Division of Workers' Compensation

PO Box 12050 | Austin, TX 78711 | 800-252-7031 | tdi.texas.gov/wc

Medical Fee Dispute Resolution Findings and Decision

General Information

Requester Name

Comprehensive Hearing Center of Texas

Respondent Name

City of Austin

MFDR Tracking Number

M4-26-0809-01

Insurance Carrier's Austin Representative

BOX 19 Flahive Ogden & Latson

DWC Date Received

November 20, 2025

Summary of Findings

Date(s) of Service	Disputed Services	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
July 25, 2025	V5267	$350.00	$0.00
July 25, 2025	V5267	$450.00	$0.00
	Total	$800.00	$0.00

Requester's Position

"I am writing to formally appeal against the denial of CPT V5160. CPT V5160 was denied with explanation code 97-Payment adjusted because the benefit for this service is included in the allowance for another service/procedure. V5160 is for the dispensing of hearing aids and is not included with any other code billed on this claim."

Amount In Dispute: $800.00

Respondent's Position

The Austin carrier representative for City of Austin is Flahive Ogden & Latson. The representative was notified of this medical fee dispute on November 24, 2025. 228 TAC Section 133.307(d)(1) states that

if the division does not receive the response within 14 calendar days of the dispute notification, then the division may base its decision on the available information

As of today, no response has been received from the carrier or its representative. We therefore base this decision on the information available as authorized under 228 TAC Section 133.307(d)(1)

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. Labor Code Section 413.011 sets out the policies and guidelines for medical fee dispute resolution.
3. 28 TAC Section 133.305 sets out the general medical fee dispute resolution process.
4. 28 TAC Section 134.1 sets out the guidelines for reimbursement.

Adjustment Reasons

The insurance carrier denied the payment for disputed services with the following claim adjustment reason code:

1. 97 – Payment adjusted because the benefit for this service is included in the payment/allowance for another service/procedure that has already been adjudicated.

Issues

1. What is DWC considering in this medical fee dispute?
2. Is the insurance carrier's denial reason supported?
3. Is the requester entitled to reimbursement?

Findings

1. This dispute concerns the billing for services provided under HCPC codes V5267 x 2 - Hearing aid or assistive listening device/supplies/accessories, not otherwise specified (often used for miscellaneous hearing-aid supplies or accessories) rendered on July 25, 2025. The provider billed and is requesting reimbursement in the amount of $800.00, which the insurance carrier denied after auditing the claim using the specified reduction code indicated above.

2. The requester seeks $800.00 for HCPC codes V5267 x 2 rendered on July 25, 2025. The

insurance carrier denied the charge citing that the benefit for this service is included in the payment/ allowance for another service/procedure that has already been adjudicated. On the disputed dates of service, the requester billed the following HCPCs codes:

- V5261 – Hearing aid, digital, binaural, behind-the-ear (BTE) – *digital, binaural BTE* hearing aid
- V5260 – Hearing aid, digital, binaural, in-the-ear (ITE) – *digital, binaural ITE* hearing aid.
- **V5267 x 2** – Hearing aid or assistive listening device/supplies/accessories, not otherwise specified (often used for miscellaneous hearing-aid supplies or accessories).
- V5268 – Assistive listening device, telephone amplifier, any type
- V5270 – Assistive listening device, television amplifier, any type.
- V5264 – Ear mold/insert, not disposable, any type
- V5160 – Dispensing fee, binaural (fee associated with dispensing two hearing aids)

Insufficient evidence was submitted to support the carrier's denial that the disputed service is included in the payment/allowance for another service/procedure. The service in dispute will be reviewed in accordance with the applicable fee guidelines.

3. This dispute concerns the billing for services provided under the HCPC code V5267 x 2 with no Division of Workers' Compensation (DWC) and Medicare assigned reimbursement rate. 28 TAC Section 134.1 sets out the guidelines for reimbursement for medical services.

   Specifically, 28 TAC Section 134.1(e) states that healthcare services not provided through a workers' compensation healthcare network must be reimbursed based on:

   - Division fee guidelines.
   - A negotiated contract; or
   - A fair and reasonable reimbursement amount under subsection (f), when neither of the above apply.

