





































The Underlying Facts



- April 21, 1999 Aguilera was struck by a forklift and pushed against a pallet. He suffered immediate injuries and was rushed to the emergency room. Testing performed in the ER showed blood in Aguilera's urine.
- Aguilera began to complain of kidney and bladder pain.
- May 24, after two physicians examined him and concluded that he could not return to work, Aguilera's attorney requested that he be examined by a board certified urologist.
- The workers' compensation insurance carrier **denied authorization of the urologist**, asserting that Aguilera's injury was not work related.
- June 17, 1999, the insurance carrier was again notified that urological care was now needed on an emergency basis because Aguilera's urine had begun to smell like feces.
- June 21, Aguilera was advised that his workers' compensation benefits were being terminated as of July 9, 1999, notwithstanding the report of two doctors, including the opinion of the insurance carrier's own doctor, that he should not return to work.



Facts (cont'd)



- By November 4, 1999. Heath, the case manager, and a nurse practitioner also employed by the insurance carrier had changed positions and agreed that Aguilera needed immediate hospitalization for surgery. However, the insurance carrier's adjuster again intervened and overruled the decision of medical personnel simply because he wanted a second opinion from a general surgeon. Notwithstanding this intervention, the insurance carrier did not follow its own position and authorize Aguilera to consult with a general surgeon, but instead again changed course and sent Aguilera to a gastroenterologist. At this point in time. Aguilera had allegedly been urinating feces and blood for over six
- Aguilera's ultimate surgery, the need for which had been diagnosed as an emergency as early as June of 1999, was not finally authorized or approved until March 22, 2000. By this time, according to the allegations, Aguilera had been urinating feces and blood for over ten months.



Facts





June 25, 1999 - the insurance company intervened and blocked Aguilera's receipt of medication prescribed by the hospital emergency room doctor for his urinary condition.

- June 30, the carrier again **denied authorization of emergency medical care** for the urinary problems, claims it was not medically necessary.
- July 7, 1999, Aguilera's treating doctor advised the carrier that his need for medical care was urgent and that his condition was deteriorating.
- July 9, 1999, the carrier's own doctor issued prescriptions for various urinary
- July 30, 2009, the adjuster intervened and simply unilaterally cancelled
- some of the medical testing.

 Testing that was ultimately done revealed that Aguilera had a fistula, a hole in his bladder.
- August 6, 1999, Mippy Heath Assigned as the new insurance company's nurse case manager. She was specifically told by Aguilera's attorney that s should have no direct contact with Aguilera. She also agreed that no intervention with Aguilera's care would be attempted.



Protegrity Services Vs Vaccaro



PROTEGRITY SERVICES v. VACCARO, 2005 FL App. LEXIS 13283 (FL 4th DCA, August 24. 2005)

First case applying the Supreme Court's decision in Aguillera v. Inservices, Inc., 905 So. 2d 84 (FL 2005), in which the Court held that the workers' compensation Act does not afford blanket immunity for all conduct during the claim process, particularly the insurance carrier's intentional tortuous conduct





- On August 19. Aguilera's attorney alerted the insurance carrier that the injured employee was in need of emergency care for the fistula. Heath refused the authorization and insisted on a second opinion.
- On August 25, Heath secretly appeared at the physician's office for Aguilera's appointment. She urged Aguilera to lie to his attorney that she has not appeared at his doctor's appointment.
- Subsequently, Heath insisted that Aguilera submit to the administration of invasive tests that were not only painful but also contraindicated by his then-present medical condition.
- The insurance company then proceeded to use Aguilera's refusal to submit to the tests as a basis to justify a refusal and denial of his then needed critical, surgical treatment.



Florida Supreme Court 😯



The Florida Supreme Court has never permitted compensation insurance carriers to cloak themselves with blanket immunity in circumstances where the carrier has not merely breached the duty to timely pay benefits, or acted negligently, but has actually committed an intentional tort upon an employee.



































