

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0017636		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/05/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	03/12/2002
<b>Decision Date:</b>	03/30/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	01/20/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	01/29/2015

### 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: New Jersey, Michigan, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular 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 was a 53 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury, March 12, 2002. According to progress note of January 9, 2015, the injured workers chief complaint was right foot pain. The injured worker reported good pain control with Norco and functional improvement. The injured worker continues to work. The physical exam noted tenderness of the right midfoot and navicular, hindfoot remains neutral. The injured worker was diagnosed with chronic right foot pain due to trauma, traumatic arthritis of the right foot and right foot pain. The injured worker previously received the following treatments of laboratory studies and Norco for pain. January 9, 2015, the primary treating physician requested authorization for a urine drug screening for routine compliance. On January 20, 2015, the UR denied authorization for a urine drug screening. The denial was based on the MTUS/ACOEM and ODG guidelines.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Urine drug screen:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids, steps to avoid misuse/addiction Page(s): 77-78; 94.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS guidelines, urine toxicology screens is indicated to avoid misuse/addiction. Consider the use of a urine drug screen to assess for the use or the presence of illegal drugs. There is no evidence that the patient have aberrant behavior for urine drug screen. There is no clear evidence of abuse, addiction and poor pain control. There is no documentation that the patient have a history of use of illicit drugs. Therefore, the request for Urine drug screen is not medically necessary.