

@B00000061,MAIC
@1
@Z19970303
@2

Indexed as:
N.L. (Re)

IN THE MATTER OF an appeal by N.L.
AICAC File No.: AC-97-01

@3

[1997] M.A.I.C.A.C.D. No. 9

@4

Manitoba Automobile Injury Compensation Appeal Commission
J.F.R. Taylor, Q.C. (Chairperson), C.T. Birt, Q.C.,
and L. Goodspeed
Heard: March 3, 1997.
Decisions: March 3, 1997.
(2 pp.)

@6

Issue(s):

Whether Appellant entitled to reimbursement for continued
chiropractic treatment.

@5

Relevant Sections:

Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation Act, S.M. 1993, c.
36, s. 136(1).
Regulation 40/94, s. 5.

@8

Appearances:

Written review.

@7

MAIC NOTE: THIS DECISION HAS BEEN EDITED TO PROTECT THE
PERSONAL HEALTH INFORMATION OF INDIVIDUALS BY REMOVING
PERSONAL IDENTIFIERS AND OTHER IDENTIFYING INFORMATION.

REASONS FOR DECISION

THE FACTS:

[para1] N.L. appeals from a decision of M.P.I.C. which
denied him the benefit of reimbursement for continuing
chiropractic treatments. His Notice of Appeal alleges that he
suffers from "worse back pain, neck pain and knee (left) pain"
which, he says, are the pains he continues to suffer as a
result of his motor vehicle accident which occurred on May
22nd, 1994.

[para2] N.L. appeared before this Commission on an earlier appeal which, although it related to a claim for income replacement indemnity rather than payment for chiropractic treatments, arose out of the same accident.

[para3] We believe that we can do no better than attach to these Reasons a copy of the Decision of this Commission bearing date December 13th, 1995. It is primarily for the Reasons set out in that earlier Decision that we are dismissing N.L.'s present appeal.

[para4] We would add, however, that we have been provided with no evidence at all beyond what was before us in December of 1995. Further, we accept the submission made by Ms Joan McKelvey, counsel for M.P.I.C., that if the frequency of continuing chiropractic treatments required by N.L. is viewed in light of the recommendations of the Clinical Guidelines for Chiropractic Practice in Canada, N.L.'s maintenance care would not normally be required beyond about once per month, which would be covered by Manitoba Health Services Commission.

[para5] For those reasons, N.L.'s appeal must be dismissed and the decision of M.P.I.C.'s Acting Review Officer confirmed.

@1

@XQL @XUpdate: 20000627
qp/d/dcb
@H
MVRT
@1<QLDATE C=19970303 U=20000919>