 35 The arbitrator found that the claimant failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that he had sustained a work-related accident on October 23, 2019. The arbitrator noted that the claimant did not testify that he reported a work injury in the shift report he gave to the Ineos

supervisors after his shift ended on the morning of October 24, 2019. Nor did he testify that he mentioned such an injury to any of the Ineos supervisors. Moreover, Hernandez did not recall the claimant saying what happened or how the claimant had hurt his back during his shift.

¶ 36 The arbitrator further noted that Huvila had testified that when he spoke with the claimant on the morning of October 25, 2019, he specifically asked the claimant if his back pain was work related, and the claimant said “no.” Huvila testified that the claimant said nothing more than that his back hurt, and he attributed it to sciatica. However, the claimant testified that he told Huvila exactly how he was injured on the locomotive stairs. The arbitrator observed that this presented a “ ‘he said she said’ type of situation,” and the arbitrator chose to credit Huvila’s account of the conversation.

¶ 37 The arbitrator further found that the medical records suggested that the claimant had not suffered a work-related accident. When the claimant went to urgent care three days after the alleged accident, he did not report that his pain was caused by any specific incident at work. Moreover, Dr. Malhotra’s initial treatment records do not reference a specific incident at work. To the contrary, the records state that there was “no inciting event” for the claimant’s condition. The arbitrator noted that the first reference to a specific incident occurring on the locomotive’s stairs was in Dr. Templin’s IME report on February 11, 2020. After that, Dr. Malhotra’s records began to describe a new history of injury that was consistent with the history that the claimant gave to Dr. Templin.

¶ 38 The arbitrator further observed that many of the things that were commonly done by the employer after a workplace accident occurred were not done in this case. For example, no accident statement was obtained, no witnesses were interviewed, and no investigation of the

incident was initiated. The arbitrator concluded that there did not seem to be much reason for Huvila not to have started this process had the claimant reported a work injury.

¶ 39 Based on the same factual findings, the arbitrator further found that the claimant had failed to prove that he had provided timely notice of the alleged work accident to the employer. The arbitrator found all other issues raised by the claimant to be moot.

¶ 40 The claimant appealed the arbitrator's decision to Commission. The Commission affirmed the arbitrator's finding that the claimant failed to prove that he had sustained a work-related accident on October 23, 2019. The Commission found it significant that that "the October 28, 2019, medical record, dated five days after the alleged accident, makes no mention of a specific event involving [the claimant] climbing stairs at work as the cause of his back and right leg pain." The Commission found this to be "consistent with the November 11, 2019, medical record which clearly states there was 'no inciting event.'" The Commission further noted that, although the claimant testified that the shift-change report he completed on the morning of October 24, 2019, indicated that he and his co-worker had less than normal production, the claimant did not testify that he included any information about an alleged injury while climbing locomotive stairs. The Commission also noted Hernandez's testimony that he did not recall where the claimant had injured his back.

¶ 41 The Commission found Huvila's testimony to be persuasive as to what the claimant told him about his back condition on October 25, 2019. Specifically, the Commission credited Huvila's testimony that 1) the claimant did not give Huvila a history of injuring his back while he was going up steps leading into a locomotive, and 2) the claimant denied that his sciatica was work-related.

¶ 42 Because the Commission agreed with the arbitrator that the claimant had not met his burden to prove that his low back condition was causally related to any event that occurred at work on October 23, 2019, it struck a sentence in the arbitrator’s decision that appeared to be inconsistent with that conclusion. Specifically, the Commission struck the sentence that read: “While it is more likely than not that [the claimant] developed back pain at work during his 10/23 to 10/24/19 shift, he has not shown, in the Arbitrator’s view, by the preponderance of the evidence, that how he alleges this occurred was ever reported to the Respondent prior to the 2/11/20 report of Dr. Templin almost four months after the alleged accident occurred.”

¶ 43 The Commission also struck the arbitrator’s finding and analysis on the issue of notice because it found that issue (and all other issues raised by the claimant) to be mooted by the arbitrator’s finding that the claimant had failed to prove a work-related accident. The Commission also corrected some scrivener’s errors in the arbitrator’s decision. The Commission affirmed and adopted the arbitrator’s decision, as modified and clarified by the Commission.

