INDEPENDENT BILLING REVIEW FINAL DETERMINATION

December 15, 2014

Dear [Name],

MAXIMUS Federal Services has completed the Independent Bill Review (“IBR”) of the above workers’ compensation case. This letter provides you with the IBR Final Determination and explains how the determination was made.

**Final Determination: UPHOLD.** MAXIMUS Federal Services has determined that no additional reimbursement is warranted. The Claims Administrator’s determination is upheld and the Claim Administrator does not owe the Provider additional reimbursement. A detailed explanation of the decision is provided later in this letter.

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its expert reviewer is deemed to be the Final Determination of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation. This determination is binding on all parties. In certain limited circumstances, you can appeal the Final Determination. Appeals must be filed with the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board within 20 days from the date of this letter. For more information on appealing the final determination, please see California Labor Code Section 4603.6(f).

Sincerely,

[Name]

cc: [Name]
DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

Pertinent documents reviewed to reach the determination:

- The Independent Bill Review Application
- The original billing itemization
- Supporting documents submitted with the original billing
- Explanation of Review in response to the original bill
- Request for Second Bill Review and documentation
- Supporting documents submitted with the request for second review
- The final explanation of the second review
- Official Medical Fee Schedule
- Negotiated contracted rates:
- National Correct Coding Initiatives
- Other: Medical-Legal Fee Schedule

HOW THE IBR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services Chief Coding Specialist reviewed the case file and researched pertinent coding and billing standards to reach a determination. In some cases a physician reviewer was employed to review the clinical aspects of the care to help make a determination. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services.

ANALYSIS AND FINDING

Based on review of the case file the following is noted:

- **ISSUE IN DISPUTE**: Provider is dissatisfied with reimbursement of ML 105, Medical-Legal Testimony.
- Claims Administrator reimbursed $500 and indicated on the Explanation of Review “Report not rec’d or document rec’d did not substantiate charge for report.”
- Provider dispute states “This is invalid as billing justification and med-legal deposition explanation letter for the QME deposition served with the original billing and again with submission of DWC form SBR-1 Second Bill Review request.”
- Maximus requested the letter of authorization or request for Medical-Legal services from both parties however, none was received. The deposition letter was also absent for this review as none was received. Without documentation there is no evidence that the request for Provider’s testimony was fulfilled.
- Based on information received in this review, no additional reimbursement is warranted.
The table below describes the pertinent claim line information.

**DETERMINATION OF ISSUE IN DISPUTE:** Additional reimbursement of code ML 105 is not warranted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Code</th>
<th>Provider Billed</th>
<th>Plan Allowed</th>
<th>Dispute Amount</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Multiple Surgery</th>
<th>Workers' Comp Allowed Amt.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ML 105</td>
<td>$937.50</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>$437.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>DISPUTED SERVICE: No reimbursement recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Copy to:

[Redacted]

Copy to:

[Redacted]