



TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF INSURANCE

Division of Workers' Compensation - Medical Fee Dispute Resolution (MS-48)

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100, Austin, Texas 78744-1645

(512) 804-4000 | F: (512) 804-4811 | (800) 252-7031 | TDI.texas.gov | @TexasTDI

MEDICAL FEE DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

GENERAL INFORMATION

Requestor Name

Memorial Compounding Pharmacy

Respondent Name

Trumbull Insurance Company

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-18-4111-01

Carrier's Austin Representative

Box Number 47

MFDR Date Received

June 25, 2018

REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Requestor's Position Summary: "Memorial Compounding is an approved provider and should be reimbursed accordingly."

Amount in Dispute: \$702.68

RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Respondent's Position Summary: "The Overall Decision on the case is Non-Certified"

Response Submitted by: The Hartford

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

| Dates of Service | Disputed Services | Amount In Dispute | Amount Due |
|------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------|
| October 13, 2017 | Compound Medication | \$702.68 | \$702.68 |

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 §133.240 sets out the procedures for payment or denial of a medical bill.
2. 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307 sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
3. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.502 sets out the procedures for pharmaceutical benefits.
4. 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.503 sets out the fee guidelines for pharmaceutical services.
5. The insurance carrier denied payment based on compensability.

Issues

1. Did the insurance carrier raise a new defense in its response?
2. Is this dispute subject to dismissal based on compensability?
3. Is Memorial Compounding Pharmacy (Memorial) entitled to reimbursement for the compound in question?

Findings

1. Memorial is seeking reimbursement for a compound dispensed on October 13, 2017. In its position statement, The Hartford, on behalf of the insurance carrier, argued that “The Overall Decision on the case is Non-Certified.”

The response from the insurance carrier is required to address only the denial reasons presented to the requestor the request for medical fee dispute resolution (MFDR) was filed with the DWC. Any new denial reasons or defenses raised shall not be considered in this review.¹

The submitted documentation does not support that a denial based on medical necessity was provided to Memorial before this request for MFDR was filed. Therefore, the DWC will not consider this argument in the current dispute review.

2. The insurance carrier processed and denied the disputed compound, in part, based on compensability. Per submitted explanation of benefits (EOB) dated October 27, 2017, the pharmacy bill was originally received by the insurance carrier on or before this date. This EOB did not include a denial based on compensability.

Per EOB dated March 27, 2018, the compound was denied based on compensability. This EOB is more than 45 days after the date the original complete bill was received.²

The insurance carrier has the obligation to dispute whether a treatment was for the compensable injury within 45 days after receiving a complete medical bill.³ The DWC notes that the insurance carrier failed to provide evidence that a denial for compensability was presented to Memorial within 45 days from the date it received the complete pharmacy bill. Therefore, the DWC finds that the dispute in question is not subject to dismissal based on this denial reason.

3. Because the insurance carrier failed to sufficiently support its denial of reimbursement, Memorial is entitled to reimbursement.

The compound in dispute was billed by listing each drug included in the compound and calculating the charge for each drug separately.⁴ Each ingredient is listed below with its reimbursement amount.⁵ The calculation of the total allowable amount is as follows:

| Drug | NDC | Generic(G) /Brand(B) | Price /Unit | Units Billed | AWP Formula | Billed Amt | Lesser of AWP and Billed |
|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|-----------------------------|
| Baclofen | 38779038809 | G | \$35.63 | 5.4 | \$240.50 | \$190.78 | \$190.78 |
| Amantadine | 38779041105 | G | \$24.23 | 3 | \$90.84 | \$72.69 | \$72.69 |
| Gabapentin | 38779246109 | G | \$59.85 | 3.6 | \$269.33 | \$204.66 | \$204.66 |
| Bupivacaine | 38779052405 | G | \$45.60 | 1.2 | \$68.40 | \$54.72 | \$54.72 |
| Amitriptyline | 38779018904 | G | \$18.24 | 1.8 | \$41.04 | \$32.83 | \$32.83 |
| Ethoxy Diglycol | 38779190301 | G | \$0.34 | 4.2 | \$1.80 | \$1.44 | \$1.44 |
| Versapro Cream | 38779252903 | B | \$3.20 | 40.8 | \$142.31 | \$130.56 | \$130.56 |
| Fee | NA | NA | NA | NA | \$15.00 | \$15.00 | \$15.00 |
| | | | | | | Total | \$702.68 |

¹ 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.307(d)(2)(F)

² 28 Texas Administrative Code §133.240(a)

³ “A carrier has up to forty-five days from the date it receives a complete medical bill to dispute whether that treatment was necessary.” State Office of Risk Management v. Lawton, 295 S.W.3d 646 (Tex. 2009), <https://caselaw.findlaw.com/tx-supreme-court/1388209.html>

⁴ 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.502(d)(2)

⁵ 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.503(c)

The total reimbursement is therefore \$702.68. This amount is recommended.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the Division finds that the requestor has established that additional reimbursement is due. As a result, the amount ordered is \$702.68.

ORDER

Based on the submitted information, pursuant to Texas Labor Code Section 413.031 and 413.019 (if applicable), the division has determined the requestor is entitled to additional reimbursement for the disputed services. The division hereby ORDERS the respondent to remit to the requestor \$702.68, plus applicable accrued interest per 28 Texas Administrative Code §134.130, due within 30 days of receipt of this order.

Authorized Signature

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------------|
| | Laurie Garnes | December 7, 2018 |
| 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 division within **twenty** days of your receipt of this decision. The request may be faxed, mailed or personally delivered to the division 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.