¶ 44 The claimant sought judicial review of the Commission’s decision in the circuit court of Will County. The circuit court issued a written order on January 8, 2024, reversing and remanding the matter to the Commission for further proceedings. Throughout its written order, the circuit court discussed and analyzed the arbitrator’s factual findings and conclusions of law but did not reference the Commission’s decision. The circuit court found that the “arbitrator’s conclusions and findings [were] against the manifest weight of the evidence,” and it rejected “the arbitrator’s” credibility determinations.

¶ 45 The circuit court held that the claimant had suffered an accident that arose out of and in the course of his employment. In support of its holding, the circuit court relied in part on the sentence in the arbitrator’s decision that had been stricken by the Commission. The court also

found that it was “undisputed” that the claimant suffered a back injury during his work shift on October 23, 2019, and that the claimant told his supervisor about the injury after that shift. Further, the court found that it was “illogical” for the arbitrator to “accept Huvila’s version alone” based upon the fact that Huvila had failed to take further action on the claimant’s claim of injury.

¶ 46 The court also held that claimant had given timely notice of the work accident to the employer. The circuit court remanded the matter to the Commission to decide the remaining issues that had been raised by the claimant, including causation, average weekly wage, and TTD.

¶ 47 In its written order on remand, the Commission stated that it was unclear whether the circuit court had reviewed the arbitrator’s decision or the Commission’s decision. The Commission noted that the circuit court’s written decision 1) did not mention that the Commission had modified the arbitrator’s decision, 2) made references to the “arbitrator’s decision” and stated that “the arbitrator ruled,” but did not mention the Commission’s decision and findings, and 3) “based its finding that the Decision was against the manifest weight of the evidence on portions of the Arbitration Decision which the Commission had stricken.” The Commission also clarified that its decision to deny the claimant’s claim was based solely on his failure to prove the accident and was not based on a failure to provide notice. The Commission further noted that, contrary to the circuit court’s conclusion, the “accident was a disputed issue, and the fundamental question is whether the claimant actually sustained an injury at work [on October 23, 2019] as he claimed.”

¶ 48 The Commission’s order then turned to the issues that the circuit court had directed the Commission to address on remand. The Commission found that the claimant had proven that his current conditions of ill-being are causally related to the October 23, 2019, work accident. It

further determined the claimant's average weekly wage and awarded the claimant TTD and medical expenses.

¶ 49 The employer sought judicial review of the Commission's decision on remand to the circuit court. The circuit court confirmed the Commission's decision. In its written order, the circuit court stated, "the court makes clear that now, and in its January 8, 2024, order, that it reviewed the entirety of the Commission's decision, the court file containing the record, and in all respects was granting relief overturning the Commission, not the Arbitrator."

¶ 50 The employer filed a motion to reconsider, which the circuit court denied.

¶ 51 This appeal followed.

¶ 52 ANALYSIS

¶ 53 The employer argues that the Commission erred in finding that the claimant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that he sustained a work-related accident on October 23, 2019.

¶ 54 The claimant has the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the evidence, that her injury arose out of and in the course of her employment. *O'Dette v. Industrial Comm'n*, 79 Ill. 2d 249, 253 (1980); *Shafer v. Illinois Workers' Compensation Comm'n*, 2011 IL App (4th) 100505WC, ¶ 35. Whether an injury arose out of and in the course of one's employment is a question of fact. *Hosteny v. Illinois Workers' Compensation Comm'n*, 397 Ill. App. 3d 665, 674 (2009). It is the function of the Commission to decide questions of fact, judge the credibility of witnesses, determine the weight that their testimony is to be given, and resolve conflicts in the evidence. *Sisbro, Inc. v. Industrial Comm'n*, 207 Ill. 2d 193, 206 (2003); *O'Dette*, 79 Ill. 2d at 253.

¶ 55 The Commission's credibility determinations and other factual findings will not be disturbed on review unless they are against the manifest weight of the evidence. *Shafer*, 2011 IL

App (4th) 100505WC at ¶¶ 35–36. A finding is against the manifest weight of the evidence only when an opposite conclusion is clearly apparent—that is, when no rational trier of fact could have agreed with the agency. *McAllister v. The Illinois Workers' Compensation Comm'n*, 2020 IL 124848, ¶ 30.

