

NEBRASKA SUPREME COURT

Melton v. City of Holdrege

309 Neb. 385 (2021) · No. No. S-20-721 · Decided May 28, 2021

SUMMARY

The Nebraska Supreme Court affirmed a workers’ compensation award to Benjamin Melton following a below-the-knee amputation caused by a work-related injury. The court upheld compensation for the loss of a foot and a 20-percent loss of leg function, rejected additional consecutive awards for the toes and leg, and found no clear error in denying waiting-time penalties, attorney fees, interest, or vocational rehabilitation.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Nebraska Supreme Court
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Cassel, J.; Heavican, C.J.; Miller-Lerman, J.; Funke, J.; Papik, J.; Freudenberg, J.
JURISDICTION	Nebraska
DECIDED	May 28, 2021
DOCKET	No. S-20-721
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Appeal from a judgment of the Nebraska Workers’ Compensation Court awarding permanent disability benefits and future medical care but denying waiting-time penalties, attorney fees, interest, and vocational rehabilitation benefits.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A compensation-court judgment, order, or award may be modified, reversed, or set aside only for lack or excess of power, fraud, insufficient competent evidence, or factual findings that do not support the order or award. Factual findings have the effect of a jury verdict and will not be disturbed unless clearly wrong. The appellate court independently determines questions of law.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Nebraska Supreme Court opinion; precedential.
PARTIES	Benjamin Melton v. City of Holdrege

TOPICS

workers compensation

damages

remedies

statutory interpretation

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

workers compensation

employment law

appellate procedure

statutory interpretation

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the compensation court properly evaluated Melton's loss and loss of use of his leg, including the effect of his prosthetic device.
2. Whether Melton suffered a total loss of use of his leg warranting benefits for loss of the leg.
3. Whether Nebraska law required consecutive disability benefits for the loss of Melton's toes, foot, and leg.
4. Whether Melton was entitled to waiting-time penalties, attorney fees, and interest for delayed payment of permanent disability benefits.
5. Whether Melton was entitled to vocational rehabilitation benefits under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 48-162.01(3).

HOLDINGS

1. The compensation court did not clearly err in finding that Melton retained functional use of his leg and in awarding compensation for a 20-percent additional loss of leg function beyond the loss of his foot.
2. Melton was not entitled to compensation for a total loss of use of his leg because the evidence supported the finding that his leg was not useless for all practical intents and purposes.
3. Melton was not entitled to separate consecutive awards for the loss of his toes and foot in addition to the below-the-knee amputation award, or to benefits for total loss of the leg.
4. The compensation court did not clearly err in finding a reasonable controversy and denying a waiting-time penalty, attorney fees, and interest.
5. Melton was not entitled to vocational rehabilitation benefits because the evidence showed he could perform suitable work for which he had prior training or experience.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"It is obvious that such a loss would include a loss of the toes on the foot, but the Legislature limited the loss to the foot." (395)

"Although Melton desired an award of vocational rehabilitation in case he needed services in the future, a workers' compensation award cannot be based on mere possibility or speculation." (397)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Benjamin Melton suffered a work-related injury in October 2011 that resulted in amputation of his left leg below the knee. He returned to work using a prosthesis and continued to experience pain, discomfort, and functional limitations. The City paid temporary disability benefits and later permanent partial disability benefits based on a

