this is the unit. I mean, I don't understand why we're here at 1 the eleventh and a half hour trying to figure out the math. I 2 3 mean. to me --I know you didn't charge it, Ms. Weckerly. 4 I know you didn't charge the case, Mr. Staudaher. 5 I believe that was done by Mr. Mitchell. Is that --6 7 MR. STAUDAHER: Actually, I was the one who was primarily involved in charging the case. 8 THE COURT: Okay. So you are to blame. 9 I'm just --10 MR. STAUDAHER: I just have to, you know, be honest. 11 THE COURT: I appreciate the honesty. You should've 12 just thrown David Roger under the bus since he doesn't work 13 14 there anymore. But in all seriousness, I mean, I don't understand 15 why these calculations weren't done early on, why we're sitting 16 here now trying to figure it out. I'm not sure --17 I mean, you can cross-examine her with what she has, 18 and see what she's got to say, and then maybe I'll strike all 19 20 of her testimony. MR. SANTACROCE: I don't want to do that. 21 THE COURT: I mean, I don't know what she even knows. 22 MR. SANTACROCE: I'm not going down that road. 23 24 RICHARD WRIGHT: I don't think she knows anything.

25

MS. STANISH: Right. All she's been able to do is

read from the documents.

THE COURT: The lawyers may be wrong. I mean -
MS. WECKERLY: I think that's more likely. They're

not the regular lawyers on this case. They talked to a

paralegal. I don't think that's correct. I think the

witness --

THE COURT: Well, let's just bring her in for a minute to see what's really going on.

Kenny, go get her.

MS. STANISH: And, Your Honor, if I may while they're getting her. My issue is exactly what Your Honor was broaching a moment ago that none of this was raised in the Grand Jury, the conversion factor, anything like that. As Your Honor noted, why wasn't this done in pretrial?

Because it was never on the radar screen of the State. It was not on their radar screen during the Grand Jury. It was not on their radar screen when they started trial however long ago, and it only came on their radar screen when we raised the issue, and now they're scrambling to investigate the case. I think it should be stricken.

THE COURT: The witness is back.

Ma'am, just come on back here, and we are out of the presence of the jury, but you are still under oath. Do you understand that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

THE COURT: Okay. We're all a little confused here after having some representations made by your lawyers or the lawyers of the company. As you know, when we took a break, we were going to look into getting --

I get confused on all these -- on all of these initials, the CMS Codes or the CPT or what from the government.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

2.3

THE COURT: What are the initials again?

THE WITNESS: The website is the CMS website. It's the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.

THE COURT: Okay. The CMS website, and then you were also, I believe, going to check into your rate schedule from your company; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And then we took a break, and can you tell me what you yourself did to further our goals of obtaining this information for the defense who requested it?

THE WITNESS: Okay. I first looked at the CMS website, and yes, I could find the codes in the website, the CPT codes. Then I went through and I started contacting our people at network management to pull the fee schedule for me. I left three phone messages initially.

I received one phone call back who said that she was not in the office right now but could have it to me by 5 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Then I received -- so then we made a phone call then 1 to the United Healthcare legal secretaries and --2 THE COURT: Now, whose idea was that? 3 THE WITNESS: That was -- I don't know who --4 THE COURT: Did you do it? 5 THE WITNESS: -- initiated it, but it was not me. 6 THE COURT: Okay. Did you make the phone call, or 7 did the lawyers make the phone call? 8 THE WITNESS: The lawyers made the phone call to the 9 corporate legal office. 10 11 THE COURT: Okay. THE WITNESS: I made the phone calls to network 12 13 management. THE COURT: Okay. And then network management 14 because of the time difference and everything nobody was there? 15 THE WITNESS: Well, they're actually here in Nevada. 16 THE COURT: Oh, they're here. Okay. 17 THE WITNESS: Right. So one just happened to not be 18 in the office and couldn't pull the document. 19 THE COURT: Okay. 20 THE WITNESS: Then one was in a meeting, and one was 21 not answering her phone. It went straight to voicemail. 22 THE COURT: Okay. 23 THE WITNESS: So then after the attorneys contacted 24 UHC corporate legal secretary they began to work with network 25

management, reached out to them, and they started working together. I was told they were taking care of it, and they would get back to me after they found it.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, you rely on these codes and everything to do fraud investigations, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

2.3

THE COURT: Okay. And that's something you do in your job?

THE WITNESS: Yep.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, do you have personal knowledge as you sit here as to whether the anesthesia is billed separately according to the time spent and the type of procedure that's done?

THE WITNESS: I do not know off the top of my head. I would have to look that up and research it.

THE COURT: Okay. And those are the fee schedules you are trying to get?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. And those are -- you were told that that would be available at 5 a.m. tomorrow morning?

THE WITNESS: Correct. And then our -- United Healthcare's counsel received a call about the documents and the fee schedule. They left the room, spoke with you guys, came back out. I do not have any knowledge of what that phone call entailed or what that conversation entailed.

THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone have any questions for this witness on the topic that I've, you know, relating to getting the fee schedule and what happened when we took the break and all that stuff?

EXAMINATION

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

BY MS. STANISH:

Q Now, assuming we get a fee schedule from 2007, do you have the -- are you qualified, do you have first-hand knowledge to explain to the jury how the fee schedule, the formula for anesthesia and the contracts how they all work together to establish what the price tag is for anesthesia services?

A No, I do not have first-hand knowledge. All I can do is read the fee schedule as it's written on the piece of paper, but I don't first-hand work with applying those fees and reimbursements.

- Q Okay. Were you in -- prior to Grand Jury, were these issues discussed with you?
- A For this case?
- 20 Q Yes.

- A No.
- Q Prior to trial, you know, a month ago when you were --
- Were you interviewed pretrial, chatted with the District Attorney to prepare your testimony today?

Q Okay. Was there any discussion of what we are now discussing with the rate schedule, et cetera?

A With the details, we did briefly discuss it, and I said, With my department, the way we would figure out the cost per unit would be to take --

Say that claim had 8 units, the 5 base units plus the 3 and divide it by the allowed amount, and then that would be amount paid per unit.

Q But you don't know the allowed amount?

A Well, the allowed amount was \$312, and I believe 40 cents. Okay. So we — in my area, we would just divide 8 into that 3, 12, and that would be the cost per unit, but that's not necessarily how the rate schedules, the fee schedules read. They could read a bigger base value and a smaller amount for each additional.

Q Right.

A So just because we looked at it that way just for calculating a possible loss amount doesn't mean that that's the way the fee schedule reads.

Q Okay. Was that explained to the District Attorney's Office that you couldn't do that?

A I explained that it was my department's area, that we did it this way.

MS. STANISH: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Santacroce, do you have any questions 1 2 regarding this? MR. SANTACROCE: No, Your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Staudaher, do you have any questions 4 regarding the issue of the documents? 5 MR. STAUDAHER: The fee schedule, no. 6 THE COURT: All right. Ma'am, thank you. I'm going 7 to go ask you and your counsel, Ms. Akridge to wait out in the 8 hallway, and then we'll give you further direction. 9 (Witness excused.) 10 THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. 11 MS. STANISH: I move to strike her testimony. 12 MR. SANTACROCE: Yes. I join. 13 THE COURT: State? 14 MR. STAUDAHER: Well, with regard to the issue of the 15 calculation, I mean, I don't have an issue with that. I mean, 16 obviously what she told us is what we relied upon. At this --17 THE COURT: Well, and it still may be correct. 18 problem is we're here at the eleventh hour hearing two 19 different things, and we don't know what's true. 20 MR. STAUDAHER: Well, she did not say at any time 21 that there was any global fee that was represented by the 22 attorneys that they -- that all of that was --2.3 THE COURT: Yes. I think they are probably wrong, 24

but what do I know. I'm not a witness.

25

MR. STAUDAHER: So based on that I don't think that it's different than what she testified to at the Grand Jury regarding the documents. As far as they're concerned that these are — well, the anesthesia policy, the contract between the clinic and so forth, the actual EOB Forms that were submitted, that with those are part of the record that they have, what was the actual HCFA Form that was submitted in electronic form, what those delineations of the different boxes are.

2.2

2.3

All of that is not changed at all by the fact that she may or may not know, be accurate on what she believes the actual unit value is. That's the part that we are having an issue with. So I don't think that there's really a reason to strike her testimony since she hasn't actually testified before the jury as to -- well, let me finish -- that she hasn't testified before the jury as to the unit value because that's where we stopped her.

THE COURT: Well, she did testify as to the method of calculation which is I think different from what the lawyers are telling us.

MR. SANTACROCE: It's different from what she said. Her department does it different, and then her department -- that her department does it for a loss purpose.

THE COURT: There's two ways we can -- well, there's three ways we can do it. The Court can dismiss the entire

counts relating to this insurer.

2.2

The State can keep her here, and we can figure out what's right and what's wrong, and she can be called for cross tomorrow morning.

The Court can strike all or part of her testimony, and the State can get the correct witness here since you've apparently noticed -- luckily for the State -- the State's noticed the correct witness. So there's not a notice issue. You can get the correct witness here with the right documents who can show those to the defense ahead of time.

That's what I see our three options as being. So if she leaves today, we're striking her testimony because I'm not making the cross — the defense try to cross—examine her based on incomplete information which is what they now have. So, you know, to say well, we can strike part of it, and then to expect the defense to cross—examine her without full knowledge I think is fundamentally unfair, and I'm not going to make them do it.

So the choice for the State is you keep her here. We get to the bottom of this, and she testifies, and we either strike part of her testimony if she's off in left field somewhere, or if she leaves, we strike all of her testimony and get another witness here, and you start from ground zero on that witness.

MR. STAUDAHER: Well, I think we would like to -THE COURT: Keep her here?

MR. STAUDAHER: -- we're going to work on both fronts --

THE COURT: Okay. So we keep her here. If it turns out that somehow the lawyers have --

I don't know what arrangement you have since they sent her away, I mean, the first time. It was my feeling that she should come back at the company's expense. I don't know what you worked out. Certainly if there was an issue now with what the lawyers have done and gotten in the middle of this they — not the taxpayers which includes all of us — should be footing the bill for her, you know, having to stay here. If it turns out that's not the case, then it's up to whatever your office does.

So is that what the State would like to do, keep her here another day, get to the bottom of this, get the documents at 5 a.m. or whatever -- obviously we won't be reconvening at 5 a.m. -- and see what they are?

And then depending on what all we get, the three options remain open for the defense like I said. If we don't get the right witness here ever, to me the remedy is dismissal of those counts relating to this provider -- or insurer.

Excuse me. I misspoke.

But as I said, I think it would be completely unfair to ask the defense to proceed with cross-examination when we don't even know -- we're getting two stories, one from the

witness and one from the lawyers.

It may just be that the lawyers -- it may just be the lawyers don't know what's really going on in their company.

That happens a lot I'm afraid. If that's the case, then there may not really be a big issue here, but there may be an issue here in which case depending on how it all plays out we'll see where we go.

MS. STANISH: Medical billing is complicated. You can't just have a custodian of record.

THE COURT: So going forward, State, those are, in my view, our options. What would you like to do?

MR. STAUDAHER: Just what I said. We're going to proceed on both fronts, keep her here, try to get to the bottom of it. On the same front we're going to try and -- we're going to go ahead and see if there is, I mean, obviously get somebody else here in case that falls apart so that we have at least another person to go forward with.

THE COURT: It sounds like they've got the right people just located right here in town at this office that she tried to call today. So it may just be that they're flying somebody in from Minnesota when the right person is just down the street -- I don't know -- or around the corner or whatever.

So here's what we're going to do. I'm going to excuse the jury because we don't have the tape cued up for the Meana thing. We'll bring them in for part of the day tomorrow.

1 If any of the people you moved to Thursday since they 2 have to come in anyway want to come in tomorrow, let's try to 3 get them back for tomorrow. 4 Well, it is what it is. 5 MS. WECKERLY: I'll see if I can get them tonight. 6 THE COURT: This is unforeseen, and then we'll play 7 the Meana deposition and hopefully get some other witnesses here for tomorrow. 8 9 MR. SANTACROCE: They're making fun of me because of the Meana deposition. 10 You're supposed to be my BFF. You are supposed to 11 12 help me. 13 RICHARD WRIGHT: Do you want to hear 14 (unintelligible). 15 THE COURT: And you're stipulating to that, 16 Mr. Santacroce? 17 MR. SANTACROCE: With the BFF part? 18 THE COURT: No, the --19 MR. SANTACROCE: Yeah, I'll stipulate to that. 20 THE COURT: All right. Bring the jury in, Kenny. 21 Ms. Weckerly, try really hard to get those other witnesses here -- back here for tomorrow. 22 23 MS. WECKERLY: It may be Whiteley instead. THE COURT: That's fine. Here's what I don't want to 24

have happen, have a really short day tomorrow and then it be

25

Friday or Thursday at 6, and we've got a ton of witnesses; do you know what I mean? And we don't get that far on Thursday, and then we're going into over next week for your case. I really want the State to rest by Friday.

(Jury entering 5:05 p.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to have to take our evening recess at this point in time. Unfortunately, Kenny lied to you and we will have to be in session tomorrow; however, it should be a relatively early day. Again, we hope and are fairly confident that we will conclude the trial by the end of the month, meaning the month of June, not another month.

Before I excuse you for the evening recess, I must remind you that you're not to discuss the case or anything relating to the case with each other or with anyone else. You are not to read, watch, listen to any reports of or commentaries on the case, any person or subject matter relating to the case. You are not to do any independent research by way of the Internet or any other medium, and you are not to form or express an opinion on the trial.

We will be reconvening tomorrow morning at 10:30 a.m. If you would please place your notepads in your chairs and follow the bailiff through the rear door.

(Jury recessed 5:06 p.m.)

MS. STANISH: Judge, did you say 10:30?

on Friday where the State has not rested. So do what you can to move some of these witnesses up, you know, back to Thursday or if it's Detective Whiteley or whatever because we have the time now in the middle of the week, and what I don't want to have happen is save everything until Friday, and then we're here Friday at 6, and the State's not prepared to rest, and then we're going still with the State's case into next week.

2.0

Because I'm planning -- and hopefully what defense is planning -- on beginning defense's case in chief on Monday so that we can be doing closings in the middle of the week and get it to the jury by no later than Friday, no later than hopefully Thursday. So then that gives them Friday at least to deliberate. If they're into the following with the deliberations, I'm not worried about that.

I just want the trial portion to be done by the end of June. So just be mindful of that. Like I said, the way things are going I can see us having an easy pace tomorrow and Thursday and then it being Friday at 6 o'clock, and we are not, you know, close to the State resting yet.

MR. STAUDAHER: Do we have confidence that we're going to have this audiovisual thing worked out for tomorrow?

THE COURT RECORDER: Yes.

MR. STAUDAHER: Because we can certainly do Meana's deposition tomorrow.

THE COURT: I was going to say we could do Meana's deposition first thing at 10:30 and make everybody -- I mean, I frankly don't care if the other people from today have to wait -- and then do them or whatever.

MR. STAUDAHER: Well, let's see what we can get.

THE COURT: That would be one way to ensure that we are cued up.

So I'll let the State -- they're your witnesses -- I'll let you coordinate all of that. I'm just offering suggestions here.

(Proceedings recessed 5:10 p.m.)

CERTIFICATION

I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE AUDIO-VISUAL RECORDING OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER.

AFFIRMATION

I AFFIRM THAT THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT CONTAIN THE SOCIAL SECURITY OR TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER OF ANY PERSON OR ENTITY.

KARR REPORTING, INC. Aurora, Colorado

KIMBERLY LAWSON

KARR Reporting, Inc.

today?

A Yes.

Q And what is this document exactly? What does it entail?

A This is what a facility would've signed if they wanted to be participating in our network, and it would've then -- our members would then -- they would be listed in our directory, and our members would go to this facility and be reimbursed as in-network.

Q Now, on the very back of that document there's a whole list of numbers. What are all those numbers?

A The facilities themselves are being paid based on groupers. There's nine groupers, and each CPT code is based on a procedure, and that tells them what kind of grouper it is.

Q What is a grouper?

A Medicare assigns nine different groupers, and then there is reimbursement for each grouper. The groupers that the -- the more intense a code is, the higher the reimbursement is, and the least amount that it is then the lower the amount is.

So Medicare assigns these numbers, and then we just negotiate what each payment is.

Q So if there's -- in this particular claim you're looking specifically at, it looks like a page that has -- that's entitled Anthem BlueCross BlueShield Participating

first of all if it's familiar to you and what it is?

25

reimbursement. We actually lowered it in 2006 to a 24 percent

25

discount off of our maximum allowable.

Q So explain that to me. What are we talking about with maximum allowable and a discount off of that?

A Yeah. Our maximum allowable is \$50.40, and then we negotiated a discount, and then each unit of CPT code has units that CMS gives.

So a 00810 which is a colonoscopy is a base of 5 units. So we would take those 5 units times the \$50.40. You would either times it that way and then take a 24 percent discount or people like me, we do it the opposite way. We take the 50, 40. We times it by the 76 percent. We come out with 38, 30. That becomes a conversion factor. Then each CPT code has units. Anesthesia has been time. So we add the time, and then that becomes the allowed amount.

Q So if I understand you correctly, you take whatever the total units are, the 5 base units and then the amount of units added on for time --

A Yes.

Q -- and whatever that number of units is, that's what you multiply your --

A Times the conversion factor. In this case 38, 30.

Q So \$38.30 is the conversion factor under this contract for anesthesia billing?

A Or anybody that bills under this tax ID number including anesthesia.

THE COURT: All right. 236, 237, and 238, I think,

1 are all admitted. 2 3 BY MR. STAUDAHER: 4 5 that? Yes. 6 7 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

(State's Exhibit Nos. 236, 237 and 238 admitted.)

- Now, the next document is 218. Are you familiar with
 - What is that document?
- That is our reimbursement policy for anesthesia.
- Okay. So specifically your -- your company meaning Anthem BlueCross BlueShield?
 - Anthem BlueCross and BlueShield, yes.
- Okay. So in this particular document, I mean, obviously is this something you're familiar with? Have you seen this before?
- Yes. Yes.
- And does this delineate what you described earlier as far as base units time, how that's calculated?
 - Yes. This is where we tell the provider itself how to bill. We tell them that the -- they have to bill a number of minutes, not the units. For every 15 minutes it equals 1 unit. So if they bill -- they have to bill 15 minutes, and it's in increments of 15 minutes. So if they bill 30, they would get 2 units, but they have to bill 30 not 2.
 - Okay. Got it. So again is it a fair and accurate representation of your policy, your anesthesia policy?

| 1 | А | Yes. | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | Q | Reimbursement policy? | |
| 3 | A | Yes. | |
| 4 | | MR. STAUDAHER: Move for admission of State's 218. | |
| 5 | | THE COURT: Any objection? | |
| 6 | | MR. SANTACROCE: No. | |
| 7 | | MS. STANISH: No objection. | |
| 8 | | THE COURT: 218 is admitted. | |
| 9 | | (State's Exhibit No. 218 admitted.) | |
| 10 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: | | |
| 11 | Q | Now, I'm going to show you a series of three | |
| 12 | documents | s that are specific to I think members or whoever your | |
| 13 | insured is, okay? | | |
| 14 | A | Yes. | |
| 15 | Q | The first is 80P. Can you flip through that, and | |
| 16 | tell me if you recognize those documents or that series of | | |
| 17 | dccuments? | | |
| 18 | А | Yes. | |
| 19 | Q | Okay. Now, what is that, and who does it pertain to? | |
| 20 | A | The first page is a HCFA 1500 which is billed by an | |
| 21 | anesthesiologist that provided a service at Endoscopy Center o | | |
| 22 | Nevada for one of our members. | | |
| 23 | Q | And who's the member? | |
| 24 | А | The member is Kenneth Rubino [phonetic]. | |

And again the next series of documents, what are we

looking at there?

A The next page is a breakdown of the information, the dates of service, the diagnosis, the procedure itself, the procedure numbers. They had a facility. They actually had the physician and the anesthesia.

Q Okay. And so those are broken down in a sort of table form?

A Yes.

Q Now, the last page, what is that?

A And the last page is the actual explanation of benefits. That explains the, again, dates of service, the procedure for the anesthesia, the charges, the allowed amount, the, you know, if there was any other insurance, the primary provider's liability which is the discount and the member's responsibility, the payment itself and what we actually paid.

Q So this actually shows you paid money on this claim?

A Yes.

MR. STAUDAHER: Okay. Move for admission of State's 80P.

MS. STANISH: No --

THE COURT: Is that 8 -- 80.

MR. STAUDAHER: Eight, zero, P as in Paul.

THE COURT: Any objection?

MS. STANISH: No, Your Honor.

MR. SANTACROCE: No.

| 1 | THE COURT: All right. 80P is admitted. | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | (State's Exhibit No. 80P admitted.) | | |
| 3 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: | | |
| 4 | Q Now, the next one is titled 80R as in Robert. Can | | |
| 5 | you look at that one and do the same thing that we just did | | |
| 6 | previously. Are you familiar with it first of all? | | |
| 7 | A Yes. | | |
| 8 | Q Does it contain the same type of documentation as the | | |
| 9 | first one did, the table and then a what did you call it? | | |
| 10 | A Yes. It's a HCFA 1500 which is the claim, the | | |
| 11 | explanation that's broken down on a table and then the | | |
| 12 | explanation of payment or benefits. | | |
| 13 | Q Okay. And again, who is this for? | | |
| 14 | A This is for Sharrieff Ziyad. | | |
| 15 | MR. STAUDAHER: At this time, Your Honor, I move for | | |
| 16 | admission of State's Proposed 80R. | | |
| 17 | THE COURT: Any objection to 80R? | | |
| 18 | MS. STANISH: No, Your Honor. | | |
| 19 | THE COURT: All right. 80R is admitted. | | |
| 20 | (State's Exhibit No. 80R admitted.) | | |
| 21 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: | | |
| 22 | Q Now, the last one of these of this series of | | |
| 23 | documents that I want to show you is 216B as in boy. Can you | | |
| 24 | go through that and tell us what if you're familiar with it | | |
| 25 | and what it is. | | |

(State's Exhibit No. 216B admitted.)

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

2.4

Q Now, a couple of things, I'm just going to go through these as we get them. On the contracts, I just want to go to the third one which is 238. I'm going to display this for you and ask you about the percentage that you were talking about.

You mentioned that there was a 24 percent -- what was it, discount?

- A Discount, uh-huh.
- Q Can you explain what that means. What is a 24 percent discount in relation to a provider?

A When we negotiate with a provider, we have the maximum benefit allowance. Our maximum benefit allowance conversion factor is actually \$50.40. So we negotiate a discount. That discount of 24 percent, you could either take the 50, 40 then do times 24 percent to know what that discount is, or you could do the opposite and just do the 76 percent off. The 50, 40 then becomes 38, 30.

- Q That's the per unit reimbursement?
- A That's a conversion factor per unit, yes.
- Q So if we move to the anesthesia policy which was 218, is this the document that we talked about a moment ago?
 - A Yes.
- Q And I specifically want to go to the second page of that document and ask you -- I'm going to zoom out on that so

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Q

Α

0

Yes.

