STATE OF MICHIGAN
MICHIGAN ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING SYSTEM
FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH
P.O. Box 30763, Lansing, MI 48909
(877) 833-0870; Fax: (517) 373-4147

IN THE MATTER OF:

[redacted],

Docket No. 15-000174 PHR

[redacted]

Appellant

[redacted]/

DECISION AND ORDER

This matter is before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to MCL 400.9 and 42 CFR 431.200 *et seq.,* upon Appellant's request for a hearing.

After due notice, a hearing was held on [redacted]. Appellant appeared on her own behalf. The Michigan Department of Community Health (Department or DCH) was represented by [redacted], Clinical Pharmacist from [redacted] Medicaid Administration ([redacted]).

Respondent's Exhibits 1-22 were entered as evidence on the record without objection.

ISSUE

Did the Department properly deny Appellant's request for prior authorization (PA) request for Adderall?

FINDINGS OF FACT

The Administrative Law Judge, based upon the competent, material and substantial evidence on the whole record, finds as material fact:

1. Appellant is a [redacted]-year-old Medicaid beneficiary, born [redacted] (Respondent's Exhibit 10).

2. Appellant is afflicted with ADHD/ADD and depression. (Respondent's Exhibit 10; Testimony).

3. On [redacted], Appellant's physician, an internal medicine specialist, submitted a prior authorization request for Adderall for a diagnosis of ADHD for Appellant. (Respondent's Exhibit 8).

4. Appellant reported that she needs because she suffers from ADHD, ADD and depression. Other medications were not helping her. (Respondent's Exhibit 3-4).

5. Owing to contractual requirements between [redacted] Medicaid Administration (MMA) and the Michigan Department of Community Health the request for Adderall was reviewed for clinical compliance by MSA Medical Reviewer, [redacted] – who denied the request for lack of an adult mental health evaluation by a psychiatrist, psychologist, clinical social worker or licensed/certified counselor after turning [redacted] and because there was no documentation of uninterrupted therapy. (Respondent's Exhibit 14).

6. On [redacted], MMA sent Appellant an Adequate Action/Denial Notice denying Appellant's request based upon the lack of of psychiatric evaluation. (Respondent's Exhibit 11).

7. On [redacted], the instant request for hearing was received by the Michigan Administrative Hearing System. (Respondent's Exhibit 2).

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

The Medical Assistance Program is established pursuant to Title XIX of the Social Security Act and is implemented by Title 42 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). It is administered in accordance with state statute, the Social Welfare Act, the Administrative Code, and the State Plan under Title XIX of the Social Security Act Medical Assistance Program.

Social Security Act § 1927(d), [42 USC 1396r-8(d)]

LIMITATIONS ON COVERAGE OF DRUGS --

(1) PERMISSIBLE RESTRICTIONS –

(A) A state may subject to prior authorization any covered outpatient drug. Any such prior authorization program shall comply with the requirements of paragraph (5).

A state may exclude or otherwise restrict coverage of a covered outpatient drug if –

(i) the prescribed use is not for a medically accepted indication (as defined in subsection (k)(6);
(ii) the drug is contained in the list referred to in paragraph (2);

(iii) the drug is subject to such restriction pursuant to an agreement between a manufacturer and a State authorized by the Secretary under subsection (a)(1) or in effect pursuant to subsection (a)(4); or

(iv) the State has excluded coverage of the drug from its formulary in accordance with paragraph 4.

(4) REQUIREMENTS FOR FORMULARIES - A State may establish a formulary if the formulary meets the following requirements:

(A) The formulary is developed by a committee consisting of physicians, pharmacists, and other appropriate individuals appointed by the Governor of the State (or, at the option of the State, the State's drug use review board established under subsection (g)(3)).

(B) Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the formulary includes the covered outpatient drugs of any manufacturer, which has entered into and complies with an agreement under subsection (a) (other than any drug excluded from coverage or otherwise restricted under paragraph (2)).

(C) A covered outpatient drug may be excluded with respect to the treatment of a specific disease or condition for an identified population (if any) only if, based on the drug's labeling (or, in the case of a drug the prescribed use of which is not approved under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act but is a medically accepted indication, based on information from appropriate compendia described in subsection (k)(6)), the excluded drug does not have a significant, clinically meaningful therapeutic advantage in terms of safety, effectiveness, or clinical outcome of such treatment for such population over other drugs included in the formulary and there is a written explanation (available to the public) of the basis for the exclusion.

(D) The state plan permits coverage of a drug excluded from the formulary (other than any drug excluded from coverage or otherwise restricted under paragraph (2))

pursuant to a prior authorization program that is consistent with paragraph (5),

(E) The formulary meets such other requirements as the Secretary may impose in order to achieve program savings consistent with protecting the health of program beneficiaries.

