

STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES  
OFFICE OF LEGAL COUNSEL, REGULATIONS, AND ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS  
55 FARMINGTON AVENUE  
HARTFORD, CT 06105

██████████ 2021  
Signature confirmation

Case: ██████████  
Client: ██████████  
Request: 174391

**NOTICE OF DECISION**

**PARTY**

██████████  
██████████  
██████████

**PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

On ██████████ 2021, the Connecticut Dental Health Partnership (“CTDHP”), the Department of Social Services’ contractor and dental reviewer, issued ██████████ (the “Appellant”) a *Notice of Action* denying prior authorization of orthodontic services for ██████████ (the “child”), her minor child.

On ██████████ 2021, the Office of Legal Counsel, Regulations, and Administrative Hearings (“OLCRAH”) received the Appellant’s hearing request, postmarked ██████████ 2021.

On ██████████ 2021, the OLCRAH issued a notice to the Appellant scheduling an administrative hearing for ██████████ 2021.

On ██████████, 2021, in accordance with sections 17b-60, 17b-61 and 4-176e to 4-189, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes, the OLCRAH held an administrative hearing. The following individuals participated by telephone conferencing:

██████████, Appellant  
Cindy Ramos, CTDHP Representative  
Greg Johnson, D.M.D., CTDHP Witness  
Eva Tar, Hearing Officer

The hearing record closed ██████████ 2021.

## **STATEMENT OF ISSUE**

The issue is whether CTDHP's denial of prior authorization for the child's orthodontic services is supported by state statute and regulation.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. The child's date of birth is [REDACTED] (Appellant Testimony)
2. The child has dental coverage through HUSKY Health. (CTDHP Exhibit 4)
3. The child has not been diagnosed with a mental illness. (Appellant Testimony)
4. On [REDACTED] 2021, a dentist recommended to the Appellant that the child's Class III growth pattern be monitored, opining that the child could potentially outgrow treatment and require camouflage treatment or jaw surgery. (Appellant Exhibit A)
5. CTDHP received a request from [REDACTED] (the "treating orthodontic practice") for prior authorization of the child's orthodontic services. (CTDHP Exhibit 1)
6. An employee of the treating orthodontic practice scored the severity of the child's malocclusion as 26 points on a *Preliminary Handicapping and Malocclusion Assessment Record*<sup>1</sup> and indicated that there were no presence of other severe deviations that if left untreated would cause irreversible damage to the child's teeth and underlying structures. (CTDHP Exhibit 2)
7. Benson Monastersky, D.M.D. (the "first dental reviewer"), Vincent Fazzino, D.M.D. (the "second dental reviewer"), and Geoffrey Drawbridge, D.D.S., (the "third dental reviewer") are CTDHP dental consultants. (CTDHP Exhibits 3, 6, and 9)
8. The first and the second dental reviewers independently scored the severity of the child's malocclusion as equaling less than 26 points on a *Preliminary Handicapping and Malocclusion Assessment Record*. (CTDHP Exhibits 3 and 6)
9. The first and second dental reviewers agreed with the treating orthodontic practice that there existed no presence of other severe deviations that if left untreated would cause irreversible damage to the child's teeth and underlying structures. (CTDHP Exhibits 3 and 6)
10. On [REDACTED] 2021 and [REDACTED] 2021, CTDHP denied the treating orthodontist's request for prior authorization of the child's orthodontic services. (CTDHP's Exhibits 4 and 7)
11. On or around [REDACTED] 2021, the Appellant submitted a copy of the dentist's [REDACTED] 2021 digital entry on the child's dental file to CTDHP to use in its third dental review. (Hearing record)

---

<sup>1</sup> The *Preliminary Handicapping and Malocclusion Assessment Record* is also known as the Salzman Handicapping Malocclusion Index.

12. On [REDACTED] 2021, the third dental reviewer independently scored the severity of the child's malocclusion as equaling less than 26 points on a *Preliminary Handicapping and Malocclusion Assessment Record*. (CTDHP Exhibit 9)
13. The third dental reviewer declined to comment further, other than to cite a lack of substantiating diagnostic documentation accompanying the [REDACTED] 2021 digital entry to support its treatment plan or projections. (CTDHP Exhibit 9)
14. Connecticut General Statutes § 17b-61 (a) provides:  
The Commissioner of Social Services or the commissioner's designated hearing officer shall ordinarily render a final decision not later than ninety days after the date the commissioner receives a request for a fair hearing pursuant to section 17b-60, ... , provided the time for rendering a final decision shall be extended whenever the aggrieved person requests or agrees to an extension, or when the commissioner documents an administrative or other extenuating circumstance beyond the commissioner's control....

