

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

Ahmed Elsoury MD
(Applicant)

- and -

Allstate Insurance Company
(Respondent)

AAA Case No. 17-26-1439-2713

Applicant's File No. N/A

Insurer's Claim File No. 0723395611 2ES

NAIC No. 19232

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 07/27/2026
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 07/27/2026

Roman Kulik, Esq. from Kulik Law Firm, PC participated virtually for the Applicant

Jackie Zurmuhlen, Esq. from Law Offices Of Richard Schoenberg participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$1,471.76**, 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 48 year old EIP reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident on July 28, 2023; claimed related injury and underwent trigger point injections with guidance and office visits provided by the applicant on October 1, 2025, October 20, 2025 and December 29, 2025.

The applicant submitted a claim for these medical services, payment of which was timely denied by the respondent based on the IME of the EIP by Hugh Selznick, M.D. which was performed on December 2, 2025. The IME cut-off was effective on December 22, 2025.

These medical services were also denied based on the peer review dated November 24, 2025 by Shruti Patel, M.D.

In response to the IME and peer review, the applicant submitted a rebuttal by Ahmed Elsoury, M.D., the EIP's treating medical provider.

The issue to be determined at the hearing is whether the respondent established that the medical services provided by the applicant 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.

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 its contention that the services provided to the EIP were not medically necessary, the respondent relied upon the report of the independent medical examination of the EIP by Dr. Selznick, which was objectively negative and unremarkable. Range of motion was determined with the assistance of a

goniometer. The report presents a factually sufficient, cogent medical rationale in support of respondent's lack of medical necessity defense. Dr. Selznick performed a complete and comprehensive examination of the EIP which did not identify any objective positive findings and determined that her injuries were resolved.

The respondent also relied upon the peer review by Dr. Patel, who reviewed the medical records of the EIP, noted the injuries claimed and the treatment rendered to her. Dr. Patel 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.

IME

Based upon the physical examination and medical records reviewed, Dr. Selznick determined that despite her subjective complaints, the EIP was not disabled and that she could perform her activities of daily living and working without restrictions. It was Dr. Selznick's opinion that there was no medical necessity for further orthopedic treatment, physical therapy, massage therapy, surgery, injections, prescription medication, diagnostic testing, durable medical equipment, household help or special transportation.

PEER

Dr. Patel submitted a comprehensive report in which he discussed the trigger point injections with guidance provided on three dates of service and his reasons for determining that they were not medically necessary for this EIP.

He noted that the EIP underwent conservative care beginning with acupuncture on August 10, 2023 and physical therapy which started on May 12, 2025. He also discussed the other testing and treatment provided to the EIP, including MRI studies and EMG/NCV testing.

Based on the medical records provided, Dr. Patel concluded that the trigger point injections with guidance and office visits from October 1, 2025 to December 29, 2025 were not medically necessary.

He supported, with relevant medical literature, his opinion that the medical services at issue provided to the EIP were 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 medical services at issue were not indicated for this EIP. Therefore, pursuant to Bronx Expert Radiology, *supra* the burden shifts to the applicant, which bears the ultimate burden of persuasion to establish that the services at issue were medically necessary.

In response to the peer review by Dr. Patel and the IME, the applicant relied upon the submissions, including medical records, contemporaneous to the IME which documented positive objective findings and a rebuttal to the peer review by Dr. Elsoury, the EIP's treating provider. Dr. Elsoury discussed in detail the injuries sustained by the EIP and noted that she was treated by multiple medical practitioners from the date of the subject accident.

Dr. Elsoury discussed his initial pain management evaluation on October 1, 2025 and the positive objective findings he documented in his report. He discussed in detail the benefits of trigger point injections and his reasons for recommending this treatment to this particular EIP. Dr. Elsoury also provided his opinion of the insufficiency of the peer review.

After a review of all the evidence submitted an issue of fact remains as to whether the services rendered are medically necessary. Conflicting opinions have been presented by Dr. Selznick and Dr. Patel based on the independent medical examination of the EIP and the peer review and the rebuttal and records of Dr. Elsoury submitted on behalf of the applicant. I find that the submissions of the EIP's treating medical provider were more persuasive in this instance.

Under these circumstances based on the IME and peer review, the respondent has failed to establish that the post-IME treatment was not medically necessary.

Accordingly, the applicant is awarded \$1,471.76 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
	Ahmed Elsoury MD	10/01/25 - 10/01/25	\$423.26	Awarded: \$423.26
	Ahmed Elsoury MD	10/20/25 - 10/20/25	\$524.25	Awarded: \$524.25
	Ahmed Elsoury MD	12/29/25 - 12/29/25	\$524.25	Awarded: \$524.25
Total			\$1,471.76	Awarded: \$1,471.76

- B. The insurer shall also compute and pay the applicant interest set forth below. 01/23/2026 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.

08/16/2026
(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:
af7b292548ce1f430e04fed27309c531

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 08/16/2026