

SPECIAL ALERT

HEALTH CARE AND LIFE SCIENCES

The Epstein Becker & Green, P.C., **Special Alert** is published by the Health Care and Life Sciences Practice to inform health care organizations of all types of new legal developments which may affect the delivery and financing of health care services.

Information published in the **Special Alert** is not intended to be, nor should it be considered, legal advice. Readers should consult an attorney to discuss specific situations in further detail.

ATTORNEY ADVERTISING

Lynn Shapiro Snyder, Esq.
EDITOR

Published by the
HEALTH CARE AND
LIFE SCIENCES PRACTICE
OF
EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN P.C.

THOUGHT LEADERS IN HEALTH LAW®



EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN, PC

EBGLAW.COM

Supreme Court Rules Against Relator in *Rockwell International Qui Tam* Case

On March 27th, 2007, in *Rockwell International v. United States ex. rel. Stone*, the Supreme Court provided helpful clarification to the “original source” requirement and held that 1) where there is a False Claims Act *qui tam* suit based on publicly disclosed allegations, the requirement that a relator must be the original source of the information is jurisdictional and may be raised at any time; 2) a meritorious relator must have “direct and independent knowledge of the information on which the allegations are based,” as required by 31 U. S. C. §3730(e)(4)(B); and 3) the government’s intervention in the case does not provide an independent basis of jurisdiction that bootstraps a relator into an original source. *Rockwell Int’l Corp. v. United States*, No. 05 – 1272, __ U.S. __ (March 27, 2007).

Under the False Claims Act (“FCA”), Section 3730(e)(4)(A) provides that no court shall have jurisdiction over an action based upon the “public disclosure” of allegations, a term defined by the statute as including criminal, civil, or administrative hearings, investigations, or media reports, unless the action is brought by the Attorney General or the person bringing the action is an original source of the information. Section 3730(e)(4)(B) defines an “original source” as “an individual who [1] has direct and independent knowledge of the information on which the allegations are based and [2] has voluntarily provided the information to the Government before filing an action under this section which is based on the information.” The primary issue in *Rockwell* was whether, under the specific facts presented, relator Stone qualified under the original-source exception to the public-disclosure bar.

The Courts of Appeals had divided over whether the phrase “information on which the allegations are based” refers to the information on which the *relator’s allegations* are based or the information on which the *publicly disclosed allegations* that triggered the public-disclosure bar are based, and which of the relator’s allegations were the relevant ones.

Rockwell presented a factually close case. There had been an indisputable public disclosure of environmental offenses at the Rocky Flats nuclear facility that had occurred years after the relator had had anything to do with the plant. However, the relator argued that his earlier predictions of environmental system failure were what led to the successful prosecution of the company and permitted him to carry on the civil FCA case. The Supreme Court disagreed, noting that “even if a prediction can qualify as direct and independent knowledge in some cases ..., it assuredly does not do so when its premise of cause and effect is wrong.”

cont.

EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN P.C.

The Epstein Becker & Green, P.C. *Special Alert* is published by the Health Care and Life Sciences Practice to inform health care organizations of all types of new legal developments which may affect the delivery and financing of health care services.

Information published in the *Special Alert* is not intended to be, nor should it be considered, legal advice. Readers should consult an attorney to discuss specific situations in further detail.

ATTORNEY ADVERTISING

Lynn Shapiro Snyder, Esq.
EDITOR

Published by the
HEALTH CARE AND
LIFE SCIENCES PRACTICE
OF
EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN, P.C.

The Court's ruling, while very fact-specific, provides a useful clarification of the original source rule and will likely have the most impact in cases where the Government declines to intervene, but the relator decides to continue. The government declines to intervene in about 76% of the *qui tam* actions brought under the FCA.¹ This ruling could lead to the diminution of unmeritorious but expensive and time consuming litigation. Correspondingly, it is essential to raise the public disclosure/original source bar early and often when litigation is filed.

The Court's ruling also may strengthen the benefits that a company gains by participating in a voluntary disclosure program. Currently, the benefits to voluntary disclosure range from the possible reduction of civil damages, to the possibility that the government will not pursue a criminal action against the company (or a lesser criminal sentence or deferred prosecution) and/or the possible reduction or elimination of administrative remedies, such as exclusion from federal health care programs. Additionally, the government does not usually issue subpoenas when a company elects to disclose matters voluntarily. The government may let the company conduct its own investigation. Entities that view themselves as likely subjects of such claims might find potential advantage in attempting to cut off relators by participating in voluntary disclosure programs such as those administered by the Departments of Health & Human Services, Justice and Defense.

