

TENNESSEE COURT OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION CLAIMS

Bobby Williams v. HUB Group, Inc.

2026 TN WC 69 · No. 2023-08-2183 · Decided May 19, 2026

SUMMARY

The Tennessee Court of Workers' Compensation Claims granted HUB Group, Inc.'s motion for summary judgment in Bobby Williams's claim arising from alleged head and brain injuries after a March 28, 2022 incident. The court held that Williams lacked medical evidence establishing that his strokes arose primarily out of and in the course and scope of his employment, dismissed the claim with prejudice, and taxed the filing fee to HUB.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Tennessee Court of Workers' Compensation Claims
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Shatterra R. Marion
JURISDICTION	Tennessee Court of Workers' Compensation Claims, at Memphis
DECIDED	May 19, 2026
DOCKET	2023-08-2183
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	HUB Group moved for summary judgment in an employee workers' compensation claim, arguing that the employee could not establish medical causation. The court granted the motion and dismissed the claim with prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Summary judgment is appropriate when the pleadings and record show no genuine issue of material fact and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. A defendant seeking summary judgment must either submit affirmative evidence negating an essential element of the claim or demonstrate that the claimant's evidence is insufficient to establish that element.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published
PARTIES	Bobby Williams v. HUB Group, Inc.

TOPICS

- workers compensation
- summary judgment
- employment law
- civil procedure
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- workers compensation
- employment law
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether HUB Group was entitled to summary judgment because the undisputed evidence negated the essential element of medical causation.
2. Whether Williams's lay opinion and the occurrence of the incident at work were sufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact concerning whether his injury arose primarily out of and in the course and scope of employment.

HOLDINGS

1. HUB Group was entitled to summary judgment because Dr. Eljovich's testimony negated the essential element of causation and Williams presented no medical evidence establishing that his strokes or alleged injuries arose primarily out of and in the course and scope of his employment.
2. Williams's personal, lay opinion that the injury was work-related was insufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact on medical causation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

"Summary judgment is appropriate "if the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." (2026 TN WC 69)

"Mr. Williams's personal, lay opinion about causation is insufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact on causation." (2026 TN WC 69)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Williams alleged that he suffered head and brain injuries after leaving a truck-stop bathroom on March 28, 2022, when he became dizzy and lowered himself to the ground. Dr. Lucas Eljovich diagnosed Williams with two strokes, one occurring in 2015 and the timing of the other being unknown. Eljovich testified that the strokes were not primarily caused by an activity or accident at work, and Williams offered no contrary medical opinion.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Williams alleged that he sustained head and brain injuries after becoming dizzy and lowering himself to the ground at a truck stop on March 28, 2022. Following an expedited hearing, the court denied benefits and entered a scheduling order. HUB then moved for summary judgment; Williams responded to the motion but did not respond to HUB's statement of undisputed facts.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Rye v. Women's Care Ctr. of Memphis, M PLLC, 477 S.W.3d 235, 264-65 (Tenn. 2015)
- Hutchins v. Cardinal Glass Indus., No. E2023-00587-SC-R3-WC, 2024 Tenn. LEXIS 3, at *11 (Tenn. Workers' Comp. Panel Jan. 11, 2024)

OPINION

WILLIAMS, BOBBY v. HUB GROUP, Inc.

2026 TN WC 69

PER CURIAM.

FILED

May 19, 2026

12:37 PM(CT)

TENNESSEE COURT OF

WORKERS' COMPENSATION

CLAIMS

TENNESSEE BUREAU OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION

IN THE COURT OF WORKERS' COMPENSATION CLAIMS

AT MEMPHIS

BOBBY WILLIAMS, Docket No. 2023-08-2183 Employee, v. State File No. 42731-2022 HUB GROUP, Inc., Employer. Judge Shatterra R. Marion

COMPENSATION ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY JUDGMENT

HUB Group moved for summary judgment, asserting that Mr. Williams cannot prove a causal connection between his employment and his injury, which is an essential element of his claim. For the reasons below, the Court holds Mr. Williams did not present the necessary evidence, and HUB is entitled to summary judgment.

