

Anatomy of a False Claims Act Case

INVESTIGATION, NEGOTIATION AND
RESOLUTION

Investigation

Relator's Pre-Filing Investigation and Considerations

3

- ▶ Knowledge of facts involving clear FCA violation?
- ▶ Documentary evidence, other proof of fraud?
- ▶ Sufficient evidence of "who, what, when, where and why" supporting fraud and damages?
- ▶ Specific examples of the fraud?
- ▶ Requisite scienter/knowledge evidence for Defendant?
- ▶ Damages large enough to justify risks to the relator?
- ▶ Level of Government interest in specific area of law and type of fraud? Is it material to the government?

Investigation – DOJ's Perspective

4

- ▶ Government investigates *qui tams*, non *qui tams*, agency referrals, self disclosures
- ▶ Goal is to decide whether to intervene (*qui tams*) or pursue
- ▶ Considerations
 - ▶ Evidence that a violation of 31 U.S.C. § 3729(a)(1) has occurred
 - ▶ Evidence that violation was "knowing" as defined in § 3729(b)(1)
 - ▶ Evidence and arguments regarding materiality
 - ▶ Damages (amount and provability)
 - ▶ Agency policies and priorities
 - ▶ Strength of likely defenses
 - ▶ Resources necessary

Investigation – DOJ's Perspective (cont'd)

5

- ▶ Sources of evidence:
 - ▶ Applicable statutes, regulations, and policies
 - ▶ Relators and other witnesses with knowledge
 - ▶ Internal and external/third party audits
 - ▶ Agency subpoenas and Civil Investigative Demands
 - ▶ Presentations by, and discussions with, counsel
- ▶ Other considerations:
 - ▶ OIG
 - ▶ Responsibility of individuals

Recent Supreme Court *Escobar* Precedent

6

Universal Health Servs., Inc. v. United States ex rel. Escobar,
136 S. Ct. 1989 (2016)

- ▶ Key Issues: Implied Certification & Materiality
- ▶ Implied certification liability does not depend on whether a requirement is labeled a condition of payment (overruling *United States ex rel. Mikes v. Straus*, 274 F.3d 687 (2d Cir. 2001) and similar cases)

"What matters is not the label the Government attaches to a requirement, but whether the defendant knowingly violated a requirement that the defendant knows is material to the Government's payment decision." *Id.* at 1996.

Recent Supreme Court *Escobar* Precedent

7

Universal Health Servs., Inc. v. United States ex rel. Escobar, 136 S. Ct. 1989 (2016)

- ▶ Reaffirms "'material' means having a natural tendency to influence, or be capable of influencing, the payment or receipt of money or property'" *Id.* at 2002
- ▶ Materiality can be objective OR subjective:
 - ▶ Would a reasonable person attach importance to it in deciding whether to pay?
 - ▶ Would the government attach importance to it in deciding whether to pay even if a reasonable person would not?

Investigation - OIG's Role

8

- ▶ OCIG attorney assigned when OIG notified of case
- ▶ OCIG attorney coordinates with defrauded agency, Main DOJ attorney and/or AUSA assigned
 - ▶ Evaluate merits of case
 - ▶ Consult with counsel and agent regarding investigative steps
- ▶ Individual liability issues

Investigation - Defense Perspective

9

- ▶ Indicators that you might be under investigation
- ▶ When to retain expert counsel
- ▶ Steps to take when you receive a subpoena/CID/request letter
 - ▶ What you can learn from the subpoena
 - ▶ Responding to the subpoena
- ▶ Consider how proactive a role to take
- ▶ Missteps to avoid
- ▶ Attempt to negotiate resolution or litigate?
- ▶ Individuals and Impact of Yates Memo
- ▶ Impact of the Granston Memo

Self - Disclosures

10

- ▶ Intersection of self-disclosure under HHS-OIG Self-Disclosure Protocol and *qui tam* filing alleging related facts
- ▶ Impact of self-disclosure on civil and administrative resolution to the case

Negotiation

Overview - Negotiation

- ▶ Timing can vary
- ▶ Objectives of the various parties (DOJ, OIG, MFCU, relator, defendant)
- ▶ Key negotiating issues
 - ▶ Civil monetary damages
 - ▶ Scope of release
 - ▶ Administrative remedy
 - ▶ Relators' share
 - ▶ Attorneys' fees

Negotiation – DOJ Priorities

13

- ▶ Make government whole
- ▶ Deter fraud
- ▶ Consider and address views of victim agency
- ▶ Identify individual wrongdoers and proceed accordingly
- ▶ Fairly reflect strengths and weaknesses of case
- ▶ Provide a release tailored to damages recovered

OIG Objectives

14

- ▶ Appropriate prospective program safeguards in exchange for forbearance of exclusion authority
 - ▶ Evaluation of Risk

Risk Categories

- Highest Risk - Exclusion
- High Risk - Heightened Scrutiny
- Medium Risk - CIAs
- Lower Risk - No Further Action
- Low Risk - Self-Disclosure

Relator Objectives

15

- ▶ Monetary resolution of FCA claims
 - ▶ Intervened
 - ▶ Non-intervened
- ▶ Relator's share percentage
- ▶ Resolution of any retaliation claims
- ▶ Resolution of attorneys' fee claims
- ▶ Coordination with DOJ

