

Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation

7551 Metro Center Drive, Suite 100 • Austin, Texas 78744-1609

MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Type of Requestor: (x) Health Care Provider () Insurance Carrier	
Requestors Name and Address: Spine Hospital of South Texas	MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-1541-01
18600 N. Hardy Oak Blvd San Antonio TX 78258	Claim No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Box #: ROYAL INDEMNITY CO	Date of Injury:
Representative Box #11	Employer's Name: BAPTIST HEALTH SERVICES
	Insurance Carrier's No.: 290901320300

PART II: REQUESTOR'S PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION AND POSITION SUMMARY

- 1. DWC-60 and Position Statement
- 2. UB-92
- 3. EOB's
- 4. Medical records

Position Summary: "...Code used incorrectly for fee guideline "MAR" reductions. Carrier did not make "fair and reasonable" reimbursement and did not make consistent reimbursements ..."

PART III: RESPONDENT'S PRINCIPLE DOCUMENTATION AND POSITION SUMMARY

1. No response received

Position Summary: No position summary submitted

PART IV: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGSDate(s) of ServicePart V
ReferenceAdditional Amount
Due (if any)8/30/04Hospital Outpatient Services1, 2, 3\$00.00TOTALImage: Solution of the second second

PART V: MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION REVIEW SUMMARY, METHODOLOGY, AND/OR EXPLANATION

The request for medical dispute in this case was received on 10/29/04.

1. This dispute relates to hospital outpatient services provided in a hospital that are not covered under a Texas Department of Insurance, Division of Workers' Compensation ("TDI, DWC") fee guideline for this date of service. Therefore, the reimbursement determined through this dispute resolution process must reflect a fair and reasonable rate as described in 28

Texas Administrative Code §134.1 and Texas Labor Code §413.011(d) to achieve, in part, access to quality medical care and effective medical cost control. This case involves a factual dispute about what is a fair and reasonable reimbursement for the services provided.

2. The Requestor stated in their position that "...Code used incorrectly for fee guideline "MAR" reductions. Carrier did not make "fair and reasonable" reimbursement and did not make consistent reimbursements..." The Respondent made total payments of 2,236.00 with reduction code of "M – Allowance for this procedure was made at the "fair and reasonable" amount for this geographical area. Denial of "M" is appropriate as the issues in this dispute are paid under the fair and reasonable reimbursement for the entire procedure.

3. In this situation, the Requestor did not provide sufficient information on what a "fair and reasonable" reimbursement should be for these services. The Requestor purports that their total charges should be considered the amount for the "fair and reasonable" reimbursement. Hospital charges, however, are not a valid indicator of a hospital's costs at providing service nor at what is being paid by other payors. 22 *TexReg* 6269. In addition, Texas Labor Code section 413.011(d) provides, in part: "The [fee] guidelines may not provide for payment at a fee in excess of the fee... **paid** by that individual or by someone acting on that individual's behalf (emphasis added)." The Requestor has provided only charged amounts and not evidence of typical paid amount(s) for the disputed service(s).

PART VI: GENERAL PAYMENT POLICIES/REFERENCES IMPACTING DECISION

1. 28 Texas Administrative Code Sec. 134.1(d)

2. Other statutes, rules, and reference specified in this decision

PART VII: DIVISION FINDINGS AND DECISION

Based upon the lack of sufficient supporting documentation submitted by the Requestor and in accordance with the provisions of Texas Labor code, Sec. 413.031, the Division has determined that the Requestor **is not** entitled to additional reimbursement.

Decision by:

	James Schneider	10/ 27 /06	
Authorized Signature	Typed Name	Date	
PART VIII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST JUDICIAL REVIEW			
County [see Texas Labor Code, Sec. 41	a, findings and decisions are procedurally made of 3.031(k), as amended and effective Sept. 1, 200 date on which the decision that is the subject of	05]. An appeal to District Court must	

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

The Division is not considered a party to the appeal.