KARR REPORTING, INC.

Is that what you follow in your policy?

And what is the base unit value, only if you know,

KARR REPORTING, INC.

24

25

supervision.

Anesthesia time units are defined as 1 unit of

2.4

25

with the patient?

That is correct.

Α

А

That is correct.

Is this the general layout of all of these forms? 1 Q 2 Yes. Α So under 24A, what is this here? 3 That is the date of service. 4 When the procedure was actually completed? 5 6 Correct. 7 And moving across we go to 24 under Box B, what is 8 that? 9 That tells us where the services were done, and the 24 is a surgical center. 10 Okay. And then if we move across to, I think it's 11 0 24D as in dog, what are we looking at there? 12 That's the anesthesia procedure codes. 13 Now, the next one is, it looks like a QZ and then Q 14 15 or -- I don't know if that's QS or P2. Do you see those are 16 all together? Right. Those are modifiers. 17 А And what are those exactly? 18 19 Modifiers tells us whether a member needed some additional -- what kind of risk that they were having, if they 20 needed some additional -- anything that had like a P4 would get 21 an additional reimbursement, where a P1 and a P2 are just 22 23 normal. And this one is listed as P2; is that correct? 2.4

25

Uh-huh.

Α

And that would be reimbursed at this \$38.30 per unit?

| 1 | А | Correct. Plus the base. | |
|----|---------------------------------|---|--|
| 2 | Q | Plus the base. But the time additional would be | |
| 3 | based on | | |
| 4 | | Well, all the units are the same as far as | |
| 5 | reimbursement? | | |
| 6 | А | The base is the same plus the units. | |
| 7 | Q | Got it. Now, on the very bottom here under I | |
| 8 | think it's 32, do you see that? | | |
| 9 | А | Yes. | |
| 10 | Q | It says service facility location information, and | |
| 11 | what is t | hat? | |
| 12 | А | That is the place of service where the member had the | |
| 13 | endoscopy | or colonoscopy. | |
| 14 | Q | And the service provider? | |
| 15 | А | That is the physician's name. | |
| 16 | Q | Okay. And who is it in this particular case? | |
| 17 | А | Keith Mathahs. | |
| 18 | Q | Mathahs I believe? | |
| 19 | А | Yes, Mathahs. | |
| 20 | Q | Now going to the next page of this document, what are | |
| 21 | we lookin | g at here? | |
| 22 | А | That's a spreadsheet that was done to tell what | |
| 23 | services | were done on that date for that member. | |
| 24 | Q | Is that the 9/21 date? | |
| 25 | A | Yes. | |
| | | | |

- Q And did that amount actually get paid?
- A Yes. It should be on the next page that has the explanation of payment.
- Q That would be actually the second page after that; is that correct?
 - A Yes.

2.4

- Q And we're looking again at -- it looks like your record; is that correct?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Tell us what we're looking at here.
- A Again that's an explanation of payment. It tells you the patient's name, the date that it was sent, who the provider is, where it was sent to and the member's information, the date of service.

And then down below it has the table that has the dates of service, the procedure which was the anesthesia procedure code, the bill charges to match that claim, the allowed amount which is where, you know, we came up with the base times the time, times the conversion factor to come up with that amount, and then it has that this member does not have other insurance according to our records.

They have the provider liability. It's a discount of that 24 percent that we were talking about and then the subscriber which is the member's liability and our payment.

Q So the payment is different than this allowed amount

KARR REPORTING, INC.

The date of service in this case?

| 1 | А | 7/25/07. |
|----|-----------|---|
| 2 | Q | And if we come across here? |
| 3 | А | The place of service was 24 which was at a surgical |
| 4 | center. | |
| 5 | Q | Now, this one has a different code? |
| 6 | А | Yes. |
| 7 | Q | It says 00740? |
| 8 | А | Yes. 740 is for a gastro GI where the other one was |
| 9 | for a col | onoscopy. |
| 10 | Q | So when you say gastro, is that the upper side of |
| 11 | things? | |
| 12 | А | The upper, uh-huh. |
| 13 | Q | And then the next thing, the same issues here with |
| 14 | the codin | g here, we see that there's also the designation P2? |
| 15 | A | Right. |
| 16 | Q | So no additional time or anything would've been |
| 17 | allowed? | |
| 18 | А | Correct. |
| 19 | Q | Now, if we get across to this section, this is what I |
| 20 | want to a | ask you about. We've got a charge here which is the |
| 21 | same char | ge 5, 60 \$560 |
| 22 | А | Uh-huh. |
| 23 | Q | As the one that we saw before |
| 24 | А | Right. |
| 25 | Q | from the other record, and in that instance it had |

that are supposed to be minutes in G is what we reimburse based

| 7 | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 1 | on. | |
| 2 | Q | So this would've been reimbursed at 6 units then |
| 3 | total; is | that right? |
| 4 | А | Correct. |
| 5 | Q | And again the location is the same? |
| 6 | A | Yes. |
| 7 | Q | And the provider is different in this one? |
| 8 | А | Yes. Ron Lakeman. |
| 9 | Q | Now, if we go to the next page of this document, that |
| 10 | table that | t you had designated before, is it the same layout? |
| 11 | A | Yes. |
| 12 | Q | If we move across for that same date $7/25/07$, the |
| 13 | part that | says anesthesia, do you see that? |
| 14 | A | Right. It says on there that anesthesia is \$560, and |
| 15 | we paid 2 | , 0, 6, 82. |
| 16 | Q | Okay. So that's the amount of money that came out of |
| 17 | your pock | et? |
| 18 | A | Correct. |
| 19 | Q | You being the insurance company? |
| 20 | A | Correct. |
| 21 | Q | Now, this one is a little harder. |
| 22 | А | Yes. |
| 23 | Q | I know it's small. I may have to zoom in a little |
| 24 | bit so yo | u can see it a little better, and I may have to move |
| 25 | it around | but it looks like a little bit different kind of |

form, but what is it? 1 2 It's an explanation of payment. It's just different 3 types of members have different systems that the EOBs come 4 from. So this was a -- still an EOB from Anthem, and it has 5 the information. It's just a different layout. 6 So it has anesthesia, the charge is that \$560. 7 allowed -- I think it was 2, 29, 80. 8 I can zoom in one more time on that or twice. 9 Yeah. It's 2, 29, 80. MR. SANTACROCE: I'm sorry. Can I get some reference 10 as to who this is or a Bates number or something. 11 12 MR. STAUDAHER: It's the same individual. It's the Grand Jury exhibit original number, and it's Ziyad Sharrieff. 13 BY MR. STAUDAHER: 14 This is the same document, correct? 15 16 Yes. 17 We can go to the name right here. I think it is 18 Sharrieff Ziyad? 19 Α Sharrieff Ziyad. 20 Okay. So we'll go down to the numbers again as we go 21 across. The 5, 60 charge --22 The charges, the plan allowance. Α

KARR REPORTING, INC.

23

24

25

0

А

Code 610?

Okay. And then what is this where it says, Remark

It gives an explanation of the code. So down below

you'll see the 610 that matches. 1 That's what this is, correct? 2 Yes. And pretty much it will just say that, you 3 know, anything above the allowed amount is a write off. 4 Okay. And on this particular one the copay --5 6 The copayment was 22, 98. Α 7 And then --\$206.98. 8 Α Let me make sure we get that closer. And it looks --9 all I can see, it looks like an 8. 10 8. Yeah. 11 Α It's a little bit difficult. 12 13 Α 2, 0, 6, 82. 14 Okay. The amount you actually -- your company Q 15 actually paid? 16 Α Yes. 17 The last one is on the one that you said -- I think if I understood you correctly is the -- I think you are the 18 secondary payor? 19 20 Α Yes. Okay. So what are we looking at here on this first 21 22 page? That's the explanation of payment, and it has the --23 Α This looks like a different -- this has a different 24 25 dollar amount up here?

А

KARR REPORTING, INC.

25

MR. STAUDAHER: Your Honor, I'm going to ask that

| 1 | А | P1. |
|----|-----------|--|
| 2 | Q | would that be eligible for additional charges? |
| 3 | А | No. |
| 4 | Q | Okay. And we go across here? |
| 5 | А | 5, 80 or 5, 60, I can't |
| 6 | Q | Let me show it to you. |
| 7 | А | Yeah. |
| 8 | Q | Would it be better. You can look at any of the |
| 9 | forms, to | o, because I know it's sort of |
| 10 | A | 5, 60. |
| 11 | Q | 5, 60. And the minutes that were listed here? |
| 12 | А | 31 minutes. |
| 13 | Q | Now, one thing, I want to go back to this box here. |
| 14 | Do you se | ee above this one? |
| 15 | А | Yes. |
| 16 | Q | There are time well, do you know what those are? |
| 17 | А | It's the start and finish time. |
| 18 | Q | Okay. Did your company require the start and finish |
| 19 | time? | |
| 20 | А | No. |
| 21 | Q | So that's just on this particular form? |
| 22 | А | Yes. |
| 23 | Q | And it appears, does it not, that that adds up to 31 |
| 24 | minutes? | |
| 25 | А | Yes. |

| 1 | Q | What's depicted here for \$560? |
|----|-----------|---|
| 2 | A | That is correct. |
| 3 | Q | The location again, same location? |
| 4 | А | Endoscopy Center of Southern Nevada. |
| 5 | Q | 700 Shadow Lane? |
| 6 | A | Yes. |
| 7 | Q | And the provider? |
| 8 | A | Ron Lakeman, CRNA. |
| 9 | Q | I'm going to skip right to the last page of this |
| 10 | which I t | hink it said that this had to include the primary's |
| 11 | informati | on? |
| 12 | A | With the claim because it's a secondary claim. They |
| 13 | put it on | the claim itself that it's a secondary, and they |
| 14 | attached | the explanation of benefits of the primary. |
| 15 | Q | Okay. Is that what we are looking at on page 3 of |
| 16 | this docu | ment? |
| 17 | А | Yes. |
| 18 | Q | So when we get to the very back page of this |
| 19 | document, | do you see the name again? |
| 20 | А | Yes. Patty Aspinwall. |
| 21 | Q | Is this the same date of service? |
| 22 | А | Yes, 9/21/07. |
| 23 | Q | And again I'm interested in the anesthesia charges |
| 24 | here. Do | es this appear to be your explanation of benefits for |
| 25 | the anest | hesia? |

| 1 | • | |
|----|------------|---|
| 1 | А | Yes. |
| 2 | Q | And if we go across, the dollar amount? |
| 3 | А | 56, 48. |
| 4 | Q | Is that what you actually paid on this claim? |
| 5 | А | Yes. |
| 6 | Q | So even though another insurer may have paid, you |
| 7 | paid addit | tionally on this same claim? |
| 8 | А | Correct. |
| 9 | Q | Now, with regard to these records, do you rely upon |
| 10 | them to be | e accurate when they're provided to you? |
| 11 | А | Yes. |
| 12 | Q | If they in fact are not accurate, will you pay on the |
| 13 | claim? | |
| 14 | А | We pay based on what is billed, yes. |
| 15 | Q | If there is false information on the claim though, |
| 16 | would you | process it and pay it? |
| 17 | А | Yes. |
| 18 | Q | You would pay it if there was false information on |
| 19 | the claim | ? |
| 20 | А | We wouldn't the physician is attesting that it's |
| 21 | ccrrect. | So the only way that we would know that it's |
| 22 | incorrect | is if we did an audit or if we asked for medical |
| 23 | records. | |
| 24 | Q | Let's just assume that you knew that there was false |

information on the claim. Would you process it?

MR. STAUDAHER: Fair enough.

| 1 | | Pass the witness, Your Honor. |
|----|------------|---|
| 2 | | THE COURT: All right. Who would like to go first? |
| 3 | | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 4 | BY MS. S | TANISH: |
| 5 | Q | Good afternoon, ma'am. |
| 6 | А | Hello. |
| 7 | Q | I just first wanted to start with the math, and in |
| 8 | particula | ar I wanted to ensure that I understood your conversion |
| 9 | factor. | |
| 10 | A | Okay. |
| 11 | Q | Well, I'm going to use my copy of your anesthesia |
| 12 | policy. | Just disregard all of the yellow on it. |
| 13 | А | Okay. |
| 14 | Q | I don't want to write on the exhibit. Can you see |
| 15 | that oka | y? |
| 16 | А | Yes. |
| 17 | Q | As I understand it, you paid Ziyad's claim based on |
| 18 | an 8-min | ute increment, correct? |
| 19 | А | Correct. |
| 20 | Q | So you already explained that the base unit is 5, |
| 21 | right? | |
| 22 | А | Yes. |
| 23 | Q | And then they get 1 point for having the time between |
| 24 | 1 minute | and 15 minutes; is that correct? |
| 25 | А | Correct. |
| | \ [| |

responsibility, and it tells you the paid amount. 1 All right. Then what I'm going to do is ask you to 2 3 figure it out for me. MR. STAUDAHER: Margaret, I think it's there over 4 5 there. MS. STANISH: It's over there? 6 7 MR. STAUDAHER: Yes. MS. STANISH: All right. Thanks. 8 BY MS. STANISH: 9 What I'm trying to determine here is what is the 10 value of the anesthesia service that is ultimately paid to the 11 clinic, and we have the bottom lines for somebody, Mr. Ziyad 12 who was between -- paid at eight minutes for \$206.82, correct? 13 14 Α Right. On the EOB, it tells you on the -- it tells you the billed amount, and then it tells you the plan allowance 15 which is 229, 80. The member co-share is 22, 98, and we paid 16 17 the \$206.82. All right. 18 But you have to add the 22, 98 to come out with the 19 2, 29, 80. So 6 times 38, 30 is 2, 29, 80. 20 And that figure represents what again? 21 The conversion factor of 38, 30 times the 6 equals 2, 22 29 and 80 cents. 23

24

25

clinic?

Okay. What was the check that was paid to the

Is the allowed amount 2, 6, 8 and 10 cents, \$268.10?

1

4 5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

2.4 25

And then you have to do more math to get the amount that actually would've gone to the clinic?

Right. And without knowing the member benefit, I don't know if the coinsurance would've been the same or different, but if you want to use the same amount --

Well, can you tell from Mr. Rubino's documentation? Can you extrapolate from that what the fill-in-the-blank amount would be?

We always have the allowed amount minus the member benefit, the coinsurance. The coinsurance is going to depend on whether the member has a maximum out of pocket, whether they've met their deductible. So without actually looking at his benefits at that time I don't know whether it was It's deductible, whether something was met. So I don't know. not a straight 10 percent, 20 percent.

You can't tell from the EOB on Mr. Rubino?

It just has an amount. It doesn't say what percent or deductible. See, it just has 61, 28. It doesn't say --

Okay. Q

-- if that's deductible or if that's a percentage.

All right. Suffice to say the amount --

If I want to fill in this blank, the amount would have to be some figure between 206 -- or I'm sorry. number would have to be less than \$268.10?

You have to take away the member responsibility, yes. 1 Α Right. Let me do some quick math here. 2 Q Do you want to use the same amount? You can. 3 Yeah, let's do that. 4 61, 28. So you take 2, 68, 10 --5 Α 6 2, 68, point, 10. 7 Minus 61, 28. 8 Well, that's the same as Mr. Ziyad's, \$206.82? Q 9 Because again that 206 -- the member responsibility was probably different. 10 Okay. So there's a lot of math involved? 11 12 Yes. But basically if Mr. Rubino had an anesthesia time 13 14 between 16 and 30, it would be \$206.82? MR. STAUDAHER: Objection, Your Honor. 15 THE WITNESS: With the member responsibility being 16 17 that amount that we used, yes. MR. STAUDAHER: It mischaracterizes the state of the 18 19 evidence, Your Honor. THE COURT: Well, she just answered the question. 20 21 overruled. BY MS. STANISH: 22 The anesthesia time includes the time that the CRNA 23 Q

preps the patient?

24

25

When the member goes back to the surgery center at

Q Does that include putting in that Hep-Lock? Do you know what a Hep-Lock is?

A We don't specify like exactly what it is other than what's on our reimbursement policy. It's a face-to-face. So if they are facing the member, and they're in the preop, I would say yes.

- Q Did you have personal dealings with people who worked for the clinic?
 - A The billing company, yes.
 - Q And do you recall the name of the billing company?
- 13 A No.

Q Would you describe your dealings with the billing company one of confusion, that they had difficulties with billing?

A From the facility standpoint, they used to bill on the same HCFA 1500 where most facilities bill on a UB04, and the CMS allows, which is Medicare, allows a provider or a facility to bill on either form.

They have to put that modifier of SG saying it's a facility because otherwise the physician bill and the surgery-center bill looks exactly the same. So in a system without that modifier it could look like it's a duplicate claim. So the modifier is put in so it differentiates that one

is for the facility.

They refused to bill on a UB. So they had a lot of issues because they were constantly forgetting in some cases to put that modifier on the surgical center.

- Q And did you have any other issues with the billing company that you recall?
 - A No.
- Q That you recall or you didn't have any other issues other than that?
- A Yeah. I mean, on an ongoing basis they would send us spreadsheets of just reviewing whether we had received their claims, and, you know, whether we had paid it, and, you know, sometimes they would lose their explanation of benefits. We would get copies for them, things like that.
- Q And is that your experience with other clinics as well? The billing personnel or the billing company has difficulty understanding the requirements?
 - A No.
- Q This is the only company you've ever had problems with?
 - A Yes.
- Q All right. And as far as BlueCross goes it sounds like -- it looks like from these contracts that you had a business relationship with the clinic that extends back to 1995?

24

25

going to be doing any math.

A

KARR REPORTING, INC.

I had just gotten good at it.

Ms. González, I can tell you one thing, we're not

- Q This whole billing process seems like it requires some knowledge and expertise; would you agree with that?
 - A I would agree.
- Q So I'm not going to go into that area, but I am going to ask you a couple of things about -- Ms. Stanish asked you about the preop area, and whether a CRNA could bill for the preop area?
 - A Uh-huh.

Q Okay. I want to ask you specifically about the postop area, okay. And if you could direct me to this, is --

I'm looking at Exhibit 218 which you testified to.

If you can direct me in this exhibit as to where the anesthesia billing is defined.

- A (Unintelligible) and time reporting.
- Q Okay. Time reporting, can you see that?
- A Uh-huh.
- Q It says, Anesthesia time begins when the anesthesiologist begins to prepare the patient for induction of the anesthesia in the operating room or any equivalent area and ends when the anesthesiologist is no longer in personal attendance. That is when the patient may be safely placed under postoperative supervision.

What does that mean when the patient is safely under

KARR REPORTING, INC.

If the patient was in the postoperative area in the

ambulatory surgical center such as this, and the CRNA was responsible for the care of that patient in that postoperative area, could they bill for that?

A If they're still providing anesthesia, they can. If they're not providing anesthesia, then they are not supposed to if they're no longer face-to-face with that patient.

Q Okay. Well, that's not what the procedure says, and that's why I'm confused. Let's look at that again. It says, When the patient may be safely placed under postoperative supervision, they can bill until that time, correct?

A If the medical records show that they are with the patient, yes.

Q Okay. Where does it say with the patient on here?

A Right before that section it says on there, Personal attendance.

Q Okay. That is when the patient may be safely placed under postoperative supervision. In other words, my reading of this is that you hand off the patient to somebody else's responsibility. Do you have a differing opinion of that?

A Again I am just going by what it states, that it has to be face-to-face, that they have to be in personal attendance.

Q Okay. Fair enough. You represent Anthem BlueCross; is that correct?

A Yes.

KARR REPORTING, INC.

| 1 | was under | contract? |
|----|------------|--|
| 2 | А | Yes. |
| 3 | Q | So if the provider was the Nevada Gastroenterology |
| 4 | Center, th | nat's to who the check would have been made? |
| 5 | А | Yes, it would have been to the Gastroenterology |
| 6 | Center. | |
| 7 | Q | It wouldn't have been made out to Ron Lakeman, |
| 8 | correct? | |
| 9 | A | No. |
| 10 | Q | And with regard to Patty Aspinwall the total amount |
| 11 | that your | company paid was 56, 48, \$56.48, correct? |
| 12 | А | Correct. |
| 13 | Q | And again that check would've been made out to the |
| 14 | contract | provider and not Mr. Lakeman, correct? |
| 15 | А | Correct. |
| 16 | | MR. SANTACROCE: Nothing further. |
| 17 | | THE COURT: All right. |
| 18 | | Redirect. |
| 19 | | REDIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 20 | BY MR. ST | AUDAHER: |
| 21 | Q | I want to ask, and you know we've got to revisit |
| 22 | these for | ms. I want to make sure we are clear on this. When |
| 23 | counsel a | sked you about postop personal attendance and |
| 24 | face-to-f | ace time, what does that mean to you? |
| 25 | A | When the member is in surgery and having anesthesia, |

- Q Okay. What number is that based on on this list?
- A The allowed amount is the \$306.40.
- Q Okay. So the allowed amount is 3, 0, 6, 40. Is that what you used to come up with your calculation of 38, 30 times the number of units?
- A You would have to divide the 3, 0, 6, 40 by the 38 to come up with the units. From this document here it doesn't have the time. So you wouldn't be able to -- you could assume the total units by doing the 3, 0, 6, 40 divided by the 38, 30, but you would need the claim.
- Q Let's just go to the claim form itself. Do you see where it says 32 minutes here?
 - A Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q How many units?
- A That's 3.
- Q Total?
- A It's 8 total because it's 5 for the base, plus 32, 3 units. So a total of 8.

