

# 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 Las Colinas Medical Center HCA Patient Account Services 10030 N. MacArthur Blvd., Suite 100 Irving, TX 75063	MDR Tracking No.: M4-05-9950-01
	TWCC No.:
	Injured Employee's Name:
Respondent's Name and Address Hartford Underwriters Ins./Rep. Box #: 27 Ste. 555 9020 N. Capital of Texas Hwy. Austin, TX 78759	Date of Injury:
	Employer's Name: Stocker Enterprises Inc
	Insurance Carrier's No.: YBUC 23493

## PART II: SUMMARY OF DISPUTE AND FINDINGS

Dates of Service		CPT Code(s) or Description	Amount in Dispute	Amount Due
From	To			
11-6-03	11-9-03	Inpatient Hospitalization	\$18,919.63	\$00.00

## PART III: REQUESTOR'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position summary was not submitted. The Requestor's rationale on the Table of Disputed Services states, "Per TWCC Fee Guidelines, this claim qualified for stop loss methodology payment. Charges exceed \$40,000 threshold, so claim should be paid at 75% of entire billed charges per San Antonio School Board vs. TWCC and Metropolitan Methodist Hospital... implants should not be removed on stop loss claims."

## PART IV: RESPONDENT'S POSITION SUMMARY

Position summary of February 10, 2005 states, "... It is Carrier's position they have correctly reimbursed the provider using the per diem methodology and no additional reimbursement should be made."

## 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 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 documentation provided by both parties, it does **not** appear that this particular admission involved "unusually extensive services." The UB-92 lists the "Prin Diag 722.10"; lumbar disc displacement and "Princi;al Procedure 81.06"; lumbar and lumbosacral fusion, anterior technique. Accordingly, the stop-loss method does not apply and the reimbursement is to be based on the per diem plus carve-out methodology described in the same rule.

The total length of stay for this admission was 3 days (consisting of 3 days for surgical). Accordingly, the standard per diem amount due for this admission is equal to \$3,354.00 (3 times \$1,118). The Requestor billed \$2,400.75 for Rev. Code 110 (Room and Board) and the Respondent reimbursed \$2,400.75. In addition, the hospital is entitled to additional reimbursement for (implantables/MRIs/CAT Scans/pharmaceuticals) as follows: The Respondent reimbursed \$953.25 for Rev. Code 250 (Pharmacy), \$21,196.07 for Rev Code 278 (Implants). The requestor did not submit any medical documentation that the surgery involved unusually extensive services or any invoices.

Considering the reimbursement amount calculated in accordance with the provisions of rule 134.401(c) compared with the amount previously paid by the insurance carrier, we find that no additional reimbursement is due for these services.

**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.

Findings and Decision by:

Roy Lewis

6-29-05

Authorized Signature

Typed Name

Date of Decision

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

Either party to this medical dispute may disagree with all or part of the Decision and has a right to request a hearing. A request for a hearing must be in writing and it must be received by the TWCC Chief Clerk of Proceedings/Appeals Clerk within 20 (twenty) days of your receipt of this decision (28 Texas Administrative Code § 148.3). This Decision was mailed to the health care provider and placed in the Austin Representatives box on \_\_\_\_\_. This Decision is deemed received by you five days after it was mailed and the first working day after the date the Decision was placed in the Austin Representative’s box (28 Texas Administrative Code § 102.5(d)). A request for a 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.

The party appealing the Division’s Decision shall deliver a copy of their written request for a hearing to the opposing party involved in the dispute.

**Si prefiere hablar con una persona en 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 in the Austin Representative’s box.

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