

Medicare Jurisdictional Bar Limits Bankruptcy Court Authority in Health Care Bankruptcy

by Wendy G. Marcari

July 2015

Introduction

In an opinion dated June 26, 2015, the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Florida ruled that the bankruptcy court administering the *Bayou Shores SNF, LLC* (“Debtor” or “Bayou Shores”), chapter 11 proceeding lacked subject matter jurisdiction to enjoin the termination of the Debtor’s Medicare and Medicaid provider agreements or to order the assumption of the provider agreements.¹ Specifically, the district court held that the Medicare jurisdictional bar under 42 U.S.C. § 405(h) limits the authority of the bankruptcy court to interfere with efforts by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (“CMS”) to terminate the provider agreements except to provide judicial review under section 405(g) after administrative remedies have been exhausted. Bayou Shores has expressed its intention to appeal the district court’s decision, but if the decision is affirmed, it could have broad implications for health care bankruptcies by limiting the ability of health care businesses in bankruptcy to reorganize or sell their assets on a going-concern basis.

Background

Bayou Shores operates a skilled nursing facility in Florida serving patients with neurological disorders and psychiatric conditions. This skilled nursing facility is one of only a few facilities in the area that serves this population and receives more than 90 percent of its revenue from Medicare and Medicaid. Pursuant to 42 C.F.R. Part 482, Subpart B, payment under Medicare and Medicaid programs is contingent on compliance with the requirements set forth in the regulations governing those programs.

¹ See Fla. Agency for Health Care Admin. v. Bayou Shores SNF, LLC (In re Bayou Shores SNF, LLC), Case No. 8:14-cv-02816 (M.D. Fla. June 26, 2015), available at <http://www.justice.gov/usao-mdfl/file/627661/download>.

Based on surveys of the Debtor over the course of five months in 2014, the Debtor was found to no longer be in compliance with these requirements, and, as such, CMS notified the Debtor that its Medicare provider agreement would terminate on August 3, 2014.

Procedural History

To thwart the upcoming termination of its provider agreements, the Debtor sought and obtained from the district court a temporary restraining order (“TRO”) enjoining the termination of the provider agreements until August 15, 2014. On that date, the Debtor’s motion to extend the TRO was denied and subsequently dissolved by the district court on the ground that 42 U.S.C. § 405(h) precluded the district court from exercising jurisdiction over the controversy prior to the Debtor exhausting its administrative remedies. Within an hour, the Debtor filed a voluntary chapter 11 petition and obtained an interim order of the bankruptcy court enjoining CMS from terminating the provider agreements or denying payments of claims. The bankruptcy court stated that it had jurisdiction over the matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334 (the statute that provides bankruptcy jurisdiction) and found the Medicare and Medicaid provider agreements to be “property of the estate,” warranting the entry of an order precluding the termination of the provider agreements.

In a subsequent evidentiary hearing, the bankruptcy court noted that jurisdiction over this matter was appropriate pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1334 and concluded that since the provider agreements were not terminated prior to the Debtor’s bankruptcy filing, the provider agreements constituted executory contracts that could be assumed in bankruptcy. The bankruptcy court noted that the Debtor’s patients were not in any danger, the Debtor had cured the asserted deficiencies, and CMS had notified the Debtor that it was in substantial compliance with the regulations. Accordingly, the bankruptcy court prohibited the termination of the provider agreements. In addition, the bankruptcy court approved the Debtor’s assumption of the provider agreements pursuant to the Debtor’s plan of reorganization. The United States, on behalf of the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services (“Secretary”) and the Florida agency that administers the Medicaid program, appealed.

The Medicare Jurisdictional Bar

The Medicare jurisdictional bar promulgated in 42 U.S.C. § 405(h) states that “no findings of fact or decision . . . shall be reviewed by any person, tribunal, or governmental agency except as herein provided,” and no action against the Secretary “shall be brought under section 1131 or 1346 of Title 28 to recover on any claim arising under” the Medicare Act. The government argued that section 405(h) precludes the bankruptcy court from taking *any* action related to the provider agreements *until* the Debtor exhausts its administrative remedies. In response, the Debtor argued that the bankruptcy court’s jurisdiction was not barred by section 405(h) because that section does not *expressly* proscribe the bankruptcy court’s jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1334. Having examined congressional intent in enacting the Medicare jurisdictional bar to

broadly apply to all cases in which administrative remedies have not been exhausted, the district court concluded that section 405(h) precluded the bankruptcy court's exercise of jurisdiction over the provider agreements before the Debtor's administrative remedies had been exhausted. The district court therefore reversed the bankruptcy court orders.

Possible Impact on Health Care Bankruptcy Cases

Bankruptcy can be a strategic tool for a debtor at risk of losing a valuable contract. The Bankruptcy Code's automatic stay and a bankruptcy court's equitable powers are often utilized to prevent a counter-party from terminating a contract, which can be critical to a debtor's ability to reorganize or sell its assets as a going concern.

