	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION OF INSURANCE 550 W. 7 <sup>th</sup> AVENUE, SUITE 1560 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501-3567
STATE OF ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIVISION OF INSURANCE 550 W. 7th AVENUE SUITE 1560 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99513-3567 PHONE: (907) 269-7900	<ol> <li>11</li> <li>12</li> <li>13</li> <li>14</li> <li>15</li> <li>16</li> <li>17</li> <li>18</li> <li>19</li> <li>20</li> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ol>	In the Matter of: NEW HAMPSHIRE INSURANCE COMPANY Insurer Division of Insurance Case No. D 22-05 STIPULATED AGREEMENT AND ORDER The State of Alaska Division of Insurance (division) and New Hampshire Insurance Company (New Hampshire), the insurer in this case, stipulate and agree to the following: I. BACKGROUND A. On June 30, 1969, the division issued New Hampshire (FEIN 02-0172170), a
	25 26 27 28 29	<ul> <li>New Hampshire Insurance Company</li> <li>Stipulated Agreement and Order</li> </ul>

1	B. In 2016 New Hampshire was the workers' compensation insurer for an Alaska			
2	employer. York Risk Services Group, Inc. (York) (FEIN 13-1963636) was retained as			
3	the independent adjuster for certain workers' compensation claims. York, a			
4 5	corporation domiciled in California, was licensed as an independent adjuster under			
6	Alaska License 37972.			
7				
8	C. On February 3, 2016, an Alaska employee covered under New Hampshire's			
9	worker's compensation policy, suffered a workplace injury, filed workers'			
10	compensation claim 7699564 with New Hampshire and the claim was adjusted by			
11	York. The claim became the subject of Alaska Workers' Compensation Board			
12	(AWCB) case 201601904. During the pendency of claim 7699564, New Hampshire			
13	filed controversions on April 19, 2017, and May 16, 2017, denying portions of the			
14 15	employee's claim.			
16	D. The matter of the two controversions was heard by the AWCB and the Alaska			
17	Workers' Compensation Appeals Commission (AWCAC), who issued decisions 18-			
18				
19	0037 and 18-006 respectively. Neither the AWCB nor the AWCAC found New			
20	Hampshire's controversions frivolous; however, on November 6, 2020, the Alaska			
21	Supreme Court found both controversions frivolous and ordered the matter returned			
22	to AWCB and reported to the DOI under Alaska Statute (AS) 21.30.155(o). The DOI			
23	investigated the controversions to determine whether they constituted Unfair Claim			
24	Settlement Practices under AS 21.36.125.			
25				
26	E. DOI's investigation revealed:			
27				
28				
29				

New Hampshire Insurance Company Stipulated Agreement and Order

1 (i) The April 2017 controversion of the injured employee's pain treatments (i.e. 2 Lyrica and pulsed neuromodulation) violated subsection (a)(15) prohibiting the 3 failure to "promptly provide a reasonable explanation of the basis in the insurance 4 policy in relation to the facts or applicable law for denial of a claim" in that New 5 Hampshire, in denying such treatments, relied on the opinion of its medical provider who testified that he lacked sufficient expertise with such treatment. (ii) The May 2017 controversion of the injured employee's 2016 period of Temporary Total Disability (TTD) violated subsection (a)(15) prohibiting the failure to "promptly provide a reasonable explanation of the basis in the insurance policy in relation to the facts or applicable law for denial of a claim" in that New Hampshire failed to provide any explanation for the specific period of TTD controverted (i.e. April 20, 2016, to August 24, 2016). (iii) The May 2017 controversion of the injured employee's "medical benefits" which are unnecessary, unreasonable, or unrelated to the injured employee's injury violated subsection (a)(15) prohibiting the failure to "promptly provide a reasonable explanation of the basis in the insurance policy in relation to the facts or applicable law for denial of a claim," in that New Hampshire, in its controversion, did not state with specificity what medical benefits were unnecessary, unreasonable or unrelated to the employee's injury. F. New Hampshire's actions reflected in paragraph (E) constitute violations of AS 21.36.125.

New Hampshire Insurance Company Stipulated Agreement and Order

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 29

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 26	<ul> <li>S. The director, under AS 21.36.910(d), may impose a civil penalty of not more than</li> <li>\$2,500 for each violation or a civil penalty of not more than \$25,000 for engaging in</li> </ul>
	dul
21	DATED: <u>5 3  202</u> DIVISION OF INSURANCE
22	G all P
	Chief Investigator
26 27	
27	
20	
20	New Hampshire Insurance Company Stipulated Agreement and Order

1	New H	ampshire Insurance Company	
2	Bur	Peto Morela	
3	Peter M	lacdonald	
5	Vice Pr	esident	
	By:	li lit	
6	Tanya I	Kent	
7	Secreta	гу	
8			
9 10			
11		R. TAYLOR	
12		NEY GENERAL	
12			
14	D	N.	
15	Dan Wi	lkerson	
16	Assistar	nt Attorney General	
17			
18	<u>ORDER</u>		
19	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this Stipu	lated Agreement and Order is	
20	adopted in full resolution of the civil liability issues t	between the parties to this agreement	
21	in these cases and shall constitute the final order in fi	ese matters	
22	In these cases and shall constitute the final order in these matters.		
23	$(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$		
24	DATED this $13^{4h}$ day of $\underline{June}$ , 2022.	ul lingt Join_	
25	Lori K.	Wing-Heier	
26	Director	r, Division of Insurance	
27			
28			
29	New Hampshire Insurance Company		
	Stipulated Agreement and Order		
I	11		