100-percent loss of the foot and an additional 5-percent loss of the leg. By trial, Melton had obtained substantial gainful employment as a corrosion technician with another employer.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Melton petitioned the Nebraska Workers' Compensation Court for additional workers' compensation benefits arising from a below-the-knee amputation. The compensation court awarded benefits for loss of a foot and a 20-percent loss of leg function, for a combined total of 193 weeks, but denied penalties and vocational rehabilitation. Melton appealed, and the Nebraska Supreme Court moved the appeal to its docket and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Rogers v. Jack's Supper Club, 308 Neb. 107, 953 N.W.2d 9 (2021)
- Parks v. Hy-Vee, 307 Neb. 927, 951 N.W.2d 504 (2020)
- Smith v. Mark Chrisman Trucking, 285 Neb. 826, 829 N.W.2d 717 (2013)
- Jacob v. Columbia Ins. Group, 2 Neb. App. 473, 511 N.W.2d 211 (1994)
- Herold v. Constructors, Inc., 201 Neb. 697, 271 N.W.2d 542 (1978)
- D'Quaix v. Chadron State College, 272 Neb. 859, 725 N.W.2d 558 (2007)
- Picard v. P & C Group 1, 306 Neb. 292, 945 N.W.2d 183 (2021)
- Gardner v. International Paper Destr. & Recycl., 291 Neb. 415, 865 N.W.2d 371 (2015)
- Rodriguez v. Hirschbach Motor Lines, 270 Neb. 757, 707 N.W.2d 232 (2005)
- Bower v. Eaton Corp., 301 Neb. 311, 918 N.W.2d 249 (2018)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

Nebraska Supreme Court Online Library www.nebraska.gov/apps-courts-epub/ 06/08/2021 09:08 AM CDT - 385 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 Benjamin Melton, appellant, v. City of Holdrege, appellee. ___ N.W.2d ___ Filed May 28, 2021. No. S-20-721. 1. Workers' Compensation: Appeal and Error.

A judgment, order, or award of the compensation court may be modified, reversed, or set aside only upon the grounds that (1) the compensation court acted without or in excess of its powers; (2) the judgment, order, or award was procured by fraud; (3) there is not sufficient competent evidence in the record to warrant the making of the order, judgment, or award; or (4) the findings of fact by the compensation court do not support the order or award.

2. ____: _____. On appellate review, the factual findings made by the trial judge of the Workers' Compensation Court have the effect of a jury verdict and will not be disturbed unless clearly wrong. 3. ____: _____. An appellate court is obligated in workers' compensation cases to make its own determinations as to questions of law. 4. Workers' Compensation. Neb. Rev. Stat. § 48-121(3) (Reissue 2010) generally provides the manner by which a worker is compensated for the loss or loss of use of a scheduled member.

5. Damages. As a general rule, a party may not have double recovery for a single injury. 6. Workers' Compensation: Attorney Fees: Penalties and Forfeitures: Time. Neb. Rev. Stat. § 48-125 (Cum. Supp. 2020) authorizes a 50-percent penalty payment for waiting time involving delinquent payment of compensation and an attorney fee, where there is no reasonable controversy regarding an employee's claim for workers' compensation.

7. Workers' Compensation: Attorney Fees: Words and Phrases. A "reasonable controversy" exists (1) if there is a question of law previously unanswered by the Supreme Court, which question must be answered to determine a right or liability for disposition of a claim under the Nebraska Workers' Compensation Act, or (2) if the properly adduced evidence would support reasonable but opposite conclusions by the compensation court about an aspect of an employee's claim, which - 386 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 conclusions affect allowance or rejection of an employee's claim, in whole or in part.

8. Workers' Compensation: Words and Phrases. Whether a reasonable controversy exists under Neb. Rev. Stat. § 48-125 (Cum. Supp. 2020) is a question of fact. 9. Workers' Compensation. Whether an injured worker is entitled to vocational rehabilitation is ordinarily a question of fact to be determined by the compensation court.

10. _____. A workers' compensation award cannot be based on mere possibility or speculation. Appeal from the Workers' Compensation Court: Dirk V. Block, Judge. Affirmed. Todd D. Bennett, of Rehm, Bennett, Moore & Rehm, P.C., L.L.O., for appellant. David A. Dudley and Micah C. Hawker Boehnke, of Baylor Evnen, L.L.P., for appellee. Heavican, C.J., Miller-Lerman, Cassel, Funke, Papik, and Freudenberg, JJ. Cassel, J. I. INTRODUCTION Benjamin Melton sought workers' compensation benefits after an injury resulted in a below-the-knee amputation of his leg.

