

**From:** MARIA PATINO <lolainucla@msn.com>  
**Date:** Thursday, December 5, 2013 at 2:31 AM  
**To:** Eric Ting <erickangting@gmail.com>, "wmoon@dentistry.ucla.edu" <wmoon@dentistry.ucla.edu>  
**Subject:** FW: Invoice 43080 from Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory

Maria Patino lolainucla@msn.com

---

From: mpatino@dentistry.ucla.edu  
To: lolainucla@msn.com  
Subject: FW: Invoice 43080 from Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory  
Date: Wed, 4 Dec 2013 18:26:47 +0000

Maria Patino  
Manager Service Officer,  
Supervisor for the Orthodontic Program, CHS 30-121  
UCLA School of Dentistry  
Division of Associated Clinical Specialties  
Clinic: 310-825-5161  
Office: 310-825-4705  
Fax: 310-206-5349

**From:** Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory [mailto:dentalartsortho@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 04, 2013 7:31 AM  
**To:** Patino, Maria  
**Subject:** Re: Invoice 43080 from Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory

\*\*Note all this extra work was order by Dr hong and went beyond what we normally do to make study models and board case were made by the owner and he had oversee all the work done, and the owner's work is done at different rate.

1. We made board exam model and dr hong requested us to reset 4 teeth to her specific needs for her exam grade. All her extra request cost money to do, it cost money to reset teeth. Dr Hong herself requested.
2. Again we made a board exam model for dr hong but her impressions were distorted and she would not take a new impression she did not have access to patient and the impressions were for her initial study models and so we had to again reset teeth and anatomy. She told us to do this and cost money to do what she ask for.
3. Dr hong gave us an old study model for [REDACTED] and she realized that lower model was distorted and did not match her inter oral photos the lower gum line and teeth were not at midline position. So we clean up the upper model due how old and chips on the model the lower model

was reconstructed and reset and duplicated but we gave her a break on the charge and only charge \$27.00

4. The difference between ■ and ■ was the model given to us to duplicate, the model for nicole was a surgical model that was cut into 3 to 4 quadrant sections and held together by wax and in result of cutting in to quadrants the model was missing anatomy so we had to remove all the wax and recreate the missing anatomy and duplicate in white stone because the surgical model was in green stone. the incisors for ■ were present but just cut in half by whatever blade she used to cut surgical model and ■ teeth were broken so we had to recreate the teeth.

■ and ■ case was chipped teeth but not completely broken and only a small anatomy was missing on teeth so we recreated them and prepared for duplication.

Yes there was allot more work needed not just remove wax as i answer # 4, model was cut into pieces and held together by wax and anatomy was missing. All the work to recreate the model cost \$10 more.

5. Board quality means we take 2 to 3 weeks to make a model to as close as perfect as we can, and do any adjustments needed for the Doctor to pass board exam, i.e reset, reconstruct and shift and whatever else dr requires and the board quality models are handle by owner and overseen by him and he inspects them himself this usually requires a meeting before hand and instructions are given by the doctor to the owner on how the dr wants the model made.

Normal finish is a model that we make in 4 to 5 days and does not require any extra work to complete and is given to regularly tech.

On Tue, Dec 3, 2013 at 3:16 PM, Patino, Maria <[mpatino@dentistry.ucla.edu](mailto:mpatino@dentistry.ucla.edu)> wrote:  
Hello Juan

I have the following questions:

1. What do they mean by "Study Model ABO (Final Board Case) Reset Tooth" on ■? Is this mean that they re-positioned the teeth? Is that why it costed us \$12 more? Who told them to do this and charge us more?
2. What do they mean by "Study Model ABO ( Final Board Case) From Impression that was distorted...Reset Tooth UR6 & UR7" on ■? Why not ask for a new impression? Who told them to do this and charge us \$6?
3. What do they mean by "S.M. Finished & extra fee for: reconstruct lower gum line and teeth" on ■? Why is this \$27? How much work was necessary? Why not ask for a new impression? Who told them to do this?

4. They charged \$10 for "remove wax from surgical model & Fix lower incisors teeth and restore" on ■, but they did not charge for "Fix broken teeth on lower model" on ■, "Fixed chipped upper central teeth and repair & prepare for duplication" on ■ and "Fixed chipped tooth" on ■. Is this mean \$10 was for removing wax or was there more work needed to be done? If so, what costed us \$10?
5. What do they mean by Board Quality? How is this different than the normal finish

Sorry for all these questions, I wish I was able to answer them.