So this ends up being your payment over here, and

| l | |
|----|---|
| 1 | this ends up being the subscriber's liability for this |
| 2 | particular claim? |
| 3 | A Yes. |
| 4 | MR. STAUDAHER: Pass the witness, Your Honor. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 6 | MR. SANTACROCE: What did you do with 218? |
| 7 | MR. STAUDAHER: What was that? |
| 8 | MR. SANTACROCE: 218, where did you put it? |
| 9 | MR. STAUDAHER: It should |
| LO | THE COURT: Do you have any exhibits up there? |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: No. I gave it to him. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Oh, okay. |
| 13 | MR. SANTACROCE: You just used 218. |
| 14 | MR. STAUDAHER: It's right on top then. |
| 15 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 16 | BY MR. SANTACROCE: |
| 17 | Q I don't mean to belabor this point, but you keep |
| 18 | using the words face-to-face, and this document doesn't mention |
| 19 | face-to-face at least that I can see |
| 20 | A It says that it begins when the anesthesiologist |
| 21 | begins to prepare for anesthesia in the operating room or an |
| 22 | equivalent area, and it says it ends when no longer in personal |
| 23 | attendance. That's what we consider face-to-face. |
| 24 | Q Okay. So you're using face-to-face in place of |

KARR REPORTING, INC.

personal attendance?

| | l . | |
|-----|-----------|--|
| 1 | А | It's just a reference of they have to be in personal |
| 2 | attendanc | e. |
| 3 | Q | Okay. But that's what you mean when you say |
| 4 | face-to-f | ace? |
| 5 | А | Yes. |
| 6 | Q | Then you would agree that face-to-face does not |
| 7 | appear an | ywhere in this time reporting area? |
| 8 | А | Correct. |
| 9 | Q | Do you have the documents for Sharrieff Ziyad up |
| 10 | there? | |
| 11 | А | No. They went back over there. |
| 12 | | MR. STAUDAHER: No. They're back over there. |
| 13 | BY MR. SA | NTACROCE: |
| 1.4 | Q | I want you to take a look at this and tell me how |
| 15 | many minu | tes were billed for that procedure. |
| 16 | A | Eight. |
| 17 | Q | Eight minutes, so that would be 1 unit, correct? |
| 18 | А | Correct. |
| 19 | Q | So you didn't pay based on 30 or 31 minutes? |
| 20 | А | No. |
| 21 | Q | And finally the 56, 48 that you paid for Patty |
| 22 | Aspinwall | , that was not based on any time at all, was it? |
| 23 | А | It was based on the primary's the member's |
| 24 | responsib | pility from the primary's. |
| 25 | Q | Okay. But that well, my question was , there was |

| 1 | |
|----|--|
| 1 | no time calculation where you billed 56, 48 for the procedure? |
| 2 | A No. |
| 3 | Q That was the patient's share, and that's what you |
| 4 | paid? |
| 5 | A Correct. |
| 6 | MR. SANTACROCE: Nothing further. Thank you. |
| 7 | THE COURT: Ms. Stanish? |
| 8 | MS. STANISH: I have nothing further. Thank you. |
| 9 | THE COURT: Mr. Staudaher, anything else? |
| 10 | MR. STAUDAHER: Nothing, Your Honor. |
| 11 | THE COURT: Any juror questions for the witness? |
| 12 | (No response.) |
| 13 | THE COURT: All right. Ma'am, thank you for your |
| 14 | testimony. Please don't discuss your testimony with anyone |
| 15 | else who may be a witness in this matter. |
| 16 | Thank you, ma'am, and you are excused. |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: Okay. Thank you. |
| 18 | THE COURT: May I see counsel at the bench, please. |
| 19 | (Conference at the bench not recorded.) |
| 20 | THE COURT: We need to take another quick break. |
| 21 | We're going to stay a little bit late tonight if that's okay |
| 22 | with everybody. If anybody has issues with that, just tell |
| 23 | Kenny. |
| 24 | He may or may not tell me. No, he'll tell me. |
| 25 | We'll work with that. |

We're hoping -- I've been told the good news is we should be finished by the end of the month. I know that we told you that we would not be in session tomorrow.

That may still be the plan, but I can't tell you that for sure. So having said that, we're going to take a quick break.

I must remind you you're not to discuss the case or anything relating to the case with each other, with anyone else. You are not to read, watch or listen to any reports of or commentaries on this case, person or subject matter relating to the case, and please don't form or express an opinion on the trial.

Notepads in your chairs. Follow Kenny through the rear door.

(Jury recessed at 4:25 p.m.)

THE COURT: Why doesn't somebody get the last witness and Ms. Akridge, and we'll figure out what they are talking about because I don't understand this note.

Ms. Weckerly, did you move the two insurance people to Thursday, or are they still up in the air?

MS. WECKERLY: I moved them to Thursday.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. WECKERLY: So, okay. Yeah.

THE COURT: Could we move Detective Whiteley around?

MS. WECKERLY: He's doing some things on another

case. I can check with him. 1 2 THE COURT: Because here's my thinking. Because 3 well --Where's the witness? 4 MR. STAUDAHER: They want to say something before she 5 6 brings her in. 7 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am. Ms. Akridge, did you want to 8 say something? MS. AKRIDGE: Yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: Okay. Come forward. We need to do this 10 on -- we're doing all of this -- this is all on the record. 11 MS. AKRIDGE: Okay. 12 THE COURT: And do you have her bar number already? 13 14 MS. AKRIDGE: 3353. THE COURT: Yes? 15 MS. AKRIDGE: So, Your Honor, what we found out is 16 17 that the answer, the fee issue is contained within the document. It's already, I believe, admitted. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. And that is the contract? 20 MS. AKRIDGE: Yes. THE COURT: Okay. And maybe you can show the lawyers 21 just kind of there together, or you can put it up here on the 22 23 monitor or something. MR. STAUDAHER: We've got the documents. Which one, 24

KARR REPORTING, INC.

the anesthesia policy or the contract?

25

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 1 | THE COURT: What you're talking about. |
| 2 | MS. STANISH: It's in that table. |
| 3 | MR. STAUDAHER: This? |
| 4 | MS. STANISH: Which Grand Jury exhibit? |
| 5 | MS. AKRIDGE: 55A, page 24. |
| 6 | MS. STANISH: I don't have a page 24. Do you, |
| 7 | Michael? |
| 8 | MR. STAUDAHER: I'm just looking through the Grand |
| 9 | Jury exhibits right now. |
| 10 | THE COURT: And so just for the record, what you're |
| 11 | saying is the fee schedule we've all been trying to figure out, |
| 12 | how much the fees are for the units, it's in this chart right |
| 13 | there? |
| 14 | MS. WECKERLY: Well, it says is that the 2 percent |
| 15 | reduction? Is that what you're talking about? |
| 16 | MS. MAZIARZ: No. It's a chart that says, Outpatient |
| 17 | Procedure Grouper. |
| 18 | MS. AKRIDGE: Table 1A. |
| 19 | THE COURT: And that shows the anesthesia rates? |
| 20 | MS. MAZIARZ: No. The anesthesia was included in a |
| 21 | combined-case rate for the visit to the facility. |
| 22 | THE COURT: So you're saying the way this insurer |
| 23 | reimbursed there wasn't a separate reimbursement for |
| 24 | anesthesia? |
| 25 | MS. AKRIDGE: Right. |

MS. MAZIARZ: As far as what we've been able to 1 2 gather from all of our phone calls. THE COURT: That's inconsistent with what was 3 testified. 4 MS. STANISH: As well as what was in the Grand Jury. 5 MR. STAUDAHER: Why don't we bring her in here? 6 7 THE COURT: Yes. Let's bring her in here. going to need to do this on the record. Because here's the 8 deal, the testimony as I heard it -- and correct me, Lawyers, 9 freely if you think I'm wrong -- was that it was different --10 it was there -- the rate for the whatever, colonoscopy plus the 11 anesthesia. What you're saying is it's all together? 12 MS. MAZIARZ: That was the information that we 13 14 gathered. THE COURT: Okay. Well, we need to get her in, and 15 16 she needs to explain. MS. AKRIDGE: Except that she doesn't have any 17 knowledge about that --18 MR. STAUDAHER: We've got an EOB --19 THE COURT: Where did you get this information? 20 MR. STAUDAHER: -- that says Anesthesia Billing right 21 here. That's what the company submitted. In the explanation 22 of benefits it says for anesthesia, and it's a charge and a 23 24 payment. That's not included in the base agreement.

KARR REPORTING, INC.

25

MS. MAZIARZ: We could go make some more phone calls,

but we had lots of phone calls, and this is what we were told. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. Well --MS. STANISH: My understanding --3 4 I'm sorry, Judge. THE COURT: No, Ms. Stanish, go ahead. 5 MS. STANISH: My understanding was that as I read 6 7 this contract that it dealt with the procedures, the colonoscopy procedures and that there was something somehow 8 separate with respect to anesthesia. 9 By the way, what you referred to talks about 10 anesthesiologists at 2 percent. These are CRNAs. 11 12 MS. AKRIDGE: Okay. MS. STANISH: I don't know if that makes a difference 13 14 to you. THE COURT: Can we maybe have on the record exactly 15 where this information is coming from, and who spoke to who. 16 17 And, Ms. Akridge, did you speak to someone? MS. AKRIDGE: I did not. 18 THE COURT: Did the witness speak to someone? Where 19 20 is this information coming from? Because the last I heard we were going to try and find the CMS Codes and the fee schedule, 21 22 and she was going to contact her office to see about the fee schedule relating to the anesthesia charges. 23

KARR REPORTING, INC.

MS. AKRIDGE: Right.

2.4

25

THE COURT: And then apparently someone wanted to use

my court clerk's computer in the back, and she was amenable to 1 2 that. MS. AKRIDGE: Right. 3 THE COURT: And now we learn that, oh, no. 4 no fee schedule. So can someone please clarify how this 5 information has been imparted to the two of you? 6 7 THE COURT RECORDER: And, ma'am, could you tell me your name first? 8 MS. MAZIARZ: Sure. Jessica. 9 THE COURT: And are you an attorney as well? 10 MS. MAZIARZ: I'm an attorney as well. I'm not 11 licensed here in Nevada though. 12 THE COURT: Okay. And you're an employee of Holland 13 14 and Hart or no? 15 MS. MAZIARZ: No. MS. AKRIDGE: No. She's with Bryan Cave. 16 THE COURT: I'm sorry? 17 MS. MAZIARZ: Bryan Cave. 18 19 THE COURT: Okay. MS. MAZIARZ: In Phoenix. 20 THE COURT RECORDER: Can you spell your name, please. 21 MS. MAZIARZ: Sure. It's Maziarz. M-a-z-i-a-r-z. 2.2 THE COURT: And then can you tell us what you learned 23 24 and who you learned it from. 25 MS. MAZIARZ: I just had a conversation with a

paralegal at the legal department at United Healthcare, and she was the one who called various people for us.

2.4

THE COURT: And she's located where, in Minnesota?

MS. MAZIARZ: No. I believe she's in California.

THE COURT: So do you know where she got this information from? Because it seems to me -- and again, Lawyers, correct me if I'm wrong, meaning the prosecutor and the defense attorneys -- this seems inconsistent with the information that the designated witness -- whom I'm assuming was designated by the company -- to come here in response to a subpoena issued by the State. So the company chose who we are going to get and came in here.

What you're telling us now is inconsistent with the information we had. So I'd like to know who at the company is saying something inconsistent with what a witness told us on the stand, and again, you know, the State --

State, right? You didn't choose this gal to come out here. This was the witness that was the designated person who -- after you subpoenaed; is that what happened?

MR. STAUDAHER: That's correct, Your Honor. That's who testified at the Grand Jury.

THE COURT: So, I mean, they have to rely on the company to designate the correct person to come out here, and, I mean, I'd like to know -- I don't know if the lawyers care -- but I'd certainly like to know who's telling us something

different than what the witness who was designated, flown out here at State expense has told us and everybody relied on.

MS. AKRIDGE: I agree, Your Honor. Let me just say I think the subpoena actually had Katie Kalka's name on it as opposed to a list of areas to designate a witness.

THE COURT: Okay. I apologize.

MS. AKRIDGE: Yeah. No wcrries.

THE COURT: I assumed it was COR, DP, blah, blah, blah, blah records that they need.

MS. AKRIDGE: I don't think that's the case. I mean, I think you --

THE COURT: Okay. I apologize. I made a false assumption.

MS. STANISH: Then my question would be is whether the State requested that individual. I mean, my experience having done insurance fraud is I work with the fraud investigator, and I'd like the State to answer the Court's earlier question, Who selected this witness who's been depicted as a custodian of record?

MR. STAUDAHER: We actually subpoenaed both, Your Honor. We subpoenaed the custodian of records, person most knowledgeable and specifically Katie Kalka. The reason Katie Kalka was done is because she testified at the Grand Jury to this very thing.

If she ended up not being a person still employed at

that location or with the company, then we wanted them to send whoever was available, but because she previously testified to these very records that's why she was specifically subpoenaed in addition to the COR, slash, person most knowledgeable.

THE COURT: So did you issue three subpoenas, or did you do Katie Crowley --

MR. STAUDAHER: One combined.

2.4

THE COURT: -- or what ever her name is -- I

apologize -- and/or PMK and/or COR? How did you subpoena -
MR. STAUDAHER: COR, slash, PMK and then a separate

one to Katie Kalka.

THE COURT: So two subpoenas?

MR. STAUDAHER: Right.

THE COURT: And in response to the two subpoenas the company sent this one person?

MR. STAUDAHER: Yes. But we -- I -- our --

THE COURT: Do you then say she's --

MR. STAUDAHER: Our investigator or whoever that actually does the process serving — when I do the subpoena request, I say, Look, this is the person that came out. If that person can't do it or there's some problem, then they need to send somebody else, but if this person is still available and can come out, then that's the only person we would need.

So that's how it gets relayed to the investigator.

The investigator calls the company or whatever to find out if

that's the person that still needs to come out. If that's the person that is still designated, that's the person --

What has happened in other instances is a person has left the company and is no longer available, and the company says, we don't have this person anymore. So then we get the next person that can come in in that stead. So it's a combined thing. Two separate subpoenas were what were originally ordered by our office for, you know — which ones actually got to the company, I don't know.

THE COURT: Okay. And then I guess -- so in other words, you two ladies don't know who at the company has now said in contradiction to what we've heard in the past that, oh, it's all some kind of combined charge; is that correct??

MS. MAZIARZ: That's correct.

THE COURT: And all you have is the name of a paralegal. Is this an in-house paralegal?

MS. AKRIDGE: Yes.

2.3

MS. MAZIARZ: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Could we at least have that person's name on the record?

MS. MAZIARZ: Her name is Christina Stecki.

THE COURT: Do you know how to spell that?

MS. MAZIARZ: Yes. It's C-h-r-i-s-t-i-n-a --

THE COURT: That part I knew.

MS. MAZIARZ: Well, sometimes it's C-r.

| - 11 | |
|------|---|
| 1 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 2 | MS. MAZIARZ: And then the last name is |
| 3 | THE COURT: It could be a K, okay, to be fair to you. |
| 4 | MS. MAZIARZ: And then the last name is Stecki. |
| 5 | S-t-e-c-k-i. |
| 6 | THE COURT: Okay. I'm going to ask if you don't |
| 7 | mind, ladies, if you'd go back out, and then we're going to try |
| 8 | to I'm going to see what the lawyers say, and then decide |
| 9 | where we are going from here, and so go ahead and |
| 10 | MS. AKRIDGE: Okay. Sure. |
| 11 | THE COURT: Does anyone have any questions for them |
| 12 | while they're here? |
| 13 | MR. STAUDAHER: Well, I just |
| 14 | THE COURT: These two ladies. |
| 15 | MR. STAUDAHER: It just seems like we should bring |
| 16 | the witness in at some point and talk to her. Because I'm |
| 17 | looking at a record from their company |
| 18 | THE COURT: Oh, no. She's not off the hook. Don't |
| 19 | put her on a plane. |
| 20 | MS. AKRIDGE: She's still out there. |
| 21 | THE COURT: Yes. Don't drive her to McCarran |
| 22 | whenever you do. |
| 23 | MR. STAUDAHER: it says anesthesia billing |
| 24 | THE COURT: Don't send her off. |
| 25 | MR. STAUDAHER: That's what it specifically says in |

the EOB is for anesthesia, not a global fee or anything like that is delineated.

THE COURT: Yes. I'm really concerned. I mean, frankly, I'm concerned that we're hearing from one part apparently of the company, it's this, and we're hearing from another part of the company -- oh, by the way, under oath and before the Grand Jury -- that it's something else, and, you know, the State relied on what was presented at the Grand Jury. That's been --

Yes, Ms. Stanish.

MS. STANISH: If I could talk about what was presented at the Grand Jury, I don't think the State should be so surprised about this particular witness's lack of knowledge and blame it on civil attorneys.

MR. STAUDAHER: I'm not trying to blame it on anything. I just want to get the proper information.

MS. STANISH: Well, I just think the case should have been investigated before trial.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. STANISH: Okay. My point is -- Your Honor, I'm sorry -- at the Grand Jury Mr. Staudaher asked the witness whether she knew what the base unit was, and she said, No, I don't know. I mean, it seemed to me to be indicated in the Grand Jury that this witness didn't have the pertinent knowledge so that we could put a value on the anesthesia

service.

2.3

THE COURT: Well, I'm more concerned -- and unless

I'm confused -- that we're hearing billing was done two

different ways for the anesthesia. Is that what everybody else
heard?

MS. WECKERLY: Well, yes. I mean, it sounds really different. I think --

THE COURT: It sounds really different to me, and I'm wondering why is the one company presenting two different views of how this is done. That's why I'm concerned.

I mean, however it's done we need a fee schedule to say a colonoscopy with 3 minutes of anesthesia is going to cost this. A colonoscopy with 32 minutes of anesthesia is going to cost this. A colonoscopy with 17 and a half minutes or whatever the real number is is going to cost that.

That's what we need to know. And so is that record going to answer that question, or is there some other record out there that's going to answer that question? That's really what the issue is.

Here's what it costs at this amount. An endoscopy for 5 minutes, endoscopy for 32 minutes, endoscopy for 12 minutes, how much are those three things going to cost the insurer? That's the issue here because it's insurance fraud and theft, and so that's what we need to know.

Are you telling us that whatever the information is

that you've got has that answer or no?

2.4

MS. MAZIARZ: Your Honor, what I'd like to do is call back in-house and go over this again with them to make sure that --

Ms. Akridge knows called Court Call, and we also just have a good cld-fashioned telephone and a microphone, and so, you know, at some point I think somebody from the company, you know -- I don't think they can slough it off on the two of you -- I think we need somebody from the company to explain to us what the situation is and why we apparently have the wrong witness here, maybe the right witness and the wrong records or the right records and the wrong witness or whatever's going on.

So I'm going to excuse you ladies, let you do that.

I'm going to talk to the lawyers.

MR. SANTACROCE: Your Honor, I'm going to object to that. We are not in the investigatory stage of this case.

THE COURT: No. I know we're not. That's why I said, Mr. Santacroce, I'm going to send them out.

There's two problems going on here. There is what are we going to do with this trial going forward, number one, and there is number two, you know, why is there the wrong witness here telling us different things, one thing under oath. Now, their lawyers are coming in here telling us something different.

That's a different concern; wouldn't you agree? 1 MR. SANTACROCE: I agree with whatever you say, Your 2 3 Honor. THE COURT: No. I mean, the Court's concerned. 4 do we rely and spend all this time based on what a witness has 5 told us under oath, and then the lawyers come in and say, oh, 6 no. That's something totally different. I'm wondering why we 7 wasted over an hour if it's wrong. 8 MR. SANTACROCE: I am, too. 9 THE COURT: I'm concerned about that. 10 MR. SANTACROCE: And I'm more concerned about the 11 12 proof issues with wrong testimony. THE COURT: All right. Here's what I would suggest. 13 I don't know what everybody wants to do. 14 State, what do you want to do going forward? 15 Let me say what I suggest, and then I'll hear from 16 everybody since this is all a mess. We don't know what the 17 truth is. We don't know what we're going to do going forward. 18 I don't know how the defense can cross-examine her based on new 19 information that is coming from the attorneys. 20 I would say let's cue up the Meana deposition, and 21 deal with this later. 22 THE COURT RECORDER: I can't do it. 23 24 THE COURT: Oh.

KARR REPORTING, INC.

THE COURT RECORDER: Jordan has to --

25

MR. STAUDAHER: We can do it. We can do it.

THE COURT RECORDER: No. There's no sound. There won't be any sound coming out of anywhere.

MR. STAUDAHER: I can probably --

MR. SANTACROCE: Are we on the record?

THE COURT RECORDER: Yes.

2.3

THE COURT: Yes, this is all on the record.

MR. SANTACROCE: I just -- I need to renew my objection regarding the Meana deposition very briefly.

THE COURT: Well --

MR. SANTACROCE: I'm objecting to this coming in because I didn't have the right to confront Mr. Meana. I didn't have a right to cross-examine him. I sat there for an hour and a half --

THE COURT: Mr. Santacroce, here's the problem. You keep objecting. Every few weeks you object again on the record to the Meana deposition.

MR. SANTACROCE: I'm not sure where it is.

THE COURT: You've objected before. Your objection has been overruled. You did it again recently, and then finally the State stood up and said, Why are we relitigating this issue? And I said, well, I've allowed Mr. Santacroce to make a record again because I like to do that. I feel like you should be given -- whether I agree with you or not -- I feel like you should be given an opportunity to make a record.

At some point in time you've made your record. You don't have to remake it --

MR. SANTACROCE: Okay, Judge.

2.2

THE COURT: -- every so often --

MR. SANTACROCE: Well, I obviously --

THE COURT: -- the record --

MR. SANTACROCE: I obviously think it's a very important issue.

THE COURT: It is an important issue, and I don't mean to minimize the issue, but you objected when they sought to admit the deposition transcript. You objected again -- I don't remember if it was a few weeks ago before we started the trial. I think you objected again, and I entertained argument again, and finally the State stood up -- I don't remember what day it was -- the State stood up and said, Well, why are we -- it was Ms. Weckerly. She said, Why are we doing this again? Hasn't this all been litigated?

Do you remember that, Ms. Weckerly?

MS. WECKERLY: I do.

THE COURT: And I said, Well, Ms. Weckerly, you are correct, but I'm letting Mr. Santacroce make a record. So that was the record. We don't have to remake a record every few weeks.

MR. SANTACROCE: Well, you know, I have a short memory, and someone once told me the third time is the charm.

So I was just going by that statement, Your Honor.

2.2

THE COURT: Well, it's not. I mean, I think you've made your record, and we don't have to keep remaking the record because, you know, for appellate purposes you can go back and say we objected to this. I mean, your objection is again noted for the record. For the record, it's noted --

MR. SANTACROCE: But --

THE COURT: -- but we don't have to keep rehearing argument. Like I said, just because this is dragging on forever doesn't mean you have to keep rearguing all the motions from months ago.

MR. SANTACROCE: Well, I didn't mean this to be a 10-minute argument. All I wanted to do was put it on the record so I would know where to find it if -- in case there was an appeal.

RICHARD WRIGHT: That was a joint.

THE COURT: All right. So what are we going to do going forward?

What is the State's suggestion at this point?

MS. WECKERLY: Well, my suggestion is they can cross this witness to the extent of her knowledge. We've noticed an expert, a designated expert. We'll get an expert here from that company who can do it accurately.

MR. SANTACROCE: I move to strike her testimony.

RICHARD WRIGHT: Right. I'm worried I'm doing more

if we end up striking it.

MR. STAUDAHER: Well, her testimony is, I mean, there is no indication other than from the lawyers that there's any problem with her testimony regarding these documents. The documents are what she testified to as far as her record. They can cross her on those.

As far as the actual fee schedule that everybody is at issue with, I mean, clearly if she doesn't have it, then the company needs to provide somebody who does have the fee schedule to talk about that issue. We designated a person most knowledgeable or COR or designee for these issues, and that's what we think that they need to provide.

Now, if she comes in here and testifies differently than what her lawyers just came in and said the policy is --

What they're saying does not match up with the records.

THE COURT: Absolutely. It doesn't match up with what she said. I don't agree with the State that it's not a big deal that a company's lawyers come in and say, oh, by the way, this is wrong. It's this other answer based on a paralegal. I don't know. I have a real problem with a witness representing a company saying one thing, and the company's lawyers coming in and telling us something different.

MS. WECKERLY: They are not the --

MR. SANTACROCE: But plus we already know -- we know

there's an issue. We know there's contradictory testimony or evidence. For the State to now proffer this witness as having knowledge of that is wrong. I mean it, it borders on misconduct again.

2.3

THE COURT: No. I can't blame the State for this mess.

