



FILED

Nov 16, 2023, 9:37 am
OFFICE OF FAIR HEARINGS

**STATE OF FLORIDA
AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE ADMINISTRATION
OFFICE OF FAIR HEARINGS**

[REDACTED]

PETITIONER,

AHCA Case No.: 23-FH2041

vs.

**AGENCY FOR HEALTH CARE
ADMINISTRATION,**

RESPONDENT.

_____ /

FINAL ORDER

Pursuant to notice, the undersigned convened a telephonic Fair Hearing on the instant case on October 12, 2023, at 1:04 p.m. Eastern Standard Time (“EST”).

APPEARANCES

For the Petitioner:

[REDACTED]

Petitioner’s Authorized Representative

For the Respondent:

Marielisa Amador
Medical/Health Care Program Analyst
Agency for Health Care Administration

STATEMENT OF ISSUE

The issue is whether Respondent proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent’s decision to terminate Petitioner’s Behavior Analysis (“BA” or “ABA”) services was correct.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

All parties and witnesses appeared telephonically. Petitioner’s Authorized Representative and [REDACTED], [REDACTED] (“[REDACTED]”), appeared on behalf of Petitioner. Melissa

Mason (“Ms. Mason”), Board Certified Behavior Analyst with [REDACTED], appeared as a witness for Petitioner.

Marielisa Amador (“Ms. Amador”), Medical/Health Care Program Analyst for the Agency for Health Care Administration (“Agency” or “AHCA”), appeared on behalf of Respondent. Dr. Joseph Darling (“Dr. Darling”), Board Certified Behavior Analyst at the doctoral level and Second Level Reviewer for eQHealth Solutions Inc. (“eQHealth”), appeared as a witness for Respondent.

Prior to the hearing, Petitioner sent to the Office of Fair Hearings and Respondent a fifty-three (53)-page evidence packet. The fifty-three (53)-page evidence packet appears in the Office of Fair Hearings’ document management system as the file title “Petitioner evidence 23-FH2041.pdf”. Absent an objection from the Respondent, the undersigned admitted the fifty-three (53)-page evidence packet into evidence as Petitioner’s Composite Exhibit 1 (“PCE 1”).

Prior to the hearing, Respondent sent to the Office of Fair Hearings and Petitioner a three-hundred and one (301)-page evidence packet and a forty-nine (49)-page evidence packet. The three-hundred and one (301)-page evidence packet appears in the Office of Fair Hearings’ document management system as the file titles “[REDACTED] FH 10.12.2023 1-128.pdf”, “[REDACTED] FH 10.12.2023 129-144.pdf”, “[REDACTED] FH 10.12.2023 145-161.pdf”, “[REDACTED] FH 10.12.2023 162-178.pdf”, “[REDACTED] FH 10.12.2023 179-197.pdf”, “[REDACTED] FH 10.12.2023 198-258.pdf”, and “[REDACTED] FH 10.12.2023 259-301.pdf”. The forty-nine (49)-page evidence packet appears in the Office of Fair Hearings’ document management system as the file title “23-FH2041 AHCA Evidence (Pages 1-49 of 49).pdf”. Absent an objection from the Petitioner, the undersigned admitted the three-hundred and one (301)-page evidence packet into evidence as

Respondent's Composite Exhibit 1 ("RCE 1") and the forty-nine (49)-page evidence packet into evidence as Respondent's Composite Exhibit 2 ("RCE 2").

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Petitioner receives Medicaid services on a fee-for-service basis from the Agency. eQHealth is a Quality Improvement Organization contracted by the Agency to review prior authorization requests for services. See page 2 of RCE 2.

2. Petitioner is [REDACTED]. See page 16 of RCE 1. Petitioner is diagnosed with [REDACTED]. *Id.*

3. Petitioner requested continuation of BA services; specifically, 3,120 units of code 97153; 520 units of code 97155; and 208 units of code 97156. In a Notice of Outcome ("NOO"), dated July 25, 2023, Respondent terminated Petitioner's ABA services. *Id.* at 22. The NOO explained the basis for the termination as follows:

[T]he requested services are not medically necessary under the following standard(s):

Consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational.

