

American Arbitration Association  
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

Healthware DME Corp  
(Applicant)

- and -

Allstate Insurance Company  
(Respondent)

AAA Case No. 17-23-1310-7196

Applicant's File No. LIP-29583

Insurer's Claim File No. 0708718804

NAIC No.

### ARBITRATION AWARD

I, Anne Malone, the undersigned arbitrator, designated by the American Arbitration Association pursuant to the Rules for New York State No-Fault Arbitration, adopted pursuant to regulations promulgated by the Superintendent of Insurance, having been duly sworn, and having heard the proofs and allegations of the parties make the following **AWARD**:

Injured Person(s) hereinafter referred to as: EIP

1. Hearing(s) held on 08/26/2024  
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 08/26/2024

Lee-Ann Trupia, Esq. from Law Offices of Ilya E Parnas P.C. participated virtually for the Applicant

Stephanie Vitiello, Esq. from Law Offices of John Trop participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$3,894.07**, was NOT AMENDED at the oral hearing.  
Stipulations WERE NOT made by the parties regarding the issues to be determined.
3. Summary of Issues in Dispute

The 22 year old EIP reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident on March 31, 2023; claimed related injury and received various items of DME provided by the applicant on May 11, 2023 and May 25, 2023.

The applicant submitted a claim for this durable medical equipment (DME), payment of which was timely denied by the respondent based upon a peer review by Isandr Dumesh, M.D. dated July 25, 2023. In response, the applicant submitted a rebuttal dated August 17, 2024 by Nick Nicoloff, PA one of the EIP's treating medical providers who prescribed the DME at issue.

**The issue to be determined at the hearing is whether the respondent established that the DME provided by the applicant was not medically necessary.**

#### 4. Findings, Conclusions, and Basis Therefor

This hearing was held on Zoom and the decision is based upon the documents reviewed from the Modria File as well as the arguments made by counsel and/or representative at the arbitration hearing. Only the arguments presented at the hearing are preserved in this decision; all other arguments not presented at the hearing are considered waived.

To support a lack of medical necessity defense respondent must "set forth a factual basis and medical rationale for the peer reviewer's [or examining physician's] determination that there was a lack of medical necessity for the services rendered." Provvedere, Inc. v. Republic Western Ins. Co., 2014 NY Slip Op 50219(U) (App. Term2d, 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> Jud. Dists. 2014.) Respondent bears the burden of production in support of its lack of medical necessity defense, which if established shifts the burden of persuasion to applicant. See Bronx Expert Radiology, P.C. v. Travelers Ins. Co., 2006 NY Slip Op 52116 (App. Term 1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 2006.)

The Civil Courts have held that a defendant's peer review or report of medical examination must set forth more than just a basic recitation of the expert's opinion. The trial courts have held that a peer review or medical examination report's medical rationale will be insufficient to meet respondent's burden of proof if: 1) the medical rationale of its expert witness is not supported by evidence of a deviation from "generally accepted medical" standards; 2) the expert fails to cite to medical authority, standard, or generally accepted specifics as to the claim at issue, is conclusory or vague. See Nir v. Allstate, 7 Misc.3d 544 (N.Y. City Civ. Ct. 2005.)

To support its contention that the durable medical equipment provided by the applicant was not medically necessary, respondent relies upon the peer review by Dr. Dumesh, who reviewed the medical records of the EIP, noted the injuries claimed and the treatment rendered to her. Dr. Dumesh considered possible arguments and justification for the need for the durable medical equipment at issue and determined that it was not warranted under these circumstances.

Dr. Dumesh submitted a comprehensive report in which he discussed each item of equipment provided and his reasons for determining that each one was not medically necessary for this EIP. He discussed in detail the general uses, benefits of the devices and the inappropriateness of their use for the type of injuries sustained by the EIP.

He supported, with relevant medical literature, his opinion that the DME provided to the EIP was not medically necessary.

Respondent has met its evidentiary burden. The peer review adequately sets forth the factual basis and medical rationale to support the conclusion that the durable medical equipment was not indicated for this EIP at the time it was provided. Therefore, pursuant to Bronx Expert Radiology, *supra* the burden shifts to the applicant, who bears the ultimate burden of persuasion to establish that the durable medical equipment at issue was medically necessary.

In opposition to the peer review, the applicant presented a rebuttal by Nick Nicoloff, PA. who disagreed with the conclusions reached by Dr. Dumesh and explained the rationale for his determination that each item of durable medical equipment was necessary. He described in detail the injuries claimed by the EIP and the treatment rendered to her and cited relevant medical literature to support the general benefits for each item of durable medical equipment.

Nick Nicoloff, PA addressed each of the arguments by Dr. Dumesh in the peer review and discussed the value of DME to supplement in-office treatment. He concluded that prescribing DME for home use is a proven, effective technique in rehabilitative care and in this case it was prescribed to enhance the effectiveness of the conservative care the EIP was receiving.

