

Reasons for Decision:

Order # AP1920-0172

On <date removed>, <name removed> appealed the decision of the Director, Winnipeg West to deny funding for requested dental services. The decision for dental services was made on <date removed>.

At the hearing, <name removed> stated their dentist had determined that a root canal was necessary for the tooth in question. The appellant stated the work had already been performed, at a cost of <amount removed>. The appellant requested that the appeal issue include the root canal.

<name removed> clarified that their dentist determined the original treatment plan was inadequate, and they decided that a root canal was the best course of action. <name removed> asserted that their dentist attempted to contact the Department for the past several months, but was unsuccessful. They began work on the tooth before receiving Department approval.

<name removed> asserted that the dental work could have been avoided if the Department had approved their request for a night guard in <year removed>.

The Department stated it had not heard <name removed> required a root canal. The Department requires prior approval of major dental work, including root canals.

The Department stated <name removed>'s dentist requested approval for a dental filling on a tooth in <date removed>, which was approved. The dentist subsequently requested approval to extract the tooth and replace it with a partial upper denture. While the Department approved the work, the dentist never billed the Department.

In <date removed>, <name removed>'s dentist requested approval to refill the same tooth, and for certain orthodontic work. The Department denied the request to refill the tooth, because it was the second request to fill the tooth in six months.

The Department denied the request for orthodontic work, because it does not cover orthodontic work as a matter of policy. The Department funds major work on an emergency basis, while orthodontics is a long-term treatment.

The Department acknowledged that <name removed>'s dentist submitted a request for a night guard in <year removed>, but noted they did not submit x-rays or other supporting evidence. If <name removed> obtains new x-rays and documentation, the appellant can submit a new request for a night guard.

The Department told the Board that the provision of dental service is covered by a contract with the Manitoba Dental Association. Certain procedures, including orthodontics, are not covered by the contract.

<name removed> requested an adjournment so they could obtain a letter from their dentist describing their efforts to get approval from the Department for a root canal. The Board denied the request for an adjournment, because those efforts occurred after the Department made the decision currently being appealed.

The Board notes that <name removed>'s dentist no longer believes that the tooth extraction and partial upper denture are the appropriate treatments, meaning <name removed> is appealing the denial of a service their dentist no longer plans to provide. While <name removed> asked the Board to rule on the request for root canal approval, the Department has not made a decision on the request and there is no appealable issue.

After carefully reviewing the written and verbal evidence, the Board determines that the Department applied its dental policy correctly, and that <name removed>'s personal circumstances do not warrant an exception to the policy. The Board confirms the decision of the Director to deny coverage for a tooth extraction and partial upper denture.

DISCLAIMER

These are electronic copies of the Reasons for Decision issued by the Social Services Appeal Board. These written reasons have been edited to protect the personal information of individuals by removing personal identifiers.