

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 6-155 / 05-0698

Filed April 26, 2006

CAROL MART,
Petitioner-Appellee,

vs.

ROCKWELL COLLINS, INC.,
Respondent-Appellant.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Linn County, Patrick R. Grady,
Judge.

Employer appeals from an order remanding this matter to the workers'
compensation commissioner. **AFFIRMED.**

Scott E. McLeod and Amy L. Reasner of Lynch Dallas, P.C., Cedar
Rapids, for appellant.

Thomas M. Wertz and Matthew D. Dake of Wertz Law Firm, P.C., Cedar
Rapids, for appellee.

Considered by Mahan, P.J., and Hecht and Eisenhauer, JJ.

EISENHAUER, J.

A deputy workers' compensation commissioner concluded Carol Mart had a permanent and total disability and also qualified as an odd-lot employee. The deputy awarded her permanent total disability benefits, and Rockwell Collins, Inc., her employer, appealed to the workers' compensation commissioner. The commissioner concluded Mart was not permanently and totally disabled. He further concluded Mart had a sixty-five percent permanent partial disability. On Mart's petition for judicial review, the district court remanded the case to the commissioner to (1) "set out in full his reasons for rejecting Mart's claim of permanent disability including the 'odd-lot' claim," and (2) "set out in full his reasons for arriving at any other level of disability." Rockwell Collins appeals. We apply Iowa Code section 17A.19(10) (2005) to determine whether we reach the same result as the district court. *ABC Disposal Sys., Inc v. Department of Natural Res.*, 681 N.W.2d 596, 601 (Iowa 2004). After doing so, we affirm.

The commissioner gave no discussion to Mart's claim under the odd-lot doctrine, which is conceptually distinct from the other method of establishing permanent and total disability. *Michael Eberhart Constr. v. Curtin*, 674 N.W.2d 123, 125-28 (Iowa 2004). Furthermore, he gave no reason why he selected sixty-five percent as a level of partial disability, as opposed to any other level. While decisions in contested cases are held to a standard of adequacy, not perfection, we believe reviewing courts (not to mention Mart) are entitled to a more thorough explanation from the commissioner about the result he reached.

We affirm the order remanding this matter to the commissioner.

AFFIRMED.