Texas Department of Insurance
Division of Workers' Compensation
Medical Fee Dispute Resolution, MS-48
7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name and Address:	MFDR Tracking #: M4-06-5247-01
LAW OFFICE OF CASS BURTON PO BOX 684749 AUSTIN TX 78768-4749	DWC Claim #:
	Injured Employee:
Respondent Name and Box #:	Date of Injury:
TEXAS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO Box #: 54	Employer Name:
	Insurance Carrier #:

PART II: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's rationale for increased reimbursement taken from the "Table of Disputed Services", states: "Carrier did not pay this claim at usual and customary. No response to request for reconsideration. Hospital is requesting we be reimbursed at usual and customary."

Amount in Dispute: $7,027.69

PART III: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The 2005 APC code for 64483 and 62311 is 0207. The median payment for APC 207 is $341.09. Since 62311 is a secondary procedure it is reduced by 50% to $170.55. When $341.09 and $170.55 are added the sum is $511.64. To convert to the Ingenix recommended MAR the sum of $557.77 is multiplied by 140% which equals $716.30. Texas Mutual originally paid $397.80. To reach the Ingenix recommended MAR Texas Mutual will issue a supplemental payment of $318.50 under separate cover. The requestor, on the other hand, has failed to submit any information to support its billing of $7,425.49 is either fair or reasonable for the service provided."

PART IV: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Date(s) of Service	Denial Code(s)	Disputed Service	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
8/4/2005	None provided	Outpatient Surgery	$7,027.69	$0.00
			Total Due:	$0.00

PART V: REVIEW OF SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY AND EXPLANATION

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), titled *Reimbursement Policies and Guidelines*, and Division rule at 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.1, titled *Use of the Fee Guidelines*, effective May 16, 2002 set out the reimbursement guidelines.

This request for medical fee dispute resolution was received by the Division on April 10, 2006. Pursuant to Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, the Division notified the requestor on April 19, 2006 to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute as set forth in the rule.

1. U.S. Bankruptcy Judge Michael Lynn issued a "STIPULATION AND ORDER GRANTING RELIEF FROM AUTOMATIC STAY TO PERMIT CONTINUANCE AND ADJUDICATION OF DISPUTED WORKERS COMPENSATION CLAIMS BEFORE THE TEXAS STATE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS," dated August 27, 2010, in the case of *In re: Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, Inc. d/b/a/ Renaissance Hospital – Grand Prairie, et al.,* in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division in Case No. 08-43775-7. The order lifted the automatic stay to allow continuance of the Claim Adjudication Process as to the WC Receivables before SOAH, effective October 1, 2010. The order specified John Dee Spicer as the Chapter 7 Trustee of the debtor's estate. By letter dated October 5, 2010, Mr. Spicer provided express written authorization for Cass Burton of the law office of Cass Burton, PO Box 684749, Austin, Texas 78768-4749, to be the point of contact on Mr. Spicer's behalf relating to matters between and among the debtors and the Division concerning medical fee disputes. The Division will utilize this address in all communications with the requestor regarding this medical fee dispute.
2. The requestor did not submit EOB's along with the DWC060 request.

3. This dispute relates to outpatient surgical services provided in a hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1, effective May 16, 2002, 27 TexReg 4047, which requires that "Reimbursement for services not identified in an established fee guideline shall be reimbursed at fair and reasonable rates as described in the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, §413.011 until such period that specific fee guidelines are established by the commission."
4. Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) requires that fee guidelines must be fair and reasonable and designed to ensure the quality of medical care and to achieve effective medical cost control. The guidelines may not provide for payment of a fee in excess of the fee charged for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living and paid by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf. It further requires that the Division consider the increased security of payment afforded by the Act in establishing the fee guidelines.
5. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires that the request shall include "a copy of each explanation of benefits (EOB)… relevant to the fee dispute or, if no EOB was received, convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the request does not include any EOBs for the disputed services. Neither has the requestor submitted convincing evidence of carrier receipt of the provider request for an EOB. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B).
6. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including "documentation of the request for and response to reconsideration (when a provider is requesting dispute resolution on a carrier reduction or denial of a medical bill) or, if the carrier failed to respond to the request for reconsideration, convincing evidence of the carrier's receipt of that request." Review of the submitted evidence finds that the requestor has not provided documentation of the insurance carrier's response to the request for reconsideration or convincing evidence of the carrier's receipt of that request. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(A).
7. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including "a copy of any pertinent medical records." Review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not provided medical records to support the services in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(B).
8. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not provide a description of the healthcare for which payment is in dispute. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(i).
9. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(ii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "the requestor's reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid." Review of the submitted documentation finds no documentation of the requestor's reasoning for why the disputed services should be paid. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(ii).
10. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the Texas Labor Code and commission [now the Division] rules, and fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the Texas Labor Code and Division rules impact the disputed fee issues. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iii).
11. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to send additional documentation relevant to the fee dispute including a statement of the disputed issue(s) that shall include "how the submitted documentation supports the requestor position for each disputed fee issue." Review of the submitted documentation finds that the requestor did not state how the submitted documentation supports the requestor's position for each disputed fee issue. The Division concludes that the requestor has not met the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(C)(iv).
12. Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(g)(3)(D), effective January 1, 2003, 27 TexReg 12282, applicable to disputes filed on or after January 1, 2003, requires the requestor to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement." Review of the submitted documentation finds that:
    - The requestor's rationale for increased reimbursement taken from the "Table of Disputed Services", states: "Carrier did not pay this claim at usual and customary. No response to request for reconsideration. Hospital is requesting we

