

[Cite as *State ex rel. Lacroix v. Indus. Comm.*, 144 Ohio St.3d 17, 2015-Ohio-2313.]

**THE STATE EX REL. LACROIX, APPELLANT, v. INDUSTRIAL COMMISSION OF
OHIO ET AL., APPELLEES.**

**[Cite as *State ex rel. Lacroix v. Indus. Comm.*, 144 Ohio St.3d 17,
2015-Ohio-2313.]**

*Workers' compensation—Permanent total disability—Evidence in the record
supports the commission's denial of compensation—Court of appeals'
judgment denying writ of mandamus affirmed.*

(No. 1 T1 affirmed.)

{¶ 5} Lacroix applied again in 2010, with a report from his treating physician, Timothy Morley, D.O. Kiva Shtull, M.D., examined Lacroix on behalf of the employer. He concluded that Lacroix was capable of full-time employment “in the sedentary category, in the seated position, with the following additional restrictions: 1) The ability to change positions as necessary; 2) No foot pedal operation with the lower extremities; 3) No exposure to vibratory forces.”

{¶ 6} Mark A. Anderson performed a vocational assessment of Lacroix and concluded that no occupations existed that matched all of his restrictions. Craig Johnston, Ph.D., also performed a vocational assessment. In his report, he identified the medical opinions submitted and concluded that “if one accepts the opinion of Dr. Shtull, then Mr. Lacroix is again capable of sedentary physical activity.” Johnston examined Lacroix’s nonmedical disability factors and concluded that he remained capable of sustained remunerative employment.

{¶ 7} Following a hearing, a staff hearing officer denied Lacroix’s application. The hearing officer relied on the report of Dr. Shtull as evidence that Lacroix was medically capable of performing sedentary employment. The hearing officer also reviewed all vocational evidence submitted, analyzed Lacroix’s nonmedical disability factors, and determined that he was vocationally capable of returning to work or going into a rehabilitation program.

{¶ 8} Lacroix filed a complaint for a writ of mandamus. He argued that the staff hearing officer abused his discretion when he relied on the vocational report of Dr. Johnston because the report was flawed.

{¶ 9} The court of appeals concluded that there was evidence in the record supporting the commission’s decision that Lacroix was medically and vocationally capable of sedentary employment. The court noted that Lacroix did not challenge Dr. Shtull’s medical opinion and that the commission independently evaluated the nonmedical disability factors. Thus, the appellate court concluded, despite any deficiencies in the Johnston report, the record nevertheless contained

January Term, 2015

evidence and had the discretion to accept or reject all or some of the Johnston report. *Id.* at 271; *see also State ex rel. Culbert v. Indus. Comm.*, 10th Dist. Franklin No. 11AP-172, 2012-Ohio-1217, ¶ 3. Lacroix's argument lacks merit.

{¶ 15} Next, Lacroix contends that the commission abused its discretion by relying on Dr. Shtull's report because it was contradictory. Lacroix also contends that the commission failed to explain how the additional limitations set forth by Dr. Shtull correspond with the ability to perform work at the sedentary level.

{¶ 16} It is undisputed that Lacroix did not raise these arguments in the appellate court. *See* 2013-Ohio-4881, ¶ 8 and 31. Consequently, they have been waived. *State ex rel. Roxbury v. Indus. Comm.*, 138 Ohio St.3d 91, 2014-Ohio-84, 3 N.E.3d 1190, ¶ 14; *State ex rel. Rollins v. Indus. Comm.*, 105 Ohio St.3d 319, 2005-Ohio-1827, 825 N.E.2d 1104, ¶ 8.

{¶ 17} Lacroix was not entitled to mandamus relief, because there was evidence in the record to support the commission's denial of permanent-total-disability compensation. Therefore, Lacroix failed to establish that he was entitled to relief in mandamus.

{¶ 18} Finally, both the claimant and the

PFEIFER, J., dissenting.

{¶ 20} Lacroix’s injuries are substantial enough that he is confined to a wheelchair, among other limitations. Even so, one of the vocational experts, whose report provides the evidence that the commission relies upon to justify its conclusion, determined that Lacroix is capable of being a security guard. That just isn’t plausible, and reliance on that report is misguided.

{¶ 21} I would reverse the judgment of the court of appeals. I dissent.

O’NEILL, J., concurs in the foregoing opinion.

Nager, Romaine & Schneiberg Co., L.P.A., Jennifer L. Lawther, Jerald A. Schneiberg, and Stacy M. Callen, for appellant.

Michael DeWine, Attorney General, and Andrew J. Alatis, Assistant Attorney General, for appellee Industrial Commission.

Reminger Co., L.P.A., Melvin J. Davis, and Ronald Fresco, for appellee GMRI, Inc.
