

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA**

No. 6-756 / 06-0457  
Filed January 18, 2007

**UNIVERSITY OF IOWA HOSPITALS  
AND CLINICS AND STATE OF IOWA,**  
Petitioners-Appellants,

**vs.**

**ZELLA JEAN COCHERELL,**  
Defendant-Appellee.

---

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Polk County, Karen A. Romano,  
Judge.

The University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics and the State of Iowa appeal  
a judicial review decision affirming an award of workers' compensation benefits.

**AFFIRMED.**

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, and Julie A. Burger, Assistant  
Attorney General, for appellants.

Dennis W. Emanuel and Michael O. Carpenter, Ottumwa, for appellee.

Considered by Sackett, C.J., and Vaitheswaran, J., and Robinson, S.J.\*

\*Senior judge assigned by order pursuant to Iowa Code section 602.9206 (2005).

**VAITHESWARAN, J.**

The University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics and the State of Iowa seek further judicial review of a workers' compensation decision. They contend claimant Zella Cocherell was not an employee but an independent contractor who was not entitled to workers' compensation benefits.

The workers' compensation commissioner made detailed findings of fact on this issue, as did the deputy workers' compensation commissioner, whose decision the commissioner "affirm[ed] and adopt[ed] as final." Based on these findings, the commissioner determined Cocherell was an employee and not an independent contractor.

On judicial review, the district court applied the standards for review of agency action set forth in Iowa Code section 17A.19(10) and determined that the agency's fact findings were supported by substantial evidence. Iowa Code § 17A.19(10)(f) (2005). The court further determined that those fact findings "would permit a reasonable fact finder to reach the conclusion of the agency on the issue of the Claimant's status."

Applying the section 17A.19(10) judicial review standards, we agree with the district court that the agency's fact findings are supported by substantial evidence. *Id.* In light of the district court's comprehensive ruling, no useful purpose would be served by recounting the fact findings or the evidence supporting those findings. We further conclude that the agency's application of law to fact was not "irrational, illogical, or wholly unjustifiable." Iowa Code § 17A.19(10)(m).

**AFFIRMED.**