The NOO further provided:

PR Clinical Rationale – Denial: This recipient has received services since [REDACTED]. According to The Florida Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy (9.5.c), one of the criteria for discharge from behavior analysis services is that data provided shows the recipient has made no progress toward any goals in the last 12 consecutive months. A review of treatment plans from the previous 12 months shows no progress. The current data show high variability with current frequencies higher than those of [REDACTED]; and higher than initial baseline levels. The information submitted does not support the continuation of BA services. This request for BA services is denied.

...

Pages 22 – 23 of RCE 1.

4. Petitioner requested reconsideration of the Respondent’s decision. In a Notice of Reconsideration Determination (“NRD”), dated August 21, 2023, Respondent upheld its decision.

Id. at 34 – 35. The NRD explained the basis for the decision as follows:

PR Recon Determination: At reconsideration all documents were carefully reviewed. According to the Florida Medicaid State Plan (Appendix 9.3.b), the data provided must show evidence that the frequency of the maladaptive behavior(s) has decreased since the last review and, if not, that there is a modification of the behavior plan. The recommendations for procedural modifications include: additions/changes to treatment plan to impact behaviors targeted for reduction. Procedural modifications should include one or more of the following: antecedent manipulation modifications, modifications of prompting procedures used in acquisition, modifications in consequence-based strategies- - ones that either reduce maladaptive behavior or reinforce replacement behavior (e.g., manipulation of reinforcement schedules, switch to a different decelerative procedure), or if lack of progress was due to therapist error (e.g., poor data collection or poor training on intervention methods), how the provider will address human error. The recommendations are insufficient to support continued care.

...

Pages 34 – 35 of RCE 1.

5. On August 18, 2023, Petitioner requested a Fair Hearing to challenge the termination of ABA services. *Id.* at 8. On September 13, 2023, the undersigned issued an Order Scheduling Fair Hearing by Telephone and Prehearing Instructions, setting the hearing for October 12, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. EST. *Id.*

6. Dr. Darling is a Board Certified Behavior Analyst at the doctoral level. Dr. Darling testified to the following at the Fair Hearing:

- a. Based on the treatment plan submitted for this authorization, the treatment plan was not consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards, as determined by the Medicaid program. The treatment plan was reviewed by two

(2)-Board Certified Behavior Analysts at the doctoral level and a Licensed Mental Health Counselor to ensure that the plan met standards of applied behavior analysis. While Petitioner does meet criteria and requires behavior analysis services, the treatment plan does not meet criteria to continue to provide services for Petitioner. Petitioner has participated in behavior analysis services with this agency for [REDACTED].

- b. Petitioner's maladaptive [REDACTED] behavior occurred [REDACTED] times per session during baseline at the end of [REDACTED]. See page 19 of PCE 1. Baseline is defined as prior to treatment. The average occurrence of this behavior, from [REDACTED] [REDACTED], is [REDACTED] times per session, which is an increase from the baseline occurrence reported in [REDACTED]. *Id.* at 20. There were no treatment modifications in this six (6)-month period to address the lack of progress, resulting in the denial of continued services.
- c. The maladaptive behavior of [REDACTED] occurred [REDACTED] times per session at baseline [REDACTED]. *Id.* at 22. The average occurrence, from [REDACTED] [REDACTED], is [REDACTED] times per session *Id.* at 23. This represents an increase in this behavior after [REDACTED] of therapy. The behavior of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] occurred [REDACTED] times per session at baseline. *Id.* at 25. The average occurrence, from [REDACTED] [REDACTED], is [REDACTED] per session. *Id.* at 26. Occurrence of this maladaptive behavior is higher than it was [REDACTED]. The maladaptive behavior of [REDACTED] occurred [REDACTED] times per session at baseline. *Id.* at 28. This behavior, from [REDACTED] [REDACTED], occurs [REDACTED]

times per session. *Id.* at 29. The maladaptive behavior of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] occurred [REDACTED] times per session at baseline. *Id.* at 31. This behavior, from [REDACTED] [REDACTED], occurs [REDACTED] times per session. *Id.* at 32. This is an insignificant decrease. There have been no changes in the frequency of the maladaptive behaviors, nor have there been procedural changes to help Petitioner reduce the maladaptive behaviors. This treatment plan is not demonstrating that it is rendering effective treatment, resulting in a denial of services. Dr. Darling stated there is a lack of progress and variability regarding the maladaptive behaviors.