Procedural History Mr. Williams alleged work injuries to his head and brain, because after leaving a truck-stop bathroom on March 28, 2022, he felt so dizzy he had to lower himself to the ground. After an expedited hearing, the Court denied benefits and later entered a scheduling order. HUB filed this motion. Although Mr. Williams filed a response to the motion, he did not respond to HUB's statement of undisputed facts. Facts HUB filed a statement of undisputed material facts with citations to the record under Tennessee Rule of Civil Procedure 56.03 (2025). Because Mr. Williams did not respond to them, the facts are unrebutted. Dr. Lucas Elijovich diagnosed Mr. Williams with two strokes. One stroke occurred in 2015, and he could not tell when the other occurred. However, Dr. Elijovich testified Mr. Williams's strokes were not primarily caused by an activity or accident at work. Mr. Williams did not offer a medical opinion to show that his work primarily caused his strokes. Mr. Williams argues that because the incident happened at work, and because of Dr. Elijovich's stroke diagnoses, it is work-related.

Law and Analysis Summary judgment is appropriate "if the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, and admissions on file, together with the affidavits, if any, show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law." Tenn. R. Civ. P. 56.04. As the moving party, HUB must either: (1) submit affirmative evidence that negates an essential element of Mr. Williams's claim, or (2) demonstrate that his evidence is insufficient to establish an essential element of his claim. Tenn. Code Ann. § 20-16-101 (2025); *Rye v. Women's Care Ctr. of Memphis, M PLLC*, 477 S.W.3d 235, 264 (Tenn. 2015). If HUB meets this burden, Mr. Williams must then establish that the record contains specific facts upon which the Court could base a decision in his favor. *Id.* at 265. HUB met its burden, successfully negating the essential element of causation through Dr. Elijovich's testimony. Causation is an essential element because Tennessee Code Annotated section 50-6-102(12) requires expert medical proof that the injury arose primarily out of and in the course and scope of employment. Additionally, Mr. Williams did not respond with a doctor's opinion upon which the Court could decide this claim in his favor. In a similar case, a trial court did not err in granting summary judgment where the employee failed to respond to the motion with medical evidence of causation. *Hutchins v. Cardinal Glass Indus.*, No. E2023-00587-SC-R3-WC, 2024 Tenn. LEXIS 3, at *11 (Tenn. Workers' Comp. Panel Jan. 11, 2024). Just as in *Hutchins*, Mr. Williams presented no medical evidence that his injury arose primarily out of and in the course and scope of his employment. Causation must be supported by a medical

opinion given within a reasonable degree of medical certainty. Tenn. Code Ann. § 50-6-204. Mr. Williams's personal, lay opinion about causation is insufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact on causation. Thus, HUB is entitled to summary judgment as a matter of law. IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED as follows:

1. HUB's motion for summary judgment is granted, and Mr. Williams's claim against HUB is dismissed with prejudice to its refiling.
2. Unless appealed, this order shall become final 30 days after entry.
3. The Court taxes the \$150.00 filing fee to HUB under Tennessee Compilation Rules and Regulations 0800-02-21-.06 (2026), for which execution may issue as necessary.
4. HUB shall prepare and submit the SD-2 with the Clerk within 10 days of the date of judgment. ENTERED May 19, 2026. _____

JUDGE SHATERRA R. MARION

Court of Workers' Compensation Claims

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of this Order was sent on May 19, 2026. Regular Name Email Service sent to: Mail Bobby Williams, X Employee Rhoberta Orsland, rorsland@manierherod.com X Employer's Attorney

PENNY SHRUM, COURT CLERK

wc.courtclerk@tn.gov Right to Appeal: If you disagree with the Court's Order, you may appeal to the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board. To do so, you must:

