

BRB No. 93-1474 BLA

CHARLES W. BENNETT )  
 )  
 Claimant-Petitioner )  
 )  
 v. )  
 )  
 KARST-ROBBINS COAL COMPANY )  
 )  
 and )  
 )  
 LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE ) DATE ISSUED:  
 COMPANY )  
 )  
 Employer/Carrier- )  
 Respondents )  
 ) )  
 DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF WORKERS' )  
 COMPENSATION PROGRAMS, UNITED )  
 STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR )  
 )  
 Party-In-Interest ) DECISION and ORDER

Appeal of the Decision and Order of Bernard J. Gilday, Jr., Administrative Law Judge, United States Department of Labor.

John C. Carter (Carter & Busroe Law Offices), Harlan, Kentucky, for claimant.

John T. Chafin (Francis, Kazee & Francis), Prestonsburg, Kentucky, for employer.

Before: , Acting Chief Administrative Appeals Judge, and ,  
Administrative Appeals Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Claimant appeals the Decision and Order (91-BLA-2685) of Administrative Law Judge Bernard J. Gilday, Jr. denying benefits on a claim filed pursuant to the provisions of Title IV of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969, as amended, 30 U.S.C. §901 *et seq.* (the Act). Based on the date of filing, December 31, 1990, the administrative law judge considered the claim pursuant to 20 C.F.R. Part 718. After crediting claimant with fourteen and one-half years of coal mine employment, the administrative law judge found that claimant failed to establish the existence of pneumoconiosis pursuant to 20 C.F.R. §718.202(a). Accordingly, benefits were denied. On appeal, claimant generally contends that the administrative law judge erred in denying benefits without making any specific allegations of error. Employer responds in support of the administrative law judge's Decision and Order. The Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs (the Director), has chosen not to respond to this appeal.

The Board's scope of review is defined by statute. The administrative law judge's findings of fact and conclusions of law must be affirmed if they are supported by substantial evidence, are rational, and are in accordance with law. 33 U.S.C. §921(b)(3), as incorporated by 30 U.S.C. §932(a); *O'Keeffe v. Smith, Hinchman & Grylls Associates, Inc.*, 380 U.S. 359 (1965).

On appeal, Claimant generally contends that the administrative law judge erred in weighing the medical evidence of record. Claimant states that his hearing testimony supports a finding that he is totally disabled from the occupational disease of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. However, lay testimony is generally insufficient to

establish either the existence of pneumoconiosis or total respiratory disability unless it is corroborated by at least a quantum of medical evidence. See *Trent v. Director, OWCP*, 11 BLR 1-26 (1987). Claimant does not make any specific allegations of error regarding the administrative law judge's weighing of the medical evidence of record. The Board has consistently held that it will not address any issues on appeal that are inadequately briefed. Claimant must allege with specificity any error of fact or law committed by the administrative law judge. See 20 C.F.R. §802.211; *Sarf v. Director, OWCP*, 10 BLR 1-119 (1987); *Slinker v. Peabody Coal Co.*, 6 BLR 1-465 (1983); *Fish v. Director, OWCP*, 6 BLR 1-107 (1983). As a result, the administrative law judge's Decision and Order denying benefits is affirmed.

Accordingly, the administrative law judge's Decision and Order denying benefits is affirmed.

SO ORDERED.

Administrative Appeals Judge

Administrative Appeals Judge

Administrative Appeals Judge

