

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

IDM Supply Group Inc
(Applicant)

- and -

Allstate Fire & Casualty Insurance Company
(Respondent)

AAA Case No. 17-25-1395-4619

Applicant's File No. M24-765943

Insurer's Claim File No. 0750708975-01

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 08/24/2026
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 08/24/2026

Candace Kronholm, Esq. from Shapiro & Associates, P.C. participated virtually for the Applicant

Anisah Molic, Esq. from Law Offices Of Richard Schoenberg participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$2,549.00**, 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 42 year old EIP reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident on April 5, 2024; claimed related injury and received a shoulder CPM with pad on July 22, 2024 and a cold compression unit provided by the applicant on August 11, 2024.

The applicant submitted a claim for this durable medical equipment (DME) partial payment for the CPM with pad and delivery and set up fee was made by the for the made by the respondent based on its calculation of the correct reimbursable amount pursuant to the New York Workers' Compensation DME fee schedule. This payment was delayed pending the EUO of the EIP.

Payment of the charge for the cold compression unit was delayed pending a response to the verification request for the purchase invoice for this item of DME and the EUO of the EIP.

The respondent asserted a fee schedule defense for both items of DME.

The issues to be determined at the hearing are:

Whether the respondent established that the claim is premature.

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.

Both 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 the instant matter, the applicant responded to the verification requested on April 9, 2025 by providing a copy of the purchase invoice. The EUO was held on October 14, 2024.

The denial of the NF-10 for the shoulder CPM with pad and set-up indicates that the bill was received by the respondent on August 16, 2024, was delayed pending responses to outstanding verification and partial payment was made on October 24, 2024.

Fee Schedule

Late denial/No Denial

The respondent did not submit a denial for the cold compression unit. However effective April 1, 2013, 11 NYCRR 65-3.8(g)(1) has been amended so that the application of the New York State Worker's Compensation fee schedule is no longer a precludable defense and no payment is due on those claims in excess of the fee schedule. Per 11 NYCRR 65-3.8(g), where the services were rendered after April 1, 2013, a defense of excessive fees is not subject to preclusion Surgicare Surgical Associates v. National Interstate Ins. Co., Misc.3d, N.Y.S.3d, 2015 N.Y. Slip Op. 25338 (App. Term 1st Dept. Oct. 8, 2015), 46 Misc.3d 736, 997 N.Y.S.2d 296 aff'g (Civ. Ct. Bronx Co. 2014) (New Jersey fee schedule). The insurer is entitled to reduce the bills to the proper fee schedule amount.

In order 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.)

A fee schedule defense does not always require expert proof. There are two fee schedule scenarios. The first involves the basic application of the fee codes and simple arithmetic. The second scenario involves interpretation of the codes and often requires testimony and evidence beyond that of a lay individual. I find that the fee schedule issue presented in this case is analogous to the latter scenario and requires an expert's opinion.

The respondent supported its fee schedule defense, with the affidavit of Allison Harford-Braxton, CPC, a certified professional coder who submitted a comprehensive analysis and determined that the correct reimbursable amount for the shoulder CPM with pad is \$674.49 with no reimbursement for set up and delivery charges. The reimbursable amount for the cold compression device is \$494.75.

The applicant acknowledged payment in the AR-1 of \$674.49 for the shoulder CPM, leaving a balance due of 494.75.

The applicant did not submit the affidavit of a certified professional fee coder, medical professional or other expert to refute the determination of the respondent's expert.

Based on the foregoing, the respondent established its fee schedule defense.

Accordingly, the applicant is awarded \$494.75 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
	IDM Supply Group Inc	07/22/24 - 08/11/24	\$2,549.00	Awarded: \$494.75
Total			\$2,549.00	Awarded: \$494.75

B. The insurer shall also compute and pay the applicant interest set forth below. 04/11/2025 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.

09/06/2026
(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:
757c9d8dc4a63376f6d7ea7a597e02b2

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 09/06/2026