The trial court awarded compensation for a loss of foot and a partial loss of leg function. On appeal, Melton challenges the court's determination of his loss and its decision to not award a penalty regarding permanent loss of his foot or vocational rehabilitation.

Because the court's factual findings were not clearly wrong and we find no error of law, we affirm.

II. BACKGROUND 1. Injury and Disability Payments The City of Holdrege (City) employed Melton as a journey man lineman.

In October 2011, Melton sustained a work-related injury resulting in an amputation of his left leg a few - 387 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 inches below the knee.

In December, he was fitted for a prosthesis, but attaining a good fit was a recurring problem. In March 2012, Melton returned to his position with the City. He was able to perform at least some aspects of his job. Melton did not feel that he could perform his lineman duties without the prosthesis, having tried to do so. While performing his job duties, he encountered issues with the use of his prosthesis, such as shrinking, swelling, sweating, and obtaining a good fit.

In 2014, Melton underwent a “stump revision” surgery that helped him obtain a better fit with his prosthetic leg, though he still encountered pain and discomfort. From the date of the accident until Melton’s return to work, the City paid 23 weeks of temporary total disability benefits. Between March 14, 2012, and March 12, 2016, the City paid temporary partial disability benefits for 833/7 weeks.

In May 2017, Melton provided the City with a record from his physician stating that he had reached maximum medical improvement (MMI) and the City paid permanent partial disability benefits based on a 100-percent loss of Melton’s foot and an additional 5-percent loss to his leg. There is no dispute that the City paid all medical expenses under the fee schedule and all temporary disability benefits.

2. Petition and Trial In May 2017, Melton filed a petition seeking workers’ compensation benefits. He requested temporary and permanent disability benefits, payment of medical expenses, and vocational rehabilitation benefits. He also asked for waiting-time penalties, attorney fees, and interest. Three years later, the workers’ compensation court conducted a trial.

The evidence established that in 2018, Melton secured a new position as a corrosion technician with a different employer. He remained in that employment at the time of trial. Melton testified that he continues to suffer pain in his knee, that his knee is weak, and that he does not have much use of his leg without employing a prosthetic device. He cannot - 388 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 stand for long periods of time or bear weight on the left leg without the prosthetic device.

He testified that he would not even try to perform his job duties without his prosthesis. The court received conflicting evidence concerning an impairment rating for Melton. In an April 2017 record, a doctor determined that Melton’s total combined whole person impairment was 40 percent and the “WP Impairment Converted to Lower Extremity” was 32 percent.

On the other hand, a different doctor opined within a reasonable degree of medical certainty that Melton’s correct impairment rating was a 70-percent permanent partial impairment of his left lower extremity. The evidence regarding MMI differed, also. A February 2012 medical record

stated, “Plan for MMI at one year post injury.” In an April 2017 record, a doctor stated that Melton had “reached a medically stable point in time.” 3.

Award The court awarded Melton future medical care and permanent disability benefits. It rejected Melton’s argument that he was entitled to an award for the loss of each toe on his left foot in addition to the loss of that foot. Interpreting Neb. Rev. Stat. § 48-121(3) (Reissue 2010), the court determined that Melton’s amputation below the knee entitled him to statutory benefits for 150 weeks.

The court found credible Melton’s testimony regarding his limitations and retained use of his leg. It concluded that Melton had not lost all functional use of his left leg, but that “his loss of thigh strength and atrophy combined with his knee pain have reduced the function of his leg beyond the loss of his foot.” The court found that Melton suffered a 20-percent loss of function to his leg, entitling him to 43 weeks of disability benefits.

Thus, the court awarded a combined total of 193 weeks of compensation. The court recognized the parties’ disagreement as to when the City should have begun making periodic permanent disability payments for the amputation of Melton’s left foot. It looked for an explanation concerning the City’s delay in - 389 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 paying for the loss of Melton’s foot and stated that “[t]he differing dates of MMI by [Dr.

