

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Criminal No. 18-cr-45-RGA

PATRICK TITUS,

Defendant.

MEMORANDUM ORDER

Before me is the Government's motion to exclude the testimony of Dr. Jonathan Mack. (D.I. 49). I heard oral argument on this motion on June 16, 2021 (D.I. 82) and the parties have submitted helpful briefing. (D.I. 49, 55, 83).¹ For the reasons set forth below, the Government's motion is GRANTED.

I. BACKGROUND

Defendant Dr. Patrick Titus is charged with fourteen counts of knowingly and intentionally distributing controlled substances outside the usual course of professional practice and not for a legitimate medical purpose in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 841(a)(1) and 841(b)(1)(C). (D.I. 3 ¶ 24). Dr. Titus is also charged with one count of maintaining a drug-involved premises in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 856(a)(1) and 18 U.S.C. § 2. (*Id.* ¶¶ 25-26).

Dr. Titus noticed his intent to introduce the testimony of Dr. Mack relating to mental disease or defect bearing on the issue of guilt under Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 12.2(b). (D.I. 41). The Government argues that Dr. Mack's proposed testimony violates the applicable legal standards set forth in *United States v. Pohlott* and the Insanity Defense Reform Act (IDRA). (D.I. 49 at 1).

¹ The motion for leave to file (D.I. 90) is DENIED as the proposed letter (D.I. 90-2) adds nothing to the arguments previously made.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

The Third Circuit case, *United States v. Pohlot*, 827 F.2d 889 (3d Cir. 1987), provides the governing standard. In *Pohlot*, the Court explained:

We conclude that although Congress intended § 17(a) [of IDRA] to prohibit the defenses of diminished responsibility and diminished capacity, Congress distinguished those defenses from the use of evidence of mental abnormality to negate specific intent or any other mens rea, which are elements of the offense. While the contours of the doctrines of diminished responsibility and diminished capacity are unclear, the defenses that Congress intended to preclude usually permit exoneration or mitigation of an offense because of a defendant's supposed psychiatric compulsion or inability or failure to engage in normal reflection; however, these matters do not strictly negate mens rea.

Despite our disagreement with the government's broad contention, we agree that the Congressional prohibition of diminished responsibility defenses requires courts to carefully scrutinize psychiatric defense theories bearing on mens rea. Psychiatrists are capable of supplying elastic descriptions of mental states that appear to but do not truly negate the legal requirements of mens rea. Presenting defense theories or psychiatric testimony to juries that do not truly negate mens rea may cause confusion about what the law requires.

Id. at 890. Following *Pohlot*, courts in this Circuit have applied the *Pohlot* standard to a variety of proffered expert testimony. *See, e.g., United States v. Andrews*, 811 F. Supp. 2d 1158 (E.D. Pa. 2011); *United States v. Sacks*, 2009 WL 4114169 (D.N.J. Nov. 23, 2009); *United States v. Mister*, 533 F. Supp. 2d 377 (D.N.J. 2008).

In particular, the Court in *Mister* engaged in a lengthy examination of *Pohlot* as applied to a “knowledge” crime rather than an “intent” crime. *Mister*, 533 F. Supp. 2d at 384. The Court’s analysis is instructive and highly relevant to the facts at hand. I will follow the approach of *Mister*, beginning with the proffered testimony, the applicable mens rea, and the link, if any, between the testimony and the elements of the charged crimes. *See id.* at 381-88; *see also Sacks*, 2009 WL 4114169, at *4-7 (considering the pertinent mens rea, the proffered testimony, and applying the *Pohlot* standard).

III. DISCUSSION

A. Proposed Testimony

The description of the proposed testimony has varied over time. The original notice, in January 2021, was brief:

Dr. Titus suffers impairments in reasoning and mental organization, which rendered him unqualified to practice medicine based on being unfit for duty due to substandard neurocognitive functioning. The substandard neurocognitive functioning reached the level of chronic brain damage with evidence of Organic Personality Syndrome and Mild Neurocognitive Disorder predominately connected to the right cerebral hemisphere.

(D.I. 49, Ex. A). Dr. Mack's full fifty-page report (D.I. 49, Ex. B) was dated March 1, 2021. Dr. Mack interviewed Dr. Titus for approximately 4-5 hours and administered numerous neuropsychological and psychological tests, in addition to reviewing Dr. Titus' previous neuropsychological evaluation history. (D.I. 49, Ex. B at 2, 3-13, 43). Dr. Mack diagnosed a "chronic mild neurocognitive disorder now presenting with clear lateralizing features to the right temporal parietal region, as well as marked difficulties in certain aspects of executive frontal function, specifically involving nonverbal problem solving and adaptive reasoning." (*Id.* at 47). The report additionally describes two further diagnostic impressions: "Organic Personality Syndrome/Personality Change due to above medical condition/Neurocognitive Disorder with marked stickiness, hyperreligiosity, and excessive religious rumination" and "Schizotypal Personality Disorder." (*Id.* at 48).

In sum, Dr. Mack's lengthy report concluded by opining that Dr. Titus had been working as an "impaired physician" since the early 2000s and that he was unfit to practice medicine during the relevant time period. (*Id.*). The Report goes on to state, "Dr. Titus' impairments in reasoning and mental organization rendered him unable to assess his own performance realistically, and he lapsed in to the arrogant and proselytizing view that his world view and his medical opinions were correct without question." (*Id.* at 49).