A prior authorization program established by a State under paragraph (5) is not a formulary subject to the requirements of this paragraph.

(5) REQUIREMENTS OF PRIOR AUTHORIZATION PROGRAMS. — A State plan under this title may require, as a condition of coverage or payment for a covered outpatient drug for which Federal financial participation is available in accordance with this section, with respect to drugs dispensed on or after July 1, 1991, the approval of the drug before its dispensing for any medically accepted indication (as defined in subsection (k)(6)) only if the system providing for such approval –

(A) Provides response by telephone or other telecommunication device within 24 hours of a request for prior authorization; and

(B) Except with respect to the drugs referred to in paragraph (2) provides for the dispensing of at least 72-hour supply of a covered outpatient prescription drug in an emergency situation (as defined by the Secretary).

(6) OTHER PERMISSIBLE RESTRICTIONS – A State may impose limitations, with respect to all such drugs in a therapeutic class, on the minimum or maximum quantities per prescription or on the number of refills, if such limitations are necessary to discourage waste, and may address instances or fraud or abuse by individuals in any manner authorized under this Act.

Furthermore, the Medicaid Provider Manual (MPM) sets forth significant criteria for documentation of unusual off-label uses and prior authorization requests:

DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

For all requests for PA, the following documentation is required:

- Pharmacy name and phone number;
- Beneficiary diagnosis and medical reason(s) why another covered drug cannot be used;

- Drug name, strength, and form;
- Other pharmaceutical products prescribed;
- Results of therapeutic alternative medications tried; and
- MedWatch Form or other clinical information may be required.

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION DENIALS

PA denials are conveyed to the requester. PA is denied if:

- The medical necessity is not established.
- Alternative medications are not ruled out.
- Evidence-based research and compendia do not support it.
- It is contraindicated, inappropriate standard of care.
- It does not fall within MDCH clinical review criteria.
- Documentation required was not provided.

(Emphasis supplied)

MPM, Pharmacy §§8.4, 8.6, pages 15 and 16, April 1, 2014.[1]

***

The Department witness testified that the requested drug was designed to help treat ADD/ADHD. She added that a request for treatment when the patient is over [redacted]-years of age requires additional documentation and clinical evaluation from a psychiatrist, a clinical psychologist or a clinical social worker. The patient had not been evaluated by a psychiatrist, psychologist, clinical social worker, or licensed counselor after age [redacted] to confirm the diagnosis. She testified that owing to contractual requirements the request was forwarded to MDCH MSA physician reviewer, [redacted] who conducted his review and concluded that the PA would be denied for lack of supporting documentation and proof of evaluation from a psychiatrist, clinical psychologist or clinical social worker that supports the diagnosis of ADHD for an adult.

Appellant testified on the record that in [redacted] she was living in [redacted], where she was diagnosed with depression. She saw a psychologist who diagnosed her with ADD and was treated with Adderall. The medication helped her tremendously with focus, attention to tasks and disruption of social environments. She took the medication for [redacted] years until she lost her health care coverage. She managed without the medication for ten years until she got health care coverage. Her primary care physician recommended the medication that he thought was most beneficial to her condition.

The Department's evidence clearly showed that the Appellant had not satisfied the Medicaid criteria for renewed approval of Adderall XR – owing to the lack of a current [post [redacted]-years of age] evaluation from one of the aforementioned medical professionals.

In review, based on the clinical judgment of the state reviewing physician and the credible testimony of the Department's witness, the Appellant has failed to prove, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the Department's denial was improper. The necessary evaluation has not been performed and supporting evidence was not received by MDCH prior to the time a decision was made.

The Department's decision to deny prior authorization for Adderall, based on this record was supported with sufficient evidence and the credible testimony of the MMA representative.

DECISION AND ORDER

The Administrative Law Judge, based on the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, decides that the Department properly denied Appellant's request for prior authorization of Adderall.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

The Department's decision is AFFIRMED.



Landis Y. Lain
Administrative Law Judge
for Nick Lyon, Director
Michigan Department of Community Health

Date Signed: [redacted]

Date Mailed: [redacted]

LYL/db

cc: [redacted]

***** NOTICE *****

The Michigan Administrative Hearing System may order a rehearing on either its own motion or at the request of a party within 30 days of the mailing date of this Decision and Order. The Michigan Administrative Hearing System will not order a rehearing on the Department's motion where the final decision or rehearing cannot be implemented within 90 days of the filing of the original request. The Appellant may appeal the Decision and Order to Circuit Court within 30 days of the receipt of the Decision and Order or, if a timely request for rehearing was made, within 30 days of the receipt of the rehearing decision.