

## **Second Circuit Rules That Certain Speech Regarding the Off-Label Use of Drugs Is Protected Under the U.S. Constitution**

by **Stuart M. Gerson, Wendy C. Goldstein, Benjamin S. Martin, Daniel G. Gottlieb, David C. Gibbons, and Natasha F. Thoren**

**December 2012**

---

In a long-awaited decision, on December 3, 2012, a divided panel (2–1) of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit vacated the conviction of Alfred Caronia, a former pharmaceutical sales representative for Jazz Pharmaceuticals whom a federal district court jury found guilty of conspiring to introduce a “misbranded” drug into interstate commerce in violation of the federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (“FDCA”).<sup>1</sup> *A copy of the full opinion is available [here](#).*<sup>2</sup> In this case, the majority held that the First Amendment bars the criminal prosecution of pharmaceutical manufacturers or their employees for truthful, non-misleading speech promoting the lawful, off-label use of an FDA-approved drug.

This Client Alert reviews the holding of the case and assesses the potential impact that this case may have for the industry.

### **Off-Label Use of Drugs as Defined Under the FDCA**

#### **Off-Label Use as Misbranding**

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (“FDA”) has long held the position that, although off-label promotion by pharmaceutical manufacturers and/or their agents is not expressly prohibited by the FDCA or its attendant regulations, such commercial activities are impliedly prohibited as “misbranding.” This position has been accepted by federal and state enforcement authorities. The FDCA prohibits the introduction of a “misbranded” drug into interstate commerce and provides that “misbranding” occurs, *inter alia*, when a product’s label is false or misleading<sup>3</sup>—that is, when a drug is placed

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act (FDCA), 21 U.S.C. §§ 331(a) and 333(a)(1) (2011).

<sup>2</sup> *United States v. Caronia*, No. 09-5006-cr (2d Cir. Dec. 3, 2012).

<sup>3</sup> §§ 331(a) and 352(a).

in interstate commerce without adequate directions for use and adequate warnings.<sup>4</sup> It is the FDA's view that, by definition, a drug fails to bear adequate directions for an off-label use. Therefore, promotion beyond the scope of the product label may be construed as "misbranding" in violation of the FDCA.

### ***United States v. Caronia***

#### **The Basis of the Prosecution**

The government obtained, through discovery, tape-recorded conversations between Mr. Caronia and health care providers during which Mr. Caronia was alleged to be promoting Xyrem for uses outside the scope of the product's approved FDA labeling. At trial, the government argued that those conversations were "act[s] of misbranding."<sup>5</sup> The jury found Mr. Caronia guilty of conspiracy to introduce a misbranded drug into interstate commerce in violation of the FDCA.<sup>6</sup> On appeal to the Second Circuit, the government argued that these conversations "play[] an evidentiary role in determining whether a drug is misbranded."<sup>7</sup> Specifically, the government argued that "Caronia's promotion of Xyrem for off-label uses served merely as 'evidence of intent' or evidence that the 'off-label uses were intended ones[] for which Xyrem's labeling failed to provide any direction.'"<sup>8</sup>

In reaching its conclusion, the majority of the Second Circuit panel disagreed with the government's contention that Mr. Caronia's speech was introduced merely as evidence of his intent to misbrand Xyrem. The majority concluded that the government did not introduce these conversations as evidence of Mr. Caronia's off-label promotion to prove Xyrem's "intended use and, thus, [its] mislabeling for that intended use."<sup>9</sup> Rather, the majority concluded that the government sought to convict Mr. Caronia for the speech, itself.

#### **The *Caronia* Majority's Analysis**

The majority then evaluated whether Mr. Caronia's speech was protected by the First Amendment. In its evaluation, the majority relied on *Sorrell v. IMS Health, Inc.*, a U.S. Supreme Court case.<sup>10</sup> In particular, the majority focused on the *Sorrell* Court's determination that the FDA prohibitions regarding promotional activity by a pharmaceutical manufacturer constitute both speaker- and content-based restrictions on speech, thus, subjecting the FDA's prohibitions to heightened judicial scrutiny.

Once the *Caronia* majority found both speaker- and content-based speech restrictions, the court would have been bound to analyze the government's regulation (i.e., the

---

<sup>4</sup> § 352(f).

<sup>5</sup> *Caronia*, No. 09-5006-cr, slip op. at 21 (citing Trial Tr. 848).

<sup>6</sup> *Caronia*, No. 09-5006-cr, slip op. at 24.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* at 27 (citing Gov't Br. 51).

<sup>8</sup> *Caronia*, No. 09-5006-cr, slip op. at 27 (citing Gov't Br. 52).