* * *

If you would like additional information regarding this topic, please contact Stuart Gerson at 202/861-4180 or sgerson@ebglaw.com, George Breen at 202/861-1823 or gbreen@ebglaw.com, Amanda Schlager at 202/861-5336 or aschlager@ebglaw.com in the firm's Washington, DC office or the Epstein Becker & Green attorney who regularly handles your legal matters. For further information about Epstein Becker & Green's Health Care & Life Sciences Practice, or to see back issues of Special Alerts, please visit our website at www.ebglaw.com.

THOUGHT LEADERS IN HEALTH LAW®



¹ Information on False Claims Act Litigation: Briefing for Congressional Requestors, December 15, 2005 available at <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d06320r.pdf>.

EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN P.C.

The Epstein Becker & Green, P.C. *Special Alert* is published by the Health Care and Life Sciences Practice to inform health care organizations of all types of new legal developments which may affect the delivery and financing of health care services.

Information published in the *Special Alert* is not intended to be, nor should it be considered, legal advice. Readers should consult an attorney to discuss specific situations in further detail.

ATTORNEY ADVERTISING

Lynn Shapiro Snyder, Esq.
EDITOR

Published by the
HEALTH CARE AND
LIFE SCIENCES PRACTICE
OF
EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN, P.C.

If you would like to be added to our mailing list or need to update your contact information, please complete the form below and return it to:

Amy Simmons
Marketing & Recruitment Manager
Health Care & Life Sciences Practice
Epstein Becker & Green, P.C.
1227 25th St., NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20037
phone (202) 861-1811 – fax (202) 296-2882
asimmons@ebglaw.com

Name: _____ Title: _____

Company/Firm/Organization: _____

Street address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip Code: _____

Phone number: _____ Fax number: _____

Internet E-mail address: _____

HEALTH CARE & LIFE SCIENCES PRACTICE PROFESSIONALS OF THE FIRM

ATLANTA

Michael Barry, Robert Berg, Beth Davis, Christy Durden
Maxine Hicks, Kristen McDonald, Matt Moore,
Rebekah Plowman, Kim Ruark, Carol Saul and Alan Wynne

CHICAGO

Amy Dow, Steve Drake, Diane Romza-Kutz
James Lancheros, John Maher, Corey Perman, Kevin Ryan
Rich Ruzich and Kathy Tarallo

DALLAS

Gayla Crain and Elise Healy

HOUSTON

Steve Cochell, Michelle Moore and Marty Wickliff

LOS ANGELES

Susan Graham and Karen Weaver

NEW YORK

Jeffrey Becker, Scott Drago, Jerrold Ehrlich, Beth Essig
Jim Frank, Philip Gassel, Jay Gerzog, John Gleason
Wendy Goldstein, Daniel Gospin, Robert Groban
Alicia Hayes, Barry Kazan, Carrie Kissick
Purvi Maniar, Christopher Panczner, Howard Pianko,
Brian Platton, Bill Ruskin, Bernadette Spina
Steven Swirsky, Jonathan Trafimow and Eric Vieland

NEWARK

Richard Davis, Joan Disler, James Flynn
Hervé Gouraige, Sucharita Iyengar, Dan Levy
Philip Mitchell, Maxine Neuhauser, Kerry Parker
Michael Slocum and Jana Taylor

SAN FRANCISCO

Carrie Becker, William Helvestine
Michael Horan and Jamie Platto

WASHINGTON, DC

Daniel Abrahams, Jana Kolarik Anderson
Kirsten Backstrom, Clifford Barnes, Kelly Barnes
John Benevelli, Uri Bilek, Michael Bissegger
George Breen, Teresa Brooks, Lee Calligaro
Paul Campbell*, Jason Caron, Jason Christ, Michael Cook
John Eriksen, Steven Epstein, Maura Farrell*
Stuart Gerson, Alexis Gilroy, Julianna Gonen
Marc Handler, Douglas Hastings
Robert Hudock, Leah Kendall (admitted in IN only)
William Kopit, Mark Lutes, Ted Mannen, David Matyas
John Murdock, Elizabeth Murphy, Clayton Nix
Sarah Oliker, Kathleen Peterson, Helen Quick
Robert Reif, Caroline Rogers, Amanda Schlager
Anuj Shah, Rachael Shenkman
Lynn Shapiro Snyder, Rachel Spitz
David Tatge, Daly Temchine
Bradley Merrill Thompson (admitted in IN only)
Linda Tomaselli (admitted in MA & NH only), Carrie Valiant
Dale Van Demark, Bonnie Wagman*
Patricia Wagner, Robert Wanerman
Hilary Weckstein and Connie Wilkinson

*Not admitted to the practice of law

THOUGHT LEADERS IN HEALTH LAW®