be reimbursed at usual and customary."

- The requestor does not discuss or demonstrate how payment at the usual and customary would result in a fair and reasonable reimbursement. The Division has previously found that "hospital charges are not a valid indicator of a hospital's costs of providing services nor of what is being paid by other payors," as stated in the adoption preamble to the Division's former *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline, 22* TexReg 6276 (July 4, 1997). It further states that "Alternative methods of reimbursement were considered… and rejected because they use hospital charges as their basis and allow the hospitals to affect their reimbursement by inflating their charges…" 22 TexReg 6268-6269. Therefore, the use of a hospital's "usual and customary" charges cannot be favorably considered when no other data or documentation was submitted to support that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services in dispute.
- The Division has previously found that a reimbursement methodology based upon payment of a hospital's billed charges, or a percentage of billed charges, does not produce an acceptable payment amount. This methodology was considered and rejected by the Division in the *Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline* adoption preamble which states at 22 Texas Register 6276 (July 4, 1997) that:

  "A discount from billed charges was another method of reimbursement which was considered. Again, this method was found unacceptable because it leaves the ultimate reimbursement in the control of the hospital, thus defeating the statutory objective of effective cost control and the statutory standard not to pay more than for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living. It also provides no incentive to contain medical costs, would be administratively burdensome for the Commission and system participants, and would require additional Commission resources."
- The requestor does not discuss or explain how payment of the requested amount would satisfy the requirements of Division rule at 28 TAC §134.1.

The request for additional reimbursement is not supported. Thorough review of the documentation submitted by the requestor finds that the requestor has not demonstrated or justified that payment of the amount sought would be a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement for the services in dispute. Additional payment cannot be recommended.

13. The Division would like to emphasize that individual medical fee dispute outcomes rely upon the evidence presented by the requestor and respondent during dispute resolution, and the thorough review and consideration of that evidence. After thorough review and consideration of all the evidence presented by the parties to this dispute, it is determined that the submitted documentation does not support the reimbursement amount sought by the requestor. The Division concludes that this dispute was not filed in the form and manner prescribed under Division rule at 28 TAC §133.307(e)(2)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(A), §133.307(g)(3)(B), §133.307(g)(3)(C) and §133.307(g)(3)(D). The Division further concludes that the requestor failed to support its position that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is $0.00.

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES

Texas Labor Code §413.011(a-d), §413.031 and §413.0311
28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307, §134.1
Texas Government Code, Chapter 2001, Subchapter G

PART VII: DIVISION DECISION

Based upon the documentation submitted by the parties and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor Code §413.031, the Division has determined that the requestor is not entitled to additional reimbursement for the services involved in this dispute.

DECISION:

Authorized Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date
Authorized Signature	Martha Luevano Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Manager	Date

PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST AN APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to request an appeal. A request for hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the DWC Chief Clerk of Proceedings within **20** (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision. A request for hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings, Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers Compensation, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas, 78744. **Please include a copy of the Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** together with other required information specified in Division rule at 28 TAC §148.3(c).

Under Texas Labor Code §413.0311, your appeal will be handled by a Division hearing under Title 28 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 142 Rules if the total amount sought does not exceed $2,000. If the total amount sought exceeds $2,000, a hearing will be conducted by the State Office of Administrative Hearings under Texas Labor Code §413.031.

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de ésta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 512-804-4812.