

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0061215		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/07/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	07/04/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/08/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	03/17/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/31/2015

### 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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

The injured worker is a 68 year old male who sustained a work related injury July 4, 2014. According to a primary treating physician's re-evaluation, dated February 25, 2015, the injured worker presented with ongoing and worse low back pain, right hip pain, and bladder complaints (unspecified). There are complaints of numbness and tingling in the bilateral lower extremities. Diagnoses included lumbago; lumbar spine musculogamentous sprain/strain with radiculopathy; unsteady gait; right hip myalgia/arthritis. Treatment included requests for authorization for; referrals for bladder complaints and orthopedic for hip complaints, electrodiagnostic studies, medication, continue use of TENS unit, hot/cold pack wrap acupuncture, x-ray of the lumbar spine, urine toxicology and functional capacity evaluation.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Functional capacity evaluation:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Fitness For Duty, Functional capacity evaluation (FCE).

**Decision rationale:** The Official Disability Guidelines state that a functional capacity evaluation is appropriate if, case management is hampered by complex issues and the timing is appropriate; such as if the patient is close to being at maximum medical improvement or additional clarification concerning the patient's functional capacity is needed. Functional capacity evaluations are not needed if the sole purpose is to determine a worker's effort or compliance, or the worker has returned to work. There is no documentation in the medical record to support a functional capacity evaluation based on the above criteria. Functional capacity evaluation is not medically necessary.