

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

Atlantic Medical & Diagnostic PC
(Applicant)

- and -

Progressive Casualty Insurance Company
(Respondent)

AAA Case No. 17-24-1363-8909

Applicant's File No. ACT24-201007

Insurer's Claim File No. 248683563

NAIC No. 24260

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 01/06/2025
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 01/06/2025

Jared Mallimo, Esq. from The Licatesi Law Group, LLP participated virtually for the Applicant

Erin Ferrone from Progressive Casualty Insurance Company participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$2,787.72**, was AMENDED and permitted by the arbitrator at the oral hearing.

The amount claimed was amended by the applicant to \$2,099.80 to conform to the appropriate fee schedule. The respondent did not agree to this amended amount.

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

3. Summary of Issues in Dispute

The 37 year old EIP reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident on April 11, 2024; claimed related injury and underwent an office visit and trigger point injection provided by the applicant on June 26, 2024 and prolonged E/M provided on July 1, 2024.

The applicant submitted a claim for these medical services, payment of which was delayed pending verification requests and then denied after 120 days from the initial date of the request for verification.

The verification requested was for documents a copy of the invoice for the drugs provided as part of the services at issue.

The applicant contends that the verification request is improper.

The respondent also asserted a fee schedule defense.

The issues to be determined at the hearing are:

Whether the respondent established its 120 day defense.

Whether the respondent established its fee schedule defense.

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.

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 verification request 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 verification request, the insurer must act affirmatively once it receives a response to its verification request. Media Neurology, P.C. v. Countrywide Ins. Co., 21 Misc.3d 1101 (N.Y. City Civ. Ct. 2005.)

In this matter, the respondent issued timely requests for verification.

In Island Life Chiropractic, PC v Travelers Ins.Co., 64 Misc. 3d 143(A), 117 N.Y.S.3d 428 (App Term 2d Dept. 2019) the court held that "Where a no-fault insurer is relying on the defense that an action is premature because verification is outstanding, it is the defendant insurer's prima facie burden at trial to demonstrate (1) that verification requests were timely mailed and that the defendant did not receive the requested verification. (see 11 NYCRR 65-3.8[a]; Right Aid Medical Supply Corp. v State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co., 58 Misc 3d 140(A), 94 N.Y.S.3d 540 NY Slip OP 51875[U] (App Term 2d Dept, 2d, 11th & 13th Jud Dists (2017.)

In the instant matter, the respondent did not submit proof of mailing of the verification requests and did not submit evidence from someone with personal knowledge that a response was not received from the applicant.

However, the applicant submitted responses to the verification requests, which establishes that they were received. The first response stated in pertinent part: "[t]he carriers request for an invoice is unjustified and serves only to shift the burden of fee schedule from the insurance carrier to the medical provider..."

The remaining responses repeat the initial response and also state: "[t]his comprises full and complete compliance with demand based on documents and information in the control of the provider." This response establishes that the applicant has not provided a response to the verification requested.

I find that the respondent is entitled to a response that is "arguably responsive" to the verification requested and this was not provided.

Based on the foregoing, the respondent has established its 120 day defense.

Under these circumstances, the fee schedule issue is moot.

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.

01/21/2025

(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:
f8e12e07aa178808b80294bd046c7844

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 01/21/2025