

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

**LISA STEGMAN,
APPELLANT,**

v.

**GRAND RIVER REGIONAL AMBULANCE DISTRICT,
RESPONDENT;
NORTH KANSAS CITY HOSPITAL,
RESPONDENT;
PHYSICIANS ACUTE CARE SERVICES, INC.
D/B/A NORTHWEST MISSOURI EMERGENCY PHYSICIANS,
RESPONDENT;
MISSOURI RURAL SERVICES
WORKERS COMPENSATION INSURANCE TRUST,
RESPONDENT.**

WD69099

DATE: December 9, 2008

Appeal From:
LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Appellate Judges:
Division Two: James M. Smart, Jr., P.J., Lisa White Hardwick and James E. Welsh, JJ.

Attorneys:
Robert E. Douglass, St. Joseph, MO, **for appellant.**

Brian Gordon, Independence, MO, **for respondent North Kansas City Hospital**
Paul D. Huck, Clayton, MO, **for respondent Missouri Rural Services Workers
Compensation Insurance Trust.**

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS, WESTERN DISTRICT

LISA STEGMAN, APPELLANT

v.

**GRAND RIVER REGIONAL AMBULANCE DISTRICT, RESPONDENT;
NORTH KANSAS CITY HOSPITAL, RESPONDENT; PHYSICIANS ACUTE
CARE SERVICES, INC. D/B/A NORTHWEST MISSOURI EMERGENCY
PHYSICIANS, RESPONDENT; MISSOURI RURAL SERVICES WORKERS
COMPENSATION INSURANCE TRUST, RESPONDENT.**

WD69099

LABOR AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Before Division Two Judges: James M. Smart, Jr., P.J., Lisa White Hardwick and James E. Welsh, JJ.

Lisa Stegman was employed by the Grand River Regional Ambulance District as an emergency medical technician and paramedic. In March 2002, she suffered an injury in her own garage while responding to an emergency page from her employer. Stegman filed a claim for workers' compensation benefits, which the ambulance district opposed. Stegman's claim was denied by the Labor and Industrial Relations Commission on the basis that the injury did not arise out of and in the course of her employment. Stegman appeals.

REVERSED AND REMANDED.

Division Two holds: The Commission did not make proper findings of fact and conclusions of law. The Commission summarized all of the testimony at trial, without indicating which facts it found to be pertinent or credible. It then separately discussed possible legal theories in an abstract manner without relating any such theories to the facts. These inadequacies leave us unable to properly evaluate Stegman's claim that the Commission's judgment is in error. Consequently, the judgment is vacated, and the case is remanded to the Commission for further proceedings in accordance with this opinion.

Opinion by James M. Smart, Jr., Judge

December 9, 2008

This summary is **UNOFFICIAL** and
should not be quoted or cited
