

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

NetRx Inc.
(Applicant)

- and -

Hereford Insurance Company
(Respondent)

AAA Case No. 17-24-1348-1790

Applicant's File No. BT23-269340

Insurer's Claim File No. 104490-02

NAIC No. 24309

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 06/02/2025
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 06/02/2025

Sabina Sciarotto, Esq. from The Tadchiev Law Firm, P.C. participated virtually for the Applicant

Cliff Ryan, Esq. from Law Offices of Ruth Nazarian participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$1,538.51**, 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 44 year old EIP reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident on July 28, 2023; claimed related injury and received Lidocaine ointment and Cyclobenzaprine provided by the applicant on November 17, 2023.

The applicant submitted a claim for this topical prescription medication, payment of which was timely denied by the respondent based upon a peer review by Isandr Dumesh, M.D. dated January 10, 2024. In response, the applicant submitted a rebuttal dated April 1, 2025 by Andrew Glyptis, M.D.

The respondent also asserted a fee schedule defense for the oral medication provided to the EIP.

The issues to be determined at the hearing are:

Whether the respondent established that the medical services at issue were not medically necessary.

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 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.

Medical Necessity

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.)

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 topical medication 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 Lidocaine ointment at issue and determined that it was not warranted under the circumstances presented.

He also discussed the Cyclobenzaprine and determined that it was necessary for this EIP at the time it was provided.

Dr. Dumesh submitted a report in which he discussed in detail the Lidocaine ointment provided and his reasons for determining that it was not medically necessary for this EIP.

He specifically stated that topical medication would be appropriate if the EIP could not tolerate standard pain medications. He also determined that there is no indication for Lidocaine ointment for treatment of muscular disorders and discussed the risks of using this medication. He noted that there was no indication that this particular EIP had tried oral NSAIDs or muscle relaxants prior to using this topical medication.

He supported, with the AMA definition of medical necessity and determined that this EIP did not meet these criteria.

I find that the peer review is conclusory and factually insufficient to meet the burden of rebutting the applicant's presumption of medical necessity. The respondent did not provide an adequate response to the recommendations made by the EIP's treating medical providers to establish that the topical prescription medication at issue was not medically necessary. Under these circumstances, pursuant to Provvedere, Inc., supra the burden did not shift to the applicant since respondent did not meet its burden to establish lack of medical necessity.

Although it was not necessary under these circumstances, the applicant submitted a rebuttal by Dr. Glyptis.

Therefore, the applicant is awarded \$1,524.00 for the topical prescription medication at issue.

Fee Schedule

To prevail in a fee schedule defense, the respondent must demonstrate by competent evidentiary proof that applicant's claims were in excess of the appropriate fee schedules, or otherwise respondent's defense of noncompliance with the appropriate fee schedule cannot be sustained. Continental Medical, P.C. v. Travelers Indemnity Co., 11 Misc.3d 145(A) (App. Term 1st Dept. 2006.)

An insurer fails to raise a triable issue of fact with respect to a defense that the fees charged were not in conformity with the Workers' Compensation fee schedule when it does not specify the actual reimbursement rates which formed the basis for its determination that the claimant billed in excess of the maximum amount permitted. See St. Vincent Medical Services, P.C. v. GEICO Ins. Co., 29 Misc.3d 141(A), 907 N.Y.S.2d 441 (App. Term 2d, Dec. 8, 2010.)

The applicant billed \$98.10 for the Cyclobenzaprine provided to the EIP, for which the respondent made partial payment of \$83.59, leaving a balance of \$14.51. The respondent did not rely upon any documentation sufficient to establish its fee schedule defense.

The respondent has already made payment of \$83.59 for this oral medication, which is acknowledged in the AR-1.

Based on the foregoing, the respondent has failed to establish its fee schedule defense.

Therefore, the applicant is awarded \$14.51 for the oral medication provided to the EIP.

Accordingly, the applicant is awarded a total of \$1,538.51 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.

		Claim	
--	--	--------------	--

Medical		From/To	Amount	Status
	NetRx Inc.	11/17/23 - 11/17/23	\$1,538.51	Awarded: \$1,538.51
Total			\$1,538.51	Awarded: \$1,538.51

- B. The insurer shall also compute and pay the applicant interest set forth below. 05/16/2024 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.

06/11/2025

(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:
ba8e1d9ae912b7aeb1306299f3b4170a

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 06/11/2025