

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0009598		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/14/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	10/11/1995
<b>Decision Date:</b>	08/08/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/15/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	01/24/2014

### HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. 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. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

As noted in the MTUS ACOEM Guidelines in Chapter 5, page 83, to achieve functional recovery, applicants must assume certain responsibilities, one of which includes making and keeping appointments. Thus, the service being sought here, namely medical transportation, has been deemed an article of applicant responsibility as opposed to a matter of payer responsibility. Per ACOEM, applicants are responsible for making and keeping appointments. Therefore, the proposed driver for medical visits is not medically necessary.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

**A DRIVER FOR MEDICAL VISITS:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 5 Cornerstones of Disability Prevention and Management Page(s): 83.

**Decision rationale:** As noted in the MTUS-Adopted ACOEM Guidelines in Chapter 5, page 83, to achieve functional recovery, applicants must assume certain responsibilities, one of which includes making and keeping appointments. Thus, the service being sought here, namely medical transportation, has been deemed an article of applicant responsibility as opposed to a matter of

payer responsibility. Per ACOEM, applicants are responsible for making and keeping appointments. Therefore, the proposed driver for medical visits is not medically necessary.