

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

Refua Rx Inc. (Applicant)	AAA Case No.	17-24-1352-5260
- and -	Applicant's File No.	GM24-744613, GM24-747996, GM24-748176, GM24-757390, GM24-760635
State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company (Respondent)	Insurer's Claim File No.	32-49M7-18D
	NAIC No.	25178

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 11/04/2024
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 11/04/2024

Matthew Sledzinski, Esq. from Law Offices of Gabriel & Moroff, P.C. participated virtually for the Applicant

Andrew Williams, Esq. from Rivkin & Radler LLP participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$1,566.40**, was AMENDED and permitted by the arbitrator at the oral hearing.

The amount claimed was amended by the applicant to \$933.80 to conform to the appropriate fee schedule.

Stipulations WERE NOT made by the parties regarding the issues to be determined.

3. Summary of Issues in Dispute

The 51 year old EIP reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident on May 9, 2023; claimed related injury and received various oral medications provided by the applicant from October 18, 2023 to December 1, 2023.

The applicant submitted a claim for this prescription medication, payment of which was delayed pending the EUO of the applicant and requests for documents and information submitted after the EUO of the applicant was completed and then timely denied after 120 days from the date of the original request.

The post-EUO requests were for further documents and information related to this claim and/or the corporate structure and business practices of the applicant.

The issue to be determined at the hearing is whether the respondent's 120 day denial is proper.

4. Findings, Conclusions, and Basis Therefor

This hearing was held on Zoom and the decision is based upon the documents reviewed in 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.

If an insurer requires any additional information to evaluate the proof of claim, such request for verification must be made within 15 business days of the receipt of the bill in order to toll the 30 day period to pay or deny the claim. See 11 NYCRR 65-3.5(b); See also New York Hosp. Med. Ctr. of Queens v. Allstate Ins. Co., 2014 NY Slip Op 00640 (2d Dept. 2014.)

Where there is a timely original request for verification, but no response to the original request for verification is received within 30 days, or the response to the verification request is incomplete, then the insurer, within 10 calendar days after the expiration of that 30 day period, must follow up with a second request for verification. Id.

If there is no response to the second or follow up request for verification, the time in which the insurer must decide whether to pay or deny the claim is indefinitely tolled. Id.

Therefore, when a no-fault medical service provider fails to respond to the requests for verification the claim is premature and should be denied without prejudice.

However, pursuant to 11 NYCRR §65-3.5(o) an insurer may issue a denial if, more than 120 calendar days after the initial request for verification, the applicant has not submitted all such verification under applicant's control or possession or written proof providing reasonable justification for the failure to comply.

11 NYCRR 65-3.5(o) specifically excludes EUOs from its purview. The document requests at issue were in response to the testimony by the witness on behalf of the applicant at the EUO and therefore, fall outside of the 120-day rule.

In any event, the Court in Neptune Med. Care, P.C. v. Ameriprise Auto & Home Ins., 48 Misc. 3d 139A (2015), Appellate Term, 2d Department, found that "even if defendant had tolled the 30-day period within which it was required to pay or deny the bills at issue, by timely requesting verification pursuant to 11 NYCRR 65-3.8(a)...the Regulations do not provide that such a toll grants an insurer additional opportunities to make requests for verification that would otherwise be untimely." Thus, Respondent's request for post-EUO verification and its denial based upon the 120-day rule.

The parties have a duty to communicate with each other. The purpose of the No-Fault statute is to ensure prompt resolution of claims submitted by parties injured in motor vehicle accidents. The parties' obligations are centered on good faith and common sense. Any questions concerning a communication should be addressed by further communication, not inaction. Dilon Medical Supply Corp. v. Travelers Ins. Co., 7 Misc.3d 927, 796 N.Y.S.2d 872 (Civ. Ct. Kings Co. 2005.)

The response to a post-EUO request for documents/information that is "arguably responsive" places the burden to take further action upon the respondent. All Health Medical Care, P.C. v. GEICO, 2 Misc.3d 907 (N.Y. City Civ. Ct. 2004.) Moreover, as long as applicant's documentation is "arguably responsive" to an insurer's post-EUO request, the insurer must act affirmatively once it receives this response. Media Neurology, P.C. v. Countrywide Ins. Co., 21 Misc.3d 1101 (N.Y. City Civ. Ct. 2005.)

In the instant case, respondent issued requests for a witness on behalf of the applicant to appear at an EUO. The applicant complied and a witness on its behalf attended. Following the EUO of applicant, respondent issued timely requests for post-EUO information/documents.

There have been numerous hearings related to the same post-EUO documents/information requested by this respondent from this applicant involving other EIPs. Many of these other determinations have relied upon the findings by Arbitrator Andreotta (AAA case no. 17-23-1310-5036) in which she found that the applicant "substantially complies with these extensive and unreasonable requests."

After a review of the submissions in the instant matter, I find that, although the prior awards are not *res judicata* to the claim at issue there is no new or different evidence in the record in the case at issue which would lead to a contrary finding and conclusion.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the respondent has not established its 120 day defense and that its denial is not proper.

Accordingly, the applicant is awarded \$933.80 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	Amount Amended	Status
	Refua Rx Inc.	10/18/23 - 10/18/23	\$122.80		Awarded: \$122.80
	Refua Rx Inc.	10/18/23 - 10/18/23	\$1.40		Awarded: \$1.40

	Refua Rx Inc.	10/18/23 - 10/18/23	\$26.40		Awarded: \$26.40
	Refua Rx Inc.	10/18/23 - 10/18/23	\$632.60		Denied
	Refua Rx Inc.	12/01/23 - 12/01/23	\$1.40		Awarded: \$1.40
	Refua Rx Inc.	12/01/23 - 12/01/23	\$122.80		Awarded: \$122.80
	Refua Rx Inc.	12/01/23 - 12/01/23	\$26.40		Awarded: \$26.40
	Refua Rx Inc.	12/01/23 - 12/01/23	\$632.60		Awarded: \$632.60
Total			\$1,566.40		Awarded: \$933.80

- B. The insurer shall also compute and pay the applicant interest set forth below. 06/18/2024 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 30th 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.

11/11/2024
(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:
33fadab6bff1c0883977120b143ff8d1

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 11/11/2024