- d. In questioning Ms. Mason, Dr. Darling asserted that the research in applied behavior analysis does not support waiting six (6)-months to see if an intervention is going to work. Dr. Darling stated the lack of intervention during the authorization period was part of the reason for the denial.
- e. Dr. Darling stated some replacement behaviors are increasing, while others are variable. Dr. Darling asserted that the graphs are messy, that it is difficult to determine where increases occur, and that there is no clear progress regarding the replacement behaviors. *Id.* at 40. Progress is defined as a clear downward trend for maladaptive behaviors and a clear upward trend for replacement goals. After [REDACTED] of therapy, it is unclear whether effective behavior analysis services are being implemented.

7. Ms. Mason is a Board Certified Behavior Analyst. Ms. Mason testified to the following at the Fair Hearing:

- a. Petitioner meets all criteria for medically necessary ABA services. Petitioner displays behaviors that put [REDACTED] and others at risk within all environments. Petitioner's behaviors include [REDACTED], [REDACTED] behavior, [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], which include [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED].
- b. The denial states that Petitioner has not made progress toward any goals, which Ms. Mason stated is not quantified. While there was an increase in the maladaptive behaviors of [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], the behavior plan was modified. For [REDACTED] behavior, the provider added [REDACTED]. For [REDACTED], the provider added [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] is now showing a downward trend. For the increase in [REDACTED], the provider added [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] to the behavior plan. The behavior of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] is decreasing, so that treatment will remain the same.
- c. Ms. Mason stated that Petitioner has made progress with [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. Ms. Mason also stated that [REDACTED] have improved within the [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED] have improved within the [REDACTED], and [REDACTED] has improved within the [REDACTED].

- d. In terms of skill acquisition goals, Petitioner has mastered [REDACTED] [REDACTED], which is a long-term goal. Petitioner has mastered other targets within several of [REDACTED] programs.
- e. In response to a question from Respondent regarding the change in procedure for [REDACTED] behavior, Ms. Mason stated that interventions were added in [REDACTED] and in [REDACTED]. Ms. Mason confirmed there were no new changes made during the six (6)-month authorization period. In response to Respondent's question regarding procedural changes during the authorization period for the behavior of [REDACTED], Ms. Mason responded that intervention was made in [REDACTED]. Ms. Mason confirmed that there were no changes made during the authorization period, from [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. Ms. Mason said the provider was giving Petitioner time to see if the behavior would decrease, which it did not.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 8. The Agency's Office of Fair Hearings has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceeding and the parties pursuant to section 409.285(2), Florida Statutes (2019). This order is the final administrative decision of AHCA under section 409.285(2)(a).
- 9. This hearing was held as a *de novo* proceeding pursuant to Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.100(17)(b).
- 10. Because Respondent terminated a previously approved service, Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.100(17)(g) assigns the burden of proof to the Respondent. The standard of proof in an administrative hearing is a preponderance of the evidence. The preponderance of the evidence

standard requires proof by “the greater weight of the evidence” (Black’s Law Dictionary at 1201, 7th Ed.)

11. The Florida Medicaid Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy (October 2017) (“BA Policy”), incorporated by reference in Fla. Admin. Code. R. 59G-4.125, governs BA services available under Florida Medicaid. The BA Policy provides as follows:

1.0 Introduction

Behavior analysis (BA) services are highly structured interventions, strategies, and approaches provided to decrease maladaptive behaviors and increase or reinforce appropriate behaviors.

...

1.4.5 Medically Necessary/Medical Necessity

As defined in Rule 59G-1.010, F.A.C.

...

4.0 Coverage Information

4.1 General Criteria

Florida Medicaid covers services that meet all of the following:

- Are determined medically necessary
- Do not duplicate another service
- Meet the criteria as specified in this policy

4.2 Specific Criteria

Florida Medicaid covers the following BA services in accordance with the applicable Florida Medicaid fee schedule(s), or as specified in this policy:

4.2.1 Behavior Assessment

One per fiscal year, per recipient, when completed within 30 days of the start of the assessment.

