

**MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.**

Independent Medical Review

P.O. Box 138009

Sacramento, CA 95813-8009

(855) 865-8873 Fax: (916) 605-4270



---

**Notice of Independent Medical Review Determination**

Dated: 11/27/2013

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Employee:	[REDACTED]
Claim Number:	[REDACTED]
Date of UR Decision:	7/1/2013
Date of Injury:	3/10/2008
IMR Application Received:	8/28/2013
MAXIMUS Case Number:	CM13-0017733

- 1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the retrospective request for **Norco 10/325mg #150 is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

## INDEPENDENT MEDICAL REVIEW DECISION AND RATIONALE

An application for Independent Medical Review was filed on 8/28/2013 disputing the Utilization Review Denial dated 7/1/2013. A Notice of Assignment and Request for Information was provided to the above parties on 11/25/2013. A decision has been made for each of the treatment and/or services that were in dispute:

- 1) MAXIMUS Federal Services, Inc. has determined the retrospective request for **Norco 10/325mg #150** is not **medically necessary and appropriate**.

### **Medical Qualifications of the Expert Reviewer:**

The independent Medical Doctor who made the decision has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician reviewer is Board Certified in Internal Medicine, has a subspecialty in Rheumatology 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 treatments and/or services at issue.

### **Expert Reviewer Case Summary:**

This 43 year old male sustained a left knee injury on 3/10/08. An MRI dated 6/19/08 showed partial ligamentous tears and two subsequent surgeries were performed in 9/08 and 2/08, an arthroscopic debridement and patellofemoral chondroplasty. The requesting provider's medical reports dated 01/2013 through 07/2013 stated that the patient continued to complain of severe knee pain. The treatment plan and request included ongoing Norco, Naprosyn, Butrans patches.

### **Documents Reviewed for Determination:**

The following relevant documents received from the interested parties and the documents provided with the application were reviewed and considered. These documents included:



- 1) **Regarding the retrospective request for Norco 10/325mg #150:**

The Medical Treatment Guidelines Relied Upon by the Expert Reviewer to Make His/Her Decision

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, which is part of MTUS.

The Expert Reviewer based his/her decision on the Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, Opioids, pgs. 76-85, 88-89, which is part of MTUS.

Rationale for the Decision:

There is no evidence that the treating physician is prescribing opioids according to the MTUS section cited above, which recommends prescribing according to function, with specific functional goals, return to work, random drug testing, opioid contract and a documentation of failure of non-opioid therapy. None of these aspects of prescribing are in evidence. There is no evidence of specific functional benefit or effective pain relief compared to baseline documented in the office visits. There is no documentation of satisfactory response to treatment as evidenced by a decrease in pain, increase in function or improvement in quality of life. **The retrospective request for Norco 10/325mg #150 is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

**Effect of the Decision:**

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its physician reviewer is deemed to be the final determination of the Administrative Director, Division of Workers' Compensation. With respect to the medical necessity of the treatment in dispute, this determination is binding on all parties.

In accordance with California Labor Code Section 4610.6(h), a determination of the administrative director may be reviewed only if a verified appeal is filed with the appeals board for hearing and served on all interested parties within 30 days of the date of mailing of the determination to the employee or the employer. The determination of the administrative director shall be presumed to be correct and shall be set aside only upon proof by clear and convincing evidence of one or more of the grounds for appeal listed in Labor Code Section 4610.6(h)(1) through (5).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, MD, MPH  
Medical Director

cc: Department of Industrial Relations



/amm

Disclaimer: MAXIMUS is providing an independent review service under contract with the California Department of Industrial Relations. MAXIMUS is not engaged in the practice of law or medicine. Decisions about the use or nonuse of health care services and treatments are the sole responsibility of the patient and the patient's physician. MAXIMUS is not liable for any consequences arising from these decisions.