MR. SANTACROCE: I'm not blaming the State for what happened. I'm blaming the State for suggesting to go forward with this witness knowing there is an issue. I'm not faulting the State for what happened, but for us to go forward now with a witness that we know is contradictory to what others have told us would be improper.

THE COURT: When can you get this expert from -
MS. WECKERLY: Well, I have to make a, I mean -
THE COURT: Is this person coming in from Minnesota
or what?

MS. WECKERLY: Well, I mean, we've got to make a phone call to see who we can get here because, I mean, this is like five minutes ago. So, I mean, I don't know who it is or where they're going to come from, but it's noticed that way. So we can get someone here, and then I guess the Court can, you know, hold in abeyance whether to strike the testimony or not.

THE COURT: I don't know. In the pretrial it seems to me this should've been gone over. Like, okay, what are you basing your figures on. It's simple arithmetic, you know, okay

MS. STANISH: This Wednesday? 1 2 THE COURT: What? 3 MS. STANISH: This Wednesday? MR. WRIGHT: Tomorrow? 4 5 THE COURT: Yes. MR. WRIGHT: No. 6 7 THE COURT: So what do we -- okay. So the State should rest Friday, and we'll go as late Friday as we need to 8 9 finish essentially. MS. WECKERLY: That's fine. 10 THE COURT: I mean, assuming -- oh, shoot. One of 11 12 the jurors who was losing her insurance or something has a 13 doctor's appointment. So we may only be able to --That was inadvertent. Trust me. 14 15 Let me find out scheduling because we may only be 16 able to go until 4 on Friday. MS. WECKERLY: I still -- unless they have a really 17 extensive cross of Olson and Meana's referring, I still think 18 19 we could finish. 20 THE COURT: Right. MR. SANTACROCE: I don't see Meana's -- I don't see it 21 22 being that long. 23 MS. WECKERLY: Right. 24 THE COURT: Yes. 25 MS. WECKERLY: So I think we might still be okay.

THE COURT: Okay. And then what do we have to look forward to next week then? I know you don't want to tip your hands, but, you know, it's getting kind of late in the game.

What are we looking at for closing? I mean, I've got all these jurors, you know, trying to balance their vacations and, you know, this and that. I need to know here for scheduling.

MR. SANTACROCE: No more than a day or two, right?

MS. STANISH: A day or two.

THE COURT: Okay. For the defense case?

MS. STANISH: Right.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. SANTACROCE: How about you?

MR. WRIGHT: Joint.

2.4

MR. SANTACROCE: Okay.

THE COURT: Okay. So --

MS. WECKERLY: Well, on Friday can we have some indication if they're actually calling people because we've pretty much given week by week, day by day --

THE COURT: No, I know.

MR. STAUDAHER: Yes.

THE COURT: That's what I'm saying. The time to show your cards is really here because, I mean, I get it. You don't have to do all this. The State's been, I mean, I say it again, you know, I've yelled at Mr. Staudaher a few times, but you

know, you've got to give credit where it's due, and they have been excellent in accommodating the defense in every way in terms of disclosing witnesses and sending over statements and information and getting whatever they've been asked to get. So there is -- so a little courtesy going the other way might be nice here, not just for them, but for the Court.

MR. SANTACROCE: I agree. I agree.

THE COURT: I know. And again, as you know, the Court's getting the letters, and they are complaining to the bailiff, and they've got a vacation, and they've got a this, and they've got a that, and I'm trying to keep track of it all and figure out, you know, when are these people likely to be excused. So you know, Ms. Pomykal reported today she's feeling weakness in her legs. You know, I'm balancing all of this stuff. So I'm trying to -- I need to know.

MR. SANTACROCE: We are looking at a couple of days next week. What, I don't know.

THE COURT: I'm not going to --

MR. SANTACROCE: You never know. We have to reevaluate.

THE COURT: I'm not going to shoot you if you are wrong.

MR. SANTACROCE: Okay. Well, I didn't -- I mean, I don't want to tell them the whole load of witnesses, and then we don't call them.

MS. WECKERLY: We just want to know Friday, right? MR. SANTACROCE: No. We're bearing down, figuring out what we already have in. We might add or detract by putting someone else on. We have a list. We have eliminated a MR. STAUDAHER: number of witnesses here at the end, and we gave them the latest version of what we sent to them indicating who we are not calling that was originally in our lineup. So that's pretty much it. THE COURT: No. Like I said, I think the State has been really great. MS. STANISH: I did identify yesterday one of the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

experts that we thought would testify in advance of the Friday.

THE COURT: So maybe you guys rest on the 25th. could do closings then and instructions maybe the 26th and the 27th which would give it to them on Friday of next week. that sound realistic?

MS. WECKERLY: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. STANISH: Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. STANISH: Sorry, another issue relating to Government Exhibit 210A. I have to admit I looked at the first page and thought this was just going to be regular computerized claim information, but I see it has attached to it a report of

investigative activity from the Office of the Investigating 1 2 General. I caught it that the witness testified that OIG was 3 conducting an investigation, and therefore they provided this 4 spreadsheet, and to me this is going once again into 404(b) 5 evidence, and, you know, I get these exhibits, and I try to 6 look at them quickly, but this -- and it's my bad for not 7 catching this -- but this is a report of investigation of an 8 officer requesting the details of the VA claims data. 9 MR. SANTACROCE: What did you want out of that? I 10 mean, can we just remove part of that? 11 THE COURT: Yes. Maybe we could just pull out a page 12 or something?

MS. WECKERLY: Yes. I think it's the request for this -- for this case. I think it's them saying we want -- or their response to us.

THE COURT: Could we just take that page out if the rest of it is what you want?

MS. WECKERLY: Can we just look at it and then we'll --

THE COURT: Sure.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. WECKERLY: -- let you know.

THE COURT: Maybe you can work it out between the two of you or both sides. If we can, great. If not --

So I'm thinking we'll be dark on the trial then Wednesday.

| 1 | MS. STANISH: Your witness testified about an OIG |
|----|--|
| 2 | investigation which is based on this and that. |
| 3 | MS. WECKERLY: I'm just going to confirm that the two |
| 4 | tomorrow can come Thursday or Friday. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Okay. Try to put them on for Thursday. |
| 6 | MS. WECKERLY: Okay. |
| 7 | THE COURT: When is that lady's the juror's |
| 8 | doctor appointment? |
| 9 | THE MARSHAL: We have Ms. Mayo has one Friday at |
| 10 | 4:30. She says she needs to be out by 3:45 to make it there on |
| 11 | time because it's across town, and then we have Mr. Billotte |
| 12 | has another one on June 24th at 1:30. |
| 13 | THE COURT: So maybe we could put them |
| 14 | MS. WECKERLY: Thursday. |
| 15 | THE COURT: on Thursday. That would be better. |
| 16 | MS. WECKERLY: Thursday. Sure. |
| 17 | THE COURT: And you need to find out more about |
| 18 | Ms. Mayo. |
| 19 | All right. So we can all go to lunch then. |
| 20 | (Proceedings recessed 12:17 p.m. to 1:30 p.m.) |
| 21 | (Outside the presence of the jury.) |
| 22 | THE COURT: So I don't know if I made it clear before |
| 23 | the break, but we'll be dark tomorrow and then have everybody |
| 24 | for Thursday. Does that work? |
| 25 | MS. WECKERLY: I've called them. I think they'll be |

Thursday or Friday, but how, you know, we said Thursday. I 1 2 just haven't --THE COURT: Okay. If for some reason there's a 3 4 problem --MS. WECKERLY: I'll really try to get them. 5 THE COURT: No. Well, I was going to say, I hate to 6 start really early, but maybe we'll have to then start at 8:30 7 or something on Friday just to make sure that we finish up. 8 (Discussion between attorneys.) 9 MS. WECKERLY: I'll be persuasive that it's Thursday. 10 THE COURT: Bring them in. 11 (Jury entering 1:34 p.m.) 12 THE COURT: All right. Court is now back in session. 13 And the State may call its next witness. 14 MR. STAUDAHER: State calls Katie Kalka to the stand, 15 Your Honor. 16 THE COURT: All right. 17 Face this lady right there. 18 (State's witness, Katie Kalka, sworn.) 19 THE CLERK: Please be seated, and please state and 20 spell your name. 21 THE WITNESS: Katie Kalka. K-a-t-i-e, K-a-l-k-a. 2.2. THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 23 24 Mr. Staudaher. 25 MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor.

DIRECT EXAMINATION

| RY | MR | STAUDAHER. |
|----|----|------------|

1.0

- Q Ms. Kalka, what do you do for a living?
- A I'm a fraud investigator with United Healthcare.
- Q And what kinds of things do you do as a fraud investigator?
- A We answer subpoenas and requests for information from law-enforcement agencies and regulatory agencies. We provide them with documents, claims data, that sort of stuff when it's asked for. We also file reports with state agencies and law enforcement for doctors and members who are suspected of committing health-insurance fraud.
- Q So in your capacity as an investigator, do you have access to the records of your business?
- A Yes, I do.
- Q And when I say that, I mean the billing records, the contracts, things like that?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Have you accessed those records in preparation for your testimony today?
 - A Yes, I have.
- Q Have you provided records of your company in preparation for today?
- 24 A Yes, I have.
 - Q Now, are those records themselves kept in the

ordinary course of business? Yes, they are. And the records that you provided, are they fair and accurate representations of what's contained in your company files, or computers, or the like? Correct. Yes. MR. STAUDAHER: Your Honor, may I approach? THE COURT: You may. MR. STAUDAHER: And these have all been previously 10 shown to counsel. 11 BY MR. STAUDAHER: We're going to go through a couple of documents here 12 13 that I believe may have come from you, but I want you to tell me if they -- if you recognize them or not, and I'm going to 14 hand them to you one by one. 15 Yes, sir. 16 Α The first one is marked as State's Proposed 216. Can 17 you tell me if you recognize that document and if so what it 18 19 is. I do. It's the electronic claim for Patty Aspinwall. 20 Α When you say an electronic claim, what do you mean by 21 22 that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

2.3

24

25

being sent in.

electronically within our system rather than a paper-claim form

It's the HCFA 1500 medical claim form, but it's filed

To where?

0

25

A To Nevada Gastroenterology Center.

in the first part of this document?

Yes.

~

Q Okay. And is there another page of this as well.

Is that related to the claim that you're referring to

A There is. The explanation of benefits that was sent to Patty Aspinwall which is a three -- two-page document explaining the charges and what was paid and why it was paid, and then also the last document -- the 1194 -- is the provider explanation of benefits that was sent to the facility.

Q Okay. Can I have that back. I think that that one got mixed up because it's BlueCross BlueShield.

Now, I want to show you some -- it looks like some sort of agreements or the like. Can you tell us what they are if you recognize them. This first one is designated as 80S as in Sam. Tell us if you recognize that document and what it is.

A I do. This is the ancillary provider participation agreement. So this is the contract between United Healthcare of Nevada -- United Healthcare and the Endoscopic Center of Nevada. This was the provider document that they were contracted with us for to be a participating provider.

Q And on the very back of it is there a signature page somewhere in this document?

A Yes.

And who is the signatory on that document, the

| l | |
|----|---|
| 1 | document provider? |
| 2 | A The provider was Dr. Desai. |
| 3 | MR. STAUDAHER: Your Honor, I'm not going to move to |
| 4 | admit this at this time. |
| 5 | THE COURT: That's fine. |
| 6 | MR. STAUDAHER: I just want to have it as a Court's |
| 7 | record of the contract that was provided by this witness. |
| 8 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 9 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: |
| 10 | Q With regard to the next document which is 229, can |
| 11 | you tell us what that is? |
| 12 | A Yes. This is the anesthesia reimbursement policy. |
| 13 | Q That was I mean, was it in effect, this particular |
| 14 | one, was it in effect in 2007? |
| 15 | A It was, yes. |
| 16 | Q Okay. Is this the policy that your company uses to |
| 17 | determine reimbursement for anesthesia billing? |
| 18 | A Yes, sir. |
| 19 | MR. STAUDAHER: At this time, Your Honor, I would |
| 20 | move for admission of State's 229 and State's 216, and I will |
| 21 | obviously not move for admission of 80S at this time. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Any objection to those two exhibits? |
| 23 | Ms. Stanish? |
| 24 | MS. STANISH: If I may just voir dire the witness, |
| 25 | Your Honor? |

| 1 | | THE COURT: Sure. |
|----|-----------|---|
| 2 | | VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION |
| 3 | BY MS. ST | ANISH: |
| 4 | Q | Good afternoon. |
| 5 | А | Good afternoon. |
| 6 | Q | I just wanted |
| 7 | | MR. STAUDAHER: Margaret, do you need these? |
| 8 | BY MS. ST | ANISH: |
| 9 | Q | Well, let me start with this. How long have you been |
| 10 | employed | at the United Healthcare Group? |
| 11 | А | Eight and a half years. |
| 12 | Q | And have you been so employed in the capacity of a |
| 13 | fraud inv | estigator? |
| 14 | А | Yes, ma'am. |
| 15 | Q | All right. And with respect to the anesthesia policy |
| 16 | that is G | overnment's Exhibit |
| 17 | | What's the number I'm at? |
| 18 | | MR. STAUDAHER: It's right there. |
| 19 | | MS. STANISH: All right. |
| 20 | BY MS. ST | TANISH: |
| 21 | Q | Government's Proposed Exhibit 229, that sets forth |
| 22 | the as | I understand it the policy for reimbursing for |
| 23 | anesthesi | a services, correct? |
| 24 | А | Correct. |
| 25 | Q | Does it contain the conversion factor, the price that |
| 1 | | |

KARR REPORTING, INC.

Is that it? Is that the only one?

25

Q

| ı | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 1 | А | This is the only one. |
| 2 | Q | All right. |
| 3 | | THE CLERK: I'm sorry. What did you say? |
| 4 | | MS. STANISH: 80S. |
| 5 | | THE CLERK: Is that what that is? |
| 6 | | THE WITNESS: 80S as in Sam, yes. |
| 7 | | It does not appear that this directly speaks of the |
| 8 | anesthesia | a CPT codes. |
| 9 | BY MS. ST | ANISH: |
| 10 | Q | All right. So basically what you have is the claim |
| 11 | form, the | amount of money that was actually paid but not the |
| 12 | fee sched | ule? |
| 13 | А | Correct. |
| 14 | Q | Does the do you know well, let me |
| 15 | | I know you're a fraud investigator, but do you also |
| 16 | have expe | rience in calculating the value of anesthesia |
| 17 | services, | or is that a billing coder specialist that does that? |
| 18 | А | That's a claims processing specialist that would do |
| 19 | that. | |
| 20 | Q | All right. So you're basically the custodian of |
| 21 | records w | ho is designated to work with law-enforcement folks? |
| 22 | A | Correct. |
| 23 | | MS. STANISH: All right. I understand. |
| 24 | | May we approach, Your Honor? |
| 25 | | THE COURT: Of course. |

(Conference at the bench not recorded.)

MR. STAUDAHER: May I proceed, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes, please.

CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

- Q Let me ask you a couple of questions about the Exhibit 229, the anesthesia policy with your (unintelligible), okay?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q Now, you said that this one -- and I'm displaying it now, the first page of this document -- you said that this was the one that was in effect in 2007; is that right?
 - A Correct, sir.
- Q Now, as we move through this I want to go to a couple of pages, specifically this section here. In -- first of all, does it say that -- up here talk about the ASA Relative Value Guide?
- A Yes.
 - Q Is that some sort of benchmark, or how does that incorporate into this document?
 - A Actually, if you go back to the first page I believe, and if you go down to the overview, it states that the American Society of Anesthesiology Relative Value Guidelines, the Crosswalk Guide and the CMS Guidelines are all used to create this policy.

25

business that you do?

| 1 | A Yes, I dc. | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | Q And do you use those things in the course of your | | |
| 3 | business to conduct your investigations? | | |
| 4 | A Yes, I do. | | |
| 5 | Q Is that something that you looked at that was related | | |
| 6 | to the 2007 time period that is in question? | | |
| 7 | A Yes. | | |
| 8 | Q So this isn't something that's a current CPT Code. | | |
| 9 | It was back then that you had access to, looked it up and | | |
| 10 | utilized it? | | |
| 11 | A Correct. | | |
| 12 | THE COURT: When did you I'm sorry. | | |
| 13 | When did you look this up in the CPT Codebook? | | |
| 14 | THE WITNESS: When I first looked up the documents | | |
| 15 | three years ago in 2010 | | |
| 16 | THE COURT: Okay. | | |
| 17 | THE WITNESS: and we in our offices we keep | | |
| 18 | archived copies of all the CPT Codebooks so we can go back and | | |
| 19 | refer to them when necessary. | | |
| 20 | THE COURT: Okay. So you looked it up in 2010 | | |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: Correct. | | |
| 22 | THE COURT: but then did you use a 2007 CPT | | |
| 23 | Codebook? | | |
| 24 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | | |
| 25 | THE COURT: And this is like these books, they're | | |

actually physically books, bound, old-fashioned, good 1 2 old-fashioned books, and what are they, on a shelf somewhere in 3 your office? THE WITNESS: Correct. 4 THE COURT: Okay. So you go and you look it up, and 5 now as you sit here today are you remembering from 2010 what 6 7 that number was? THE WITNESS: I actually re-went through all my 8 notes, the books and everything in preparation for today. 9 THE COURT: Okay. And you would've done that I'm 10 guessing within the last week or two? 11 12 THE WITNESS: Correct. 13 THE COURT: So you didn't check the codebook again? THE WITNESS: No. 14 THE COURT: You just looked at your notes? 15 THE WITNESS: Correct. 16 THE COURT: Okay. And did you bring any of that 17 18 stuff with you? 19 THE WITNESS: No, I did not. THE COURT: Okay. So as you sit here today you are 20 testifying on your memory based on your notes, based on your 21 22 review of this CPT Codebook in 2010? 23 THE WITNESS: Correct. 24 THE COURT: Okay.

KARR REPORTING, INC.

25

/ / /

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

Q So when you say that those things are included -MS. STANISH: Objection still, Your Honor. It's
hearsay.

THE COURT: Let me ask you --

MR. STAUDAHER: Well --

THE COURT: -- you didn't bring your notes today, and the CPT Codebook, is that something that is there like an electronic copy of that codebook or anything like that, or do all you have is the physical codebooks or what?

THE WITNESS: No. You can actually go online to the CMS website and put in the code and the year, and it will come up with what -- the information you're looking for as well.

THE COURT: Okay. So you can do that, but you need to be like a subscriber to the webpage or something?

THE WITNESS: Not for CMS, no.

THE COURT: Okay. Is it the same? The CMS website would have the same information as the CPT codebook?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. And so what you physically consult in your office, these good old-fashioned bound books, somebody else with the proper code could look on the computer and get that information?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

1

Counsel, approach.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

2.4 25 (Conference at the bench not recorded.)

THE COURT: Just to make sure I understood you. did not bring your notes with you when you came here to testify; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: You left those back in the office?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

All right. Mr. Staudaher, go on.

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

So you were talking about this particular procedure here, this particular set of items, the preoperative evaluation, postoperative evaluation is contained within the base unit according to your policy; is that correct?

Correct.

When we go forward in this, specifically the next section which is on page 4 of this 28 page document at the very top, the area where it talks about CMS guidelines and time-based anesthesia, what is that?

That is CMS Guidelines that time-based anesthesia must be reported in actual time, so many units. So if 30 minutes is performed, 30 minutes needs to be billed.

It actually even says in one minute increments that it needs to be reported; is that correct?

| 1 | А | Correct. | |
|----|-------------------|---|--|
| 2 | Q | And that's your policy of your company? | |
| 3 | A | Correct. | |
| 4 | Q | Is this policy disseminated to the providers when | |
| 5 | they actu | ally are they aware of it in some way when they | |
| 6 | contract | for services with you all? | |
| 7 | A | It is my understanding with credentialing that they | |
| 8 | do. | | |
| 9 | | MS. STANISH: Objection. | |
| 10 | | THE COURT: Sustained. | |
| 11 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: | | |
| 12 | Q | If you know, I mean, do you have first-hand knowledge | |
| 13 | of this o | r not? | |
| 14 | А | No. | |
| 15 | Q | Okay. So this is again the policy of your company; | |
| 16 | is that r | ight? | |
| 17 | A | Correct. | |
| 18 | Q | Now, if we go down here where it talks about the | |
| 19 | actual st | andard anesthesia maximum, do you see that? | |
| 20 | А | Yes. | |
| 21 | Q | Relate to us what we're looking at here. | |
| 22 | А | This is the formula that is used to determine what | |
| 23 | the reimb | bursement amount would be. | |
| 24 | Q | Okay. And it says the standard anesthesia max, and | |

25 then there's also another one which is below that that also

MS. STANISH: Objection.

THE COURT: Sustained. 1 2 Rephrase your question 3 BY MR. STAUDAHER: 4 The document itself, your policy reads that it's a 5 CRNA being supervised by an anesthesiologist? 6 Correct. 7 So when we look back up here again under the standard 8 conversion, does it not say --9 MR. SANTACROCE: Your Honor, I have to object to that 10 last as vague and ambiguous. THE COURT: Mr. Staudaher, if you're going to read 11 12 and quote from the record, then read and quote from the record 13 meaning read the record the way it's written. Don't put your 14 spin on it or change the words if she's only relying on the 15 record itself. Do you understand? 16 If she has personal knowledge, you can ask her 17 whatever you want using your own words, but if you're relying 18 solely on the record, then I think you need to quote directly 19 from the record --20 MR. STAUDAHER: Certainly. 21 THE COURT: -- and not change it. 22 MR. STAUDAHER: I will go back and read it directly 23 from the record, Your Honor. BY MR. STAUDAHER: 2.4

KARR REPORTING, INC.

CY is medical direction --

THE COURT: I'm sorry. QY for the record. 1 2 MR. STAUDAHER: Excuse me. BY MR. STAUDAHER: 3 QY, medical direction of one certified registered 4 5 nurse anesthetist, CRNA by an anesthesiologist; do you see that? 6 7 Yes. Α And then under reimbursement allowed, it gives 8 0 percentage calculated as a modifier? 9 10 Α Yes. 11 And it's got a 50 percent number in that situation, 12 correct? 13 А Yes. Now, if we go back up to standard anesthesia max, see 14 where it says base unit or base value, plus time increments 15 plus modifying units, plus conversion factor, times modifier 16 percentage; do you see that? 17 18 Yes. Modifier percentage is delineated here on the same 19 page of this document; is it not? 20 21 Α Yes. 22 Now, with regard to the asterisk which is contained in the various items listed under anesthesia max it says refer 2.3 24 to the definitions section; do you see that?

KARR REPORTING, INC.

25

Α

Yes.

KARR REPORTING, INC.

definitions here, and this is on page 22, correct?

23

24

25

Under the definitions section talking about anesthesia time specifically, are you able to read that, or would you like me to zoom in on it for you?

Can you read for us what this document -- your company -- defines anesthesia time as.

Begins when the anesthesiologist prepares the patient for induction of anesthesia in the operating room or in an equivalent area, i.e, a place adjacent to the operating room, and ends when the anesthesiologist is no longer in personal attendance and when the patient may safely be placed under

Anesthesia time involves the continuous actual presence of the anesthesiologist or medically directed certified registered nurse anesthetist.