4.2.2 Behavior Analysis

Up to 40 hours per week, per recipient, consisting of services identified on the recipient’s behavior plan in order to reduce maladaptive behaviors and to restore the recipient to his or her best functional level. Services include:

- Implementing behavior analysis interventions, and monitoring and assessing the recipient’s progress towards goals in the behavior plan
- Behavior analysis interventions, for example, discrete trial teaching, task analysis training, differential reinforcement, non-contingent reinforcement, conducting task analyses of complex responses, and teaching using chaining, prompting, fading, shaping, response cost, and extinction
- Training the recipient’s family, caregiver(s), and other involved persons on the implementation of the behavior plan and intervention strategies (the recipient must be present when clinically appropriate)

...

4.3 Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment

As required by federal law, Florida Medicaid provides services to eligible recipients under the age of 21 years, if such services are medically necessary to correct or ameliorate a defect, a condition, or a physical or mental illness. Included are diagnostic services, treatment, equipment, supplies, and other measures described in sectioned 1905(a) of the Social Security Act, codified in Title 42 of the United States Code 1396d(a). As such, services for recipients under the age of 21 years exceeding the coverage described within this policy or the associated fee schedule may be approved, if medically necessary. For more information, please refer to Florida Medicaid's General Policies on authorization requirements.

12. Appendix 9.0 of the BA Policy provides Review Criteria for Behavior Analysis Services.

These Review Criteria state as follows:

Review Criteria for Behavior Analysis Services

Behavior analysis (BA) services are considered as either the treatment of choice or as an adjunct treatment modality for a variety of conditions and disorders where maladaptive behaviors are part of the recipient's clinical presentation, including behavioral manifestations of diagnoses such as Autism Spectrum Disorder and other behavioral health conditions.

Critical Elements Necessary for ANY Type of Behavior Analysis Service:

The following critical elements **MUST** be satisfied to qualify for BA services:

- a. Eligibility – The recipient must meet all criteria for BA services as outlined in the Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy, Rule 59G-4.125, F.A.C.
- b. Medical necessity – The recipient must meet medical necessity criteria as outlined in Rule 59G-1.010, F.A.C.
- c. The recipient currently engages in maladaptive behaviors
- d. These maladaptive behaviors interfere with the recipient's daily functioning

1. Criteria for Initial Behavior Analysis Assessment - BOTH of the following **MUST** be satisfied:

- a. **ALL** critical elements are met
- b. Provide submits a valid written physician's order as stipulated in the Behavior Analysis Services Coverage Policy, Rule 59G-4.125, F.A.C.

2. Criteria for Behavior Analysis Services and Reassessments – ALL of the following **MUST** be satisfied:

- a. **ALL** critical elements are met

- b. An assessment or, if applicable, a reassessment, authored by a lead analyst, is provided. An assessment of the maladaptive behavior(s) is a necessary element of the process of identifying the frequency and magnitude of the behaviors as well as the variables associated with the occurrence of the maladaptive behavior(s). This helps in defining what are the functional consequences of the problem behavior(s) so that an adequate behavior plan can be implemented. This (re)assessment **MUST** include, at a minimum, **ALL** of the following:
 - i. A clear operational description of the maladaptive behavior(s)
 - ...
- c. A behavior plan authored or updated by a lead analyst. The behavior plan is the cornerstone of the delivery of behavior analysis services and it is based on the information obtained in the assessment. It proposes specific interventions to reduce or eliminate the maladaptive behavior. These interventions take into consideration the variables, both present before the behavior, as well as after the behavior, that influence the occurrence of the maladaptive behavior(s). This plan also includes replacement appropriate behaviors for the recipient to engage in instead of the maladaptive behaviors in order to obtain the same function. The plan must be detailed enough to warrant the requested services and include mechanisms to monitor its effectiveness. This **MUST** include, at a minimum, **ALL** of the following:
 - i. Observable and measurable descriptions of the maladaptive behavior(s)
 - ii. Identified function of the maladaptive behavior(s) behavior as a result of the assessment or reassessment conducted
 - iii. Goals and strategies for changing the maladaptive behavior(s)
 - iv. Written detailed description of when, where, and how often these goals will be addressed and proposed strategies will be implemented
 - v. System for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the plan
 - vi. Safety and crisis plan, if applicable
 - vii. Summary and recommendations
 - viii. Discharge criteria
 - ix. Transition plan (if applicable)

NOTE: Although the assessment and behavior plan were addressed separately in section 2, both of them can be submitted as a single document.

