IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

| |) |
|--|------------------|
| PHARMACEUTICAL CARE MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, |)) |
| 601 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W., Suite 740 Washington, D.C. 20004 |))) |
| Plaintiff, |) |
| V. |) |
| UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, |) Case No) |
| 200 Independence Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20201; |))) |
| UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES – OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL, |))) |
| 330 Independence Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20201; |))) |
| UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES – OFFICE OF COUNSEL TO THE INSPECTOR GENERAL, |)))) |
| 330 Independence Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20201; |))) |
| UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, |))) |
| 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20530; |))) |
| ALEX M. AZAR, II, in his official capacity as Secretary of Health and Human Services, |))) |
| 200 Independence Avenue, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20201; |))) |



| JEFFREY A. ROSEN, in his official capacity |) |
|--|---|
| as Acting Attorney General of the United |) |
| States, | Ś |
| States, | |
| 050 D 1 ' 1 N NIVI | 7 |
| 950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. |) |
| Washington, D.C. 20530; |) |
| • |) |
| CHRISTI A. GRIMM, in her official capacity | Ś |
| = - | 7 |
| as Acting Inspector General of the |) |
| Department of Health and Human Services, |) |
| |) |
| 330 Independence Avenue, S.W. | ĺ |
| Washington, D.C. 20201; and | |
| washington, D.C. 20201, and | 7 |
| |) |
| GREGORY E. DEMSKE, in his official |) |
| capacity as Chief Counsel to the Inspector |) |
| General of the Department of Health and | ĺ |
| Human Services, | |
| Truman Services, | 7 |
| |) |
| 330 Independence Avenue, S.W. |) |
| Washington, D.C. 20201 |) |
| 5 , | Ś |
| Defendants. | 7 |
| Detendants. | 7 |
| |) |

COMPLAINT AND PRAYER FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF



TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | rage |
|-----------|--------|--|------|
| INTRODUC | TION . | | 1 |
| PARTIES | | | 9 |
| JURISDICT | ION Al | ND VENUE | 13 |
| FACTUAL A | ALLEG | ATIONS | 13 |
| I. | Lega | l And Factual Background | 13 |
| | A. | Retrospective Rebates Play A Critical Role In Controlling Prescription Drug Prices | |
| | B. | Confidentiality Is Essential To The Functioning Of The Retrospective Rebate System | 17 |
| | C. | Medicare Part D Provides Subsidized Access To Prescription Drug Coverage Through A Market-Based Program Modeled On Longstanding Rebate Practices | 19 |
| | D. | Part D Plan Sponsors Compete For Enrollees Based On Coverage, Premiums, And Out-Of-Pocket Costs At The Point Of Sale | 23 |
| | E. | Designing Part D Plans, Submitting Bids For Each Contract Year, And Coming Into Compliance With New Program Rules Is A Complex, Lengthy, And Highly Regulated Process That Begins More Than A Year In Advance Of A Contract Year | 28 |
| | F. | A Statutory Exception And Regulatory Safe Harbor For Manufacturer "Discounts" Protect Price Concessions To Pharmacy Benefit Managers From Liability Under The Federal Anti- Kickback Statute | 35 |
| II. | The l | Rebate Rule | 40 |
| | A. | HHS Introduces The Rebate Rule By Issuing A Request For Information And A Notice Of Proposed Rulemaking | 40 |
| | B. | Governmental And Commercial Actuarial Studies Of The Rebate Rule Predict Troubling Economic Consequences | 46 |
| | C. | The Proposed Rule Draws Praise From Drug Manufacturers And Broad Concerns From PBMs, Plan Sponsors, Pharmacies, And Others About Higher Premiums And Federal Spending | 52 |
| | D. | HHS-OIG Withdraws The Proposed Rule | 57 |
| | E. | President Trump Issues An Executive Order Directing HHS-OIG To Promulgate A Rule | 61 |



TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| | | | <u>P</u> | <u>age</u> |
|------|----|-------|---|------------|
| | F. | | OIG Proceeds With The Rebate Rule Over Serious Criticism Multiple Stakeholders And Federal Agencies | 64 |
| III. | | | Rule Is Contrary To Law And Violates The Administrative | 70 |
| | A. | | Rebate Rule Is Ultra Vires And Contravenes Multiple tory Limitations | 70 |
| | | 1. | The Rebate Rule Exceeds The Department's Statutory Authority Under The Anti-Kickback Statute | 70 |
| | | 2. | The Rebate Rule Violates The Medicare Act's Non- Interference Clause | 74 |
| | | 3. | The Rebate Rule Impermissibly Institutes A Price Structure | 76 |
| | B. | The R | Rebate Rule Is Arbitrary And Capricious | 77 |
| | | 1. | The Effective Date Of The Rebate Rule Disrupts The Bidding Process For Contract Year 2022 And Makes It Impossible For CMS To Timely Issue Necessary Determinations That PBMs And Plan Sponsors Must Account For Before The Bidding Deadline | 77 |
| | | 2. | The Rebate Rule's Central Premise—That The Rule Will Not Increase Premiums Or Federal Spending—Is Arbitrary And Capricious | 89 |
| | | | a. The Rebate Rule Will Increase Net Prices Because Public Disclosure Of Sensitive Price Information Will Undermine Pharmacy Benefit Managers' Bargaining Power | 90 |
| | | | b. Even If Net Prices Remain Constant, The Rebate Rule Will Increase Premiums And Federal Spending | 93 |
| | | 3. | The Rebate Rule Reflects Flawed And Unsupported Assumptions About The Growth Of List Prices | 97 |
| | | 4. | The Rebate Rule Will Not Achieve Its Intended Purpose And Will Only Harm The Vast Majority Of Enrollees | 99 |
| | | 5. | The Rebate Rule Will Undermine Value-Based Arrangements | 107 |
| | C. | | OIG Failed To Comply With The Procedural Requirements Amending The Regulatory Safe Harbors | 110 |
| | | 1. | The Rebate Rule Was Not Promulgated With The Required | 110 |



TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|-----------------------|--|-------------|
| 2. | HHS-OIG Failed To Consult With The Attorney General Before Proposing The Rebate Rule | 111 |
| COUNT I (CONTRARY T | O LAW) | 112 |
| COUNT II (ARBITRARY A | AND CAPRICIOUS) | 113 |
| COUNT III (DECLARATO | RY JUDGMENT) | 114 |
| PRAYER FOR RELIEF | | 115 |



DOCKET

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.