Dennis] McGowan (2012) and [Dr. Bryan] Scheer (2017), when combined with the unanswered question of when [the City] received McGowan’s opinion, create a factual controversy, if having a medical opinion is required.” The court declared that whether MMI must be proved by expert medical opinion was an unanswered question of law, but it concluded that an expert medical opinion was not required where temporary disability benefits are discontinued before MMI.

The court found, as a matter of law, that in an uncontested case involving the amputation of a hand, arm, foot, or leg, payment for permanent disability for the amputation should begin immediately at the discontinuance of temporary disability benefits or MMI, whichever occurs first. Based on that finding, the court determined that Melton’s entitlement to payment for the amputation of his foot began on June 17, 2012, when he returned to full-time work and his temporary disability benefits were discontinued.

The court denied Melton’s requests for a waiting-time penalty and vocational rehabilitation. In declining to award a penalty, the court found that “a reasonable controversy exists regarding an unanswered question of law” as to whether the discontinuance of temporary disability payments triggers payment of permanent disability payments in a case involving an amputation.

Because Melton had secured substantial gainful employment, the court denied his request for vocational rehabilitation. Melton filed a timely appeal, which we moved to our docket. 1 III.

ASSIGNMENTS OF ERROR Melton assigns that the court erred in (1) failing to evaluate his loss and the loss of use of his leg without the assistance of his prosthetic device in determining impairment; (2) failing 1 See Neb. Rev. Stat. § 24-1106(3) (Cum.

Supp. 2020). - 390 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 to award him for the total loss of use of his leg; (3) failing to award him consecutive disability benefits for the total loss of all his toes, his foot, and use of his leg pursuant to § 48-121(3); (4) failing to award waiting-time penalties, attorney fees, and interest for late payment associated with the total loss of his foot; and (5) failing to find that he was entitled to an award of vocational rehabilitation services for satisfying criteria of Neb. Rev. Stat. § 48-162.01(3) (Reissue 2010) despite no further services being requested or necessary at the time of trial.

IV. STANDARD OF REVIEW [1] A judgment, order, or award of the compensation court may be modified, reversed, or set aside only upon the grounds that (1) the compensation court acted without or in excess of its powers; (2) the judgment, order, or award was procured by fraud; (3) there is not sufficient competent evidence in the record to warrant the making of the order, judgment, or award; or (4) the findings of fact by the compensation court do not support the order or award.

2 [2] On appellate review, the factual findings made by the trial judge of the Workers' Compensation Court have the effect of a jury verdict and will not be disturbed unless clearly wrong. 3 [3] An appellate court is obligated in workers' compensation cases to make its own determinations as to questions of law. 4 V. ANALYSIS 1. Determination of Loss Melton challenges three aspects of the court's determination of his loss.

First, he argues that in determining his impairment, the court failed to evaluate loss of use of his left leg without the prosthesis attached. Second, Melton contends that the 2 Rogers v. Jack's Supper Club, 308 Neb. 107, 953 N.W.2d 9 (2021). 3 Parks v. Hy-Vee, 307 Neb. 927, 951 N.W.2d 504 (2020). 4 Rogers v. Jack's Supper Club, supra note 2. - 391 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 court should have awarded him compensation for the total loss of use of his leg.

Third, Melton claims that the court erred in failing to award him consecutive disability benefits for a total loss of all his toes, his foot, and use of his left leg. Before addressing these challenges, we review statutory language central to our analysis.

[4] Section 48-121(3) generally provides the manner by which a worker is compensated for the loss or loss of use of a scheduled member. 5 Loss of a foot or leg are examples of scheduled member injuries. Under § 48-121(3), compensation for the loss of a foot lasts for 150 weeks while compensation for loss of a leg extends for 215 weeks.