¶ 56 As an initial matter, we agree with the Commission that it is not clear whether the circuit court reviewed the arbitrator's decision or the Commission's decision. In response to the concerns that the Commission raised about this issue in its written decision on remand, the circuit court insisted that it had reviewed the Commission's decision. However, the fact that the circuit court's order discusses the arbitrator's findings, "rulings" and "decision" at length without making a single reference to the Commission's findings or decision is troubling. It is also concerning that the circuit court based its holding in part on portions of the arbitrator's decision that the Commission had stricken. If the circuit court reviewed the arbitrator's decision instead of the Commission's decision, that would constitute reversible error.

¶ 57 In any event, the Commission's initial decision was not against the manifest weight of the evidence. As the Commission recognized, this case largely boils down to a "he said, he said" credibility contest between the claimant and Huvila. The claimant testified that, when he spoke to Huvila the day after the alleged work accident, the claimant told Huvila that he had injured his back while walking up the steps on a locomotive during his October 23 work shift. He denied telling Huvila that his injury was due to sciatica. By contrast, Huvila testified that, when he spoke to the claimant the day after the accident, the claimant did not say that he had injured his back at work. To the contrary, Huvila swore that, when he asked the claimant whether his back condition was work-related, the claimant responded "no, nothing like that," and attributed his condition to sciatica.

¶ 58 The Commission chose to credit Huvila’s testimony on this issue over the claimant’s conflicting testimony. It is the Commission’s province to judge the credibility of witnesses, determine the weight that their testimony is to be given, and resolve conflicts in the evidence. *Sisbro, Inc.*, 207 Ill. 2d 193, 206 (2003); *O’Dette*, 79 Ill. 2d at 253. We may reverse the Commission’s findings on these matters only if they are against the manifest weight of the evidence, *i.e.*, only if no rational trier of fact could have taken the Commission’s view. Based on all the evidence, we cannot say that no rational trier of fact could have found Huvila’s account of the conversation to be more credible than the claimant’s account.

¶ 59 Huvila’s credibility is enhanced by other evidence in the record that supports an inference that the claimant did not sustain a work-related accident on October 23, 2019. For example, the claimant did not note that he had sustained a work injury in the shift report he gave to the Ineos supervisors after his shift ended. Nor did he otherwise mention such an injury to any of the Ineos supervisors.

¶ 60 Moreover, the medical records immediately following the alleged work accident are at odds with the claimant’s account. When the claimant went to urgent care three days after the alleged accident, he did not report that his pain was caused by any specific incident at work. Similarly, Dr. Malhotra’s initial treating records do not reference a specific incident at work. To the contrary, they note repeatedly that there was “no inciting event” for the claimant’s onset of pain and other symptoms. The first reference to a specific incident occurring on the locomotive’s stairs was in Dr. Templin’s IME report, which was prepared approximately four months after the alleged accident at a time when the employer was disputing the accident.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In his brief on appeal, the claimant states that, when he saw an orthopedic spine surgeon on December 24, 2019, the claimant reported that he was climbing up a train car on October 25, 2019, when he noticed

¶ 61 Accordingly, although there was evidence in the record that arguably supports the claimant's position, the Commission's finding that the claimant failed to prove a work-related accident was not against the manifest weight of the evidence. All other issues raised by the claimant are therefore moot, and we will not address them.

¶ 62 CONCLUSION

¶ 63 For the foregoing reasons, we reverse the circuit court's judgment, vacate the circuit court's order reversing the Commission's initial decision, vacate the Commission's decision on remand, and reinstate the Commission's initial decision.

¶ 64 Circuit court reversed; Commission's decision on remand vacated and original decision reinstated.

---

excruciating pain in his lower back traveling into the right buttocks region. However, the claimant provides no citation to the record for this statement. Thus, we cannot confirm it. Regardless, even assuming *arguendo* that the claimant made this statement to his orthopedic surgeon on December 24, 2019, it would not change our analysis. The medical records for the two months preceding that date suggest that there was no specific incident at work that caused the claimant's symptoms.