

American Arbitration Association
New York No-Fault Arbitration Tribunal

In the Matter of the Arbitration between:

Find Diagnostic Chiropractic PC
(Applicant)

- and -

Allstate Fire & Casualty Insurance Company
(Respondent)

AAA Case No. 17-25-1409-4912

Applicant's File No. OS-108743

Insurer's Claim File No. 0778995729

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 10/19/2026
Declared closed by the arbitrator on 10/19/2026

Olga Sklyut, Esq. from Law office of Olga Sklyut, PC participated virtually for the Applicant

Madison Huberman, Esq. from Law Offices Of Richard Schoenberg participated virtually for the Respondent

2. The amount claimed in the Arbitration Request, **\$584.16**, 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 24 year old EIP reported involvement in a motor vehicle accident on December 11, 2024; claimed related injury and underwent diagnostic ultrasound provided by the applicant on May 15, 2025.

The respondent made partial payment for these medical services based on its calculation of the correct reimbursable amount pursuant to the New York Workers' Compensation Chiropractic Fee Schedule.

The issue to be determined at the hearing is 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 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.

The applicant billed a total of \$894.26 under CPT code 76999 for which the respondent made partial payment of \$310.20, leaving a balance of 177.10 based its calculation of the correct reimbursable amount pursuant to the New York Workers' Compensation Chiropractic Fee Schedule. The applicant contends that the total correct reimbursable amount due is \$584.16.

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 affirmation of Mariellen Mezzacappa CPC, a certified professional coder, who noted that CPT code 76999 is listed in the Chiropractic Fee Schedule and is identified as "BR" in the Relative Value Column. This represents services that are too variable in nature of their performance to permit assignment of relative value units and fees need to be justified "by report" as stated in Ground Rule 2.

In addition, she noted that CPT code 76800 defined as "ultrasound, spinal canal" is listed in the chiropractic radiology fee schedule and that there are no comparative CPT codes in the Chiropractic Fee Schedule. Therefore, she

concluded that if reimbursement is allowed it would be compared to CPT codes 76800 and 76881 which would include the cervical, thoracic, and lumbar ultrasound. The respondent had already paid \$310.20 for CPT code 76999.

Based on the foregoing, Ms. Mezzacappa submitted a comprehensive review and analysis and determined that the applicant is entitled to \$487.80 as reimbursement for this claim based on the New York Workers' Compensation Chiropractic Fee Schedule. The respondent had already made payment of \$310.20 leaving a balance owed of \$177.60.

The applicant submitted an "explanation of billing" by Henry Estrada, D.C. and an affidavit by Jennifer Nestoiter, CBCS to support its fee schedule calculation.

Ms. Nestoiter reviewed the EIP's medical records and the bills provided by the applicant and noted that the applicant must use CPT code 76999, a "by report" code to report diagnostic ultrasound. She agreed that the fee must be justified by report and, according to Ground Rule 2 of the Chiropractic Fee Schedule, the chiropractor must establish a relative value unit consistent in relativity with other relative value units shown in the schedule.

Ms. Nestoiter distinguished the difference between x-rays and diagnostic ultrasound and determined that the respondent must look at the Radiology Section of the Medical Fee Schedule in order to establish an appropriate RVU for Diagnostic Ultrasound.

Based on this analysis, she determined that the correct reimbursable amount for the services at issue is \$894.26 based on charges for 76800, 76881, 76604, 76536 and 76856.

The applicant acknowledged payment from the respondent of \$310.20 and reduced the amount in dispute to \$584.16. The NF3 only lists CPT code 76999 in the amount of \$894.36 as billing for this claim.

Dr. Estrada's submission included a comprehensive explanation of the services performed and agreed that the total reimbursable amount for the services at issue is \$894.36. However, he only noted that the codes to be considered are CPT 76856, 76800, 76881 and 76536. Ms. Nestoiter added code 76604 to her calculations.

After a review of the reports of Ms. Mezzacappa, Ms. Nestoiter and Dr. Estrada, I find that the respondent's submission was more persuasive.

Based on the foregoing, the respondent has failed to establish its fee schedule and has made payment of \$310.20 which has been acknowledged by the applicant.

Under these circumstances, the applicant is entitled to additional payment for this claim.

Accordingly, the applicant is awarded \$177.60 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
	Find Diagnostic Chiropractic PC	05/15/25 - 05/15/25	\$584.16	Awarded: \$177.60
Total			\$584.16	Awarded: \$177.60

- B. The insurer shall also compute and pay the applicant interest set forth below. 07/17/2025 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 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.

10/20/2026
(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:
5ab6e7b7cfc2530b0125401c7da1babd

Electronically Signed

Your name: Anne Malone
Signed on: 10/20/2026