The statute specifies that “amputation between the knee and the ankle shall be considered as the equivalent of the loss of a foot,” while “amputation at or above the knee shall be considered as the loss of a leg.”⁶ Under § 48-121(3), Melton’s amputation is considered a loss of a foot. Section 48-121(3) also touches on loss of use of a scheduled member. A permanent total loss of the use of a leg is considered as the equivalent of the loss of such leg.

⁷ For a permanent partial loss of the use or function of a leg, “the compensation shall bear such relation to the amounts named in such subdivision as the disabilities bear to those produced by the injuries named therein.”⁸ We now turn to Melton’s arguments. (a) Consideration of Prosthesis Melton argues that the court erred by determining the loss of use of his left leg with the prosthetic device rather than without the use of a prosthesis.

We disagree that it did so. The court’s award recognized Melton’s limitations and use of a prosthesis. It acknowledged Melton’s testimony that he ⁵ Smith v. Mark Chrisman Trucking, 285 Neb. 826, 829 N.W.2d 717 (2013). ⁶ § 48-121(3). ⁷ See id. ⁸ Id. - 392 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 would have no functional use of his leg without the prosthesis and that the function of his leg was reduced by his loss of thigh strength, atrophy, and knee pain.

But the court found that Melton “has not lost all functional use of his left leg.” The court’s factual finding is not clearly wrong. The court explained, “The retained strength and function in the knee and thigh, although reduced, enable [Melton] to walk, climb steps, navigate uneven terrain, and generally support the use of the prosthesis below the knee.” This comports with Melton’s testimony regarding what he could do without his prosthesis: he could “pick up [his left] leg... waist high,” crawl up stairs, climb ladders (although Melton qualified that doing so would be “tough” and not “very safe”), and navigate uneven terrain by “crawl[ing] or scoot[ing] or slid[ing].” Because the court did not determine Melton’s loss based on use of his prosthesis, this assignment of error lacks merit. (b) Total Loss of Use of Leg Melton next argues that the court should have awarded him for a total loss of use of his left leg.

He claims that without the prosthesis, his leg is a useless object for all practical intents and purposes. But Melton’s left leg was not useless—he remained able to bend his knee and support weight on the residual limb.

As discussed above, the court’s finding that Melton had not lost all functional use of his leg was not clearly wrong. Melton relies on a Pennsylvania test mentioned by the Nebraska Court of Appeals in one of its decisions.

In Jacob v. Columbia Ins. Group, ⁹ an employee suffered such extensive injuries to his left hand that doctors considered amputating it, but were ultimately able to save part of it. The Court of Appeals found Pennsylvania’s “‘practical intents and purposes’ test” to be persuasive on the

question of whether the employee suffered such disability to his hand that the hand served no real purpose.

10 The Court of Appeals found as a matter of 9 Jacob v. Columbia Ins. Group, 2 Neb. App. 473, 511 N.W.2d 211 (1994). 10 Id. at 487, 511 N.W.2d at 219. - 393 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 law that the employee's left hand was useless and that he suffered a 100-percent disability to his hand.

Using that test, Melton argues that he has sustained a 100-percent loss of use of his left leg for all practical intents and purposes. However, the court's finding that Melton retained enough strength in his left leg to use the prosthetic device is supported by the record.

We cannot find that Melton's left leg was useless. Melton next contends that the effects of his amputation were not usual, logical, and expected. Long ago, in considering whether an employee who sustained an injury to his thumb should also be compensated on the basis of an injury to the hand, we observed that injuries to the thumb and to the hand were separate scheduled injuries under § 48-121(3) and that we had "consistently held that where the effect of an injury to a finger only is the usual and natural one, compensation cannot be allowed for loss of use of the hand." 11 In Jacob, the Court of Appeals applied the principle for loss of or injury to any of the scheduled members listed in § 48-121(3), stating that "so long as the injury is only to a lesser member, the scheduled compensation for loss of or injury to that member controls, unless there is an unusual and unexpected result to the greater members." 12 Here, the trial court found that Melton suffered an additional 20-percent loss of function in his leg that went beyond what would have otherwise been expected after amputation of his left leg below the knee.