MR. SANTACROCE: Your Honor, I'm going to object. I'm confused. Can we approach.

THE COURT: That's the confusion objection.

MR. SANTACROCE: Confusion.

THE COURT: That's NRS 48 --

THE COURT: Come on up.

RICHARD WRIGHT: I'll join.

(Conference at the bench not recorded.)

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Staudaher, you may proceed or you may continue rather.

MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor.

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

2.2

- Q Now, we had some discussion about the basic value, and do you see the basic value defined there?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Will you read the basic value for us as well.

A The value of all usual anesthesia services except the time actually spent in anesthesia care and the modifying factors. The basic value, parentheses, base value includes usual operative and postoperative visits, the administration of fluids and/or blood incident to the anesthesia care, the interpretation of noninvasive monitoring, parentheses, ECGs, temperature, blood pressure, oximetry, capnography, mass spectrometry, parentheses, placement of arterial central venous and pulmonary artery catheters and use of transesophageal echocardiography, parentheses, TEE are not included in the basic value.

Note, any procedure around the head, neck or shoulder girdle requiring field avoidance or any procedure requiring a position other than supine or lithotomy has either a minimum base value, parentheses, base value of 5.0 regardless of any lesser basic value, parentheses, base value assigned to such procedure in the relative value guide.

25

Α

Yes.

A Correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

So when we go back to the original page where we're talking about standard anesthesia time, we defined the base value, the time increments, the modifier percentage, the conversion factor -- I don't think I looked that up, but I will -- and the modifying units; do you see those?

А Yes.

Okay. So let me go back to that just to make sure we have everything defined. Modifying units, and if we look here I'm just going to read it.

Time units added for additional reimbursement allowed as defined by the physical status modifier or qualifying circumstances code reported, i.e, 1 additional unit to the base value for a pending modifier P3. See Section 2B.

When we looked at Section 2B, did it not say that P2 and below was 0 units additional?

Yes. Α

Now, that was in the modifying units. The modifier percentage also on that same page says, The reduction in the reimbursement allowed as defined by the modifier, i.e, 50 percent of the max of the fee max factor. For the modifier QK see Section 2, slash, B, and we also looked at that; did we not?

A Yes.

2.0

Q Just making sure we have every one of these defined. Base value, time increments, modifying units and the last one I think was conversion factor, and I don't recall if I've done that one, but let me look at that.

Conversion factor, the incremental multiplier rate defined by specific contracts or industry standards for nonnetwork physicians the applied conversion factor is based on a recognized national source.

So those — this we have definitions for every item contained in this portion that is entitled Standard Anesthesia ${\tt Max}$; is that correct?

A Yes.

Q Now, with regard to Exhibit 216 I want you to walk us through what we are looking at here. Because these are your records now, the ones that we are showing you, correct -- or showing up on the screen; is that correct?

A Yes.

- Q And if we need to zoom in on any portion of this, we can do so, but who is this for?
 - A This page is for patient Patty Aspinwall.
- Q Now, when you said that this was the HCFA 1500 Form electronic equivalent, what are we talking about here? I see

And what is the amount billed here?

25

| ı | | |
|----|------------|---|
| 1 | А | \$560. |
| 2 | Q | Now, G looks like it's a category for units. There |
| 3 | is nothing | g indicated there? |
| 4 | А | Correct. |
| 5 | Q | Is that typical? |
| 6 | А | For anesthesia that is my experience, yes. |
| 7 | Q | Okay. We'll move over across to anesthesia time. |
| 8 | Where is t | chat? |
| 9 | А | 31. |
| 10 | Q | Now, based on your fee schedule that we just looked |
| 11 | at a momer | nt ago, how many units of time would that entail? |
| 12 | А | Based on the reimbursement policy that is 3 units. |
| 13 | Q | Above the base units value which we saw in the fee |
| 14 | schedule : | is 5; is that correct? |
| 15 | A | The reimbursement policy, yes. |
| 16 | Q | Okay. So a total of 8 based on the math of your fee |
| 17 | schedule? | |
| 18 | А | Correct. |
| 19 | Q | Now, the rest of this as we go down, the total |
| 20 | charges un | nder Box 28 the same \$560? |
| 21 | А | Correct. |
| 22 | Q | And then under the locations of the I think it's |
| 23 | Box 32 of | the place where the service was done, what is that? |
| 24 | A | That is the Endoscopic Center of Southern Nevada. |

Q And what is the address?

| 1 | А | 700 Shadow Lane 16. | |
|----|--|--|--|
| 2 | Q | And when it says servicing physician supplier, who is | |
| 3 | listed t | here? | |
| 4 | А | Ron Lakeman. | |
| 5 | Q | So this again is your electronic version? | |
| 6 | А | Correct. | |
| 7 | Q | I want to go to what is marked as GJ Desai 1191. Can | |
| 8 | you tell | us what we are looking at here? | |
| 9 | А | This is the check that was presented to | |
| 10 | Gastroenterology Center of Nevada for payment on the claim for | | |
| 11 | Patty Aspinwall. | | |
| 12 | Q | Does it look as though based on your review of this | |
| 13 | record t | that this was actually negotiated based on the stamps | |
| 14 | and so t | forth on the back of the check? | |
| 15 | А | Yes. | |
| 16 | Q | The dollar amount of the check was? | |
| 17 | А | \$249.92. | |
| 18 | Q | So on the claim that was originally submitted of \$560 | |
| 19 | this is | the amount that your company paid? | |
| 20 | А | Correct. | |
| 21 | Q | Now going to the next page, do you see this? | |
| 22 | А | Yes. | |
| 23 | Q | Can you tell us what it is. | |
| 24 | А | This is the explanation of benefits that was sent to | |
| | 11 | | |

Patty Aspinwall.

| | l . | |
|----|-----------|---|
| 1 | Q | I'm going to zoom in on this. Just a moment. |
| 2 | | So your company would've sent this document to Patty |
| 3 | Aspinwall | ? |
| 4 | А | This is a copy of the letter that was sent to her, |
| 5 | yes. | |
| 6 | Q | Under services detail there is an item here listed; |
| 7 | what is t | hat? |
| 8 | A | Anesthesia. |
| 9 | Q | If we go across, do we see the same numbers as we saw |
| 10 | on your p | revious form? |
| 11 | А | Yep, the amount billed, the \$560. |
| 12 | Q | And there is a discount rate. Do you know what that |
| 13 | is? | |
| 14 | А | Correct. That would be the amount that the provider |
| 15 | is discou | nted for being a participating provider. |
| 16 | Q | And if you go across to the amount approved, it says |
| 17 | \$312.40? | |
| 18 | А | Correct. |
| 19 | Q | And then based on your plan it says here according to |
| 20 | this reco | rd, Plan pays 80 percent? |
| 21 | А | Correct. |
| 22 | Q | Which was the total of 400 or of \$249.92? |
| 23 | А | Correct. |
| 24 | Q | Now, the amount the total balance left over, this |
| 25 | 62.48, is | that something that is the responsibility of the |

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

patient so to speak?

had been a mistake in the submission of the claim?

KARR REPORTING, INC.

that and move to strike. I don't want to make a speaking

23

24

25

Α

No.

MR. SANTACROCE: Your Honor, I'm going to object to

1 objection. 2 THE COURT: Well, I'll see counsel up here. I'm not 3 sure what your objection is. (Conference at the bench not recorded.) 4 5 THE COURT: Overruled. Go on. MR. STAUDAHER: I pass the witness, Your Honor. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. MS. STANISH: Judge, do you want us to wait until we 8 9 get additional documents? That would be my preference. 10 THE COURT: What was that again? I'm sorry. I'11 11 see counsel up here. 12 (Conference at the bench not recorded.) 13 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to take 14 a quick recess until right around 2:35. 15 During this quick recess you are reminded that you are not to discuss this case or anything relating to the case 16 17 with each other, with anyone else. You're not to read, watch, 18 listen to any reports of or commentaries on this case, any 19 person or subject matter relating to the case by any medium of 20 information. Please do not do any independent research. 21 Please do not form or express an opinion on the trial. 2.2 Notepads in your chairs, follow the bailiff through the double doors. 23 24 (Jury recessed 2:21 p.m.)

KARR REPORTING, INC.

25

THE COURT: Before we take our break and I let you

take your break, a couple of documents you mentioned in your 1 2 testimony that none of us have, the first was you mentioned 3 that you can just access the CMS Codes from 2007 online but 4 that you need a password, or you need to know something. Can 5 you tell us how to do that, how to access that online. THE WITNESS: If you go to the CMS website --6 7 THE COURT: Okay. THE WITNESS: -- CMS.gov --8 9 THE COURT: Okay. Hang on. Okay. 10 THE WITNESS: And what I do is I search, like, 2007 CPT Code and then the number, and it will come up with the 11 definition. 12 13 THE COURT: Okay. And what number would I use? MR. STAUDAHER: 810. 14 15 THE WITNESS: 00810. 16 MR. STAUDAHER: 00810. 17 THE COURT: 00810? 18 MR. STAUDAHER: Yes. 19 THE COURT: And it says -- well, what came up for me 20 was HCPCS, general information, like articles. 21 THE WITNESS: Right. A lot of those are archived 22 into PDF articles. 23 THE COURT: Okay. 2.4 THE WITNESS: So it takes some digging around to find

25

the correct report.

THE COURT: Okay. So basically you've got to dig 1 2 through this stuff --3 THE WITNESS: You do. THE COURT: -- and find --4 5 MR. STAUDAHER: I can just bring my iPad up there. 6 THE COURT: Okay. 7 THE WITNESS: Unfortunately, yes, you do. 8 THE COURT: Okay. And then the second thing that 9 they wanted to know about was you mentioned your notes that you 10 left, I'm assuming, back on your desk in Minnesota? 11 THE WITNESS: Yeah. 12 THE COURT: And I guess the question is is there any 13 way to transmit that to us here, e-mail or anything like that? 14 THE WITNESS: Not unless I go back and do it. 15 THE COURT: Okay. 16 MS. STANISH: Your Honor, I also have concern about 17 any attorney-client-privileged information that may be in those 18 notes. 19 THE COURT: Well, she said she can't do it. She just 20 said --21 MS. STANISH: Okay. 22 THE COURT: I mean, I don't know if you were in the 23 room or Ms. Weckerly had gone out in the hallway.

researched the CMS Codes or the CPT Codes to find out the unit

that the notes were notes she made to herself because she

24

amounts or something like that in notes to herself. 1 2 MS. STANISH: Right. Right. I heard that, Your 3 Honor. 4 THE COURT: Obviously we don't want any privileged 5 information. So those are the only two things I recall that she referred to in her testimony that we haven't seen. 6 7 Ms. Stanish, do you recall anything else that the 8 witness referred to in her testimony that we haven't seen? 9 MS. STANISH: Well, obviously the rate schedule. THE COURT: I thought that was the CPT Codes. 10 MS. STANISH: No, it's not. 11 THE COURT: Oh, that's something different. 12 13 THE WITNESS: The fee schedule. THE COURT: Fee schedule. 14 15 RICHARD WRIGHT: How we figured out how much the 16 claim is 17 THE COURT: I get it. 18 RICHARD WRIGHT: Something basic. 19 MS. STANISH: I think they referred to it as the 20 conversion factor which would be the price tag that you would 21 put on to each unit. 22 THE WITNESS: Which we call a fee schedule. 23 yeah. 2.4 MS. STANISH: That's what we are missing. 25 THE COURT: Is there any way to get that transmitted

here so that the defense can see it? 1 2 THE WITNESS: I can check in the system and see --3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 THE WITNESS: -- and try to get ahold of somebody if 5 I cannot locate it. MS. STANISH: From 2007. 6 7 THE WITNESS: Correct. 8 THE COURT: Right. That's the day --THE WITNESS: Yes. It would be archived. 9 10 THE COURT: She gets it. 11 RICHARD WRIGHT: Get going. THE WITNESS: So it would be archived. 12 13 THE COURT: All right. And then why don't you do 14 I'm going to take a break in the back. 15 THE WITNESS: Do you want me to do that right this 16 minute? 17 THE COURT: On the --18 THE WITNESS: Because I would have to log into my system at work to do that. 19 20 THE COURT: Okay. Can you do that? Did you bring a 21 computer with you, or maybe Ms. Akridge has a personal computer 22 that she would let you use if you feel --23 THE WITNESS: I would have to use my company laptop 24 because of the firewall system within our --25 THE COURT: I see. Did you bring that with you?

THE WITNESS: I do have it with me. 1 2 THE COURT: Okay. Then you can use that. I mean, we 3 don't want you to have to share any protected passwords with 4 any of us or anything like that. The defense just needs the 5 information. That's what were trying to get here. MS. AKRIDGE: We have a couple of laptops she can --6 7 THE COURT: She said that she didn't -- that's what I 8 asked. So she said she can't use your laptop because it might 9 not go into their system. So she has a laptop, and she's going to use that. So we'll just take a break. 10 11 You can just do that in here if you can. 12 THE WITNESS: Okay. 13 THE COURT: If not, when I come back in, let me know. 14 RECORDER: Ma'am, can I have your name. THE COURT 15 MS. AKRIDGE: I'm sorry. Connie Akridge. 16 THE COURT RECORDER: A-c-k or --17 MS. AKRIDGE: A-k-r-i-d-g-e. THE COURT RECORDER: A-k-r --18 19 MS. AKRIDGE: Ridge. 20 THE COURT RECORDER: Thank you. 21 (Proceedings recessed 2:26 p.m. to 2:54 p.m.) 22 (Outside the presence of the jury.) 23 THE COURT: Is everybody ready? 2.4 MR. STAUDAHER: I don't know. They were working on a

computer back there. So I don't know.

| 1 | THE COURT: Ms. Weckerly? | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | MR. STAUDAHER: The witness. | | |
| 3 | THE COURT: Oh. | | |
| 4 | MR. STAUDAHER: They had to use a real computer. | | |
| 5 | THE COURT: Oh, I get it. Okay. I didn't know who | | |
| 6 | was back there. | | |
| 7 | MR. STAUDAHER: Well, we have the other witness who | | |
| 8 | is ready on all of those things. | | |
| 9 | THE COURT: Okay. So the next witness has | | |
| 10 | everything? | | |
| 11 | MR. STAUDAHER: Yes. | | |
| 12 | THE COURT: Can we maybe start with the next witness | | |
| 13 | and do the cross altogether? | | |
| 14 | MR. STAUDAHER: Doing the you mean the cross later | | |
| 15 | with this witness? | | |
| 16 | THE COURT: Of everybody at the same time if we have | | |
| 17 | to wait longer for these records. | | |
| 18 | How much longer? | | |
| 19 | THE MARSHAL: She doesn't know. She's got calls in | | |
| 20 | to people. She's doing her thing. | | |
| 21 | THE COURT: Can we do this | | |
| 22 | RICHARD WRIGHT: Let's start the next witness. | | |
| 23 | THE COURT: Let's start the next one, cross that one, | | |
| 24 | and then cross this last gal. Everybody cool with that? | | |
| 25 | MR. STAUDAHER: Okay. | | |

THE COURT: All right. Bring the jury in. 2 RICHARD WRIGHT: Hold on. This witness is on the 3 phone to her office. THE COURT: This next witness? 4 5 RICHARD WRIGHT: Yes. With Weckerly and Stanish getting some additional information. 6 7 (Jury entering 3:05 p.m.) 8 THE COURT: Court is now back in session. 9 Ladies and gentlemen, we're going to interrupt the testimony of the last witness before we go into the 10 11 cross-examination, and the State is going to call their next 12 witness, and then at some later time the last witness will be 13 called, and the defense will have the opportunity to 14 cross-examine that witness. 15 As I've told you before and would like to remind you 16 again, the order in which the testimony comes in is immaterial, 17 but you have to keep an open mind until you've heard everything in this trial. 18 19 So, Mr. Staudaher, call your next witness. 20 MR. STAUDAHER: State calls Patty -- or Patricia Gonzalez. 21

THE COURT: All right.

22

23

24

25

spell your name.

KARR REPORTING, INC.

(State's witness, Patricia Gonzalez, sworn.)

THE CLERK: Please be seated, and please state and

THE WITNESS: Patricia González. 1 P-a-t-r-i-c-i-a, 2 G-o-n-z-a-1-e-z. 3 THE COURT: Thank you. 4 Mr. Staudaher. 5 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. STAUDAHER: DIRECT EXAMINATION 6 7 BY MR. STAUDAHER: Ms. Gonzalez, what do you do for a living? 8 0 I am the director at Anthem BlueCross and BlueShield. 9 When you say director, what do you mean? 10 I am the Provider Network Management Director. I 11 Α oversee the contracts, the network that providers and 12 13 physicians and hospitals do for the whole state but where the 14 members utilize our services. Can you tell us a little bit of your background and 15 16 training that got you up to that point? 17 Yeah. I started with the company pretty much doing 18 the physicians -- contracting with the physicians and then moved on to be a manager and overseeing the staff that did the 19 20 physicians contracted with the hospitals and then currently 21 contracting with the hospitals and overseeing the network. 22 So how long have you been with the company? Since 1997. 23 Α 24 Are you familiar with the policies and so forth

related to the areas that you're familiar with as far as your

job goes?

1.0

A Yes.

Can you walk us through the timeline of where you were in the company from '99 to the present, meaning what you started doing in '99, what you moved to at a different time, changed sort of hats so to speak.

Have you been involved in those, I mean --

A Pretty much I've been in the same position since '99.

I moved pretty quickly when I came in in '97, then became a director in pretty much in '98.

Q So when you talk about your interactions or the physicians or whatever, what are you talking about exactly? What do you do for them?

A Pretty much if a physician group wants their contract -- or even the ones that are not contracted -- if a claim comes in, if it -- they either call us up and find out if the contract has been processed, if we've received it.

Sometimes if they don't feel it got paid appropriately or if they have questions on how it got paid, it's cur responsibility in my department to answer any of those questions.

- Q So you deal with contracting and claims as well?
- A Yes.
- Q Okay. So tell me about that issue. If somebody -- if you have a claim that somebody has a question about, how do

you deal with that?

2.4

A Pretty much the first thing we ask them is their tax ID number to make sure what contract they're calling about. Once they contact us and they tell us their tax ID number we look up their information to find out, you know, what their contract did, how long, what we would have paid.

Then if they have a specific claim issue, we ask them for the member ID. Then we look it up in the system based on that member ID and their tax ID number, whether we've received the claim or not.

- Q So in your job do you have access to all these records?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Do you access them regularly as a part of your job?
- 15 A Yes
- 16 Q Are they all kept in the ordinary course of business?
- 17 A Yes.
 - Q Now, when you go online to access these different documents, I mean --

You talked about claims, and you've talked about contracts and the like. Do you sometimes have to deal with multiple documents related to a single provider in order to deal with a specific claim for example?

- A Yes.
 - Q So you have to know the contract. You have to know

the claim, and is there anything else? I mean, are there any 1 2 policies that you go by to determine things? Yeah. We have provider manuals. We have 3 4 reimbursement policies. Well, as far as reimbursement policies, do you have 5 6 any specifically for anesthesia billing? 7 Yes. Α Are you involved in at least dealing with those and 8 9 are familiar with them in dealing with these claims and providers that you talked about? 10 А Yes. Uh-huh. 11 MR. STAUDAHER: Your Honor, may I approach? 12 13 THE COURT: You may. 14 BY MR. STAUDAHER: I'm going to show you a few documents, and I want to 15 16 ask you about them one by one. First of all, I'm showing you 17 Proposed State's 236. Can you tell us what that is. This is the facility agreement for Endoscopy Center 18 19 of Nevada. 20 Okay. And just flip through it if you would to see Q if you are familiar with the documents --21 22 Sure. Α -- if you've seen them before. 23 24 Α Yes.