<sup>9</sup> *Caronia*, No. 09-5006-cr, slip op. at 27-28. The court was clear that it did not decide whether such use would be permissible.

<sup>10</sup> 131 S.Ct. 2653 (2011).

FDCA) as a First Amendment issue, except that the majority, in this case, exercised the doctrine of “constitutional avoidance” and construed “the FDCA as not criminalizing the simple promotion of a drug’s off-label use.”<sup>11</sup> Instead, the majority concluded that Mr. Caronia was improperly prosecuted, under criminal laws, for his off-label speech, which the court determined to be protected by the First Amendment.<sup>12</sup>

### The *Caronia* Majority’s Holding

The majority held that the FDCA’s misbranding provisions cannot be interpreted as a blanket ban on off-label promotion by pharmaceutical manufacturers. However, the court was clear that its holding did not prevent the FDA from regulating the marketing or promotion of prescription drugs and limited its decision to the truthful off-label promotion of prescription drugs for which an off-label use is not prohibited.<sup>13</sup> The court also stated that more narrowly tailored regulation of speech by the FDA as it concerns off-label use might be permissible.<sup>14</sup>

### Conclusions and Potential Key Takeaways from the Holding

- Given the divided panel of the Second Circuit in *Caronia*, there could be a petition for a rehearing of the appeal *en banc*.
- Courts outside of the Second Circuit are not bound by this decision. Similar cases are pending in other jurisdictions, which could decide the issue differently. It is critical that the industry and key stakeholders continue to watch developments as the case law evolves. It is possible that the U.S. Supreme Court also may be asked to review this issue at some later time.
- It was clear to the majority in *Caronia* that the government’s basis for the misbranding violation centered on the sales representative’s speech and nothing more. Courts, in general, as well as the courts addressing the specific issue in *Caronia* and *Sorrell*, are hesitant to criminalize speech without an articulable public good (such as harm or safety) to be gained from doing so. That is, a desire merely to stop speech is not a sufficient interest (without another countervailing public need) in order to permit the government to regulate or prohibit speech.
- This opinion does not preclude the FDA from using off-label promotion as evidence of a drug’s intended off-label use for which the approved label does not contain adequate direction.
- Unfortunately, *Caronia* does not provide a bright-line test to determine which aspects of promotion are purely speech and thus protected by the First Amendment and which aspects of promotion are not protected by the First

---

<sup>11</sup> *Caronia*, No. 09-5006-cr, slip op. at 26.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 20.

<sup>13</sup> *Id.* at 51.

<sup>14</sup> *Id.* at 48-49.

Amendment when the speech can be used as the basis of finding intent to commit or to conspire to misbrand.

- While some might suggest the *Caronia* decision allows pharmaceutical manufacturers to more broadly promote their products for off-label uses, the holding is narrow in that truthful off-label promotion is not prohibited or criminalized under the FDCA. Further, it is premature to suggest that the FDA will not be permitted to regulate promotional speech.
- Pharmaceutical and medical device manufacturers should consider educating their sales and marketing personnel about the *Caronia* decision in order to prevent misconceptions regarding the scope of the holding and to reiterate the company policies regarding compliant promotion.
- *Caronia* may have a significant impact on FDA criminal prosecutions, particularly when it comes to convincing the Justice Department not to proceed with a particular matter, depending on the facts and circumstances of the case. The decision also will be raised as a defense to civil fraud cases, particularly *qui tam* actions, brought under the federal civil False Claims Act.

\* \* \*

*This Client Alert was authored by **Stuart M. Gerson, Wendy C. Goldstein, Benjamin S. Martin, Daniel G. Gottlieb, David C. Gibbons, and Natasha F. Thoren.** For additional information about the issues discussed in this Client Alert, please contact one of the authors or the Epstein Becker Green attorney who regularly handles your legal matters.*

### About Epstein Becker Green

Epstein Becker & Green, P.C., founded in 1973, is a national law firm with approximately 300 lawyers practicing in 11 offices, in Atlanta, Boston, Chicago, Houston, Indianapolis, Los Angeles, New York, Newark, San Francisco, Stamford, and Washington, D.C. The firm is uncompromising in its pursuit of legal excellence and client service in its areas of practice: [Health Care and Life Sciences](#), [Labor and Employment](#), [Litigation](#), [Corporate Services](#), and [Employee Benefits](#). Epstein Becker Green was founded to serve the health care industry and has been at the forefront of health care legal developments since 1973. The firm is also proud to be a trusted advisor to clients in the financial services and hospitality industries, among others, representing entities from startups to Fortune 100 companies. Our commitment to these practices and industries reflects the founders' belief in focused proficiency paired with seasoned experience. For more information, visit [www.ebglaw.com](http://www.ebglaw.com).

