

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0078701		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	04/29/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	12/13/2005
<b>Decision Date:</b>	06/02/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	04/08/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	04/24/2015

### 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, Texas, Florida

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management, Hospice & Palliative 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 50 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/13/2005. He reported injury while laying sod. The injured worker was diagnosed as having low back pain with a flare of radicular symptoms in the right leg, disc herniation at lumbar 4-5 and lumbar 5-sacral 1 and intermittent claudication leg cramps in the right leg. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included home exercises, TENS (transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation) and medication management. In a progress note dated 3/23/2015, the injured worker complains of worsening back pain with spasms and burning pain down the right leg. Documentation states the injured worker has been using Norco since at least 2012, is under a narcotic contract and urine drug screens have been appropriate. The treating physician is requesting Norco.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Norco 10/325mg #120:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Opioids for chronic pain - Criteria for use of Opioids.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 9792.20 - 9792.26 Page(s): 44, 47, 75-79, 120 of 127.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen), California Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines state that Norco is an opiate pain medication. Due to high abuse potential, close follow-up is recommended with documentation of analgesic effect, objective functional improvement, side effects, and discussion regarding any aberrant use. Guidelines go on to recommend discontinuing opioids if there is no documentation of improved function and pain. Within the documentation available for review, there is no indication that the medication is improving the patient's function (in terms of specific examples of functional improvement), no documentation regarding side effects, and no discussion regarding aberrant use. As such, there is no clear indication for ongoing use of the medication. Opioids should not be abruptly discontinued, but unfortunately, there is no provision to modify the current request to allow tapering. In light of the above issues, the currently requested Norco (hydrocodone/acetaminophen) is not medically necessary.