25

Is this actually one that you provided for the court

Electronically Filed IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF IN AD 2014 09:17 a.m. Tracie K. Lindeman Clerk of Supreme Court

| DIPAK KANTILAL DESAI, |) CASE NO. 64591 |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| | |
| Appellant, | |
| | |
| VS. |) |
| | |
| THE STATE OF NEVADA, |) |
| | |
| Respondent. | |
| | _) |

APPELLANT'S APPENDIX VOLUME 34

FRANNY A. FORSMAN, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 000014 P.O. Box 43401 Las Vegas, Nevada 89116 (702) 501-8728

RICHARD A. WRIGHT, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 000886 WRIGHT, STANISH & WINCKLER 300 S. Fourth Street, Suite 701 Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Attorneys for Appellant

STEVEN S. OWENS Chief Deputy District Attorney Nevada Bar No. 004352 200 Lewis Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89155 (702) 671-2750 Attorney for Respondent

INDEX TO APPENDIX VOLUMES 1 through 41

| DOCUMENT | <u>vol</u> . | PAGE(S) |
|---|--------------|---------------|
| Indictment | 1 | 000001-000042 |
| Amended Indictment | 1 | 000043-000084 |
| Court Minutes 7/21/10 | 1 | 000085 |
| Court Minutes 2/08/11 | 1 | 000086 |
| Finding of Competency | 1 | 000087-000090 |
| Recorder's Transcript - Hearing: Video Deposition Tuesday, March 20, 2012 | 1 | 000091-000129 |
| Indictment (C-12-283381 - Consolidated Case) | 1 | 000130-000133 |
| Second Amended Indictment | 1 | 000134-000176 |
| Third Amended Indictment | 1 | 000177-000212 |
| Defendant Desai's Motion and Notice of Motion for Competency Evaluation | 1 | 000213-000229 |
| Recorder's Transcript - Hearing Re: Defendant Desai's Motion for Competency Evaluation Status Check: Experts/Trial Readiness (All) Tuesday, January 8, 2013 | 1 | 000230-000248 |
| Fourth Amended Indictment | 2 | 000249-000284 |
| Notice of Motion and Motion to Use Reported Testimony | 2 | 000285-000413 |
| Reporter's Transcript Re: Status Check: Experts (All) Thursday, March 7, 2013 | 2 | 000414-000440 |

| DOCUMENT | <u>vol</u> . | PAGE(S) |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| Defendant Desai's Opposition to State's Motion to Admit Foreign Documents Relating to Rodolfo Meana | 2 | 000441-000445 |
| Order | 2 | 000446-000449 |
| Court Minutes 3/21/13 | 2 | 000450 |
| Defendant Desai's Opposition to State's Motion to Use Reported Testimony | 2 | 000451-000454 |
| Court Minutes 3/26/13 | 2 | 000455 |
| Independent Medical Evaluation, 4/14/13 Filed Under Seal - Separately | 2 | 000456 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Calendar Call (All) State's Motion to Admit Evidence of Other Crimes Tuesday, April 16, 2013 | 2 | 000457-000497 |
| Fifth Amended Indictment | 3 | 000498-000533 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 7 Friday, May 3, 2013 | 3 | 000534-000622 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 8 Monday, May 6, 2013 | 3 & 4 | 000623-000773 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 9 Tuesday, May 7, 2013 | 4 & 5 | 000774-001016 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 10 Wednesday, May 8, 2013 | 5 | 001017-001237 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 11 Thursday, May 9, 2013 | 6 & 7 | 001238-001517 |

| DOCUMENT | <u>VOL</u> . | PAGE(S) |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 12 Friday, May 10, 2013 | 7 & 8 | 001518-001784 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 13 Monday, May 13, 2013 | 8 & 9 | 001785-002061 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 14 Tuesday, May 14, 2013 | 9 & 10 | 002062-00 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 15 Wednesday, May 15, 2013 | 10 & 11 | 002303-002494 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 16 Thursday, May 16, 2013 | 11 & 12 | 002495-002713 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 17 Friday, May 17, 2013 | 12 & 13 | 002714-002984 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 18 Monday, May 20, 2013 | 13 & 14 | 002985-003247 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 19 Tuesday, May 21, 2013 | 14 & 15 | 003248-3565 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 20 Wednesday, May 22, 2013 | 15 & 16 | 003566-003823 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 21 Thursday, May 23, 2013 | 16 & 17 | 003824-004014 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 22 Friday, May 24, 2013 | 17 | 004015-004185 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 23 Tuesday, May 28, 2013 | 18 | 004186-004384 |

| DOCUMENT | <u>vol</u> . | PAGE(S) |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 24 Petrocelli Hearing Wednesday, May 29, 2013 | 19 | 004385-004510 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 24 Afternoon Session Wednesday, May 29, 2013 | 20 | 004511-004735 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 25 Thursday, May 30, 3013 | 21 | 004736-004958 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 26 Friday, May 31, 2013 | 22 | 004959-005126 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 27 Friday, June 3, 2013 | 22 & 23 | 005127-005336 |
| State's Exhibit 18 - Meana Death Certificate Admitted 6/3/13 | 23 | 005337-005345 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 28 Tuesday, June 4, 2013 | 23 & 24 | 005346-005611 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 29 Wednesday, June 5, 2013 | 24 & 25 | 005612-005885 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 30 Thursday, June 6, 2013 | 25 & 26 | 005886-006148 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 31 Friday, June 7, 2013 | 27 & 28 | 006149-006430 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 32 Monday, June 10, 2013 | 28 | 006431-006641 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 33 Tuesday, June 11, 2013 | 29 & 30 | 006642-006910 |

| DOCUMENT | <u>vol</u> . | PAGE(S) |
|---|--------------|---------------|
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 34 Wednesday, June 12, 2013 | 30 & 31 | 006911-007143 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 35 Thursday, June 13, 2013 | 31 | 007144-007382 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 36 Friday, June 14, 2013 | 32 | 007383-007619 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 37 Monday, June 17, 2013 | 33 | 007620-007827 |
| State's Exhibit 228 - Table 20-1 - Modes of Transmission and Sources of Infection Considered Admitted 7/17/13 | 33 | 007828 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 38 Tuesday, June 18, 2013 | 34 | 007829-008038 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 39 Wednesday, June 19, 2013 | 35 | 008039-008113 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 40 Thursday, June 20, 2013 | 35 & 36 | 008114-008361 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 41 Friday, June 21, 2013 | 36 & 37 | 008362-008537 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 42 Monday, June 24, 2013 | 37 & 38 | 008538-008797 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 43 Tuesday, June 25, 2013 | 38 | 008798-009017 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 44 Wednesday, June 26, 2013 | 39 | 009018-009220 |

| DOCUMENT | <u>VOL</u> . | PAGE(S) |
|--|--------------|---------------|
| Reporter's Transcript - Jury Trial Day 45 Wednesday, June 27, 2013 | 39 & 40 | 009221-009473 |
| Defendant's Proposed Instruction No. 2 | 41 | 009474-009475 |
| Defendant's Proposed Instruction No. 3 | 41 | 009476 |
| Defendant's Proposed Instruction No. 4 | 41 | 009477 |
| Defendant's Proposed Instruction No. 5 | 41 | 009478 |
| Instructions to the Jury | 41 | 009479-009551 |
| Verdict | 41 | 009552-009559 |
| Reporter's Transcript - Sentencing Hearing Thursday, October 24, 2013 | 41 | 009560-009583 |
| Judgment of Conviction | 41 | 009584-009589 |
| Amended Judgment of Conviction | 41 | 009590-009595 |
| Notice of Appeal | 41 | 009596-009600 |



Electronically Filed 03/11/2014 01:12:16 PM

| Ì | 1 | Alm & Chum |
|--------|---|--|
| | | CLERK OF THE COURT |
| 1 | TRAN | |
| 2 | DISTRICT | |
| 3 | CLARK COUNTY | * * |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | STATE OF NEVADA, | CASE NO. C265107-1,2 CASE NO. C283381-1,2 |
| 7 | Plaintiff,) | DEPT NO. XXI |
| 8 9 | DIPAK KANTILAL DESAI, RONALD) E. LAKEMAN,) | TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDING |
| 10 | Defendants.) | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | BEFORE THE HONORABLE VALERIE ADA | AIR, DISTRICT COURT JUDGE |
| 13 | JURY TRIAL - | - DAY 38 |
| 14 | TUESDAY, JUNE | 18. 2013 |
| 15 | | 10, 2010 |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | APPEARANCES: | |
| 18 | | HAEL V. STAUDAHER, ESQ. ELA WECKERLY, ESQ. |
| 19 | | ef Deputy District Attorneys |
| 20 | FOR DEFENDANT DESAI: RIC | HARD A. WRIGHT, ESQ. GARET M. STANISH, ESQ. |
| 21 | FOR DEFENDANT LAKEMAN: FRE | DERICK A. SANTACROCE, ESQ. |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | RECORDED BY JANIE OLSEN, COURT REGISTER TRANSCRIBED BY: KARR Reporting, | |
| 25 | TIMINOCATORD DI. NANA REPOTCTING, | 1110. |
| | | |
| | II | |

INDEX OF WITNESSES

| ⁻ | | |
|--------------|---|-------------------|
| 2 | STATE'S WITNESSES: | PAGE |
| 3 | JOANNE SAMS | |
| 5 | Direct Examination by Mr. Staudaher: Voir Dire Examination by Ms. Stanish: Cont. Direct Examination by Mr. Staudaher: | 18 30 46 |
| 6 7 | Cross-Examination by Ms. Stanish: Redirect Examination by Mr. Staudaher: Recross-Examination by Ms. Stanish: | 56 58 60 |
| 8 | KATIE KALKA | |
| 9 | Direct Examination by Mr. Staudaher: Voir Dire Examination by Ms. Stanish: | 75 81 |
| 10 | Cont. Direct Examination by Mr. Staudaher: Examination outside the presence of the | 84 |
| 11 | jury by Ms. Stanish: | 199 |
| 12 | PATRICIA GONZALEZ | |
| 13 14 | Direct Examination by Mr. Staudaher: Cross-Examination by Ms. Stanish: Cross-Examination by Mr. Santacroce: | 115 154 162 |
| 15 | Redirect Examination by Mr. Staudaher: Recross-Examination by Mr. Santacroce: | 167 171 |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |

INDEX OF EXHIBITS STATE'S EXHIBITS OFFERED ADMITTED 1500 Form, Check, Explanation of Benefits for Patty Aspinwall 1500 Form - Kenneth Rubino 80P 80R 1500 Form - Sharrieff Ziyad Anesthesia Insurance Billing Records -210A Washington/Source: Vista - Check for Insurance 210B Anesthesia Insurance Billing Records -Washington/Veteran Payment History 216B Anesthesia Insurance Billing Records -Aspinwall/Anthem Explanation of Benefits Anthem BlueCross BlueShield Anesthesia Reimbursement Policy Anthem BlueCross BlueShield Contracts -Provider Contract, Date Sheet - Endo Center West Anthem BlueCross BlueShield Contracts -Gastro Center INS Anthem BlueCross BlueShield Contracts -Gastro Center INS and HMO

-

ı

jury.

LAS VEGAS, CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA, JUNE 18, 2013, 10:42 A.M.

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: Are we all worked out to start?

All right. Janie, are you on the record?

THE COURT RECORDER: I am.

THE COURT: All right. Out of the presence of the

Ms. Stanish, you indicated that before we brought the jurors in you had a matter you needed to raise with the Court; is that correct?

MS. STANISH: Yes, Your Honor. I wanted to alert the Court to some issues that are still ongoing regarding the insurance witnesses.

You had ordered that the State get with the various witnesses to produce applicable contracts, and I understood the rate schedule, and we have received some of the contracts none of which answer the basic question as to is this a misdemeanor or felony, and by that, Your Honor, I mean we are still lacking the information which these witnesses will rely upon to calculate the value of the anesthesia services.

I've received for instance the 2007 anesthesia policy of United Healthcare Group, and it says that, you know, it has that formula that Ms. Syler talked about where you should have the base value plus the time increments plus modifying units, add those three items up, multiply it by the conversion factor.

The conversion factor being the price per unit, and then multiply all that by the modifier percentage.

And basically what I've got -- at least with this one insurer -- is that's the formula we're going to apply, but as Ms. Syler explains the -- how the insurance company measures the time unit whether they use the CMS way or whether they use a different measurement of time and whatever the conversion factor is that that is determined by the contract or they follow the CMS formula.

As I stand here today I can't answer those questions, Your Honor. We haven't gotten that kind of information.

THE COURT: Well, I don't have it. So I need a response from the State.

MR. STAUDAHER: I will give a response, Your Honor.

MS. STANISH: And I should clarify, Your Honor. You had mentioned earlier, well, defense just get on the Internet and figure it out.

THE COURT: No. I said that that may be -
I didn't say, Defense, you get on the Internet. I
said --

MS. STANISH: Well, we did.

THE COURT: Well, I may have said that, but what I think what I said was it may be just available on the Internet, and we may just be able to get on the Internet and find it, and then I think I also said, but I don't know if it's the kind of

thing where you have to be a provider or insurer to access that. A lot of these things you have to pay money to access, and maybe just random people such as ourselves cannot do it.

MS. STANISH: Right. And as Ms. Syler explained in her testimony, the Internet website for CMS only goes back to 2009. She couldn't even get the 2007 conversion factors and the base unit assignments and nor could I, and I feel like if the State is here today and that they didn't preserve the 2007 conversion factors or applicable contracts that specifically address the anesthesia charges, then there is a failure to preserve the evidence, and these charges should be dismissed.

THE COURT: Well, I don't know that that's something the State would've had and failed to preserve. I mean, it would be something the insurer had and may or may not have preserved, and the State may or may not have asked for it back when they had it. I think that's more, you know, it's not evidence they had that they discarded or something like that as I understand it.

Mr. Staudaher?

MR. STAUDAHER: Up to this point we have been forwarding -- and your clerk has gotten everything we've been forwarding on -- as well as -- not your clerk, your JEA. I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. STAUDAHER: So we're trying to be as open as we

possibly can. We have received documents from the VA Hospital -- or VA Hospital -- from the VA which also indicates that the latest information is that they use CMS for their anesthesia calculations.

So that's the very first witness today. They have a contract between the VA and the Endoscopy Center signed by Dr. Desai. So that's the contract as well as the way that they calculate their anesthesia or what they use for their anesthesia. So I think it's been provided for that witness.

Ratie Kalka who is the United Healthcare representative before she even was going to testify and was admitted at the Grand Jury the provider agreements were there signed by Dr. Desai. So they were provided, the actual contracts themselves as well as the anesthesia policy; however, the anesthesia policy that they had originally provided was the 2010 version. We subsequently received the 2007 version, and we provided that to counsel. So they have those for that witness who is our -- I believe to be our second witness if she gets on the ground and gets here because she is arriving by plane.

The third was Patty Schibona -- excuse me, Patricia Gonzalez who supplied us with all of the contracts that they had with the Endoscopy Center, with the Gastroenterology Center all signed by Dr. Desai as well as the information regarding how they calculate their anesthesia billing.

Now, I know Ms. Wright is looking for a conversion factor that she says is not --

THE COURT: Mr. Staudaher just married you off.

MS. STANISH: I know.

MR. STAUDAHER: I'm sorry.

MS. STANISH: It happens when you work with someone who represented --

MR. STAUDAHER: In that regard there is the issue of we believe that they have been responsive, that they have provided what they use as far as their basis whether it's an ASA — the American Association — or Society of Anesthesiologists — whether it's CMS, whether it's their own internal. Before we left last time we actually had the BlueCross BlueShield representative's anesthesia policy, and that is Patty Gonzalez who is also a scheduled witness for today.

So from my view — at least the three witnesses that we have today — all of the documents that have been responsive to what the Court's order was, what counsel was requesting have been provided in advance, and as far as the other witnesses the one that we received today, and I have not gone through it completely, was from Culinary. There were about three or four documents that came from them that they believed were responsive. Those have been provided.

So HPN documents came yesterday. They were provided.

We believe that those were responsive based on what the Court had ordered, and they used the ASA relative-value scale or relative-value guide for their determination of their anesthesia billing. They provided the entire guide for 2007. So it is the year that they had used those kinds of documents.

2.2

The only ones that are outstanding at this point from our perspective are the witness who actually did testify who was Patty Schibona from PacifiCare. We talked with their attorney today. They are in the process of trying to get whatever documents they have together regarding that. They think that they will have them, or they are in the process of doing them, and they believe that they can provide them.

Now, she obviously was not just the one testifying, but she was the one who testified that she could determine what the dollar amount was per unit by simply taking the dollar amount of reimbursement and dividing that by the number of units to get a dollar amount per unit. That's — as far as a conversion factor — that's how she was able to determine that with the existing documents that she had here.

Beyond that we are still trying to get those documents. So I don't believe that there is any hiding the ball. I don't think anybody's tried to, you know, do up something improper or that there were lost documents that were not ever provided.

Now, whether or not they have an internal computer

that does some sort of calculation based on things and whether or not that is actually spelled out in a contract in hard written form I don't know, but those people can certainly testify about it if they know, and if not, they can provide the calculations to what the unit costs were like Ms. Schibona did.

2.4

am hearing is there may be an issue with the CMS guidelines because those may have been different in 2007. So what I would say is if there are witnesses who are, you know, are going to say we used the CMS guidelines, find out if they have the 2007 CMS guidelines or if they have personal knowledge as to whether or not there were changes in the CMS guidelines from 2007 to 2009. Because a lot of times they may say I've been working with this, and in terms of this, there was no change in the CMS guidelines from 2007 to 2009 in which case you just look at the 2009 guidelines so long as they have personal knowledge having worked with the guidelines. So —

MR. STAUDAHER: Now, that information has already come in, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, I don't remember exactly.

MR. STAUDAHER: Well, when we had Joan Syler on the stand and actually counsel went up to there and looked at them. She had what she said was effective 2006 the CMS guidelines pertaining to how anesthesia is calculated. It was a transmittal. I think it was 13, 31, 16 or something like that

that she was referring to. I actually can get that document. She testified to it and provided evidence of that in court. The document itself did not come in, but that is the guideline that was in effect at that time, and that's what she testified about.

THE COURT: All I would submit --

2.3

Ms. Stanish is shaking her head. And candidly, I don't remember exactly.

All I would say is -- so we're not up here arguing at the bench all the time -- establish whether or not they have a personal knowledge or if they're just a custodian of records that really don't, establish what documents they are relying on so we all see whether they have it or there's some other document that they don't have that we can then say, well, where is it. Did you maintain the document. Did you throw it away.

If there is a change in, like, the CMS document or something like that, you know, what's the most -- latest available document, and then again you would have to establish personal knowledge that they were familiar with, you know, that they worked with it enough in 2007 and again in 2009 so they could say from 2007 to 2009 there was really no change in this area of the CMS guidelines regarding how we were reimbursing for anesthesia.

So I think if you do those things, we shouldn't have a problem going forward. Just be mindful with whoever's

witness it is because there is some confusion in this regard.

So just kind of go painstakingly through, okay, wha

So just kind of go painstakingly through, okay, what are you relying on. What did you use to calculate this reimbursement so we can make sure that we have all of the documents that they would've relied upon, and it may be a little plodding and boring, but just make sure you do it that way so again we are not up here arguing a foundation objection or something like that at the bench and then it will be clear to the extent --

She's not here today, right, Ms. -- the gal, or is she to finish up, the gal we interrupted?

MS. WECKERLY: No. She's still out of town.

THE COURT: So for her --

Oh, that's the one. We never dealt with that issue.

MS. WECKERLY: Well, with the woman who is out of town, that was the young --

THE COURT: Right. That her lawyer told her to get back on the plane and $-\!-$

MS. WECKERLY: Oh, that's a different witness.

MR. STAUDAHER: Oh, no, no, no. She's --

MS. WECKERLY: We've got compliance with them.

MR. STAUDAHER: Yes. And those have been --

THE COURT: Okay. So nothing that the Court needs to

do?

MR. STAUDAHER: No.

MS. WECKERLY: No.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STAUDAHER: But I just want to be clear on this as far as the CMS issue. Joan Syler testified that of the ones that were in effect as of 2006 or that went over this time period and those CMS guidelines, I mean, she had with her and testified about them. So to the extent that they rely on — the future witnesses rely on the CMS guidelines, the evidence about what was in place at that time has already come in through Joan Syler.

THE COURT: Well, what I would say is, you know, first of all they haven't had an opportunity to cross-examine Joan Syler yet.

MR. STAUDAHER: Oh, yes.

MS. WECKERLY: Yes.

MR. STAUDAHER: That was our billing expert.

THE COURT: Right. They did. I'm sorry. That's right. They did.

What I would say is for each witness, you know, before you get them to testify find out if they also have the personal knowledge. If they don't, then you can argue well, we're going to rely on other testimony, but I would -- as part of laying my foundation if I were you -- ask them, is this something you personally work with. Were you personally familiar with the CMS guidelines as part of your work. If they

say no, then okay. They can't make a comparison between 2007 and 2009, but if they have been and they can say, yes, as part of my work I've been working with the guidelines, and they've been the same for decades, you know, or whatever they're going to say, then I don't see a problem with the change or using 2009 guidelines.

Obviously if the witness can't say that, you know, they don't know. They don't remember, whatever, then you're going to have to rely on the testimony of other witnesses to kind of tie that in.

MS. STANISH: So I think I -- just to articulate it for the record, our objection is in large part a hearsay objection which I think Your Honor recognizes and is requiring them to set forth a solid foundation.

My second issue, Your Honor --

THE COURT: Right. As I'm -- essentially what I'm saying is if the 2009 guidelines in relevant part have not changed from 2007, I'm comfortable with the 2009 guidelines.

MS. STANISH: And I still think we may be lacking some contractual agreement that specifies whether they're going to apply CMS or just use the basic formula but tweak it to add their own --

THE COURT: All right. Well, having not seen the contracts I don't know what they specify or don't specify.

MS. STANISH: I don't either. I haven't seen it.

THE COURT: I mean, you're going to have to -they're going to have to figure out --

2.2

Some of these insurers may say, all of our contracts are the same, that we always use the CMS guidelines, or we always use this formula; it doesn't matter who the provider is. Okay.

Then they may not have separate things for each provider. It seems like it should be spelled out in some agreement so the provider knows.

MR. STAUDAHER: It should.

MS. STANISH: And real quick, the other issue, Your Honor --

THE COURT: One second.

MS. STANISH: -- is we would object to the State admitting into evidence copies of the billing, the Form 1500s EOBs that relate to the procedures. We didn't object last time when the first witness who was interrupted testified. I think it's confusing, however, for the jury to put in all the other claims as well as irrelevant given our discussions about potential 404(b) Brady issues relating to the procedures.

THE COURT: Upcoding?

MS. STANISH: Yes.

THE COURT: State?

MR. STAUDAHER: Well, I don't think there is any implication that there's upcoding. I don't necessarily have a

problem with providing to the jury that portion which we actually have testimony about which is the anesthesia, but all of those --

Part of the issue that we don't want to get into is that, oh, there's not completeness here. I mean, there were three different charges. Obviously there was a doctor charge, a facility charge and an anesthesia charge. All of those are part of the documentation that came in, and the part that we're asking them about --

THE COURT: Is the anesthesia.

Ģ

2.4

MR. STAUDAHER: -- is the anesthesia. Now, you know, at this point we've got the witnesses here. I mean, if the Court wants us to parse out those pieces and admit those, I don't have an issue with that, but I think it's a whole record.

THE COURT: Here's all I would say. Just try to make it as unconfusing as possible. So having not seen the records, you know, however you want to admit them as long as there's no inference of upcoding or something like that.

I mean, I think it's fair for them to put the anesthesia in some context that this was an endoscopy. This was a colonoscopy or whatever. I think that's only fair that the State be allowed to do that, and this was Dr. Carrol. I mean, some of that stuff is going to be as I understand it on the other billing. Maybe it's not. Maybe it just says procedure, but I think the State is certainly entitled to show

2

4 5

form.

6

7

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

20 21

19

2223

24

25

what procedure it is that they're billing for and not just the anesthesia. So to that extent I think the billing records certainly would be relevant.

MS. STANISH: And that code is on the anesthesia

THE COURT: Yes. But no one is going to remember, oh, zero 42, that was a colonoscopy, and this one is an endoscopy with a biopsy of a lesion.

MS. STANISH: Okay.

THE COURT: And this is a removed -- oh, a Code 65, that meant there were three polyps. They're not going to know that, and I know there was Code 45 or Code 49 or something we heard about.

Bring them in, Kenny.

I think the other issues, we'll deal with as they come up.

(Jury entering 11:00 a.m.)

THE COURT: All right. Court is now back in session. The record should reflect the presence of the State through the deputy district attorneys, the presence of the defendants and their counsel, the officers of the Court and the ladies and gentlemen of the jury.

And the State may call its next witness.

MR. STAUDAHER: State calls Joanne Sams.

(State's witness, Joanne Sams, sworn.)

THE CLERK: Please be seated, and please state and 1 2 spell your name. THE WITNESS: Joanne Sams. J-o-a-n-n-e, S-a-m-s. 3 THE CLERK: I didn't hear your last name. 4 THE WITNESS: Sams. S-a-m-s. 5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 6 7 Mr. Staudaher, you may proceed. MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 DIRECT EXAMINATION 9 BY MR. STAUDAHER: 10 Ms. Sams, what do you do for a living? 11 I'm a certified medical coder for the Veterans 12 Administration here in Las Vegas. 13 Can you explain to us what that is. 14 We take documentation -- medical documentation and we 15 convert it into codes for billing and reporting purposes. 16 Does that -- do you work with guidelines that are 17 considered -- called CMS guidelines? 18 I work with CMS guidelines. I see the guidelines as 19 20 well, yes. So the Veterans Administration uses those? 21 Α Yes. 22 Now, what are the CMS guidelines? What are those 23 24 things? Well, they're the standards of how to code for 25 Α

KARR REPORTING, INC.

That's the microphone. So make sure you speak into it so

25

everyone can hear you.

2.3

THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am.

MR. STAUDAHER: Could I reiterate that then, Your Honor, just so that you can hear it. I just want to reiterate the question.

THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead, please.