***The Epstein Becker Green Client Alert is published by EBG's Health Care and Life Sciences practice to inform health care organizations of all types about significant new legal developments.***

**Lynn Shapiro Snyder, Esq.**  
**EDITOR**

If you would like to be added to our mailing list or need to update your contact information, please contact Kristi Swanson at [kswanson@ebglaw.com](mailto:kswanson@ebglaw.com) or 202-861-4186.

## ATLANTA

Robert N. Berg  
Michael V. Coleman  
J. Andrew Lemons  
Kenneth G. Menendez  
Marisa N. Pins  
Evan Rosen  
Alan B. Wynne

## BOSTON

Barry A. Guryan

## CHICAGO

Amy K. Dow  
Lisa J. Matyas  
Griffin W. Mulcahey  
Kevin J. Ryan

## HOUSTON

Mark S. Armstrong  
Daniel E. Gospin  
Pamela D. Tyner

## LOS ANGELES

Adam C. Abrahams  
Dale E. Bonner  
Ted A. Gehring  
J. Susan Graham  
Kim Tyrrell-Knott

## NEW YORK

Nicholas S. Allison  
Eric L. Altman  
Jeffrey H. Becker  
Vinay Bhupathy\*  
Michelle Capezza  
Stephanie Carrington\*  
Aime Dempsey  
Sarah K. diFrancesca  
Kenneth W. DiGia  
Jerrold I. Ehrlich  
Hylan B. Fenster  
James S. Frank  
Arthur J. Fried  
Paul A. Friedman  
Philip M. Gassel  
Jay E. Gerzog  
John F. Gleason  
Robert D. Goldstein  
Wendy C. Goldstein  
Robert S. Groban, Jr.  
Gretchen Harders  
Jennifer M. Horowitz  
Kenneth J. Kelly  
Joseph J. Kempf, Jr.

Jane L. Kuesel  
Stephanie G. Lerman  
Purvi Badiani Maniar  
Wendy G. Marcari  
Eileen D. Millett  
Leah A. Roffman  
Tamar R. Rosenberg  
William A. Ruskin  
Jackie Selby  
Catherine F. Silie  
Victoria M. Sloan  
Steven M. Swirsky  
Natasha F. Thoren

## NEWARK

Joan A. Disler  
James P. Flynn  
Daniel R. Levy  
Philip D. Mitchell  
Maxine Neuhauser  
Michael J. Slocum  
Sheila A. Woolson

## STAMFORD

David S. Poppick

## WASHINGTON, DC

Kirsten M. Backstrom  
Emily E. Bajcsi  
Clifford E. Barnes  
James A. Boiani  
George B. Breen

Lee Calligaro  
Jesse M. Caplan  
Jason B. Caron  
Jason E. Christ  
Eric J. Conn  
Tanya V. Cramer  
Anjali N.C. Downs  
Gregory H. Epstein  
Steven B. Epstein  
Ross K. Friedberg  
Daniel C. Fundakowski  
Brandon C. Ge\*  
Stuart M. Gerson  
David C. Gibbons  
Shawn M. Gilman  
Jennifer K. Goodwin  
Daniel G. Gottlieb  
Philo D. Hall  
Douglas A. Hastings  
Dawn R. Helak  
Robert J. Hudock  
William G. Kopit  
Jennie B. Krasner  
Amy F. Lerman  
Christopher M. Locke  
Katherine R. Lofft  
Julia E. Loyd  
Mark E. Lutes  
Kara M. Maciel  
Benjamin S. Martin  
Teresa A. Mason\*  
David E. Matyas

Colin G. McCulloch  
Frank C. Morris, Jr.  
Leslie V. Norwalk  
Kathleen A. Peterson  
Daniela A. Pirvu  
René Y. Quashie  
Jonah D. Retzinger  
Joel C. Rush  
Serra J. Schlanger  
Deepa B. Selvam  
Alaap B. Shah  
Lynn Shapiro Snyder  
Adam C. Solander  
Ophir Stemmer  
David B. Tatge  
Daly D.E. Temchine  
Bradley Merrill Thompson  
Carrie Valiant  
Dale C. Van Demark  
Patricia M. Wagner  
Robert E. Wanerman  
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.

© 2012 Epstein Becker & Green, P.C.

Attorney Advertising

ATLANTA | BOSTON | CHICAGO | HOUSTON | INDIANAPOLIS | LOS ANGELES  
NEW YORK | NEWARK | SAN FRANCISCO | STAMFORD | WASHINGTON, DC

[www.ebglaw.com](http://www.ebglaw.com)

Epstein Becker & Green, P.C.