cc: Ms. Suzanne Caligiuri/Division of Quality & Surveillance by scan SAPA File BOA by scan



ANDREW M. CUOMO Governor HOWARD A. ZUCKER, M.D., J.D. Commissioner

LISA J. PINO, M.A., J.D. Executive Deputy Commissioner

July 13, 2021

CERTIFIED MAIL/RETURN RECEIPT

c/o Rutland Nursing Home 585 Schenectady Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11203

Deborah Headley, Social Work Director Rutland Nursing Home 585 Schenectady Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11203 Susan Marotta, Esq. One Brooklyn Health System, Inc. One Brookdale Plaza Brooklyn, New York 11212

RE: In the Matter of _____ - Discharge Appeal

Dear Parties:

Enclosed please find the Decision After Hearing in the above referenced matter. This Decision is final and binding.

The party who did not prevail in this hearing may appeal to the courts pursuant to the provisions of Article 78 of the Civil Practice Law and Rules. If the party wishes to appeal this decision it may seek advice from the legal resources available (e.g. their attorney, the County Bar Association, Legal Aid, etc.). Such an appeal must be commenced within four (4) months from the date of this Decision.

Sincerely,

James F. Horan

Chief Administrative Law Judge

Bureau of Adjudication

annof Horan long

JFH: cmg Enclosure

STATE OF NEW YORK: DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

In the Matter of an Appeal pursuant to 10 NYCRR §415.3 by:

Appellant,

COPY

DECISION

from a determination by

Rutland Nursing Home,

Respondent,:

to discharge him from a residential health care facility.

Hearing Before:

Ann Gayle

Administrative Law Judge

Held:

Via Cisco Webex

Hearing Dates:

June 17 and July 9, 2021

Parties:

- Pro Se c/o Rutland Nursing Home 585 Schenectady Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11203

Rutland Nursing Home

By: Susan Marotta, Esq.

One Brooklyn Health System, Inc.

One Brookdale Plaza

Brooklyn, New York 11212

Pursuant to Public Health Law ("PHL") §2801 and Title 10 of the Official Compilation of Codes, Rules and Regulations of the State of New York ("10 NYCRR") §415.2(k), a residential health care facility or nursing home such as Rutland Nursing Home ("Respondent" or "Facility") is a residential facility providing nursing care to sick, invalid, infirm, disabled, or convalescent persons who need regular nursing services or other professional services but who do not need the services of a general hospital.

Transfer and discharge rights of nursing home residents are set forth at 10 NYCRR §415.3(i). Respondent determined to discharge ("Appellant" or "Resident") from care and treatment in its nursing home pursuant to 10 NYCRR §415.3(i)(1)(i)(a)(2) which provides, in pertinent part:

(2) the transfer or discharge is appropriate because the resident's health has improved sufficiently so the resident no longer needs the services provided by the facility.

Appellant appealed the discharge determination to the New York State Department of Health and a hearing on that appeal was held. Pursuant to §415.3(i)(2)(iii)(b), the Facility has the burden of proving that the transfer is necessary and the discharge plan is appropriate.

A recording of the hearing was made part of the record. Appellant and Appellant's testified for Appellant. Moiz Hamdani, M.D., Deborah Headley, Marra Blank, R.N., and Annei Banzon testified for Respondent.

The following documents were accepted into evidence by the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") as ALJ, Facility, and Resident Exhibits:

ALJ

I: Notice of Hearing with attached Notice of Discharge/Transfer

II: 2021 letter

Facility:

- A: Face Sheet 4 pages
- B: Physician note -1 page
- C: Progress notes 9 pages
- D: Transfer/Discharge Notice 2 pages
- E: Social Work note -1 page
- F: Physician note -1 page
- G: Rehab screening form 1 page
- H: Progress notes 1 page
- I: Progress notes − 2 pages

Resident:

1: /21 letter – 1 page

ISSUE

Has Rutland Nursing Home established that the discharge is necessary and the discharge plan is appropriate?

FINDINGS OF FACT

Citations in parentheses refer to testimony ("T") and exhibits ("Ex") found persuasive.

- 1. Respondent, Rutland Nursing Home, is a residential health care facility located in Brooklyn, New York. (Ex I)
- 2. Appellant, age age, was admitted to the Facility on 2020, for short-term care including follow-up of the the facility on the hospital for

Appellant's chronic conditions include

completed antibiotics, wound care, and physical therapy. Appellant is alert and oriented, and able to make his needs known and care for himself. Appellant's chronic conditions including any need for additional physical therapy can be addressed in the community. (Ex 1; Ex A; B; F; G; H; T Hamdani, Banzon, Blank)

Ex 1). Appellant received and has successfully

- 3. It is the professional opinion of Appellant's caregivers at the Facility that discharge to the community, including the ("Shelter"), is appropriate for Appellant. By notice dated 2021, Respondent advised Appellant that it had determined to discharge Appellant to the Shelter on the grounds that his health has improved sufficiently so he no longer needs the services provided by the Facility. (Ex B; T Hamdani, Headley, Blank)
- 4. Prior to discharge, Respondent will order a rollator for Appellant. Upon discharge, Respondent will provide Appellant with the new rollator, medications, and any other orders, prescriptions, and recommendations identified by the various disciplines (medical, nursing, rehab, etc.). The Shelter will provide housing and assistance with obtaining more permanent housing, a job, and benefits for which Appellant might be eligible. (T Headley, Banzon, Blank)
- 5. Appellant has remained at the Facility pending the outcome of this proceeding.

DISCUSSION

The evidence presented by Respondent demonstrated that: Appellant is independent with his ADLs (Activities of Daily Living); he no longer requires skilled care and services; and discharge to the Shelter system, where Appellant previously resided, is an appropriate discharge location for Appellant.

/ Rutland

rehabilitation goals and is now at "baseline" following his restorative rehabilitative services at

the Facility, is ready for and would benefit from outpatient physical therapy in the community.

Appellant does not want to be discharged to the Shelter. Appellant's

the Shelter would not be appropriate for Appellant because a large room with many inhabitants

(which is what he believes the Shelter would provide) would not be good for Appellant.

believes a room with three or four people would be okay for Appellant. Ms.

Headley testified that the Shelter, where Appellant previously resided, was designated as a last

resort because Appellant does not have a home in the community and he does not have income.

Respondent worked with Appellant on seeking an apartment, specifically adult supportive

housing, but housing was not yet secured. Appellant will receive assistance in securing housing

when he is discharged to the Shelter.

DECISION

I find that the Facility has proved by substantial evidence that the discharge is necessary

and the discharge location is appropriate.

The appeal by Appellant is therefore DENIED.

Respondent, Rutland Nursing Home, is authorized to discharge Appellant in accordance

, 2021 Discharge Notice.

This Decision may be appealed to a court of competent jurisdiction pursuant to Article 78

of the New York Civil Practice Law and Rules (CPLR).

Dated: New York, New York

July 13, 2021

Ann Gayle

Administrative Law Judge

5



TO:

c/o Rutland Nursing Home 585 Schenectady Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11203

Susan Marotta, Esq. One Brooklyn Health System, Inc. One Brookdale Plaza Brooklyn, New York 11212

Deborah Headley, Social Work Director Rutland Nursing Home 585 Schenectady Avenue Brooklyn, New York 11203