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

- Q I just want to be clear. You said that you had been working with CMS and the anesthesia part of it for billing purposes for the last 20 years or so?
 - A Right. That's correct.
- Q Did I understand you correctly to say that those guidelines for how anesthesia time, things like that have been calculated has not appreciably changed over that time period?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Clearly from 2007 to the present, has that changed in any degree?
 - A No.
- Q Now, as far as your contracts that you have with providers, do you actually enter into some sort of agreement with a new provider that might provide services for the VA?
- A If the VA cannot provide the services in-house, they will contract with a provider in the community.
- Q Did the VA contract to your knowledge with the Endoscopy Center of Southern Nevada to provide services?

1 Α Yes, they did. 2 MR. STAUDAHER: May I approach, Your Honor? 3 THE COURT: You may. 4 BY MR. STAUDAHER: 5 Showing you what has been marked as State's Proposed 6 230 and 231. I want you to tell me what each one of them is if 7 you would. First of all if you are familiar with them and then what they are. Start with 230 if you would. 8 9 230 is the extension of the contract with the 10 Endoscopic Center and the Gastroenterology Center, and 231 is 11 the authority on how the VA pays for non-VA professional-services providers. 12 13 THE COURT: Did everybody hear that? 14 MS. STANISH: No. 15 THE COURT: Okay. You need to say that again, and if 16 you're going to turn, just move that microphone. So just make 17 sure you keep that in front of you whichever way you're facing 18 so that we can hear you, okay, ma'am? 19 THE WITNESS: Yes, ma'am. 20 THE COURT: So start over, and tell us again what 21 everything is. 22 THE WITNESS: Okav. 23 MR. STAUDAHER: Speak up as loudly as you can. 2.4 THE WITNESS: 230 is an extension of the contract,

KARR REPORTING, INC.

the initial contract with the Gastroenterology Center, the

25

KARR REPORTING, INC.

25

Now, as counsel looks at that before we go into it,

KARR REPORTING, INC.

25

Α

Yes, I have.

| 1 | Q | Specifically January 25th excuse me, July 25th of |
|----|------------|--|
| 2 | 2007? | |
| 3 | А | Yes. |
| 4 | | MR. STAUDAHER: May I approach, Your Honor? |
| 5 | | THE COURT: You may. |
| 6 | BY MR. STA | AUDAHER: |
| 7 | Q | And I'm showing you what has been marked as Proposed |
| 8 | State's 23 | 10 and I know this sticky on here is mine so I can |
| 9 | keep them | straight but would you flip through that, and tell |
| 10 | me if you | recognize those documents, and then we will talk |
| 11 | about what | t they are. |
| 12 | | That's 210; do you recognize that? |
| 13 | А | 210, I do not. This is it looks like it's the |
| 14 | provider': | s billing. |
| 15 | Q | For that particular person? |
| 16 | A | For yes. |
| 17 | Q | Go ahead and look at the whole thing. |
| 18 | A | Yeah. This is their document, their billing record. |
| 19 | Q | The provider, do you mean the Endoscopy Center's? |
| 20 | A | The Gastroenterology Center, yeah. |
| 21 | Q | Does it relate to that billing for Michael |
| 22 | Washingto: | n? |
| 23 | A | Yes, it does. |
| 24 | Q | For a date of service that you were involved with? |
| 25 | A | Yes. |
| | E . | |

| 1 | Q And that is 210? |
|----|--|
| 2 | A 210A is our is the VA's payment history. This |
| 3 | shows that we were billed and that we were paid for the |
| 4 | services rendered. |
| 5 | Q Related to the claim in 210? |
| 6 | A Yes. |
| 7 | Q Okay. |
| 8 | A And this is a release of records, I think. |
| 9 | MR. SANTACROCE: I didn't hear that. |
| 10 | THE WITNESS: It's a release of information. |
| 11 | THE COURT: I'm sorry. Could you say that again. |
| 12 | THE WITNESS: There is also a request for medical |
| 13 | records, a release of information attached to that. |
| 14 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 15 | THE WITNESS: And this is the facility charge the |
| 16 | Endoscopic Center of Nevada, their billing and our payment |
| 17 | history for their billing. |
| 18 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: |
| 19 | Q Related to the same claim? |
| 20 | A Yes. |
| 21 | Q Generally for 210? |
| 22 | A Yes. That's a duplicate. They sent a duplicate |
| 23 | entry of the same information. |
| 1 | |

24

25

Okay. Now, if we could go to 210B; what is that one?

210B is our payment history. This is what the VA has

MS. STANISH: May I see it.

25

THE COURT: Would you show that to counsel, please. 1 MR. SANTACROCE: I'm going to object to 210, Your 2 Honor. She said she didn't recognize it. I don't know how she 3 4 can admit that. It's a document she'd never seen, doesn't 5 recognize it. No objection to A and B. THE COURT: Lay a little better foundation for 210. 6 7 MR. STAUDAHER: I will, Your Honor. BY MR. STAUDAHER: 8 With regard to 210, did you not say that that at 9 10 least the provider information relates to the same claim that's in 210A and B? 11

A Right. I didn't recognize it because it's not VA documentation. It's the provider's documentation, their billing invoice.

Q Is it something -- is that the kind of thing that would've come to the VA for payment?

A The information on that invoice would've been converted onto a 1500 Form, a HCFA 1500 Form. So that the same information would be provided on a 1500 Form, and that's submitted to us.

Q Okay. So that's --

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: So where did you get that -- I'm sorry. Was that record kept and maintained in your file, or where did you get it?

THE WITNESS: That --

| 1 | THE COURT: I'm sorry. Mr. Staudaher, maybe can make |
|----|--|
| 2 | it clear. |
| 3 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: |
| 4 | Q The very first document, you said that information |
| 5 | would have been contained on a 1500 Form that would've come to |
| 6 | you? |
| 7 | A Right. |
| 8 | Q Does the information that's contained in 210 reflect |
| 9 | the information that actually made it into your computer |
| 10 | system? |
| 11 | A Yes, it's the same information. |
| 12 | Q Same information just in a different form from the |
| 13 | provider? |
| 14 | A Right. |
| 15 | Q So when you get the forms, do you they come in in |
| 16 | paper form or electronic, or how do you actually get them to |
| 17 | populate your record? |
| 18 | A At that time they came in in paper form. |
| 19 | Q Okay. So the record the paper form would have |
| 20 | been how would that have been handled once they came to you? |
| 21 | A Well, they're distributed to the clerks for payment, |
| 22 | and then it's reviewed by the coders on the back end. |
| 23 | Q Now, again the record on 210, does the information |
| 24 | there reflect the actual information that is contained in your |
| 25 | computer system accurately? |

| 1 | A Yes, it is. It's just that we require a claim form, |
|----|--|
| 2 | and the documentation 210 is the provider's invoice. It's the |
| 3 | same information. |
| 4 | THE COURT: Is that submitted to you? Was 210 |
| 5 | Exhibit 210 submitted to you, to the VA? Was that part of your |
| 6 | file? Where did that come from? |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: That's not part of |
| 8 | THE COURT: Of your file? |
| 9 | THE WITNESS: No. |
| 10 | THE COURT: Where did you get that? |
| 11 | THE WITNESS: I didn't have that. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Oh, okay. That's the confusion here. |
| 13 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: |
| 14 | Q So anyway at least on 210A and 210B it reflects that |
| 15 | information came from the Endoscopy Center. And at least 210 |
| 16 | itself is the information that is the same? |
| 17 | A Correct. |
| 18 | MR. STAUDAHER: With the caveat, Your Honor, 210A |
| 19 | certainly and 210B I would move for admission. |
| 20 | THE COURT: Yes. 210A and 210B are admitted. There |
| 21 | is no opposition to those. |
| 22 | MS. STANISH: Well, Your Honor |
| 23 | THE COURT: There is? |
| 24 | MS. STANISH: I do have some opposition. May I |

approach?

| 1 | | THE COURT: Sure. |
|----|------------|--|
| 2 | | (Conference at the bench not recorded.) |
| 3 | | THE COURT: All right. Ms. Stanish, you wanted to |
| 4 | voir dire | on Exhibits 210A and 210B; is that correct? |
| 5 | | MS. STANISH: Yes, Your Honor. |
| 6 | | THE COURT: All right. You may proceed. |
| 7 | | VOIR DIRE EXAMINATION |
| 8 | BY MS. ST. | ANISH: |
| 9 | Q | Ms. Sams is it? |
| 10 | A | Yes, ma'am. |
| 11 | Q | With respect to the Form 1500, that's the claim form, |
| 12 | correct? | |
| 13 | А | Correct. |
| 14 | Q | Do you not have the claim form that was submitted in |
| 15 | this case | ? |
| 16 | А | We do not have it on file. |
| 17 | Q | And why is that? |
| 18 | А | We had IT had purged information from our files. |
| 19 | They get | scanned after they're processed. The batches are |
| 20 | scanned, | and IT inadvertently deleted files. |
| 21 | Q | And as I recall you did not have this in the year |
| 22 | 2010 when | you testified before the Grand Jury either? |
| 23 | А | That's right. |
| 24 | Q | You did have the document that the clinic sent |
| 25 | showing t | hat a colonoscopy had been done, the operative report? |

1 A Correct.

- Q But even then you were missing the Form 1500.
- A 1500 Form.
 - Q And do you know when it was purged?
- A I do not.
- Q You don't know. Let me ask you a few questions relating to the foundation of the VA using the CMS system. I understand you say that the CMS system hasn't changed for many years --
- A Uh-huh.
 - Q And by the way, how long have you worked at the VA?
- 12 A Seven years.
 - $\,$ Q $\,$ And -- when you -- do you know in the year 2007 what the conversion rate was that the VA used to do this -- to pay this particular claim?
 - A In 2007, the authority instructs us to -- when there's no allowance for CMS --

The anesthesia is not provided on the Medicare

Physician Fee Schedule which is the schedule that the VA

initially started with, and because it's not on that fee

schedule -- it's a separate fee schedule through CMS -- we then

would default to if it's not on the Medicare Fee Schedule, then

it's either the bill charges or the VA fee schedule itself

which is a compilation of previous years' data, and it

calculates it at the 75th percentile and that would be the

payment for procedure codes.

So every October 1st we run a report of the previous year -- fiscal year information, and that we use for the current fiscal year as the VA fee schedule. So it defaults to the lesser of CMS, VA fee schedule or bill charges.

Q In this particular case, what was the basis for the payment in 2007?

A There was no fee-schedule amount for that procedure as it stood with the procedure codes and the three modifiers as it was billed. It wasn't -- it did not produce more than eight occurrences. That's when it shows up on the fee schedule. So there was no -- there was less than eight occurrences. So it then came up as no fee schedule found, and therefore it was paid at bill charges.

O Which was what amount?

A A hundred dollars. So there was no conversion factor. There was no base units in time.

 ${\tt Q}$ Okay. So it had nothing to do with ultimately what I understand you to say is --

A With the CMS.

 $\ensuremath{\mathtt{Q}}$ —— the amount paid did not have anything to do with the CMS formula?

A Correct.

Q It's a flat fee?

A It was a flat fee at that -- because -- because it

| l | | |
|----|-----------|--|
| 1 | doesn't s | how up on the Medicare Fee Schedule. |
| 2 | Q | I see. |
| 3 | A | It starts at the Medicare Fee Schedule. |
| 4 | Q | And this contract that is proposed in Government's |
| 5 | Exhibit 2 | 30, does that even have any application to anesthesia? |
| 6 | А | No. |
| 7 | | MR. SANTACROCE: What's that? |
| 8 | | THE COURT: What's the answer? |
| 9 | | THE WITNESS: No. |
| 10 | | THE COURT: No. The answer is no. |
| 11 | BY MS. ST | ANISH: |
| 12 | Q | It's just a flat fee based on what's charged? |
| 13 | A | For the anesthesia? |
| 14 | Q | Correct. |
| 15 | A | Yes. |
| 16 | Q | Regardless |
| 17 | | THE COURT: So |
| 18 | | I'm sorry. Go on, Ms. Stanish. |
| 19 | BY MS. ST | TANISH: |
| 20 | Q | Regardless of whatever time? |
| 21 | A | Regardless within that fiscal year. There is a flat |
| 22 | fee withi | in that fiscal year. |
| 23 | Q | So it didn't matter if the clinic billed 10 minutes |
| 24 | for anest | thesia time, 31 minutes for anesthesia time. They were |
| 25 | going to | get the flat fee of a hundred dollars? |
| | II | |

20

21

22

23

24

25

involve?

A Well, that's statistics. Because this was a non-VA provider that information is used for other parts of the VA. So it's not a factor in their reimbursement, but it is a factor in reviewing records at a different level.

MS. STANISH: I understand, I think, sort of.

Your Honor --

1.0

THE COURT: All right. You know what? I know we haven't been in session very long, ladies and gentlemen, but the Court actually needs a break. So we're going to take a quick break and so like 11:35, 11:40 depending on how long you folks need.

During the break you are reminded you are not to discuss the case or anything relating to the case with each other, with anyone else. You are not to read, watch, listen to reports of or commentaries on this case, any person or subject matter relating to the case. Please don't form or express an opinion on the trial.

Notepads in your chairs. Follow the bailiff through the rear door.

Ma'am, please don't discuss your testimony with anybody else during the break, and if you would like a break, please exit through the double doors, okay.

THE WITNESS: Thank you, ma'am.

(Jury recessed 11:24 a.m.)

THE COURT: I truly did need a break. So I think we need to talk about this, what just happened, but let me take a break first.

If any of you folks need to use the facilities, please do that, and then we'll come back.

(Proceedings recessed 11:24 a.m. to 11:29 a.m.)

(Outside the presence of the jury.)

THE COURT: All right. On the record.

It appears from that last bit of testimony that the dollar amount -- or the time amount, I misspoke -- the time amount is irrelevant to the rate of compensation.

So, State, what do you want to do?

MR. STAUDAHER: Well, we're not done with the witness clearly. Time on this witness was what this particular provider, which was the VA, paid basically a flat rate --

THE COURT: Paid a flat rate.

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$ STAUDAHER: -- and that was because there were -- she went through the whole thing about --

THE COURT: Right. Who cares why.

MR. STAUDAHER: -- eight or fewer occurrences, whatever. The fact of the matter is they would not have paid a dime on this claim if they had submitted anything that was false. That's the reason why there is an insurance charge in this case. If there is any false information provided in an insurance claim, one, that's a crime. Two, they don't have to pay and wouldn't pay, and I bet if we ask her the question, she will say that if there was information that was contained in the record including the anesthesia time which was not relevant for reimbursement purposes, the entire time would not have been paid.

THE COURT: Don't you have to have the --

Isn't that reasoning a little bit circular?

MR. STAUDAHER: No.

THE COURT: Don't you have to have the intent to defraud? So if you're getting the same amount, where is your intent to defraud? I mean, how are you --

MR. STAUDAHER: The intent to defraud and is -

THE COURT: -- defrauding them?

Okay, I'm filling something out, and you wouldn't pay me if you knew it was false, but where is your intent to defraud by putting false information?

MR. STAUDAHER: Because every single anesthesia submission regardless of whether it's the VA or PacifiCare or BlueCross BlueShield, they are all the same. They intend to put down false information. They submit every single claim the same regardless.

THE COURT: I know, but where -- what's the intent to defraud if you're getting the same amount of money whether you put in 5 minutes or 10 hours. How are you defrauding them?

Where is your intent to defraud?

MR. STAUDAHER: The intent to defraud is that the original document is submitted in the same way with everybody.

THE COURT: Yes. But they performed --

MR. STAUDAHER: You're not letting me finish.

THE COURT: -- anesthesia, Mr. Staudaher. Okay.

They performed anesthesia. There is no doubt about that.

These people had a procedure. There is no doubt about that.

They're getting infected. So we know they're -- according to your theory -- they're pumping the drugs in with the dirty drugs or whatever, okay. So they're entitled to compensation at the flat rate. So it's not like they are saying they did a procedure that they didn't do. Then it doesn't matter what the rate is because they didn't do the procedure.

Let's say they didn't give anesthesia. It's one of those people that says, gee, you know, I want to watch my colon on the TV. I'm not going to get any anesthesia, and then they say they were anesthetized. That's clearly fraud because they didn't do any anesthesia.

So where is the intent to defraud here? If they're going to -- if they've performed the service, they are entitled to compensation for the service regardless of how long it took. What's their intent to defraud?

MR. STAUDAHER: They're not entitled to compensation if they submit an insurance record.

THE COURT: I know, but why are they submitting the false claim?

MR. STAUDAHER: Because it's too hard to keep them all straight. They submit every single one the same.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to let you put on the witness and finish with your testimony.

Defense, you can make a motion to dismiss at the

conclusion of the case based on this, and then we'll argue about it later.

So put on the witness. Put on the testimony just like you would, and then to me the remedy is at the conclusion of the case if you don't think there's enough to give it to the jury on the intent to defraud issue, you can make a motion post trial on the VA stuff, and then you can argue your theory, and if I think well, okay. We'll maybe let the jury decide on that then, okay. If you want to say that it's part of their intent to defraud --

Basically what you're saying, Mr. Staudaher, is they had an intent to defraud other insurers, and so in order to make it something that everybody could do and not mess up, they had to put a false claim into all of their providers regardless of the rate of compensation because they intended to defraud Culinary, BlueCross BlueShield, PacifiCare. So in order to do that they had to submit false records across the board regardless of whether or not it affected the rate of compensation from certain insurers such as the VA. That essentially seems to be what your argument is, true?

MR. STAUDAHER: In a sense, but --

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. STAUDAHER: -- but you're --

THE COURT: I think my argument is better than whatever the heck it is you're trying to say.

are two -- for each one of these individuals there are two 2 separate charges. There is the insurance --3 4 THE COURT: I get it. There is the procedure, and 5 there's the anesthesia. MR. STAUDAHER: Oh, no. No. There is an insurance 6 7 charge. There is a theft-related charge. The insurance 8 charge --THE COURT: Right. You're not charging theft on 9 this. I get it. I just read over the Indictment --10 MR. SANTACROCE: He is. 11 RICHARD WRIGHT: He is charging theft. 12 13 THE COURT: -- again. 14 MS. STANISH: He is. RICHARD WRIGHT: It's in the theft count. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Here's the deal. You put in --16 I got it. I know there's two charges for each claim. 17 Theft is a dollar amount. Insurance fraud isn't a dollar 18 amount. It's basic, Mr. Staudaher. I get it. 19 20 I think the way I articulated what I thought your theory was made some sense. Whatever it is your stammering 2.1 around there trying to articulate isn't making any sense to me, 22 but hey, you know, we'll bring this up in a motion to dismiss 23

MR. STAUDAHER: You are missing the point that there

1

24

25

and you and Ms. Weckerly can put together whatever your theory

is, and maybe I won't grant their motion. Maybe they won't

make a motion. Maybe it's all going to start making sense.

2.4

Right now it's not making a lot of sense, and frankly I don't know why you're handing her a document when the Court says, Well, where did this document come from that you are testifying about? Basically she says, I don't know. They gave it to me. Since when do you hand a custodian of records documents and try to slip them in that they don't even know what they are testifying about? I mean, that's what I heard from her.

Now, we can play it back or whatever. We are not going to do that now. You finish up with your witness, and then they are going to file post evidence, post State resting. They're going to make whatever oral motions they want to make, and we'll do all of this argument at a later time.

But I think that theory I stated, I think that makes some sense. Now, maybe your theory is better, and you're just -- I'm not getting it, or maybe you are not articulating it or whatever. So put her on. Ask whatever you want, and we'll see where we are.

But there are certain legal qualifications that you have to meet before we can send this stuff to the jury. From what I've heard right now, I ain't hearing it, but hey, you can finish up with your witness, and maybe you can get it out in such a way that it makes some sense as to what your theory is. Let's wait and see.

Again, theft as we all know is a dollar amount. 2 Insurance fraud is not a dollar amount. If you're trying to 3 make it part of the global theory, I get it on the insurance 4 fraud. I don't get it on the theft where you are alleging a 5 dollar amount unless you -- I don't think that is where you're 6 going with this -- unless it is a patient who had a procedure 7 without anesthesia and they're billing for anesthesia. different. That's a totally different thing, but that's not 8 9 what we have here. 10 So, Kenny, bring them back. Mr. Staudaher, go get your witness. 11 12 MS. STANISH: Your Honor, I did want to object to

some of the exhibits.

THE COURT: Okay Well we have to wait for

THE COURT: Okay. Well, we have to wait for Mr . Staudaher.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. STANISH: Okay. Sure. Just a heads up.

THE COURT: Ma'am, just have a seat.

And before we bring the jury in, what's your objection to A and B?

MS. STANISH: Well, with respect to 210 of course, that's not a business record of this person.

THE COURT: Right. That's not coming in based with -- with this witness.

MS. STANISH: And just for the record I wanted to preserve my objection to the lack of the Form 1500 on best

evidence and hearsay.

THE COURT: As I stated at the bench, I don't think because, you know, as long as they transfer a record to a computer record then that becomes a business record. There is no requirement that they keep the paper backup, and in fact given the way business records are maintained nowadays most companies don't maintain the paper backup for extended periods. So that objection is overruled.

MS. STANISH: Understood. And then with respect to Exhibit 230, these are the contracts that do not relate to the anesthesia services as I understand the witness's testimony. These documents have nothing to do with it; therefore, I object based on relevance.

THE COURT: What's the point of those documents, Mr. Staudaher?

MR. STAUDAHER: Those were the documents that counsel requested us bring in.

THE COURT: They requested. So do you care if --

MR. STAUDAHER: I don't care if they don't come in.

THE COURT: -- we withdraw them?

MR. STAUDAHER: That's fine.

THE COURT: All right. He's fine --

MS. STANISH: No. Just to be clear, I requested contracts that support the anesthesia services. I don't want this.

THE COURT: Well, I'm not going to, you know --

MR. STAUDAHER: That's what the contract is.

THE COURT: As you know, Ms. Stanish, I'm happy to yell at Mr. Staudaher; however, I'm not going to yell at him for trying to comply with defense counsel's request and being overly broad, okay?

MS. STANISH: Fair enough.

THE COURT: He's trying to comply the best he can and give you all the information. So I'm not going to fault him or yell at him for doing more than he was required to do. So I don't see an issue there.

MS. STANISH: At any rate then that's it, not going to be admitted. Thank you.

The other document is Exhibit 231 which is a section of the Code of Federal Regulations Section 17.56 which the witness identified as the authority. I think this is confusing to the jury as any CFR is, that this should not be admitted either, and given what we learned on voir dire it's irrelevant.

THE COURT: State?