After the Government moved to exclude Dr. Mack's report and testimony, Defendant provided an "Addendum." (D.I. 55, Ex. A). The Addendum clarifies Dr. Mack's conclusions on the matter of intent. (D.I. 55, Ex. A at 1). Dr. Mack writes, "Dr. Titus has a defective thought process and significant

neurocognitive impairments that resulting in his believing that he was practicing medicine correctly, with the conclusion that he was acting in good faith within the usual course of medical practice.” (*Id.*).

At oral argument, there was extensive discussion of what exactly Defendant thought Dr. Mack could properly testify about.

COUNSEL: Dr. Mack is saying that Dr. Titus suffered from neurocognitive impairment, and then several other impairments that impacted on – causes him to act in a certain way and causes him to, how can I put this, it drives his -- the notion that how he was practicing medicine was consistent with doing so in good faith in serving his patients.

And Dr. Mack is saying due to his impairments, he wasn't able to reach certain – access certain executive functions and that he has this almost not narci[ssi]stic, but this defect causes him to believe that he knows what he's doing. He can't reflect on that, and that his way is the right way.

[Dr. Mack] goes through and talks about diagnosing him with substandard neurocognitive functioning that reach levels of chronic brain damage with clear evidence of organic personality syndrome and mild neurocognitive disorder primarily affecting the right cerebral hemisphere. These impairments cause Dr. Titus to have the effective process and significant neurocognitive impairments that resulted in his believing that he was practicing medicine correctly, prescribing in good faith while within the usual course of medical practice.

[Dr. Mack] states in his report that Dr. Titus's impairments are causing him to believe that he was prescribing medicine correctly and prescribing it with a good faith belief that he was doing so in the usual course of a medical practice. It is about Dr. Titus's -- it is about how these impairments impacted his reasoning at that time with respect to how he conducted his operation, and I think that it goes to the lack of knowledge. It goes to lack of intent in terms of the mens rea aspect of the case.

THE COURT: Do you think [Dr. Mack] can say [Dr. Titus] was operating in good faith or his state of mind was good faith?

COUNSEL: Your Honor, if we take up the good faith aspect of it, I believe that he would be saying that . . . Dr. Titus believed that he was practicing medicine and that he was prescribing patients and treating patients within the course of – with prescriptions, opioid prescriptions within the course of a medical practice.

I believe that if I read the *Cohen* case particularly, I think that there may be some basis for Dr. Mack to talk about that.

I think at least he should be able to say he believed he was practicing medicine correctly.

I believe that Dr. Mack can testify that Dr. Titus believed he was practicing medicine correctly in a broader sense, right, and that what led to that is the impairments from which he suffered in this case and his neurocognitive deficits. And I believe that that goes to whether or not -- would support the defense argument that the doctor, Dr. Titus was acting in good faith when he prescribed medication.

(D.I. 82 at 44-52) (excerpts edited for readability).

B. Applicable Mens Rea

The fourteen counts charged under 21 U.S.C. § 841 require a mens rea of “knowingly or intentionally.” *United States v. Polan*, 970 F.2d 1280, 1282 (3d Cir. 1992). That is, the Government must demonstrate that Dr. Titus knowingly or intentionally distributed a controlled substance. *Id.* The offense does not encompass “drug distribution by a physician in the usual course of professional practice.” *Id.*

The fifteenth count is charged under 21 U.S.C. § 856(a)(1), which makes unlawful to “knowingly open, lease, rent, use, or maintain any place, whether permanently or temporarily, for the purpose of manufacturing, distributing, or using any controlled substance.” 21 U.S.C. § 856(a)(1); *United States v. Nasir*, 982 F.3d 144, 152 (3d Cir. 2020). The required mens rea is “knowingly.” *Id.*

To act “knowingly” with respect to either offense, “is to act with ‘knowledge of the facts that constitute the offense’ but not necessarily with knowledge that the facts amount to illegal conduct, unless the statute indicates otherwise.” *United States v. Barbosa*, 271 F.3d 438, 457-58, (3d Cir. 2001) (quoting *Bryan v. United States*, 524 U.S. 184, 193 (1998)). To act “intentionally,” is to act “deliberately and not by accident.” *Id.* (quoting *United States v. Fuller*, 162 F.3d 256, 260 (4th Cir. 1998)).

The parties appear to agree that in the context of the first fourteen counts, the precise mens rea is that “the defendant knew that what he distributed and dispensed was a controlled substance and that the distributing or dispensing was outside the usual course of professional practice and not for a legitimate medical purpose.” (D.I. 64 at 51 (jointly proposed jury instruction)).

C. Application

The question at this stage is whether Dr. Mack’s testimony tends to negate the mens rea element of one or more of the charged offenses. *Mister*, 553 F. Supp. 2d at 386. At oral argument, the parties focused narrowly on the issues contained in the Addendum concerning Dr. Titus’ ability to reflect on his decisions and his belief in his own medical judgment. Defendant’s counsel described the disputed testimony as “Dr. Mack is saying due to his impairments, he wasn’t able to reach certain – access certain executive functions and that he has this almost not narci[ssi]stic, but this defect causes him to believe that



Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.