

# MEDICAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION FINDINGS AND DECISION

## PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

<b>Type of Requestor:</b> (x) HCP ( ) IE ( ) IC	<b>Response Timely Filed?</b> (x) Yes ( ) No
Requestor's Name and Address Vista Hospital of Dallas 4301 Vista Road Pasadena, Texas 77504	MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-9331-01
	TWCC No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Address Insurance Company of North America C/O Law Offices of John Pringle The Vaughn Building 807 Brazos, Suite 603 Austin, Texas 78701 Box 15	Date of Injury:
	Employer's Name: Cigna Health Plan, Inc.
	Insurance Carrier's No.: 135C4864827

## PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
From	To			
06/14/04	06/16/04	Surgical Admission	\$37,682.17	\$0.00

## PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

"According to the literal interpretation of TWCC Rule 134.401 and the further clarification by the TWCC from QRL 01-03, a Carrier may not 'deduct' any carve-out costs listed in Rule 134.401(c)(4). Further, additional reimbursement for implants or any other 'carve-out costs' shall only be reimbursed at cost plus 10% if the stop-loss threshold is NOT met. Therefore, in this instance, the Carrier has severely under-reimbursed the billed charges, despite the clear language in the Texas Administrative Codes and further clarification by the TWCC in QRL 01-03."

## PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

"This medical dispute concerns Requestor's hospital bill for a three day inpatient stay in the amount of \$53,225.53. Based on CPT code 63685, which is for insertion or replacement of spinal neurostimulator as well as ICD 9 Code and Operative Report, the procedure alleged to have been performed was removal and replacement of a spinal stimulator."

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

This dispute relates to inpatient services provided in hospital setting with reimbursement subject to the provisions of Rule 134.401 (Acute Care Inpatient Hospital Fee Guideline). The hospital has requested additional reimbursement according to the stop-loss method contained in that rule. Rule 134.401(c)(6) establishes that the stop-loss method is to be used for "unusually costly services." The explanation that follows this paragraph indicates that in order to determine if "unusually costly services" were provided, the admission must not only exceed \$40,000 in total audited charges, but also involve "unusually extensive services."

After reviewing the information provided by both parties, it does **not** appear that this particular admission involved "unusually extensive services." The operative report indicates that this was a removal and insertion of spinal cord stimulator. The operative report also indicates the patient tolerated the procedure well and returned to the Post Anesthesia Care Unit in stable condition and no complications were noted. Accordingly, the stop-loss method does not apply and the reimbursement is to be based on per diem methodology described in the same rule.

Reimbursement is based on per diem in the amount of \$2,236.00(2-day stay x \$1,118.00).

The carrier made reimbursement for the 2-day stay in the amount of \$2,236.00.

Therefore, based on the facts of this situation, the parties' positions, and the application of the provisions of Rule 134.401(c), we find that the health care provider is not entitled to additional reimbursement.

**PART VI: COMMISSION DECISION**

Based upon the review of the disputed healthcare services, the Medical Review Division has determined that the requestor is **not** entitled to additional reimbursement.

Ordered by:

Michael Bucklin

08/09/05

Authorized Signature

Typed Name

Date of Order

**PART VII: YOUR RIGHT TO REQUEST A HEARING**

If you are unhappy with all or part of this decision, you have the right to appeal the decision. Those who wish to appeal decisions that were issued during the month of August 2005, should be aware of changes to the appeals process which take effect September 1, 2005.

House Bill 7, recently enacted by the 79th Texas Legislature, provides that an appeal of a medical dispute resolution order that is not pending for a hearing at the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) on or before August 31, 2005 is not entitled to a SOAH hearing. This means that the usual 20-day window to appeal to SOAH, found in Commission Rule 148.3, will be shortened for some parties during this transition phase. If you wish to seek an appeal of this medical dispute resolution order to SOAH, you are encouraged to have your request for a hearing to the Commission as early as possible to allow sufficient time for the Commission to submit your request to SOAH for docketing. A request for a SOAH hearing should be sent to: Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk, P.O. Box 17787, Austin, Texas 78744 or faxed to 512-804-4011. A copy of this Decision should be attached to the request.

Beginning September 1, 2005, appeals of medical dispute resolution orders are procedurally made directly to a district court in Travis County [see Texas Labor Code, Sec. 413.031(k), as amended and effective Sept. 1, 2005]. An appeal to District Court must be filed not later than 30 days after the date on which the decision that is the subject of the appeal is final and appealable.

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

**PART VIII: INSURANCE CARRIER DELIVERY CERTIFICATION**

I hereby verify that I received a copy of this Decision and Order in the Austin Representative's box.

Signature of Insurance Carrier: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_