

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

Mid Rockland Imaging Partners Inc (Applicant)	AAA Case No.	17-24-1362-7827
- and -	Applicant's File No.	CF13029787
	Insurer's Claim File No.	0757808258 2M7
Allstate Fire & Casualty Insurance Company (Respondent)	NAIC No.	29688

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 01/13/2025
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 01/13/2025

Tinamarie Franzoni, Esq. from Choudhry & Franzoni, PLLC participated virtually for the Applicant

Shanna Nelson, Esq. from Law Offices of John Trop participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$773.23**, 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 June 4, 2024 ; claimed related injury and underwent MRI studies of the right shoulder provided by the applicant on June 18, 2024.

The applicant submitted a claim for these medical services, payment of which was denied based on the peer review by Ajendra Sohal, M.D. dated July 26, 2024.

The issue to be determined at the hearing is whether the respondent established that the medical services at issue were not medically necessary.

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.

In order 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, 11th and 13th 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 1st Dept. 2006.)

The Civil Courts have held that a defendant's peer review or medical evidence must set forth more than just a basic recitation of the expert's opinion. The trial courts have held that a peer review 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 medical practice as a medical rationale for his/her findings; and 3) the peer review report fails to provide 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 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, 11th and 13th Jud. Dists. 2014.)

To support its contention that the medical services provided by the applicant were not medically necessary, respondent relies upon the report of the peer review by Dr. Sohal, who reviewed the medical records of the EIP and noted the injuries claimed and the treatment rendered to him. Dr. Sohal considered possible arguments and justification for the need for the medical services at issue and determined that they were not warranted under the circumstances presented.

Dr. Sohal determined that the right shoulder MRI was premature and medically unnecessary. He specifically noted that the standard of care for the right shoulder

injury sustained by the EIP includes conservative treatment, including medication, physical therapy and injections, all of which could be performed without MRI studies.

It was his opinion that only if the conservative care is not helpful or there is a significant dilemma or other catastrophic findings or surgical intervention is contemplated would MRI studies be necessary.

Dr. Sohal supported, with relevant medical literature, his opinion that the MRI studies at issue were not medically necessary at the time they were provided.

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

The applicant did not submit a formal rebuttal. However, the applicant relies upon the submissions, including the June 7, 2024 initial physiatric evaluation of the EIP by Dr. Ross, which was performed 3 days post-accident, which documented limited range of motion in the right shoulder. The impression was right shoulder derangement.

The plan at that time was to begin physical therapy and obtain MRI studies of the right shoulder and to follow up in 4 to 6 weeks.

In this case, the applicant did not provide a rebuttal to the peer review and therefore it did not respond to the respondent's argument that the MRI studies of the right shoulder provided to the EIP was a deviation from a reasonable medical standard of care. The submitted medical records do not meaningfully address the arguments that are raised in the peer review and do not establish that the MRI studies at issue were medically necessary.

Based on the foregoing, I find that the respondent established that the MRI studies of the right shoulder were not medically necessary.

Accordingly, the claim is dismissed with prejudice.

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 claim is DENIED in its entirety

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.

01/16/2025

(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:
2b28f200878f86a23a5bc7f4b5102c78

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 01/16/2025