



# Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision

## General Information

**Requester Name**

Peak Integrated Healthcare

**Respondent Name**

Hartford Ins Co of Illinois

**MFDR Tracking Number**

M4-26-0729-01

**Insurance Carrier's Austin Representative**

BOX 47 Burns Anderson Jury Brenner & Donovan

**DWC Date Received**

November 13, 2025

## Summary of Findings

Date(s) of Service	Disputed Services	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
October 14, 2025	99080 Medical Documentation	\$192.00	\$0.00
<b>Total</b>		\$192.00	\$0.00

## Requester's Position

"AFTER RECONSIDERATION WE WERE AGAIN DENIED STATING 'NOT DEEMED A MEDICAL NECESSITY.' WE DISAGREE. WE HAVE ATTACHED DOCUMENTATION AND SUFFICIENT RULES SUPPORTING PAYMENT FOR SERVICES/DOCUMENTATION SUBMITTED PER TDI RULES."

**Amount In Dispute:** \$192.00

## Respondent's Position

"After further review of the documentation submitted with this dispute, there is no additional amount warranted.

"The original bill for dos 10/14/25 was received on 10/21/25 ... and denied as bundled/included as the system could not identify a separate procedure without a modifier.

"CPT code 99080 requires a modifier."

## **Findings and Decision**

### Authority

This medical fee dispute is decided according to Texas Labor Code Section [413.031](#) and other applicable laws and rules of the Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation (DWC).

### Statutes and Rules

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Section [133.307](#) sets out the procedures for resolving medical fee disputes.
2. 28 TAC Section [127.10](#) provides the general procedures for designated doctor examinations.
3. 28 TAC Section [133.10](#) sets out the requirements for a complete medical bill.
4. 28 TAC Section [134.120](#) sets out the fee guidelines for medical documentation.
5. 28 TAC Section [134.203](#) sets out the fee guidelines for professional medical services.

### Adjustment Reasons

The insurance carrier denied payment for the disputed services with the following reasons:

1. 50 – These are non-covered services because this is not deemed a 'medical necessity' by the payer.
2. 97 – Payment adjusted because the benefit for this service is included in the payment/allowance for another service/procedure that has already been adjudicated.
3. 243 – The charge for this procedure was not paid since the value of this procedure is included/bundled within the value of another procedure performed.
4. 274 – Service is not reimbursable for workers' compensation injuries in this state.
5. 2005 – No additional reimbursement allowed after review of appeal/reconsideration.

### Issues

1. What is DWC considering in this medical fee dispute?
2. Is the service in question reimbursable?
3. Is the insurance carrier's denial based on medical necessity supported?
4. Is the insurance carrier's denial based on bundling supported?
5. Is the requester entitled to reimbursement?

### Findings

1. The requester is seeking reimbursement of \$192.00 for sending medical documentation to a designated doctor billed with procedure code 99080 for one unit on date of service October 14, 2025. The insurance carrier denied payment in full. DWC will review this service for reimbursement.
2. Per explanations of benefits dated October 27, 2025, and November 6, 2025, the insurance

carrier denied payment, in part, stating, "Service is not reimbursable for workers' compensation injuries in this state."

28 TAC Section 127.10(a)(1) states, in relevant part, "The treating doctor and insurance carrier must provide the designated doctor copies of all the injured employee's medical records in their possession relating to the medical condition to be evaluated by the designated doctor ... (B) The cost of copying must be reimbursed in accordance with §134.120 of this title ..."

DWC finds that submission of medical documents to a designated doctor is a covered service. The insurance carrier's denial of payment for this reason is not supported.

3. The insurance carrier also denied payment, in part, stating that the service "is not deemed a 'medical necessity' by the payer." Because the service in question is providing medical records to a designated doctor as ordered by DWC, medical necessity does not apply. This denial reason is not supported.
4. The insurance carrier also denied payment, in part, stating that the service "is included in the payment/allowance for another service/procedure," and "was not paid since the value of this procedure is included/bundled within the value of another procedure performed."

Although DWC adopts Medicare payment policies by reference in applicable rule 28 TAC §134.203, the relevant portion of paragraph (a)(7) of that rule states that specific provisions contained in the Texas Labor Code or DWC rules shall take precedence over any conflicting provision adopted or utilized by CMS in administering the Medicare program.

DWC finds that the CMS provision that bundles the service in question is in direct conflict with 28 TAC Section 127.10(a)(1). DWC finds that submission of medical documents to a designated doctor is a covered service and not subject to Medicare bundling. The insurance carrier's denial of payment for this reason is not supported.

5. DWC finds that 28 TAC Section 133.10(f)(1)(T) requires the number of units for the billed service in CMS-1500, field 24G. The requester billed one unit in this field.

28 TAC Section 134.120(f)(1) states that the reimbursement for copies of medical documentation is \$.50 per page. In a document dated October 14, 2025, submitted as evidence, the requester indicated that it submitted "384 pages of medical records." However, since the requester only indicated a single unit on the medical bill, the maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR) would be \$0.50.

Based on the evidence presented, the requester is seeking \$192.00. DWC finds that the service as billed does not support entitlement to this amount. DWC finds that the requester is not entitled to reimbursement for the service in question.

## Conclusion

The outcome of this medical fee dispute is based on the evidence requester and the respondent presented at the time of adjudication. Though all evidence may not have been discussed, it was considered.

DWC finds the requester has not established that reimbursement is due.

## **Order**

Under Texas Labor Code Sections [413.031](#) and [413.019](#), DWC has determined the requester is entitled to \$0.00 reimbursement for the disputed services.

## **Authorized Signature**

_____	_____	February 2, 2026
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 under 28 TAC Section [133.307](#), which applies to disputes filed on or after **June 1, 2012**.

A party seeking review must submit [DWC Form-045M, Request to Schedule, Reschedule, or Cancel a Benefit Review Conference to Appeal a Medical Fee Dispute Decision \(BRC-MFD\)](#) and follow the instructions on the form. You can find the form at [www.tdi.texas.gov/forms/form20numeric.html](http://www.tdi.texas.gov/forms/form20numeric.html). DWC must receive the request within **20 days** of when you receive this decision. You may fax, mail, or personally deliver your request to DWC using the contact information on the form or the field office handling the claim. If you have questions about DWC Form-045M, please call CompConnection at 800-252-7031, option three or email [CompConnection@tdi.texas.gov](mailto:CompConnection@tdi.texas.gov).

The party seeking review of the MFDR decision must deliver a copy of the request to all other parties involved in the dispute at the same time the request is filed with DWC. **Please include a copy of this Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision** with any other required information listed in 28 TAC Section [141.1\(d\)](#).

Si prefiere hablar con una persona en español acerca de esta correspondencia, favor de llamar a 800-252-7031, opción tres o correo electrónico [CompConnection@tdi.texas.gov](mailto:CompConnection@tdi.texas.gov).