

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA**

No. 8-1059 / 08-1206  
Filed March 26, 2009

**MEDIHA CATIC,**  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

**vs.**

**HY-VEE, INC., and EMC RISK  
SERVICES,**  
Defendants-Appellees.

---

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Polk County, Artis I. Reis, Judge.

Mediha Catic appeals the district court's ruling on judicial review affirming the decision of the Iowa Workers' Compensation Commissioner denying her claim for workers' compensation benefits. **AFFIRMED.**

Gary M. Mattson of LaMarca & Landry, P.C., Des Moines, for appellant.

Wendy D. Boka & Matthew A. Grotnes of Hopkins & Huebner, P.C., Des Moines, for appellee.

Considered by Vogel, P.J., and Mahan and Miller, JJ.

**MILLER, J.**

Mediha Catic appeals the district court's ruling on judicial review affirming the decision of the Iowa Workers' Compensation Commissioner denying her claim for workers' compensation benefits. We affirm.

Catic has been employed at Hy-Vee, Inc. in the bakery department since 1998. On May, 29, 2004, she tripped over a mop bucket while at work. Hy-Vee admitted that as a result of this fall Catic sustained an injury to her left hand, wrist, or arm, and paid medical benefits, through its workers' compensation insurance carrier, with respect to this injury.

Catic filed a petition with the Iowa Workers' Compensation Commissioner on August 3, 2005, claiming she had sustained an injury to her back, as well as permanent injury to her left wrist, as a result of the fall. Following a hearing, a deputy workers' compensation commissioner determined that, while Catic had sustained an injury to her left wrist arising out of and in the course of her employment with Hy-Vee, she sustained no permanent disability as a result of that injury and thus was not entitled to permanent partial disability benefits for it. The deputy further concluded Catic did not sustain a work-related injury to her lower back, and accordingly denied payment of medical expenses and disability benefits related to her back condition.

On intra-agency appeal the commissioner summarily affirmed the deputy's arbitration decision and adopted it as final agency action. Catic filed a petition for judicial review with the district court, and the court affirmed in full the agency's decision.

On appeal Catic claims the district court applied an incorrect legal standard in affirming the workers' compensation commissioner's determination that Catic had not met her burden to prove her present back pain was caused by her earlier, work-related fall. She further claims the agency's "ruling[s]," affirmed on judicial review, that her back injury was not caused by her work-related fall, she did not sustain a permanent impairment to her left upper extremity, and she should not be awarded medical expenses for her low back injury, are "not supported by substantial evidence."

In exercising its power of judicial review of contested case decisions of the workers' compensation commissioner the district court acts in an appellate capacity to correct errors of law of the agency. *Grundmeyer v. Weyerhaeuser Co.*, 649 N.W.2d 744, 748 (Iowa 2002). "In reviewing the district court's decision, we apply the standards of [Iowa Code] chapter 17A to determine whether the conclusions we reach are the same as those of the district court." *Mycogen Seeds v. Sands*, 686 N.W.2d 457, 464 (Iowa 2004).

Upon our review we find no merit to Catic's claims of error by the district court. Otherwise stated, our conclusions are the same as its conclusions. We therefore affirm the district court's affirmance of the workers' compensation commissioner's decision. See Iowa Ct. R. 21.29(1)(b), (d), (e).

**AFFIRMED.**