

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMERISOURCEBERGEN CORPORATION;
AMERISOURCEBERGEN DRUG
CORPORATION; and INTEGRATED
COMMERCIALIZATION SOLUTIONS, LLC,

Defendants.

Jury Trial Demanded

Civ. A. No. _____

COMPLAINT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

PARTIES 3

JURISDICTION AND VENUE 4

BACKGROUND 5

I. Defendants’ obligations under the CSA 5

 A. Controlled substances generally 5

 B. The CSA creates a closed system for regulating controlled substances 7

 C. Distributors must abide by certain legal obligations when they receive controlled-substance orders from customers 8

 1. Distributors must report suspicious orders of controlled substances, including but not limited to orders of unusual size, orders deviating substantially from a normal pattern, and orders of unusual frequency 9

 2. Failure to report a suspicious order is punishable by a civil penalty and injunctive relief 11

II. Defendants’ controlled-substance businesses 12

 A. ABC distributes drugs through a network of subsidiaries 12

 B. Defendants sell huge quantities of controlled substances, and controlled substances are a significant source of revenue for Defendants 13

 C. ABC has, at all relevant times, been responsible for certain aspects of the other Defendants’ CSA compliance 16

III. Defendants’ CSA compliance programs suffered from serious systemic defects that enabled significant CSA violations 17

 A. Defendants grossly underfunded their CSA compliance programs 18

 B. Defendants adopted, but did not adequately implement, Know Your Customer policies, which facilitated Defendants’ servicing of problematic customers 20

 1. ABC allowed sales personnel—who were incentivized to recruit and retain customers—to conduct due diligence rather than compliance personnel. 22

 2. In violation of their own policies, Defendants did not obtain the diligence information necessary to assess the possible risks associated with prospective customers 23

 3. Defendants ignored, or failed to address, red flags of diversion and other problems, including when alleged diligence information conflicted with a customer’s actual practices 23

 C. ABC designed ABDC’s Order Monitoring Program to flag for review only orders that exceeded certain statistical thresholds 25

- 1. ABDC’s original Order Monitoring Program applied high thresholds for identifying suspicious orders, and CSRA sometimes raised thresholds upon request..... 25
- 2. ABDC’s original Order Monitoring Program relied exclusively on numerical order thresholds and did not monitor for other suspicious practices 27
- D. Beginning in 2014, ABC created a revised order monitoring program that sharply cut the number of suspicious-order reports to DEA..... 28
 - 1. ROMP flagged only orders that were both unusual in size and pattern or of extraordinarily unusual pattern..... 29
 - 2. ABC designed ROMP recognizing it would flag fewer orders for review and report fewer orders to DEA 31
- E. The human review element of the ABDC order monitoring program was grossly insufficient..... 33
 - 1. For a portion of the relevant period, ABC tasked insufficiently trained distribution center personnel—not compliance personnel—with reviewing many suspicious orders, including opioid orders..... 34
 - 2. Even when flagged orders were reviewed by alleged compliance personnel, ABC devoted inadequate resources towards that task, resulting in cursory, if not non-existent, reviews..... 35
 - 3. ABC’s order reviewers did not have access to information and did not receive adequate training needed to conduct investigations 37
- F. The compliance program for ICS suffered similar defects 39
- IV. Defendants violated the CSA by refusing or negligently failing to report suspicious orders of controlled substances 41
 - A. Defendants violated the CSA by failing to report suspicious orders placed by customers Defendants had notice were likely facilitating diversion 42
 - 1. Pharmacy 1 (Fort Lee, NJ)..... 43
 - 2. Pharmacy 2 (Trenton, NJ)..... 51
 - 3. Pharmacy 3 (Beckley, WV) 54
 - 4. Pharmacy 4 (Gainesville, FL)..... 58
 - 5. Pharmacy 5 (Lakewood, CO) 61
 - B. Defendants violated the CSA by failing to report flagged suspicious orders that Defendants’ reviewers confirmed were suspicious and therefore rejected.... 66
 - C. Defendants violated the CSA by failing to report flagged suspicious orders for which they did not dispel suspicion 67
 - 1. Suspicious flagged ABDC orders falsely cleared as not subject to diversion or abuse 68
 - 2. Suspicious flagged ABDC orders cleared as typical 70

3.	Suspicious flagged ABDC orders cleared without justification	72
4.	Suspicious flagged ICS orders	73
D.	Defendants violated the CSA by failing to report suspicious orders that they designed their thresholds not to flag	74
	CLAIM FOR RELIEF	77
	PRAYER FOR RELIEF	78
	JURY DEMAND	78

The United States of America brings this civil enforcement action against AmerisourceBergen Corporation, AmerisourceBergen Drug Corporation, and Integrated Commercialization Solutions, LLC (collectively, “Defendants”) for their violations of the Comprehensive Drug Abuse Prevention and Control Act of 1970, 21 U.S.C. §§ 801 *et seq.* (“Controlled Substances Act” or “CSA”). In support of this complaint, the United States alleges as follows:

INTRODUCTION

1. The opioid epidemic has had profound and devastating effects on this country and its citizens. This action seeks to hold Defendants civilly liable for their role in this epidemic.
2. Because of their significant potential for diversion and abuse, opioids and other controlled substances are regulated by the CSA and the implementing regulations issued by the Drug Enforcement Administration (“DEA”).
3. In order to prevent controlled substances from being diverted for illegal uses, the CSA requires wholesalers that distribute controlled substances to pharmacies and other customers to monitor their customers’ controlled-substance orders.
4. A controlled-substance order that has an unusual size, deviates substantially from a normal pattern, has an unusual frequency, or carries other indicia of suspicion must be reported to DEA unless the distributor conducts an investigation that dispels all suspicion. If suspicion remains after an investigation, or if no investigation is undertaken, the distributor must report the order to DEA, regardless of whether the distributor fills the order.
5. This legal obligation requires distributors either to look into their customers’ orders if there is suspicious activity and resolve the suspicion or to alert DEA to their customers’ suspicious behavior.

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.