A health care provider relying on Medicare and Medicaid, however, may be limited in its ability to use the bankruptcy process to prevent the termination of, or to obtain the assumption and assignment of, a provider agreement if CMS seeks to terminate the provider agreement or exercise other remedies. This can fundamentally affect the value and survival of a distressed health care business.

An appeal of the district court's decision is expected.

* * *

*This Client Alert was authored by **Wendy G. Marcari**, **Elena M. Quattrone**, a Summer Associate (not admitted to the practice of law) in Epstein Becker Green's New York office, contributed significantly to the preparation of this Client Alert. For additional information about the issues discussed in this Client Alert, please contact the author or the Epstein Becker Green attorney who regularly handles your legal matters.*

About Epstein Becker Green

Epstein Becker & Green, P.C., is a national law firm with a primary focus on health care and life sciences; employment, labor, and workforce management; and litigation and business disputes. Founded in 1973 as an industry-focused firm, Epstein Becker Green has decades of experience serving clients in health care, financial services, retail, hospitality, and technology, among other industries, representing entities from startups to Fortune 100 companies. Operating in offices throughout the U.S. and supporting clients in the U.S. and abroad, the firm's attorneys are committed to uncompromising client service and legal excellence. For more information, visit www.ebglaw.com.

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of: (i) avoiding any tax penalty, or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

If you would like to be added to our mailing list or need to update your contact information, please contact Lisa C. Blackburn at lblackburn@ebglaw.com or 202-861-1887.

HEALTH CARE & LIFE SCIENCES

BALTIMORE

Helaine I. Fingold
Joshua J. Freemire
Thomas E. Hutchinson*
John S. Linehan

BOSTON

Emily E. Bajcsi
Barry A. Guryan

CHICAGO

Amy K. Dow
Kevin J. Ryan

HOUSTON

Mark S. Armstrong

LOS ANGELES

Adam C. Abrahms
Ted A. Gehring
Paul A. Gomez
J. Susan Graham

NEW YORK

Jeffrey H. Becker
Lindsay M. Borgeson
Michelle Capezza
Aime Dempsey
Kenneth W. DiGia
Jerrold I. Ehrlich
Gregory H. Epstein
Hanna Fox
James S. Frank
Arthur J. Fried
John F. Gleason
Robert D. Goldstein
Robert S. Groban, Jr.
Gretchen Harders
Bethany J. Hills
Jennifer M. Horowitz
Kenneth J. Kelly
Joseph J. Kempf, Jr.
Basil H. Kim
Stephanie G. Lerman
Leonard Lipsky
Purvi Badiani Maniar
Wendy G. Marcari
Eileen D. Millett
Shilpa Prem
Jackie Selby
Catherine F. Silie
Victoria M. Sloan
Steven M. Swirsky
David E. Weiss
Benjamin M. Zegarelli

NEWARK

John D. Barry
Christina Burke
Joan A. Disler
James P. Flynn
Diana M. Fratto
Gary W. Herschman
Laurajane B. Kastner
Daniel R. Levy
Theodora McCormick
Maxine Neuhauser
Anjana D. Patel
Victoria Vaskov Sheridan
Erica F. Sibley
Scheherazade A. Wasty
Jack Wenik
Sheila A. Woolson

PRINCETON

Anthony Argiropoulos
Thomas Kane
Andrew Kaplan

SAN DIEGO

Kim Tyrrell-Knott

STAMFORD

Ted Kennedy, Jr.
David S. Poppick

WASHINGTON, DC

Alan J. Arville
Robert F. Atlas*
Kirsten M. Backstrom
Clifford E. Barnes
James A. Boiani
Selena M. Brady
George B. Breen
Merlin J. Brittenham*
Lee Calligaro
Tanya V. Cramer
Anjali N.C. Downs
Jason E. Christ
Steven B. Epstein
John W. Eriksen
Wandaly E. Fernández
Daniel C. Fundakowski
Brandon C. Ge
Stuart M. Gerson
Daniel G. Gottlieb
M. Brian Hall, IV
Philo D. Hall
Douglas A. Hastings
Richard H. Hughes, IV
William G. Kopit
Amy F. Lerman
Christopher M. Locke
Katherine R. Lofft
Mark E. Lutes
Teresa A. Mason
David E. Matyas
Colin G. McCulloch

Frank C. Morris, Jr.
Evan J. Nagler
Leslie V. Norwalk
René Y. Quashie
Jonah D. Retzinger
Serra J. Schlanger
Bonnie I. Scott
Deepa B. Selvam
Lynn Shapiro Snyder
Adam C. Solander
David B. Tatge
Daly D.E. Temchine
Bradley Merrill Thompson
Carrie Valiant
Patricia M. Wagner
Robert E. Wanerman
Meghan F. Weinberg
Constance A. Wilkinson
Kathleen M. Williams
Lesley R. Yeung

**Not Admitted to the Practice of Law*

This document has been provided for informational purposes only and is not intended and should not be construed to constitute legal advice. Please consult your attorneys in connection with any fact-specific situation under federal law and the applicable state or local laws that may impose additional obligations on you and your company.