3. Criteria for Continuation of Treatment at the Present Level and/or Using Current Methods: Providers must ensure that ALL of the following criteria are met to request continuation of treatments at the present level or using the current methods. If criteria for 3a is met, but criteria for 3b and/or 3c are not met, then a

reduction of the treatment level and/or change of treatment methods may be warranted.

- a. ALL criteria listed in 2a, 2b, and 2c regarding critical elements, assessment or reassessment, and behavior plan, are met.
- b. The data provided must show evidence that the frequency of the maladaptive behavior(s) has decreased since the last review and, if not, that there is a modification of the behavior plan.
- c. The level of functional impairment justifies continuation of BA services. The reviewer utilizes the information provided below as a guide as it relates to the level of functional impairment as expressed through the following behaviors:
 - i. Safety – aggression, self-injury, property destruction, elopement
 - ii. Communication – problems with expressive/receptive language, poor understanding or use of non-verbal communications, stereotyped, repetitive language
 - iii. Self-stimulating, abnormal, inflexible, or intense preoccupations
 - iv. Self-care – difficulty recognizing risks or danger, grooming, eating, or toileting
 - v. Other – behaviors not identified above

13. States must provide Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment (“EPSDT”) services to Medicaid-eligible children under age 21 when requested under the Medicaid state plan. See 42 U.S.C. § 1396a(a)(43); 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(a)(4). According to 42 U.S.C. § 1396d(r)(5), EPSDT services mean, in relevant part, the following items and services:

Such other necessary health care, diagnostic services, treatment, and other measures described in subsection (a) of this section to correct or ameliorate defects and physical and mental illness and conditions discovered by the screen services, whether or not such services are covered under the state plan.

14. Petitioner is under age 21, and therefore EPSDT applies to [redacted] request for services. However, a state may place medical necessity limitations on EPSDT services. See 42 C.F.R. §§ 440.230(a), (b), (d). Fla. Stat. § 409.905(2) limits EPSDT services with a medical necessity standard:

The [Agency] shall pay for early and periodic screening and diagnosis of a recipient under age 21 to ascertain physical and mental problems and conditions and all services determined by the agency to be medically necessary for the treatment,

correction, or amelioration of these problems and conditions, including personal care, private duty nursing, durable medical equipment, physical therapy, occupational therapy, speech therapy, respiratory therapy, and immunizations.

15. The Definitions Policy, incorporated by reference in Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.010, defines “Medically Necessary” or “Medical Necessity” as follows:

The medical or allied care, goods, or services furnished or ordered must meet the following conditions:

- Be necessary to protect life, to prevent significant illness or significant disability, or to alleviate pain
- Be individualized, specific, and consistent with symptoms or confirmed diagnosis of the illness or injury under treatment, and not in excess of the patient’s needs
- Be consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational
- Be reflective of the level of service that can be safely furnished, and for which no equally effective and more conservative or less costly treatment is available statewide
- Be furnished in a manner not primarily intended for the convenience of the recipient, the recipient’s caretaker, or the provider

The fact that a provider has prescribed, recommended, or approved medical or allied care, goods, or services does not, in itself, make such care, goods or services medically necessary or a medical necessity or a covered service.

16. The Florida Medicaid Authorization Requirements Policy (“Authorization Policy”), incorporated by reference in Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.053, provides as follows:

3.2.1 Continued Authorization Requests

The QIO shall not deny or reduce the amount, frequency, or duration of a service that is already being provided, unless:

- The reduction is to correct for factual error or omissions in prior certifications.
- There is a documented improvement in the recipient’s medical condition.
- There is a documented change in the recipient’s circumstances.
- The reviewing physician determines the recipient will not gain any additional benefit by continuing services at the current level.

