MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

<u>Requestor Name</u> <u>Respondent Name</u>

PACIFIC BILLING XL Specialty Insurance Company

MFDR Tracking Number Carrier's Austin Representative

M4-20-1419-01 Box Number 19

MFDR Date Received

February 6, 2020

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "AN ORIGINAL BILL AND A RECONSIDERATION, WERE SUBMITTED, THE CURRENT

RULES ALLOW REIMBURSEMENT"

Amount in Dispute: \$850.00

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: Submitted documentation does not include a position statement from the respondent. Accordingly, this decision is based on the information available at the time of adjudication.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Dates of Service	Disputed Services	Amount In Dispute	Amount Due
June 12, 2019	Designated Doctor Examination	\$850.00	\$850.00

FINDINGS AND DECISION

This medical fee dispute is decided pursuant to Texas Labor Code §413.031 and applicable rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation (DWC).

Background

- 1. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
- 2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.235 sets out the fee guidelines for examinations to determine the injured employee's ability to return to work.
- 3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.250 sets out the fee guidelines for examinations to determine maximum medical improvement and impairment rating.
- 4. The submitted documentation does not include explanations of benefits.

<u>Issues</u>

- 1. Did XL Specialty Insurance Company respond to the medical fee dispute?
- 2. Did XL Specialty Insurance Company take final action on the bill for the service in question prior to the request for medical fee dispute resolution (MFDR)?
- 3. Is Pacific Billing entitled to reimbursement for the examination in question?

Findings

- 1. The Austin insurance carrier representative for XL Specialty Insurance Company is Flahive, Ogden & Latson. The representative received the copy of this medical fee dispute on February 13, 2020. If the DWC does not receive the response within 14 calendar days of the dispute notification, then the DWC may base its decision on the available information.¹
 - As of today, no response has been received from the insurance carrier or its representative. We will base this decision on the information available.
- 2. Pacific Billing is seeking reimbursement for a designated doctor examination to determine maximum medical improvement (MMI) and the injured employee's ability to return to work. Pacific Billing argued that it had not received payment or an explanation of denial for medical bills submitted for the examination in question.
 - The insurance carrier is required to take final action by paying, reducing, or denying the service in question not later than 45 days after receiving the medical bill. This deadline is not extended by a request for additional information.²
 - The greater weight of evidence presented to the DWC supports that a complete bill for the services in question was received by the insurance carrier or its agent. No evidence was provided to support that the insurance carrier took final action on the bill for the service in question.
- 3. Because XL Specialty Insurance Company did not present any defense of its failure to pay the requestor for the examination in question, Pacific Billing is entitled to reimbursement.
 - The submitted documentation supports that Aaron Levine, M.D. performed an evaluation of maximum medical improvement as ordered by the DWC. Therefore, the maximum allowable reimbursement for this examination is \$350.00.³
 - The submitted documentation indicates that Dr. Levine performed an examination to determine the injured employee's ability to return to work. The MAR for this examination is \$500.00.4

The total allowable amount for this examination is \$850.00. This amount is recommended.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the DWC finds that the requestor has established that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$850.00.

ORDER

Based on the submitted information, pursuant to Texas Labor Code Section 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the DWC has determined the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the disputed services. The DWC hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor \$850.00, plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this order.

¹ 28 TAC §133.307(d)(1)

² 28 TAC §133.240 (a)

^{3 28} TAC §134.250(3)(C)

^{4 28} TAC §134.235

Authorized Signature

	Laurie Garnes	March 27, 2020	
Signature	Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Officer	Date	

YOUR RIGHT TO APPEAL

Either party to this medical fee dispute has a right to seek review of this decision in accordance with Rule §133.307, effective May 31, 2012, *37 Texas Register 3833*, applicable to disputes filed on or after June 1, 2012.

A party seeking review must submit a **Request to Schedule a Benefit Review Conference to Appeal a Medical Fee Dispute Decision** (form **DWC045M**) in accordance with the instructions on the form. The request must be received by the DWC within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. The request may be faxed, mailed or personally delivered to the DWC using the contact information listed on the form or to the field office handling the claim.

The party seeking review of the MFDR decision shall deliver a copy of the request to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed. **Please include a copy of the** *Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings* **and** *Decision* together with any other required information specified in 28 Texas Administrative Code §141.1(d).

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