We find no clear error in this regard. (c) Failure to Make Consecutive Awards Melton further argues that the court erred in failing to award him consecutive amounts of disability benefits for the loss 11 Herold v. Constructors, Inc., 201 Neb. 697, 701, 271 N.W.2d 542, 544 (1978). 12 Jacob v. Columbia Ins. Group, supra note 9, 2 Neb. App. at 484, 511 N.W.2d at 217. - 394 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 of his five toes, the loss of his left foot, and the total loss of his left leg.

He relies on the following statutory language: In any case in which there is a loss or loss of use of more than one member or parts of more than one member set forth in this subdivision, but not amounting to total and permanent disability, compensation benefits shall be paid for the loss or loss of use of each such member or part thereof, with the periods of benefits to run consecutively.

13 [5] Melton's argument is refuted by statutory language found in the same paragraph. As we mentioned above, § 48-121(3) explicitly states that a below-the-knee amputation is the equivalent of a loss of a foot. It is obvious that such a loss would include a loss of the toes on the foot,

but the Legislature limited the loss to the foot. This is in line with the general rule that a party may not have double recovery for a single injury.

14 For the reasons discussed above, the trial court's finding that Melton did not suffer a total loss of use of his leg was not clearly wrong. The court appropriately compensated Melton for the functional loss of his leg that was not already accounted for in the compensation for the loss of his foot. Being mindful that double recovery is disallowed and that loss of a leg is compensated for 215 weeks, the court was careful to award loss of use benefits for the leg that when coupled with the 150-week award for loss of a foot, would not exceed 215 weeks.

We affirm the court's award of a combined total of 193 weeks of compensation. 2. Penalty, Interest, and Attorney Fees Melton argues that the court erred by failing to award a waiting-time penalty, interest, and attorney fees with respect to late payment of permanent disability benefits for the loss of 13 § 48-121(3). 14 See *D'Quaix v. Chadron State College*, 272 Neb. 859, 725 N.W.2d 558 (2007). - 395 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports *MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE* Cite as 309 Neb. 385 his foot.

He does not quarrel with the trial court's conclusion regarding when permanent disability benefits become due for an amputation. Rather, he challenges only the court's factual finding that a reasonable controversy existed.

Here, the parties' disagreement centered on when the City should have made payments for the permanent loss of Melton's foot. Melton argued that payment was due when his entitlement to temporary disability ceased. On the other hand, the City asserted that permanency benefits should be paid only after MMI has been reached and that it timely paid such benefits within 30 days of being provided proof that Melton had reached MMI.

The City contends that this disagreement amounted to a reasonable controversy. [6,7] Neb. Rev. Stat. § 48-125 (Cum. Supp. 2020) authorizes a 50-percent penalty payment for waiting time involving delinquent payment of compensation and an attorney fee, where there is no reasonable controversy regarding an employee's claim for workers' compensation. 15 A "reasonable controversy" exists (1) if there is a question of law previously unanswered by the Supreme Court, which question must be answered to determine a right or liability for disposition of a claim under the Nebraska Workers' Compensation Act, or (2) if the properly adduced evidence would support reasonable but opposite conclusions by the compensation court about an aspect of an employee's claim, which conclusions affect allowance or rejection of an employee's claim, in whole or in part.

16 [8] Whether a reasonable controversy exists under § 48-125 is a question of fact. 17 The compensation court determined that a reasonable controversy existed due to "an unanswered question of law" regarding the timing of permanent disability payments. Our case law is clear

that temporary disability benefits are discontinued at the point of MMI and that when 15 *Picard v. P & C Group* 1, 306 Neb. 292, 945 N.W.2d 183 (2020).