   HCPCs code V5267 x 2 is not addressed under the Division's fee guidelines and neither party submitted documentation for a negotiated contract. Therefore, the service in dispute falls to a fair and reasonable reimbursement amount as set out in 28 TAC 134.1(f).

28 TAC Section 134.1(f) defines fair and reasonable reimbursement as a rate that:

- Complies with Labor Code Section 413.011 criteria.
- Ensures similar procedures in similar circumstances receive similar reimbursement; **and**
- It is based on nationally recognized published studies, Division medical dispute decisions, and/or valuations for comparable services.

Labor Code Section 413.011 mandates that fee guidelines be:

- Fair and reasonable,
- Promote quality care and cost control,
- Encourage timely return to work, and
- Avoid excessive payments compared to similar care for individuals with comparable standards of living.

28 TAC Section 133.307 requires the requester to provide "documentation that discusses, demonstrates, and justifies that the payment amount being sought is a fair and reasonable rate of reimbursement in accordance with Section 134.1 of this title (relating to Medical Reimbursement) . . . when the dispute involves health care for which the DWC has not established a maximum allowable reimbursement (MAR) or reimbursement rate, as applicable."

28 TAC Section 133.307 requires a position statement of the disputed issue(s) that should include:

(i) the requester's reasoning for why the disputed fees should be paid or refunded,

(ii) how the Labor Code and division rules, including fee guidelines, impact the disputed fee issues, and

(iii) how the submitted documentation supports the requester's position for each disputed fee issue.

As previously stated, reimbursement of HCPC codes V5267 x 2 is determined in accordance with 28 TAC Section 134.1(f) and Texas Labor Code Section 413.011, which require that payment be based on a "fair and reasonable" standard.

The requester billed $800.00 for HCPC codes V5267 x 2 and is requesting the full billed amount of $800.00.

Because no Division fee guideline or negotiated contract applies, the disputed services must be evaluated under the statutory and regulatory criteria for fair and reasonable reimbursement.

After a review of the submitted documentation and applicable standards, DWC finds that the requested reimbursement rate of $800.00 is not supported for the following reasons.

The requester did not provide documentation demonstrating that the billed charges for the disputed services reflect a fair and reasonable reimbursement rate as required under 28 TAC Section 134.1 and Labor Code Section 413.011.

A health care provider's "usual and customary" charges, standing alone, do not constitute evidence of a fair and reasonable reimbursement rate. Such charges do not establish what insurers customarily pay for the same or similar services in comparable circumstances.

Permitting reimbursement based solely on the provider's billed charges would effectively place payment determination within the provider's unilateral control. This outcome would be inconsistent with:

- The statutory objective of effective medical cost control, and
- The requirement that reimbursement does not exceed the amount paid for similar treatment of an injured individual of an equivalent standard of living, as contemplated by Labor Code Section 413.011.

Accordingly, usual and customary charges cannot be favorably considered absent additional objective data or documentation substantiating that the requested amount is fair and reasonable.

The requester did not submit documentation to demonstrate how the requested reimbursement:

- Ensures the quality of medical care, and
- Achieves effective medical cost control as expressly required by Texas Labor Code Section 413.011.

The statute requires that reimbursement methodologies balance adequate provider compensation with system-wide cost containment. No evidence was provided to establish that the requested $800.00 satisfies this statutory framework.

The requester did not provide:

- Nationally recognized published studies,
- Independent fee analyses,
- Benchmarking data, or
- Documentation of values assigned to services involving similar work and resource commitments to substantiate the requested reimbursement amount.

Without objective comparative data, the Division cannot determine that the requested rate aligns with fair market values for services requiring comparable time, skill, intensity, and resources.

The requester did not establish that payment of the requested amount satisfies the requirements set forth in 28 TAC Section 134.1, which governs reimbursement when no fee guideline applies. The documentation submitted does not demonstrate that the requested rate is reasonable within the context of the Texas workers' compensation system.

At the MFDR level, the requester bears the burden of proof to establish entitlement to reimbursement by a preponderance of the evidence.

DWC finds that the requester failed to submit sufficient documentation to support that the requested $800.00 constitutes a fair and reasonable reimbursement under applicable statutes and rules.

Because the evidentiary burden has not been met, payment cannot be recommended.

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 27, 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. 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.

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 electronico CompConnection@tdi.texas.gov.