1. Complete the enclosed form entitled "Notice of Appeal" and file it with the Clerk of the Court of Workers' Compensation Claims before the expiration of the deadline. ³/₄ If the order being appealed is "expedited" (also called "interlocutory"), or if the order does not dispose of the case in its entirety, the notice of appeal must be filed within seven (7) business days of the date the order was filed. ³/₄ If the order being appealed is a "Compensation Order," or if it resolves all issues in the case, the notice of appeal must be filed within thirty (30) calendar days of the date the Compensation Order was filed. When filing the Notice of Appeal, you must serve a copy on the opposing party (or attorney, if represented).
2. You must pay, via check, money order, or credit card, a \$75.00 filing fee within ten calendar days after filing the Notice of Appeal. Payments can be made in-person at any Bureau office or by U.S. mail, hand-delivery, or other delivery service. In the alternative, you may file an Affidavit of Indigency (form available on the Bureau's website or any Bureau office) seeking a waiver of the filing fee. You must file the fully-completed Affidavit of Indigency within ten calendar days of filing the Notice of Appeal. Failure to timely pay the filing fee or file the Affidavit of Indigency will result in dismissal of your appeal.
3. You are responsible for ensuring a complete record is presented on appeal. If no court reporter was present at the hearing, you may request from the Court Clerk the audio recording of the hearing for a \$25.00 fee. If you choose to submit a transcript as part of your appeal, which the Appeals Board has emphasized is important for a meaningful review of the case, a licensed court reporter must prepare the transcript, and you must file it with the Court Clerk. The Court Clerk will prepare the record for submission to the Appeals Board, and you will receive notice once it has been submitted. For deadlines related to the filing of transcripts, statements of the evidence, and briefs on appeal, see the applicable rules on the Bureau's website at <https://www.tn.gov/wcappealsboard>. (Click the "Read Rules" button.)
4. After the Workers' Compensation Judge approves the record and the Court Clerk transmits it to the Appeals Board, a docketing notice will be sent to the parties. If neither party timely files an appeal

with the Appeals Board, the Court Order becomes enforceable. See Tenn. Code Ann. § 50-6-239(d)(3) (expedited/interlocutory orders) and Tenn. Code Ann. § 50-6-239(c)(7) (compensation orders). For self-represented litigants: Help from an Ombudsman is available at 800-332-2667.

NOTICE OF APPEAL

Tennessee Bureau of Workers’ Compensation www.tn.gov/workforce/injuries-at-work/ wc.courtclerk@tn.gov

| 1-800-332-2667 Docket No.: _____ State File No.: _____ Date
of _____ Injury: _____

_____ Employee v.
_____ Employer

Notice is given that _____

[List name(s) of all appealing party(ies). Use separate sheet if necessary.] appeals the following order(s) of the Tennessee Court of Workers’ Compensation Claims to the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board ;ĐŚĢĐŮ ŽŸĢ Žđ ŵŽđĢ ĂĐĐđđĂđđŮĢ đŽđžĢĖ ĂŸĖ đŸĐđZĖĢ ĩŚĢ ĖĂĭĢ ĨđĢĢT ĖĭĂŵĐĢĖ ŽŸ ĩŚĢ ĨđđĖ ĐĂŖĢ Žĭ ĩŚĢ ŽđĖĢđ;Ė đĢĢŸŖ ĂĐĐĢĂđĢĖĢ ħ Expedited Hearing Order filed on _____ ħ Motion Order filed on _____ ħ Compensation Order filed on _____ ħ Other Order filed on _____ issued by Judge _____ . Statement of the Issues on Appeal Provide a short and plain statement of the issues on appeal or basis for relief on appeal:

Parties Appellant(s) (Requesting Party): _____ .Employer
:Employee Address: _____ Phone:
_____ Email: _____

Attorney’s Name: _____ BPR#:
_____ Attorney’s Email: _____
Phone: _____ Attorney’s Address: _____

_____ * Attach an additional sheet for each additional Appellant * LB-1099 rev. 01/20 Page 1 of 2 RDA 11082 Employee Name: _____ Docket No.: _____ Date of Inj.: _____

_____ Appellee(s) (Opposing Party): _____
:Employer :Employee Appellee’s Address: _____ Phone:
_____ Email: _____

Attorney’s Name: _____ BPR#:
_____ Attorney’s Email: _____
Phone: _____ Attorney’s Address: _____

_____ * Attach an additional sheet for each additional Appellee *

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, _____, certify that I have forwarded a true and exact copy of this Notice of Appeal by First Class mail, postage prepaid, or in any manner as

described in Tennessee Compilation Rules & Regulations, Chapter 0800-02-21, to all parties and/or their attorneys in this case on this the _____ day of _____, 20 ____.

[Signature of appellant or attorney for appellant]

LB-1099 rev. 01/20 Page 2 of 2 RDA 11082