Nick Nicoloff, PA supported, with relevant medical citations, his opinion that the durable medical equipment provided to the EIP was medically necessary.

A review of the applicant's submissions reveals that it has met the burden of persuasion in rebuttal. The medical records submitted in opposition to the findings of Dr. Dumesh are sufficient to overcome the burden of production established by respondent.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the respondent has failed to establish that the DME at issue was not medically necessary.

**Accordingly, the applicant is awarded \$3,894.07 in disposition of this claim.**

Any further issues submitted in the record are held to be moot and/or waived insofar as they were not raised at the time of this hearing. This decision is in full disposition of all claims for no-fault benefits presently before this Arbitrator.

5. Optional imposition of administrative costs on Applicant.  
Applicable for arbitration requests filed on and after March 1, 2002.

I do NOT impose the administrative costs of arbitration to the applicant, in the amount established for the current calendar year by the Designated Organization.

**6. I find as follows with regard to the policy issues before me:**

- The policy was not in force on the date of the accident
- The applicant was excluded under policy conditions or exclusions
- The applicant violated policy conditions, resulting in exclusion from coverage
- The applicant was not an "eligible injured person"
- The conditions for MVAIC eligibility were not met
- The injured person was not a "qualified person" (under the MVAIC)
- The applicant's injuries didn't arise out of the "use or operation" of a motor vehicle
- The respondent is not subject to the jurisdiction of the New York No-Fault arbitration forum

Accordingly, the applicant is AWARDED the following:

A.

Medical		From/To	Claim Amount	Status
	Healthware DME Corp	05/11/23 - 05/11/23	\$1,434.40	Awarded: \$1,434.40
	Healthware DME Corp	05/11/23 - 05/11/23	\$1,007.99	Awarded: \$1,007.99
	Healthware DME Corp	05/25/23 - 05/25/23	\$607.55	Awarded: \$607.55
	Healthware DME Corp	05/25/23 - 05/25/23	\$844.13	Awarded: \$844.13
<b>Total</b>			<b>\$3,894.07</b>	<b>Awarded: \$3,894.07</b>

B. The insurer shall also compute and pay the applicant interest set forth below. 08/08/2023 is the date that interest shall accrue from. This is a relevant date only to the extent set forth below.

Applicant is awarded interest pursuant to the no-fault regulations. See generally, 11 NYCRR §65-3.9. Interest shall be calculated "at a rate of two percent per month, calculated on a *pro rata* basis using a 30 day month." See 11 NYCRR §64-3.9(a). A claim becomes overdue when it is not paid within 30 days after a proper demand is made for its payment. However, the regulations toll the accrual of interest when an applicant "does not request arbitration or institute a lawsuit within 30 days after the

receipt of a denial of claim form or payment of benefits" calculated pursuant to Insurance Department regulations. Where a claim is untimely denied, or not denied or paid, interest shall accrue as of the 30<sup>th</sup> day following the date the claim is presented by the claimant to the insurer for payment. Where a claim is timely denied, interest shall accrue as of the date an action is commenced or an arbitration requested, unless an action is commenced or an arbitration requested within 30 days after receipt of the denial, in which event interest shall begin to accrue as of the date the denial is received by the claimant. See, 11 NYCRR §65-3.9(c.) The Superintendent and the New York Court of Appeals has interpreted this provision to apply regardless of whether the particular denial was timely. LMK Psychological Servs. P.C. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 12 NY3d 217 (2009.)

C. Attorney's Fees

The insurer shall also pay the applicant for attorney's fees as set forth below

Applicant is awarded statutory attorney's fees pursuant to the no fault regulations. For cases filed after February 4, 2015 the attorney's fee shall be calculated as follows: 20% of the amount of first-party benefits awarded, plus interest thereon subject to no minimum fee and a maximum of \$1,360.00. See 11 NYCRR §65-4.6(d.)

- D. The respondent shall also pay the applicant forty dollars (\$40) to reimburse the applicant for the fee paid to the Designated Organization, unless the fee was previously returned pursuant to an earlier award.

This award is in full settlement of all no-fault benefit claims submitted to this arbitrator.

State of CT  
SS :  
County of Fairfield

I, Anne Malone, do hereby affirm upon my oath as arbitrator that I am the individual described in and who executed this instrument, which is my award.

09/04/2024  
(Dated)

Anne Malone

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**

*This award is payable within 30 calendar days of the date of transmittal of award to parties.*

*This award is final and binding unless modified or vacated by a master arbitrator. Insurance Department Regulation No. 68 (11 NYCRR 65-4.10) contains time limits and grounds upon which this award may be appealed to a master arbitrator. An appeal to a master arbitrator must be made within 21 days after the mailing of this award. All insurers have copies of the regulation. Applicants may obtain a copy from the Insurance Department.*

**ELECTRONIC SIGNATURE**

**Document Name:** Final Award Form  
**Unique Modria Document ID:**  
b1103fa709fc3bb366350e1d980e0dd0

**Electronically Signed**

Your name: Anne Malone  
Signed on: 09/04/2024