Defendant Objectives

16

- ▶ Appropriate monetary resolution covering all claims
 - ▶ FCA liability
 - ▶ Attorneys' fees
- ▶ Release of **all** potential claims
- ▶ Least onerous compliance requirements possible going forward
- ▶ Minimize reputational/business impacts
- ▶ Appropriate consideration of individual liability/indemnification

Negotiation – Getting Started

17

- ▶ Initiation of discussions
 - ▶ When?
 - ▶ By whom?
- ▶ Mediation
- ▶ Who is at the table?
 - ▶ Intervened cases
 - ▶ Declined cases
- ▶ Roles of:
 - ▶ Relators
 - ▶ OIG

Alternative Dispute Resolution

18

- ▶ Federal government committed to ADR in “appropriate civil cases”
 - ▶ <http://www.jamsadr.com/files/Uploads/Documents/Articles/Stevens-False-Claims-Act-2012-11-20.pdf>
- ▶ Benefits of mediation
 - ▶ Objective neutral gives all parties an important reality check
 - ▶ Use of an impartial intermediary can change the personal dynamics
- ▶ Non-binding

Monetary Negotiations

19

- ▶ Damages assessment
 - ▶ Each party's principled assessment of damages (which may include use of sampling and extrapolation)
 - ▶ Each party's principled quantification of false claims at issue
- ▶ Realistic assessment of the respective litigation risks of each party
- ▶ Debate over the appropriate multiplier and calculation of penalties
- ▶ Realistic assessment of resources required for, and risks associated with, continued pursuit

20

Resolution

Settlement Agreement

21

- ▶ DOJ sends initial draft
- ▶ Standard language (including re: restitution)
- ▶ Key terms to negotiate (ideally before handshake agreement reached):
 - ▶ Covered conduct
 - ▶ Released parties
- ▶ (Mostly) Non-negotiable terms, including:
 - ▶ Post-handshake interest
 - ▶ Definition and treatment of “unallowable costs”
 - ▶ Agreement to cooperate with investigation of individuals

Settlement Agreement – Key Issues Regarding the Scope of Release

22

- ▶ Defining the “Covered Conduct” to be released
- ▶ Defining released parties
- ▶ Express reservation of unreleased claims, including:
 - ▶ Criminal liability
 - ▶ Tax liability
 - ▶ Mandatory (and/or permissive) exclusion from government programs
 - ▶ Liability of individuals
- ▶ Dismissal of complaint with prejudice as to Covered Conduct but without prejudice as to remainder
- ▶ Handling of non-intervened claims

Resolution: Other Key Issues

23

- ▶ Impact of state law claims
 - ▶ State FCAs
 - ▶ States as parties
 - ▶ Role of NAMFCU
- ▶ Parallel criminal investigations
- ▶ Relationship to other litigation with Relators
- ▶ Issues that may arise from increased focus on individual liability
- ▶ Clarity of rules going forward: “Leveling the playing field” for all like providers

Resolution: Defense-Specific Issues

24

- ▶ Cooperation
- ▶ Individuals
 - ▶ Impact of Yates Memo
 - ▶ Limitation on Releases
 - ▶ Indemnification
- ▶ Who signs
- ▶ Confidentiality
- ▶ Press release

Resolution: OIG-Specific Issues

25

- ▶ Administrative Remedies
 - ▶ Negotiated Exclusion
 - ▶ Corporate Integrity Agreement
 - ▶ OCIG sends initial draft
 - ▶ Standard language
 - ▶ Also specific terms based on conduct and provider
 - ▶ Negotiated between OCIG and defendant
 - ▶ Timing issues

Key Issues Relating to Corporate Integrity Agreements

26

- ▶ Overarching issues
 - ▶ Effectiveness of existing compliance program
 - ▶ Track record of provider
- ▶ CIA vs. Reservation of Rights
- ▶ Scope of CIA
 - ▶ Definition of issues covered by CIA
 - ▶ IRO?
 - ▶ Legal IRO?
 - ▶ Monitor?

Refusing to Enter Into a Corporate Integrity Agreement

27

- ▶ Beginning October 1, 2018, OIG is posting the names of any entities that refuse to enter into a CIA on its website.

Resolution: Relator-Specific Issues

28

- ▶ Relator's right to object to settlement as unfair, inadequate, unreasonable
- ▶ Declined vs. intervened cases and claims within cases
- ▶ Attorney fees—between Relator and Defendant
- ▶ Retaliation claims
- ▶ Releases
- ▶ Relator's share—between Relator and DOJ

Contact Information

29

Katherine A. Lauer

Latham & Watkins LLP
San Diego, CA
858.523.5451
katherine.lauer@lw.com

Amy L. Easton

Phillips and Cohen LLP
Washington, DC
202.833.3618
aeaston@phillipsandcohen.com

Amy D. Kossak

Commercial Litigation Branch, Civil Frauds
United States Department of Justice
Washington, DC
202.616.2856
Amy.D.Kossak@usdoj.gov

Laura E. Ellis

United States Department of Health and Human
Services—Office of Inspector General
Washington, DC
202.834.1665
Laura.Ellis@oig.hhs.gov