17. In the instant case, Respondent terminated Petitioner's ABA services. See ¶ 3. In the NOO dated July 25, 2023, Respondent explained that continuing services at the prior level was not medically necessary, specifically, that it did not meet the requirement that services must be "consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational." *Id.* Respondent further explained that "a review of treatment plans from the previous 12 months shows no progress. The current data show high variability with current frequencies higher than those of [REDACTED]; and higher than initial baseline levels." *Id.*

18. As provided by the EPSDT requirements, the recipient must meet the medical necessity criteria as outlined in Fla. Admin. Code R. 59G-1.010. As provided in section 2.83 of the Definitions Policy, a component of medical necessity is that services must be "consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards as determined by the Medicaid program, and not experimental or investigational." As shown by the record, Petitioner has made no progress towards decreasing [REDACTED] maladaptive behaviors. See ¶ 6. Dr. Darling asserted that the definition of progress in ABA refers to a clear downward trend for maladaptive behaviors and a clear upward trend for replacement behaviors. *Id.* In the instant case, the majority of Petitioner's maladaptive behaviors exhibit variable data and have increased from the baseline level of occurrence. *Id.* There is no intervention throughout the authorization period to improve Petitioner's behavior. *Id.* Ms. Mason confirmed that no interventions were implemented throughout the authorization period, as well as that the interventions implemented prior to the authorization period did not result in a decrease of the maladaptive behavior. See ¶ 7. Dr. Darling also stated that there is no clear progress for Petitioner's replacement behaviors. See ¶ 6. As

Petitioner has not made substantial improvements, and as no intervention was made throughout the authorization, the record shows that Petitioner will not gain any additional benefit by continuing services at the current level. In all, Respondent demonstrated that the services rendered were not consistent with generally accepted professional medical standards” within the field of ABA.

19. As QIO for the Agency, eQHealth is authorized to terminate services when “the reviewing physician determines the recipient will not gain any additional benefit by continuing services at the current level.” See ¶ 16. As discussed, *supra* ¶ 18, Petitioner has not made progress in reducing ■■■ maladaptive behaviors, nor in improving ■■■ replacement behaviors. Here, Petitioner’s lack of improvement is well documented.

20. Upon consideration of the testimony provided, evidence submitted, and applicable polices, the undersigned concludes that Respondent proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the termination of ABA services was necessary. Looking at all the evidence relevant to the particular needs of Petitioner, Respondent has demonstrated that the previously authorized services, based on the treatment plan at issue in this case, are not necessary to correct or ameliorate a defect or a physical and mental illness or condition. Accordingly, Respondent proved by a preponderance of the evidence that Respondent’s termination of ABA services was correct.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AND ADJUDGED THAT:

Respondent’s termination of ABA services is **AFFIRMED**. Petitioner’s appeal based on Respondent’s termination is **DENIED**.

DONE and **ORDERED** this 16th day of November, 2023, in Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida.



Joseph Mabry

23-FH2041

2023.11.16

08:22:44 -05'00'

JOSEPH MABRY, Hearing Officer
Agency for Health Care Administration
Office of Fair Hearings
2727 Mahan Drive, Mail Stop # 11
Tallahassee, FL 32308-5407

NOTICE OF A RIGHT TO JUDICIAL REVIEW

A PARTY WHO IS ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THIS FINAL ORDER IS ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW, WHICH SHALL BE INSTITUTED BY FILING THE ORIGINAL NOTICE OF APPEAL WITH THE AGENCY CLERK OF AHCA, AND A COPY, ALONG WITH THE FILING FEE PRESCRIBED BY LAW, WITH THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL IN THE APPELLATE DISTRICT WHERE THE AGENCY MAINTAINS ITS HEADQUARTERS OR WHERE A PARTY RESIDES. REVIEW PROCEEDINGS SHALL BE CONDUCTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE FLORIDA APPELLATE RULES. THE NOTICE OF APPEAL MUST BE FILED WITHIN 30 DAYS OF THE RENDITION OF THE ORDER TO BE REVIEWED.

Copies Furnished To:



AHCA Medicaid Hearing Unit
MedicaidHearingUnit@ahca.myflorida.com