On [REDACTED] 2021, the OLCRAH received the Appellant's [REDACTED] 2021 postmarked hearing request. The close of the hearing record was extended through [REDACTED] 2021 for evidence and comment, which accordingly extended the deadline for an administrative hearing decision by 20 days. Therefore, the hearing decision would have become due by [REDACTED] 2021. This final decision is timely.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. Section 17b-2 of the Connecticut General Statutes in part designates the Department of Social Services as the state agency to administer the Medicaid program pursuant to Title XIX of the Social Security Act.
2. "The Department of Social Services shall cover orthodontic services for a Medicaid recipient under twenty-one years of age when the Salzmann Handicapping Malocclusion Index indicates a correctly scored assessment for the recipient of twenty-six points or greater, subject to prior authorization requirements...." Conn. Gen. Stat. § 17b-282e.

**The Appellant did not establish that the severity of the child's malocclusion met or exceeded a score of 26 points on an objectively scored *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record*.**

3. Section 17b-282e of the Connecticut General Statutes provides:  
If a recipient's score on the Salzmann Handicapping Malocclusion Index is less than twenty-six points, the Department of Social Services shall consider additional substantive information when determining the need for orthodontic services, including (1) documentation of the presence of other severe deviations affecting the oral facial structures; and (2) the presence of severe mental, emotional or behavioral problems or disturbances, as defined in the most current edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, published by the American Psychiatric Association, that affects the individual's daily functioning....  
Conn. Gen. Stat. § 17b-282e.

**CTDHP correctly determined that the Appellant has not established with substantiating diagnostic documentation that there are severe deviations currently adversely affecting the child's oral facial structure.**

**The child does not meet the two exceptions set by Conn. Gen. Stat. § 17b-282e to permit authorization of orthodontic services for a malocclusion with a severity of less than 26 points on an objectively scored *Preliminary Handicapping Malocclusion Assessment Record*.**

4. Section 17b-259b (a) of the Connecticut General Statutes provides:

For purposes of the administration of the medical assistance programs by the Department of Social Services, "medically necessary" and "medical necessity" mean those health services required to prevent, identify, diagnose, treat, rehabilitate or ameliorate an individual's medical condition, including mental illness, or its effects, in order to attain or maintain the individual's achievable health and independent functioning provided such services are: (1) consistent with generally-accepted standards of medical practice that are defined as standards that are based on (A) credible scientific evidence published in peer-reviewed medical literature that is generally recognized by the relevant medical community, (B) recommendations of a physician-specialty society, (C) the views of physicians practicing in relevant clinical areas, and (D) any other relevant factors; (2) clinically appropriate in terms of type, frequency, timing, site, extent and duration and considered effective for the individual's illness, injury or disease; (3) not primarily for the convenience of the individual, the individual's health care provider or other health care providers; (4) not more costly than an alternative service or sequence of services at least as likely to produce equivalent therapeutic or diagnostic results as to the diagnosis or treatment of the individual's illness, injury or disease; and (5) based on an assessment of the individual and his or her medical condition.

Conn. Gen. Stat. §17b-259b (a).

**The Appellant did not demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that orthodontic services to treat the child's malocclusion are medically necessary, as the term "medically necessary" is defined at Conn. Gen. Stat. § 17b-259b (a).**

**CTDHP's denial of prior authorization for the child's orthodontic services is supported by state statute and regulation.**

**DECISION**

The Appellant's appeal is DENIED.

*Eva Tar-electronic signature*  
Eva Tar  
Hearing Officer

Cc: Magdalena Carter, CTDHP  
Rita LaRosa, CTDHP

### **RIGHT TO REQUEST RECONSIDERATION**

The appellant has the right to file a written reconsideration request within **15** days of the mailing date of the decision on the grounds there was an error of fact or law, new evidence has been discovered or other good cause exists. If the request for reconsideration is granted, the appellant will be notified within **25** days of the request date. No response within 25 days means that the request for reconsideration has been denied. The right to request a reconsideration is based on § 4-181a (a) of the Connecticut General Statutes.

Reconsideration requests should include specific grounds for the request: for example, indicate what error of fact or law, what new evidence, or what other good cause exists.

Reconsideration requests should be sent to: Department of Social Services, Director, Office of Administrative Hearings and Appeals, 55 Farmington Avenue Hartford, CT 06105.

### **RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The appellant has the right to appeal this decision to Superior Court within **45** days of the mailing of this decision, or **45** days after the agency denies a petition for reconsideration of this decision, provided that the petition for reconsideration was filed timely with the Department. The right to appeal is based on § 4-183 of the Connecticut General Statutes. To appeal, a petition must be filed at Superior Court. A copy of the petition must be served upon the Office of the Attorney General, 165 Capitol Avenue, Hartford, CT 06106 or the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services, 55 Farmington Avenue Hartford, CT 06105. A copy of the petition must also be served on all parties to the hearing.

The 45-day appeal period may be extended in certain instances if there is good cause. The extension request must be filed with the Commissioner of the Department of Social Services in writing no later than 90 days from the mailing of the decision. Good cause circumstances are evaluated by the Commissioner or the Commissioner's designee in accordance with § 17b-61 of the Connecticut General Statutes. The Agency's decision to grant an extension is final and is not subject to review or appeal.

The appeal should be filed with the clerk of the Superior Court in the Judicial District of New Britain or the Judicial District in which the appellant resides.