

Alabama Supreme Court: Fall at work isn't necessarily work injury

On behalf of Johnston, Moore & Thompson

- June 14, 2011

If you get into an accident and sustain an injury at the workplace, should that incident immediately be classified as a workplace accident? Should you be entitled to [workers' compensation](#) following the injury?

It depends, according to a recent Alabama Supreme Court decision. There is a distinction between an accident suffered while at work and an accident caused because of one's work. One injured Alabama cashier has learned that lesson the hard way.

According to Risk and Insurance, the plaintiff filed for worker's compensation benefits after she suffered a fall at work. She reportedly broke her wrist as a result of the incident and sought benefits that would help support her financially.

She was initially denied workers' compensation payments because representatives from the store argued that the plaintiff fell doing something unrelated to her job. Later, a civil appeals court ruled in favor of the work injury victim, claiming that as long as the injury was sustained at work, then the victim should be owed benefits.

Giving the final word on this Alabama case, however, was the state's Supreme Court. It recently ruled that if the cause of the woman's fall was not directly connected to her job expectations, then she was not eligible for benefits. The woman reportedly slipped when she was getting coffee - a task that is apparently not directly connected to her duties as a cashier.

There are definitely shades of gray within the legal realm of workers' compensation. At least in this case, the injured worker fought diligently to protect what she believed to be her rights. Unfortunately, the court just didn't agree that she had a right to payment in this case.

What do you think about this case and the causation factor?

Source

Risk and Insurance: "[But for test rejected, cashier's unexplained fall not compensable.](#)"
13 Jun. 2011