

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

_____)	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 20-11548-NMG
)	
TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC., and)	
TEVA NEUROSCIENCE, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

THE UNITED STATES' OPPOSITION TO TEVA'S MOTION TO DISMISS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

LEGAL BACKGROUND 4

 I. MEDICARE PART D AND ITS COST-SHARING PROVISIONS..... 4

 II. THE FALSE CLAIMS ACT AND THE ANTI-KICKBACK STATUTE 5

 III. HHS-OIG’S GUIDANCE CONCERNING PAYING MEDICARE BENEFICIARIES’ COST-SHARING AMOUNTS..... 6

FACTUAL BACKGROUND..... 9

 I. TEVA’S SCHEME TO SUBSIDIZE COPAXONE’S HIGH PRICE BY COVERING PATIENTS MEDICARE CO-PAYS FOR THE DRUG 9

 II. TEVA PAID TAF AND CDF TO GENERATE MEDICARE CLAIMS FOR COPAXONE..... 12

 III. TEVA KNEW ITS CONDUCT WAS UNLAWFUL 14

ARGUMENT..... 14

 I. THE GOVERNMENT HAS PLED FACTS SUPPORTING EACH ELEMENT OF THE ANTI-KICKBACK STATUTE AND THE FALSE CLAIMS ACT 15

 A. The Complaint Sufficiently Pleads That Teva Violated The AKS.....15

 1. Teva Provided Remuneration To Patients Through CDF and TAF15

 2. Teva Intended Its Payments To Induce Purchases Of Copaxone. ..16

 a. Teva Actively Ensured Its Payments Benefitted Copaxone Patients16

 b. The AKS Does Not Require The Government To Plead Or Prove Corruption Of Clinical Decision-Making.....19

 c. The Complaint Need Not Allege That Teva’s Payments To The Foundations Were Contingent On The Foundations’ Agreement To Promote Copaxone.....20

 3. Medicare Paid For Thousands of Kickback-Tainted Copaxone Claims21

4.	The Complaint Alleges That Teva’s Conduct Was Knowing And Willful.....	22
a.	The Complaint Alleges The Statutory Scienter Elements Of The AKS	22
b.	The HHS-OIG Guidance Does Not Provide Teva A Defense To Willfulness.....	23
B.	The Complaint Sufficiently Pleads That Teva Violated the False Claims Act.....	25
1.	Teva’s Kickbacks Caused False Claims	25
2.	Teva’s AKS Violations Were “Material” For Purposes Of The FCA.....	28
3.	Teva’s Conduct Was Knowing Under The FCA.	29
C.	The Government Has Sufficiently Pled An FCA Conspiracy..	30
II.	THE COMPLAINT ALLEGES FCA VIOLATIONS WITH PARTICULARITY	32
III.	THE COMPLAINT SUFFICIENTLY ALLEGES UNJUST ENRICHMENT ...	34
IV.	THE FIRST AMENDMENT DOES NOT PROTECT TEVA’S KICKBACK CONDUCT	36
	CONCLUSION.....	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIESCases

<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	14
<i>Cardigan Mountain Sch. v. N.H. Ins. Co.</i> , 787 F.3d 82 (1st Cir. 2015)	14
<i>Giboney v. Empire Storage & Ice Co.</i> , 336 U.S. 490 (1949)	37
<i>Guilfoile v. Shields</i> , 913 F.3d 178 (1st Cir. 2019)	16, 19, 25, 28
<i>In re Pharm. Indus. Average Wholesale Price Litig.</i> , 491 F. Supp. 2d 12 (D. Mass. 2007)	5
<i>Mass. Eye & Ear Infirmary v. QLT Phototherapeutics, Inc.</i> , 552 F.3d 47 (1st Cir. 2009)	35
<i>Massachusetts v. Mylan Labs.</i> , 357 F. Supp. 2d 314 (D. Mass. 2005)	35
<i>Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.</i> , 564 U.S. 552 (2011)	37
<i>United States ex rel. Arnstein v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , No. 13 Civ. 3702, 2019 WL 1245656 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 27, 2019)	25
<i>United States ex rel. Banigan v. Organon USA Inc.</i> , No. CV 07-12153-RWZ, 2016 WL 10704126 (D. Mass. Aug. 23, 2016)	15-16, 23, 29
<i>United States ex rel. Bawduniak v. Biogen Idec, Inc.</i> , No. 12-CV-10601-IT, 2018 WL 1996829 (D. Mass. Apr. 27, 2018)	27
<i>United States ex rel. Bilotta v. Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp.</i> , 50 F. Supp. 3d 497 (S.D.N.Y. 2014)	17, 23
<i>United States ex rel. Decesare v. Americare in Home Nursing</i> , No. 1:05CV696, 2011 WL 607390 (E.D. Va. Feb. 10, 2011)	29
<i>United States ex rel. Escobar v. Universal Health Servs., Inc.</i> , 842 F.3d 103 (1st Cir. 2016)	15, 25
<i>United States ex rel. Gagne v. City of Worcester</i> , 565 F.3d 40 (1st Cir. 2009)	14, 32
<i>United States ex rel. Ge v. Takeda Pharm. Co.</i> , 737 F.3d 116 (1st Cir. 2013)	32

<i>United States ex rel. Gohil v. Sanofi U.S. Servs. Inc.</i> , No. 02-2964, 2020 WL 4260797 (E.D. Pa. July 24, 2020)	28, 30
<i>United States ex rel. Gohil v. Sanofi U.S. Servs. Inc.</i> , No. 02-2964, 2020 WL 6682483 (E.D. Pa. Nov. 12, 2020)	24, 26, 29
<i>United States ex rel. Goodman v. Arriva Med., LLC</i> , No. 3:13-CV-0760, 2020 WL 3840446 (M.D. Tenn. July 8, 2020)	5, 17, 26
<i>United States ex rel. Greenfield v. Medco Health Sols., Inc.</i> , 880 F.3d 89 (3d Cir. 2018)	19, 25-26
<i>United States ex rel. Grenadyor v. Ukrainian Village Pharmacy, Inc.</i> , 772 F.3d 1102 (7th Cir. 2014)	16
<i>United States ex rel. Kosenske v. Carlisle HMA, Inc.</i> , No. 1:05-CV-2184, 2010 WL 1390661 (M.D. Pa. Mar. 31, 2010)	29-30
<i>United States ex rel. Lutz v. United States</i> , 853 F.3d 131, 135 (4th Cir. 2017)	25
<i>United States ex rel. Nargol v. DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc.</i> , 865 F.3d 29 (1st Cir. 2017)	32
<i>United States ex rel. Nevyas v. Allergan, Inc.</i> , No. 09-432, 2015 WL 3429381 (E.D. Pa. May 26, 2015)	36
<i>United States ex rel. Purcell v. MWI Corp.</i> , 254 F. Supp. 2d 69 (D.D.C. 2003)	36
<i>United States ex rel. Ruscher v. Omnicare, Inc.</i> , 663 F. App'x 368 (5th Cir. 2016)	16
<i>United States ex rel. Strunck v. Mallinckrodt ARD, LLC</i> , Nos. 12-175, 13-1776, 2020 WL 362717 (E.D. Pa. Jan. 22, 2020)	17, 29, 34
<i>United States ex rel. Vitale v. MiMedx Group, Inc.</i> , 381 F. Supp. 3d 647 (D.S.C. 2019)	18
<i>United States ex rel. Wallace v. Exactech, Inc.</i> , No. 2:18-CV-01010-LSC, 2020 WL 4500493 (N.D. Ala. Aug. 5, 2020)	27
<i>United States ex rel. Westmoreland v. Amgen, Inc.</i> , 738 F. Supp. 2d 267 (D. Mass. 2010)	30-32
<i>United States ex rel. Wilkins v. United Health Grp., Inc.</i> , 659 F.3d 295 (3d Cir. 2011)	19
<i>United States ex rel. Wood v. Allergan, Inc.</i> , 246 F. Supp. 3d 772 (S.D.N.Y. 2017)	29

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.