16 See *id.* 17 *Id.* - 396 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 an injured employee reaches MMI, any remaining disability is permanent. 18 We have also declared that MMI is not reached until all of the injuries resulting from an accident have reached maximum medical healing and that our law does not provide for partial MMI.

19 In this case, the City last paid temporary partial disability benefits in March 2016, which suggests Melton had reached MMI. That Melton had reached MMI was made clear in a May 2017 letter in which Melton's counsel informed the City that "Melton is now at MMI for the remaining impairment for the injury to his knee and leg." Ten days later, the City mailed a check for the 100-percent loss of a foot.

In finding a reasonable controversy, the court explained that "[o]ur appellate courts have not ruled that the discontinuance of temporary disability payments triggers payment of permanent disability payments in a case involving an amputation." We agree that this was an unanswered question.

Accordingly, we find no clear error in the compensation court's finding that a reasonable controversy existed. 3. Vocational Rehabilitation Finally, Melton faults the court for not awarding vocational rehabilitation benefits. He emphasizes the importance of his prosthesis and of coworkers' assistance in his ability to return to work. Melton argues that the court was "required to enter an award of vocational services as [he] has satisfied criteria a, b, c and d as set forth in [§] 48-162.01." 20 Melton misconstrues the statute.

Under § 48-162.01(3), an employee who, due to an injury, "is unable to perform suitable work for which he or she has previous training or experience,... is entitled to such 18 See *Gardner v. International Paper Destr. & Recycl.*, 291 Neb. 415, 865 N.W.2d 371 (2015). 19 See *Rodriguez v. Hirschbach Motor Lines*, 270 Neb. 757, 707 N.W.2d 232 (2005). 20 Brief for appellant at 30. - 397 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 vocational rehabilitation services, including job placement and training, as may be reasonably necessary to restore him or her to suitable employment." The statute sets forth priorities to "be used in developing and evaluating a vocational rehabilitation plan." 21 The priorities are contained in a list from (a) to (e), which are listed in order from lower priority to higher priority.

Section 48-162.01(3) specifies that no higher priority may be used unless the lower priorities would be unlikely to result in suitable employment for the injured employee. [9] Whether an injured worker is entitled to vocational rehabilitation is ordinarily a question of fact to be

determined by the compensation court. 22 In declining to award vocational rehabilitation, the court relied on Melton's testimony that he had secured, and was capable of performing, substantial gain- ful employment.

Although Melton believed he would need vocational rehabilitation if he became unable to continue his present employment, the court stated that it could not engage in speculation or give advisory opinions. [10] We find no clear error in the court's decision to deny vocational rehabilitation benefits.

The evidence establishes that Melton is able to perform suitable work for which he has previ- ous training or experience. He testified that he felt comfortable with his ability to continue performing the essential functions of his job.

Although Melton desired an award of vocational rehabilitation in case he needed services in the future, a work- ers' compensation award cannot be based on mere possibility or speculation. 23 To the extent Melton is arguing he should be entitled to vocational rehabilitation based on a future loss of his existing employment but without an increase in his disability, this argu- ment invites us to provide an advisory opinion.

We decline to do so. 21 § 48-162.01(3). 22 *Bower v. Eaton Corp.*, 301 Neb. 311, 918 N.W.2d 249 (2018). 23 See *id.* - 398 - Nebraska Supreme Court Advance Sheets 309 Nebraska Reports MELTON v. CITY OF HOLDREGE Cite as 309 Neb. 385 VI. CONCLUSION We find no clear error in the court's determination that Melton did not suffer a total loss of his leg, but, rather, suffered a 20-percent loss of function to his leg that went beyond what would have been otherwise expected following amputation of his leg below the knee.

We cannot say that the court was clearly wrong in finding the existence of a reasonable contro- versy regarding timing of payments for the loss of Melton's foot. Finally, because Melton was performing suitable work for which he had previous training or experience, the court did not err in denying vocational rehabilitation benefits.

We affirm the judgment. Affirmed. Stacy, J., not participating.