

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

LR Medical PLLC
(Applicant)

- and -

Progressive Casualty Insurance Company
(Respondent)

AAA Case No. 17-25-1435-8543

Applicant's File No. 00155857

Insurer's Claim File No. 24343785055

NAIC No. 11410

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 09/08/2026
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 09/08/2026

Morgan Browning, Esq. from Drachman Katz, LLP participated virtually for the Applicant

Alina Ladyzhinskaya, Esq. from McCormack, Mattei & Holler participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$154.65**, 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 was involved in a motor vehicle accident on November 9, 2024; claimed related injury and underwent an office visit and two emotional behavior assessments provided by the applicant on January 23, 2025.

The applicant submitted a claim for these psychological services, payment of which was denied by the respondent because the bill at issue was not submitted within 45 days of the date of service.

The respondent also asserted a fee schedule defense.

The issues to be determined at the hearing are:

Whether the applicant established its *prima facie* entitlement to no fault benefits for claim at issue.

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.

Applicant's *prima facie* case of entitlement to no-fault benefits

It is well settled that an applicant establishes its *prima facie* showing of entitlement to No-Fault benefits by submitting evidentiary proof that the prescribed statutory billing forms had been mailed, received by the respondent and that payment of no fault benefits were overdue. Mary Immaculate Hospital v. Allstate Insurance Company, 5 A.D. 3d 742, 774 N.Y.S.2d 564 (2d Dept. 2004.)

An insurer in a no-fault matter will be precluded as a matter of law from asserting a defense based upon the untimely submission of the bill/bills at issue if such defense is not raised in a timely denial. See New York and Presbyterian Hospital v. Empire Ins. Co., 286 A.D.2d 322 (2d Dept. 2001.)

If respondent has preserved such defense in a timely denial, respondent will still be precluded from proffering such defense as a matter of law unless respondent advised applicant that late submission of the bill/bills will be excused where the applicant can provide a reasonable justification of the failure to timely submit the bill/bills. 11 NYCRR 65-3.3(e). See also Radiology Today, P.C. v. Citiwide Auto Leasing, Inc., 2007 NY Slip Op 27111 (App. Term 2^d and 11th Jud. Dists. 2007.)

The respondent's denial was based on late submission of the bill at issue. The applicant contends that the bill was initially faxed MVAIC on February 17, 2025 and provided a copy of the fax transmission.

The bill which was faxed to Progressive for services rendered on January 23, 2025 was dated April 24, 2025. According to the NF-10 the bill was received on

May 5, 2025 and the denial, which contained the requisite reasonable justification" language was dated May 7, 2025. The EOB which accompanied the denial specifically stated in pertinent part:

The reason provided for failure to comply with the 45 day time limitation is not considered reasonable justification.

The applicant submitted correspondence dated May 29, 2025 from the applicant requesting reconsideration of the bill at issue based on its incorrect submission of the bill to MVAIC. However, neither this correspondence nor any of the submissions contain any information regarding when the applicant determined that MVAIC was not the correct respondent or provide any information to explain why the bill was not submitted to this respondent until May 29, 2025 more than 90 days after it was faxed to MVAIC.

Based on the foregoing, the respondent has established that the bill for the services at issue was submitted more than 45 days after the date of service and the applicant has not established its *prima facie* entitlement for no fault benefits for the claim at issue.

Under these circumstances, the fee schedule issue is moot.

Accordingly, the claim is denied 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.

09/12/2026

(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:
6a99d20cc7e812e37d6f7e03a1c267aa

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 09/12/2026