

(NOTE: The status of this decision is **Unpublished**.)

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT
THE
APPROVAL OF THE APPELLATE
DIVISION**



This opinion shall not "constitute precedent or be binding upon any court." Although it is posted on the internet, this opinion is binding only on the parties in the case and its use in other cases is limited. R.1:36-3.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY

APPELLATE DIVISION

DOCKET NO. A-0

SUNIL K. SONDHI,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

TROPICANA HOTEL AND CASINO,

Respondent-Respondent.

February 13, 2017

Submitted February 6, 2017 – Decided

Before Judges Nugent and Haas.

On appeal from the Department of Labor and Workforce Development, Division of Workers' Compensation,
Claim Petition No. 2014-21773.

Sunil K. Sondhi, pro se.

PER CURIAM

Petitioner Sunil Kumar Sondhi appeals from an August 14, 2015 workers' compensation judgment awarding him partial permanent disability of thirty-percent of the left foot. The judge of compensation entered the judgment after considering petitioner's testimony, petitioner's medical records, and the parties' expert reports.¹

On appeal, petitioner contends the thirty-percent partial permanent disability did not adequately compensate him for his injury. Petitioner also contends the judge of compensation erred by not awarding partial permanent disability and compensating petitioner for previous injuries to other body parts which were healing, but then began to worsen after his work-related accident. According to petitioner, because he is forced to walk with a cane, he puts more weight on his right side. He is also experiencing pain in his back. To support his appeal, petitioner has provided photographs and medical records.

We have considered petitioner's arguments in light of the hearing record, including the documentary exhibits, and applicable legal principles. Our review leads us to conclude the judge of compensation's decision is supported by sufficient credible evidence on the record as a whole. Petitioner's arguments are without sufficient merit to warrant discussion in a written opinion. R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(D) and (E).

Affirmed.

certify

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

1 Following petitioner's testimony, the parties agreed to have the judge of compensation decide the case based on petitioner's testimony, the medical records introduced into evidence during petitioner's testimony, and the parties' evaluating physicians' expert reports.

This archive is a service of [Rutgers School of Law](#).