

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

Sandro Femia DC
(Applicant)

- and -

State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance
Company
(Respondent)

AAA Case No. 17-25-1423-2952

Applicant's File No. N/A

Insurer's Claim File No. 3267R320Z

NAIC No. 25178

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

Marc Schwartz, Esq. from Marc L. Schwartz P.C. participated virtually for the Applicant

Bennie Philip, Esq. from Sarah C. Varghese & Associates participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$5,416.37**, was AMENDED and permitted by the arbitrator at the oral hearing.

The applicant amended the amount claimed to \$1,976.85 to conform to the appropriate fee schedule.

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

3. Summary of Issues in Dispute

The 38 year old EIP reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident on August 13, 2024; claimed related injury and underwent office visits and chiropractic treatment provided by the applicant from August 6, 2025 to September 4, 2025.

The applicant submitted a claim for these chiropractic services, payment of which was timely denied by the respondent based on the IME of the EIP by Ji Hoon Kim, D.C., L.Ac. which was performed on February 19, 2025. The IME cut-off was effective on March 28, 2025.

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. Kim, 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. Kim noted that the EIP missed one month from work as a result of the August 13, 2024 accident and that at the time of the examination he was working at the same job with the same duties. Dr. Kim performed a complete and comprehensive examination of the EIP which identified some restricted range of motion in the lumbar spine, which he noted was with suboptimal effort. The remaining objective tests, including straight leg raising and Kemps test were negative with no paraspinal spasms and no tenderness. Dr. Kim determined that the EIP's subjective complaints of pain did not match the objective findings in his.

Based on these findings and his review of the medical records, it was Dr. Kim's opinion that the EIP's injuries were resolved.

Despite the EIP's subjective complaints, Dr. Kim determined that the EIP was not disabled and that there was no medical necessity for further chiropractic treatment, massage therapy, diagnostic testing, durable medical equipment, household help or special transportation.

Respondent has factually demonstrated that the services provided by the applicant were not medically necessary. Accordingly, the burden now shifts to the applicant, who bears the ultimate burden of persuasion. See Bronx Expert Radiology, P.C. v. Travelers Ins. Co., 2006 NY Slip Op 52116 (App. Term 1st Dept. 2006.)

In response to the report of the physical examination of the EIP by Dr. Kim, the applicant relied upon the submissions, including SOAP notes from November 23, 2024 to August 4, 2025 which identified no change in unspecified range of motion and muscle spasms with office visits, CMT and massage.

Based on the foregoing, the applicant failed to document sufficient contemporaneous objective findings that would warrant continued treatment after the IME cut-off date and has not met the burden of persuasion in rebuttal. The medical records submitted do not meaningfully address the arguments that are raised in the IME report and are insufficient to overcome the burden of production established by respondent.

Therefore, the respondent has established that the chiropractic services at issue were not medically necessary.

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.

09/15/2026

(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:
39047049654a2ed2cb5eed3a8440ab17

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 09/15/2026