Thanks

Maria Patino  
Manager Service Officer,  
Supervisor for the Orthodontic Program, CHS 30-121  
UCLA School of Dentistry  
Division of Associated Clinical Specialties  
Clinic: 310-825-5161  
Office: 310-825-4705  
Fax: 310-206-5349

**From:** Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory [mailto:[dentalartsortho@gmail.com](mailto:dentalartsortho@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 03, 2013 2:56 PM  
**To:** Patino, Maria  
**Subject:** Re: Invoice 43080 from Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory

Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory  
1600 South Anaheim Blvd., Ste C  
Anaheim, CA 92805  
714-635-2008 Office  
[dentalartsortho@gmail.com](mailto:dentalartsortho@gmail.com)

Memo

Date: December 3, 2013  
From: Juan Paulin Jr, Manager  
To: Ucla Accounting department  
Subject: Invoice 43080 Pricing for Dr. Hong

Regarding the charges for the models for Dr. Hong, per our agreement with UCLA models for UCLA Doctors board exams are not priced at the \$25 level they are paid by the doctor's themselves in this case Dr. Hong insisted that UCLA pay the additional work needed for her to pass her board exams. We normally charge \$120 for board exam models in

this case we only charge \$60 due to our long business relationship. In total there were 5 models charged at \$60. We also had to duplicate 9 models total and we had to reconstruct 4 models that were broken due to the fact they were surgical models i.e. broken into several pieces. Normally we receive models in impression form all the models we were given by Dr Hong were cast or old study models that had broken teeth we had to fix. What we had to do differently from other models is we had to reconstruct anatomy of the models that were broken and we had to reset several teeth on the study model to for her exact instructions so she can score highly on her board exam. We are given only 2.5 weeks to complete 16 board exam quality models, we normally require 2 weeks to complete 1 set of initial and final models for actual board exam due to the fact that these models must be accurate as possible. I cannot stress enough how much work went into completing these board exam cases how much overtime I had to pay my technician's to finish in this short of time span and as I informed the ucla staff at the orthodontic department, we will not be making board cases with this short of time span again and with so much reconstructing of the anatomy it's too time consuming and expensive. Regarding the pricing at \$25.00 for study models that is a special price we give to UCLA we do not make board exam models at \$25 dollars, the models we make for you are at the angles standard for board exam, reason being not every case is for the Dr's board exam and this also reduces UCLA's overall cost. We made over 500 study models in 2012 for the ortho clinic at about \$25 per model, if we would had made all the study models you sent us last year and make them to board exam quality and charge you our normal rate of \$120 per board case your cost would be exponential much higher. I hope this answers your questions regarding the pricing difference for Dr hong's cases allot of time and man hours went to finish these cases and this is not typical work we do for the ucla ortho clinic we use usually get impressions and we make the study model in this instance allot work to make this Dr happy.

Sincerely,

Juan E Paulin Jr, Manager

On Tue, Dec 3, 2013 at 1:58 PM, Patino, Maria <[mpatino@dentistry.ucla.edu](mailto:mpatino@dentistry.ucla.edu)> wrote:  
Hello Juan

Per accounting their requesting in writing:

- 1) why they charged so much - for models
- 2) What they have done differently from other models

Please email a detail explanation -

Thanks

Maria Patino  
Manager Service Officer,  
Supervisor for the Orthodontic Program, CHS 30-121  
UCLA School of Dentistry  
Division of Associated Clinical Specialties  
Clinic: 310-825-5161  
Office: 310-825-4705  
Fax: 310-206-5349

-----Original Message-----

From: [dentalartsortho@gmail.com](mailto:dentalartsortho@gmail.com) [mailto:[dentalartsortho@gmail.com](mailto:dentalartsortho@gmail.com)]

Sent: Tuesday, December 03, 2013 1:34 PM

To: Patino, Maria

Subject: Invoice 43080 from Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory

Dear Customer :

Your invoice is attached. Please remit payment when statement is sent at the end of every month.

If you have any problems viewing invoice or statement contact us immediately.

Thank you for your business - we appreciate it very much.

Sincerely,

Juan Paulin Jr, Manager  
Dental Arts Orthodontic Laboratory  
714-635-2008 Office  
714-635-3396 Fax