MR. STAUDAHER: Actually that comports exactly with what she testified to. So I think it's not only appropriate, it's what her testimony was about and based on. So if that's --

THE COURT: All right. Let me see. Are you going to ask to publish that in any way, that last exhibit?

| 1 | |
|----|--|
| 1 | MR. STAUDAHER: The last exhibit, no, not at this |
| 2 | time. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Okay. Let me look it over then before we |
| 4 | admit it. |
| 5 | MR. STAUDAHER: That's fine. |
| 6 | THE COURT: As long as you're not seeking to publish |
| 7 | it then I can have a few minutes to read it. |
| 8 | All right. Bring them in. |
| 9 | (Jury entering 11:40 a.m.) |
| 10 | THE COURT: All right. Court is now back in session. |
| 11 | And, Mr. Staudaher, you may resume your direct |
| 12 | examination of the witness. |
| 13 | MR. STAUDAHER: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 14 | When we left off, there were two documents that I had |
| 15 | moved to admit which was 210A and 210B, and I am asking that |
| 16 | they be admitted into evidence at this time. |
| 17 | THE COURT: All right. Well, the Court needs to |
| 18 | review the documents. |
| 19 | MR. STAUDAHER: 210A and B, these two. |
| 20 | THE COURT: I'm sorry. 210A and B. |
| 21 | MR. STAUDAHER: Yes. The Court had reserved ruling. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Was there any objection? |
| 23 | MS. STANISH: I just want to make sure that |
| 24 | Can I look at that, what you've got there? |

These are their business records; is that --

25

| 1 | THE COURT: Yes. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. STANISH: No objection, Your Honor. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Okay. A and B will be admitted. |
| 4 | (State's Exhibit Nos. 210A and 210B admitted.) |
| 5 | MR. STAUDAHER: May I publish, Your Honor? |
| 6 | THE COURT: You may. |
| 7 | CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 8 | BY MR. STAUDAHER: |
| 9 | Q So walk us through if you would actually |
| 10 | THE COURT: Oh, Kenny, you need to get the big |
| 11 | monitor. |
| 12 | MR. STAUDAHER: It's on. |
| 13 | THE COURT: Oh, it's on. |
| 14 | MR. SANTACROCE: It's not working over here. |
| 15 | THE COURT: It's still not working? |
| 16 | THE MARSHAL: It's still not. Everything is plugged |
| 17 | in. |
| 18 | THE COURT: Is there anything else we can do? |
| 19 | MR. STAUDAHER: Well, I can try and go through |
| 20 | walk up there and go through the documents with her, and then |
| 21 | if we get it working, I will display it. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Okay. Some of you may have really great |
| 23 | eyesight and can see up there. |
| 24 | MR. STAUDAHER: Oh, was that up there? I didn't |
| 25 | even |

THE COURT: Yes, it was up on that one. 1 MR. STAUDAHER: Oh. Well, if I could at least try 2 3 that. THE COURT: Yes. I mean, I can't see anything up 4 5 there but --MR. STAUDAHER: Can you see? You don't have it on 6 7 your screen up there? THE WITNESS: No, I don't. 8 THE COURT: Oh. That's weird. 9 Is it on defense counsels' screen and the State's 10 11 screen? 12 MS. STANISH: No. THE COURT: Okay. Because it's up on that monitor, 13 and it's on my screen. It's something wrong with the system 14 15 because it's not showing on their screens, and it's not showing on the witness's screen. They can't have all come unplugged. 16 Well, do what you can do, and the JAVS fellow is on 17 18 his way. BY MR. STAUDAHER: 19 So on 210 -- and again the focus that I want to 20 emphasize is the anesthesia time. On the very first page of 21 22 this document, what is it telling us? Α It is telling us the --23 24 You just want me to --Walk through it with us if you will.

KARR REPORTING, INC.

25

- O What -- do you know what that is for?
- A It's for a colonoscopy. It's anesthesia for a colonoscopy or lower gastroendoscopic procedures.
 - Q And the actual date of service?
 - A Is 7/25/2007.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q And do we know who the patient is?
- A Yes, the patient is Michael Washington.
 - Q And who is the provider that is actually submitting

KARR REPORTING, INC.

No. A hundred dollars was charged.

So \$100 even?

24

25

Α

| 1 | А | Yes. |
|----|-----------|---|
| 2 | Q | Now, that's on this page here. What is the next page |
| 3 | that we a | re looking at, page 2 of that same document 210A? |
| 4 | A | Page 2 is documentation from the Office of the |
| 5 | Inspector | General when the Office of the Inspector General was |
| 6 | requestin | g documentation? |
| 7 | Q | So there was a documentation request from the clinic? |
| 8 | А | This is from the Office of the Inspector General. |
| 9 | Q | So what were they requesting? |
| 10 | А | They are requesting due to an investigation they |
| 11 | are reque | sting claims data. |
| 12 | Q | And then what is there's a |
| 13 | | You said the next page was the release of medical |
| 14 | records f | orm? |
| 15 | А | Right. |
| 16 | Q | And then the final page or actually not the final |
| 17 | page t | he second to last page |
| 18 | | And I think you said the next two are duplicates; is |
| 19 | that corr | ect? |
| 20 | А | Right. |
| 21 | Q | Well, what are we looking at there? |
| 22 | А | This is the payment history of the VA system. |
| 23 | Q | For who? |
| 24 | А | For Michael Washington. |

25

So you can see all the charges that came with him?

| 1 | A Yes. |
|----|---|
| 2 | Q Was there one in particular rated to this 7/25 event |
| 3 | A Yes. |
| 4 | Q What does it show there? |
| 5 | A It shows that we paid the Gastroenterology Center |
| 6 | \$100 for anesthesia services. |
| 7 | Q Okay. Now, under 210B can you describe for us what |
| 8 | that is again. |
| 9 | A This is the payment history of the VA Vista System |
| 10 | where claims payments are made. So this is a record of our |
| 11 | payment history. |
| 12 | Q Does it document that actually money left the |
| 13 | Veterans Administration to go to the clinic? |
| 14 | A Yes. Yes, it does. |
| 15 | Q Okay. And how much again? Was it the same amount, |
| 16 | the hundred dollars? |
| 17 | A The hundred dollars. |
| 18 | Q Now, the next part was you said it was some sort |
| 19 | of medical record related to Michael Washington? |
| 20 | A Yes. This is the operative report for the procedure |
| 21 | performed on 7/25/2007? |
| 22 | Q And it relates to the same I mean, the procedure |
| 23 | that we are talking about the billing and the reimbursement |
| 24 | came from? |

This document validates these charges.

- Q Is this required that this be submitted?
- A Yes.

2.3

- Q So you've got both of those. Now, the last -- or the third page of this you said was a spreadsheet --
 - A Right.
 - Q -- that you actually put together?
- A Correct.
- Q Can you describe for us what we are looking at here and why.
- A Column 1 reflects the procedure code that was billed, 00810. Column 2 is the description of that procedure code and the anesthesia base units for that procedure code which is anesthesia for lower-intestinal endoscopic procedures and has a unit value of 5. The next column, the third column is -- identifies the modifier that was billed which is a P3 which means that the physical status -- is a physical status indicator, patient with severe systematic disease.

Below that is other modifiers that were billed with QS which means it was a monitored-anesthesia care and QZ meant that the person billing the -- or rendering the services was a certified nurse anesthetist without medical direction.

I also showed that the total units billed were 8. The total anesthesia time was 31 minutes which breaks down to 3 anesthesia units.

O For time?

A For time.

Q So 31 minutes was submitted to you, and 8 units were charged?

- A Correct.
- O Go on.

A Then I just indicated what the Q modifiers identified. There are different Q modifiers identifying when a -- when anesthesia is medically directed, and there's two to four concurrent anesthesias. There is a specific modifier for that, and then the modifier that was billed in this case was a QZ which is used when I see an RA, a certified nurse anesthetist bills for the services and without medical direction. So I just wanted to show the difference between those two modifiers.

- Q Okay. Anything else on this particular spreadsheet?
- 16 A No.
 - O And then the last page, what are we looking at there?

A This again is the payment history for veteran Michael Washington, but it shows an expanded view of these services showing that we paid the hundred dollars. We were billed the hundred dollars. We paid a hundred dollars, and it shows the clerk that processed it. It shows the date it was final. It is more detail to the -- whether the patient was service-connected, the actual time, 31 minutes of actual anesthesia time, the check number, the procedure code again and

the modifiers that they billed with.

2.1

Q Now, with regard to the --

You said that you used this formula, that it was the lesser of two amounts, either the billed charges or 75th percentile of what?

A Of the previous year's services. In 1738 CFR 1756 in Paragraph A and Paragraph C, it identifies how to pay anesthesia services. It identifies — it starts out with the exception of anesthesia because we were using the CMS calculation at that time.

Q You weren't, the VA was?

A The VA wasn't. So 1756 instructs us how to pay those claims when we receive non-VA provider anesthesia claims. If there's no fee schedule — in which this case there was no fee schedule for that particular code and those modifiers — then the clerk would default to the billed charges, the 75th percentile rate which doesn't exist or the usual and customary, whichever is the less. In this case it was the hundred dollars that was billed was the lesser of.

- Q So does it even matter what even shows up on the anesthesia record? I mean, does it have to be accurate?
 - A Yes, it has to be accurate.
 - Q Why is that?
 - A Because otherwise it's fraud.
 - Q What would happen if you got --

MR. SANTACROCE: I'm going to object.

THE COURT: Sustained.

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

- Q What would happen if you got a record that you knew contained false information? What would you do with that?
 - A We would not pay it.
- Q So if it contained any false information, you wouldn't be obligated to pay it at all?
- A No, we wouldn't. If it contained false information, we wouldn't -- if we knew it was false information, we wouldn't pay the claim.
- Q Now, is there any kind of -- is that inherent with your contracts, your billing, the things that you do with your providers, I mean, is it known generally that they are supposed to be providing you with accurate, truthful information?
 - A Correct. Yes.
- Q I mean, that they make good-faith claims, and you pay amounts based on that?
- A That's right.
 - Q So just so we are clear on this. I mean, even if the anesthesia reimbursement is not going to change at all regardless of what information is there, if any of the information submitted in the insurance claim to you is knowingly false, what results?
 - A There's none.

| رسا | MR. SANTACROCE: I'm going to object just to asked |
|-----|--|
| 2 | and answered. He can go over this 10 times. He could preface |
| 3 | it by saying I'm going to make it perfectly clear. It's been |
| 4 | asked and answered, Your Honor. |
| 5 | THE COURT: I think you're right, Mr. Santacroce. |
| 6 | MR. STAUDAHER: Pass the witness, Your Honor. |
| 7 | THE COURT: All right. |
| 8 | May I see counsel up here. |
| 9 | (Conference at the bench not recorded.) |
| 10 | THE COURT: All right. Who would like to go first or |
| 11 | cross? |
| 12 | All right. Ms. Stanish, go ahead. |
| 13 | CROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 14 | BY MS. STANISH: |
| 15 | Q Ms. Sams, I think you already answered my questions |
| 16 | but just to clarify a few matters since we don't have the |
| 17 | screen |
| 18 | MS. WECKERLY: Excuse me, Margaret, I think we do |
| 19 | now. |
| 20 | MS. STANISH: Oh, that's all right. I don't want to |
| 21 | mess with it. |
| 22 | BY MS. STANISH: |
| 23 | Q The amount claimed was \$100, the amount that the |
| 24 | clinic said, pay us a hundred dollars? |
| 25 | A That's correct |

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

| RY | MR | STAIIDAHER. |
|----|----|-------------|

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

Q To the extent that again -- and I don't mean to try and draw an objection to this -- but to the extent that false information is put into --

MS. STANISH: Objection.

MR. SANTACROCE: Objection.

MS. STANISH: Asked and answered.

MR. STAUDAHER: I haven't even gotten the question out yet, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Ask the question, but just be mindful that it has to --

MR. STAUDAHER: I will try.

THE COURT: It's redirect.

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

Q To the extent that any false information would deny the claim, would the amount submitted to you in that false setting exceed that which the provider would be allowed for the service?

THE COURT: I don't --

Did you understand the question?

THE WITNESS: No, I didn't.

THE COURT: Me neither.

You can rephrase your question. I'm not sure what the question was.

MR. STAUDAHER: I'll try to rephrase.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Staudaher.

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

1.0

- Q You testified that if there was anything knowingly false on the claim that you would not pay it, correct?
 - A Correct. Right.
- Q To the extent that if there was something false in a claim that was submitted to you, would the amount submitted regardless of what that was, the hundred dollars, \$20, \$2, a thousand dollars, whatever, would that exceed what was allowable for reimbursement because it was false?

MR. SANTACROCE: I'm going to object. Vague and ambiguous.

THE COURT: Yes, that's sustained.

BY MR. STAUDAHER:

Q If the person was unable to get payment -- I mean, not the person, but the entity, the VA Hospital or VA administration rather was unable to get payment for whatever reason, I mean, they can't get payment from a provider because of false information -- well, let me -- strike that.

I'm trying to ask it in a different way. My question basically is this: You wouldn't pay for any claim that was knowingly false, correct?

- A That's correct.
- Q Would any amount submitted to you exceed that which

| 1 | would be allowable then based on that claim? |
|----|---|
| 2 | THE COURT: I think what I'm sorry. |
| 3 | Is what you're asking, does the amount of the claim |
| 4 | matter if the information is false? Is that what you're |
| 5 | asking? |
| 6 | MR. STAUDAHER: Essentially. |
| 7 | THE WITNESS: No. If it's |
| 8 | THE COURT: All right. So the answer is no. |
| 9 | THE WITNESS: a false claim |
| 10 | THE COURT: Mr. Staudaher, did you have any |
| 11 | additional questions? |
| 12 | MR. STAUDAHER: No, Your Honor. |
| 13 | THE COURT: Does the jury have any questions for this |
| 14 | witness? |
| 15 | (No response.) |
| 16 | THE COURT: Ms. Stanish, do you have any recross |
| 17 | based on what Mr. Staudaher just asked? |
| 18 | RECROSS-EXAMINATION |
| 19 | BY MS. STANISH: |
| 20 | Q I want to talk to you about the information that's on |
| 21 | the 1500, give you a hypothetical. Let's say a patient |
| 22 | Is a patient's age on the forms? |
| 23 | A No. His date of birth is. |
| 24 | Q Ckay, date of birth. Let's say a patient lies about |
| 25 | their age. Are you not going to pay that claim? |
| | 1 |

| 1 | A Well, the claim it's going to create an error if |
|----|---|
| 2 | the information on the claim form does not match the enrollment |
| 3 | information in our system. The claim is not going to be paid. |
| 4 | Q So something like that would get kicked out? |
| 5 | A Uh-huh. Absolutely. |
| 6 | Q Do you pay for services rendered by a provider? Let |
| 7 | me strike that. |
| 8 | Is the goal of the VA insurance coverage to |
| 9 | compensate providers for services rendered? |
| 10 | A Yes. We're not an insurance company. We are an |
| 11 | entitlement to veterans. So we are not insurance. |
| 12 | Q Okay. I guess that is a clarification. We want our |
| 13 | veterans to have medical care. |
| 14 | A Correct. |
| 15 | Q We, therefore the United States pays providers for |
| 16 | services rendered? |
| 17 | A Right. When unable to provide the services within |
| 18 | the VA's health system, we will fee them out to the community. |
| 19 | THE COURT: So the VA is the provider, but if you |
| 20 | can't perform the service, you get somebody else who does |
| 21 | THE WITNESS: Repurchased care. |
| 22 | THE COURT: Okay. Who can do it? |
| 23 | THE WITNESS: Correct. |
| 24 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 25 | BY MS. STANISH: |

| 1 | Q And then the goal is to fairly compensate the |
|----|--|
| 2 | provider for taking care of our veterans? |
| 3 | A That's correct. |
| 4 | MS. STANISH: I have nothing further. |
| 5 | THE COURT: Mr. Santacroce, anything else? |
| 6 | MR. SANTACROCE: No, Your Honor. |
| 7 | THE COURT: Mr. Staudaher, anything else? |
| 8 | MR. STAUDAHER: No, Your Honor. |
| 9 | THE COURT: Any juror questions before we excuse the |
| 10 | witness? |
| 11 | (No response.) |
| 12 | THE COURT: All right. Ma'am, thank you for your |
| 13 | testimony. Please don't discuss your testimony with anybody |
| 14 | else who may be a witness in this matter, and you are excused. |
| 15 | And the State may call its next witness. |
| 16 | MR. STAUDAHER: Your Honor, we have those witnesses |
| 17 | that are going to come in for the insurance. They're coming in |
| 18 | this afternoon after the lunch period. We could hook up and |
| 19 | play the video if the Court wishes us to do that, or we could |
| 20 | go to lunch, whatever the Court wants to do. |
| 21 | THE COURT RECORDER: The problem with the video is |
| 22 | that Jordan has to come back, and he went to lunch. He has to |
| 23 | come back and set up the sound. |

can see the disappointment on the faces of the jurors having to

24

25

THE COURT: Well, then I guess we'll go to lunch. I

go to lunch, but we'll go ahead and do that.

2.4

Ladies and gentlemen, we'll be in recess for the lunch break until 1:10.

During the lunch break you're reminded you are not to discuss the case or anything relating to the case with each other, with anyone else. You're not to read, watch, listen to any reports of or commentaries on this case, any person or subject matter relating to the case. Please don't do any independent research, and do not form or express an opinion on the trial.

Notepads in your chairs, follow the bailiff through the double doors.

(Jury recessed 12:05 p.m.)

THE COURT: I'm assuming, State, that since we have the insurance witnesses we won't be playing the Mr. Meana deposition then this afternoon; is that correct?

MS. WECKERLY: Right. Our preference is to do the witnesses next.

THE COURT: That's fine. I just need to know because then we don't need Jordan.

MR. STAUDAHER: Yes. And we do need him because we think that they're not going to take the whole afternoon, those two witnesses.

THE COURT: What time should we then have our JAVS people ready to set it up for the Meana deposition?

MS. WECKERLY: Well, we have two more witnesses that 1 2 are insurance. 3 THE COURT: Okay. MS. WECKERLY: So that's two we could get here 4 5 because, you know --THE COURT: Yes, that's fine. 6 7 MS. WECKERLY: I don't know, maybe 2. THE COURT: All right. Janie, would you coordinate 8 with Jordan to be up around 2. 9 And then scheduling generally, I see a light at the 10 11 end of the tunnel. 12 MS. WECKERLY: Yes. MR. STAUDAHER: We're going to finish this week. 13 MS. WECKERLY: We think we're going to rest Friday. 14 THE COURT: Okay. 15 MS. WECKERLY: The problem is there are witnesses 16 that we have that are only available Friday. 17 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MS. WECKERLY: So either way, kind of regardless we are going until Friday. We have -- if we get our two insurance 20 21 people on today, on and off, we have two more tomorrow, but 22 that's all we have because then we have an out-of-state 23 witness.

over the lunch break if they could come Thursday, and Friday if

24

25

I don't know what the Court wants to do. I can see

the defense thinks we'll get through them all, or I'll have 2 them come first thing in the morning and the day will be really short or whatever the Court prefers. 3 THE COURT: Could we do this --4 5 Now, who's coming Friday, your epidemiologist? MS. WECKERLY: She's Thursday. She's Thursday. 6 7 THE COURT: And then who is Friday? MS. WECKERLY: Dr. Meana's referring --8 THE COURT: Oh, the coroner, all that stuff? 9 MS. WECKERLY: Also Meana's, you know, referring 10 doctor which is kind of a big deal because of his treatment and 11 all that. 12 13 THE COURT: Right. And the allegation that he just didn't want to do it, and that's why he died. So that's 14 15 important. Okay. Let's just --16 Sorry, I'm being slow or obtuse on this, but so for 17 18 today what we've got is the two more insurance people and that 19 should be maybe 30 minutes each? 20 MS. WECKERLY: And we can play the Meana depo. 21 just that's all we have for today.

coming. I don't know if -- it's up to obviously you if you

22

23

24

25

Wednesday you've got what?

THE COURT: Okay. So let's get that done. And then

MS. WECKERLY: We've got two other insurance people

want. I can try and get them on a different day so we don't 1 come in for one hour of testimony if the Court wants a dark 2 day, but if you don't, then I'll have them come in. 3 THE COURT: So we are thinking one to an hour and a 4 5 half? 6 MS. WECKERLY: Right. THE COURT: Okay. And then Thursday who do you have? 7 MS. WECKERLY: We have Miriam Alter. We have 8 Dr. Lewis who is Grueskin's referring, and we have Whiteley, 9 and then I can have the insurance people come, you know, in the 10 11 afternoon. THE COURT: Right. So how long do you think for the 12 13 testimony for Thursday? MS. WECKERLY: I -- I mean I don't think it'll take 14 that long. 15 THE COURT: Well, because we've now kind of seen what 16 kind of cross we are looking at. 17 So Miriam Alter, that's the epidemiologist? 18 MS. WECKERLY: Yeah. I think she'll be, I don't 19 20 know, two hours. THE COURT: I think she'll be longer. 21 What do you guys think? 22 MR. WRIGHT: I can never tell until the direct. I 23 24 felt (unintelligible) would be two days. 25 THE COURT: Two days, okay.

| l | |
|----|--|
| 1 | And then Grueskin's referring? |
| 2 | MS. WECKERLY: He's short. He's real short. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Okay. And then Detective Whiteley? |
| 4 | MS. WECKERLY: Short. |
| 5 | THE COURT: You said he was going to be long. |
| 6 | MS. WECKERLY: I didn't but |
| 7 | THE COURT: No, I mean, the cross. |
| 8 | MR. WRIGHT: I was just needling. |
| 9 | MS. WECKERLY: I think he was kidding. |
| 10 | THE COURT: Oh, okay. |
| 11 | MR. WRIGHT: I was just making him sweat. |
| 12 | THE COURT: Yes. He's nervous he's going to be |
| 13 | Dr. Friedman. |
| 14 | THE COURT: And Friday is who? |
| 15 | MS. WECKERLY: Friday is Schibona, the insurance lady |
| 16 | kind of part two, you know, that had to go on a trip. |
| 17 | THE COURT: Right. Right. |
| 18 | MS. WECKERLY: Okay. Dr. Jurani who is Meana's |
| 19 | referring |
| 20 | THE COURT: Right. |
| 21 | MS. WECKERLY: Meana's daughter, very brief on |
| 22 | THE COURT: She's out of state? |
| 23 | MS. WECKERLY: No. She's here, but I mean, she is |
| 24 | like a five-minute witness. So I kind of don't want to call |
| 25 | her out of |
| | li de la companya de |

| 1 | THE COURT: Right. Okay. |
|----|---|
| 2 | MS. WECKERLY: And Alane Olson, and that's it. |
| 3 | THE COURT: And Alane Olson is who? |
| 4 | MS. WECKERLY: The coroner. |
| 5 | MR. STAUDAHER: The coroner. |
| 6 | THE COURT: Okay. And who is the out-of-state on |
| 7 | Friday? |
| 8 | MS. WECKERLY: It's not out-of-state. It's a doctor. |
| 9 | THE COURT: Oh, Dr. Jurani? |
| 10 | MS. WECKERLY: Right. |
| 11 | THE COURT: And that's the local Dr. Jurani? |
| 12 | MS. WECKERLY: He is local but |
| 13 | THE COURT: No. I know doctor |
| 14 | MS. WECKERLY: He's local, but it's effectively |
| 15 | out-of-state. |
| 16 | THE COURT: Okay. |
| 17 | MR. STAUDAHER: So it's what you want to do on |
| 18 | MS. WECKERLY: Tomorrow basically. |
| 19 | THE COURT: Now, what does the defense have lined up |
| 20 | for us? |
| 21 | MR. WRIGHT: For Monday? |
| 22 | THE COURT: I mean, can we |
| 23 | Well, it's stupid. I agree. It's stupid to be in |
| 24 | session Wednesday for only two people unless we can collect a |
| 25 | defense witness out of order and stick them on Wednesday. |