UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY,
Lilly Corporate Center
893 Delaware Street
Indianapolis, IN 46225,

and

LILLY USA, LLC,
1500 South Harding Street
Indianapolis, IN 46221,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ALEX M. AZAR II, in his official capacity as Secretary of Health & Human Services
Office of the Secretary
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201,

ROBERT P. CHARROW, in his official capacity as General Counsel of Health & Human Services
Office of the General Counsel
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201,

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
200 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20201,

THOMAS J. ENGELS, in his official capacity as Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20852,

and

HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20852,

Defendants.

No. 1:21-cv-81-SEB-MJD

Document Electronically Filed

PLAINTIFFS' COMBINED MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT [DKT. 88]

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 3

A. The 340B Program 3

B. The ADR Rule 7

LEGAL STANDARD 11

ARGUMENT 11

I. The December 30 Decision Is An Invalid Legislative Rule And Final Agency Action... 11

A. The December 30 Decision Is a Legislative Rule Subject to APA Challenge. 12

B. Even if the December 30 Decision is Not Legislative, It Remains Final Agency Action Subject to the APA. 19

C. The Court Should Decide The Merits of the Statutory Question. 22

II. The December 30 Decision Is Contrary To Law Because The 340B Statute Does Not Require Manufacturers To Sell Discounted Product To Contract Pharmacies..... 24

A. The 340B Statute Enumerates the Fifteen Types of "Covered Entities" that Must Receive 340B Discounts, and Does Not Include Contract Pharmacies. 24

B. The December 30 Decision's "Agency" Theory Has No Basis in the Statute. 27

C. Defendants' Construction Also Raises Grave Constitutional Concerns. 33

III. The December 30 Decision Is Arbitrary And Capricious..... 37

IV. The ADR Rule Is Procedurally And Substantively Defective..... 41

A. The ADR Rule Needed to Proceed through Notice and Comment. 41

B. The ADR Rule Violates Article II. 45

C. The ADR Rule Violates Article III. 50

D. The ADR Rule Is Arbitrary, Capricious, and Beyond the Agency's Authority. 57

CONCLUSION 60

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. Azar,
967 F.3d 818 (D.C. Cir. 2020) 4, 39

Am. Hosp. Ass'n v. HHS,
2021 WL 616323 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 17, 2021) 6, 16

Am. Min. Congress v. Mine Safety & Health Admin.,
995 F.2d 1106 (D.C. Cir. 1993) 14, 18

Amerijet Int'l, Inc. v. Pistole,
753 F.3d 1343 (D.C. Cir. 2014) 39

AMG Capital Mgmt., LLC v. FTC,
141 S. Ct. 1341 (2021) 52

Appalachian Power Co. v. EPA,
208 F.3d 1015 (D.C. Cir. 2000) 12, 20

Ariz. Pub. Serv. Co. v. EPA,
211 F.3d 1280 (D.C. Cir. 2000) 45

Ashcroft v. Iqbal,
556 U.S. 662 (2009) 11

Astra U.S.A., Inc. v. Santa Clara Cty.,
563 U.S. 110 (2011) 5, 25, 56

Atl. City Elec. Co. v. FERC,
295 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2002) 23

Azar v. Allina Health Services,
139 S. Ct. 1804 (2019) 23

Baptist Hospital East v. Secretary of Health & Human Services,
802 F.2d 860 (6th Cir. 1986) 37

Barnhart v. Peabody Coal Co.,
537 U.S. 149 (2003) 26

Barrick Goldstrike Mines Inc. v. Browner,
215 F.3d 45 (D.C. Cir. 2000) 22

Bennett v. Spear,
520 U.S. 154 (1997) 20

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Boucher v. U.S. Dep't of Agric.,
934 F.3d 530 (7th Cir. 2019) 39

Burlington Truck Lines, Inc. v. United States,
371 U.S. 156 (1962).....40

Byers v. C.I.R.,
740 F.3d 668 (D.C. Cir. 2014) 40

Cal. Cmties. Against Toxics v. EPA,
934 F.3d 627 (D.C. Cir. 2019) 20, 21

Calder v. Bull,
3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 386 (1798) 33

Carole Media LLC v. N.J. Transit Corp.,
550 F.3d 302 (3d Cir. 2008).....33

Catholic Health Initiatives v. Sebelius,
617 F.3d 490 (D.C. Cir. 2010) 14

CFTC v. Schor,
478 U.S. 833 (1986).....53, 54

Christopher v. SmithKline Beecham Corp.,
567 U.S. 142 (2012).....26

Clarian Health W., LLC v. Hargan,
878 F.3d 346 (D.C. Cir. 2017) 13

Cmty. Nutrition Inst. v. Young,
818 F.2d 943 (D.C. Cir. 1987) 13

Council Tree Commc'ns, Inc. v. FCC,
619 F.3d 235 (3d Cir. 2010).....45

CSI Aviation Servs., Inc. v. Dep't of Transp.,
637 F.3d 408 (D.C. Cir. 2011) 18, 22

Dep't of Transp. v. Ass'n of Am. R.R.,
575 U.S. 43 (2015).....48, 50

Dickson v. Sec'y of Def.,
68 F.3d 1396 (D.C. Cir. 1995) 60

Dirks v. SEC,
463 U.S. 646 (1983).....28

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Dolan v. City of Tigard,
512 U.S. 374 (1994).....35, 36

Edmond v. United States,
520 U.S. 651 (1997).....48, 49, 50

Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. DHS,
653 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2011).....14

Encino Motorcars, LLC v. Navarro,
136 S. Ct. 2117 (2016).....40

FCC v. Fox Television Stations, Inc.,
556 U.S. 502 (2009).....40

FDA v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.,
529 U.S. 120 (2000).....37

Fla. Power & Light Co. v. Lorion,
470 U.S. 729 (1985).....11

Fleming v. USDA,
987 F.3d 1093 (D.C. Cir. 2021).....49, 50

Freeman v. Quicken Loans, Inc.,
566 U.S. 624 (2012).....31

In re Grand Jury Investigation,
916 F.3d 1047 (D.C. Cir. 2019).....50

Granfinanciera, S.A. v. Nordberg,
492 U.S. 33 (1989).....55, 56

Haw. Hous. Auth. v. Midkiff,
467 U.S. 229 (1984).....34

Hawaii v. Office of Hawaiian Affairs,
556 U.S. 163 (2009).....24

Helvering v. Morgan's, Inc.,
293 U.S. 121 (1934).....26

Hoctor v. USDA,
82 F.3d 165 (7th Cir. 1996).....14

Home Builders Ass'n of Greater Chicago v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs,
335 F.3d 607 (7th Cir. 2003).....19, 20

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.