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Fraud, Waste, & Abuse Laws
False Claims Act, Anti-Kickback Statute, and the Stark Law
False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729

“Any person who . . . knowingly presents, or causes to be presented, a false or fraudulent claim for payment or approval; . . . or knowingly conceals or knowingly and improperly avoids or decreases an obligation to pay or transmit money . . . to the Government, is liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty . . . plus 3 times the amount of damages.”

- Civil Monetary Penalties (CMPs) up to ~$22,000 per claim
- Treble damages
False Claims Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1320(a)-7b(a)

- “Whoever . . . knowingly and willfully makes or causes to be made any false statement or representation of material fact for use in determining rights to such benefit or payment . . . shall . . . be fined . . . or imprisoned . . . or both.”
  - Fine up to $25,000 per violation
  - Imprisonment up to 10 years per violation
Anti-Kickback Statute (AKS), 42 U.S.C. § 1320a-7b(b)

- “Whoever knowingly and willfully solicits or receives any remuneration . . . in return for referring an individual . . . or in return for . . . ordering . . . or recommending purchasing . . . or ordering any . . . facility, service, or item for which payment may be made . . . under a Federal health care program . . . shall be fined . . . or imprisoned . . . or both.”

- “Whoever knowingly and willfully offers or pays any remuneration . . . to induce [a] person to refer an individual . . . or to . . . order . . . or recommend . . . purchasing . . . or ordering any . . . services, or item for which payment may be . . . under a Federal health care program . . . shall be fined . . . or imprisoned . . . or both.”
  - Criminal fine of up to $25,000 and imprisonment for up to five years.
  - Exclusion
  - CMP up to $50,000 per violation
  - Liability under FCA
“[I]f a physician (or an immediate family member of such physician) has a financial relationship with an entity . . . then the physician may not make a referral to the entity for the furnishing of designated health services . . . and the entity may not present or cause to be presented a claim . . . to any individual, third party payor, or other entity for designated health services furnished pursuant to a [prohibited] referral.”

- Refund of amounts collected
- CMPs of up to $15,000 for each service
- Exclusion
- CMP of up to $100,000 for each circumvention scheme
- Liability under the FCA
Other Laws Used in Enforcement Actions

- Travel Act
- Conspiracy to Defraud
  - 18 U.S.C. § 286
- Submission of Fraudulent claims
  - 18 U.S.C. § 287
- Theft or Embezzlement
  - 18 U.S.C. § 669
- Making False Statements
  - 18 U.S.C. § 1035
- Using Mail to Defraud
  - 18 U.S.C. § 134
- Scheme to Defraud Health Care Benefit Program
  - 18 U.S.C. § 1347
- Money Laundering
- Racketeering Activity
Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program (HCFAC)
Background, Collections, Enforcement Agencies
HCFAC Background

- Established under HIPAA
- Directed by Attorney General and HHS Office of Inspector General
- Coordinates enforcement activities among all levels of government
- Collaborations
  - Health Care Fraud Prevention and Enforcement Action Team (HEAT)
  - Health Care Fraud Prevention Partnership
  - Data Integration and Analytics
HCFAC Enforcement Agencies

HCFAC

Department of Health and Human Services
- HHS Office of Inspector General (OIG)
  - Office of Audit Services
  - Office of Evaluation and Inspections
  - Office of Investigations
  - Office of Counsel to the Inspector General
- Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS)
  - Unified Program Integrity Contractors
- Administration on Community Living
- Office of the General Counsel
- Food and Drug Administration

Department of Justice
- United States Attorneys
- Civil Division
- Criminal Division
- Civil Rights Division
- DOJ Office of Inspector General
- Federal Bureau of Investigations
HCFAC Results

Billions of Dollars Won, Negotiated, and Collected Under HCFAC Program

Source: OIG, Health Care Fraud Abuse Control Program Reports, FY 2016-2019
OIG Investigative Work

Oct. 1, 2020 – Mar. 31, 2021

$1.37 Billion in Expected Recoveries

221 Criminal Actions

CMPs Imposed Against 272 Individuals and Entities

Excluded 1,036 Individuals and Entities

Cases Involving Medical Directorships

Recent Settlements, Lessons Learned & Best Practices
Doctor’s Choice Home Care Inc.

- **$5.8 Million Settlement**
- **Announced November 20, 2020**
- Sham medical director agreements with physician to providing remuneration for referrals
- Paid employees bonuses for physician spouses’ referrals

Doctor’s Choice Health Agency and Former Owner to Pay $5.8 Million to Settle False Claims Act Allegations

Doctor’s Choice Home Care, Inc. and its former executives, Timothy Beach and Stuart Christensen, have agreed to pay $5.8 million to resolve allegations that the home health agency provided improper financial inducements to referring physicians through sham medical director agreements and bonuses to physicians’ spouses who were Doctor’s Choice employees, the Department of Justice announced today.

Timothy Beach and Stuart Christensen founded Doctor’s Choice and formerly served as its top executives. Doctor’s Choice is a home health agency based in Sarasota, Florida, with branches throughout the state.

Doctor’s Choice will pay $3,665,000 to settle these allegations and Beach and Christensen will each pay $447,000. Doctor’s Choice will also pay an additional $675,000 to resolve separate allegations that employees pressured clinical personnel to increase the number of home visits for Medicare patients to avoid the Medicare Low Utilization Payment Adjustment that would have decreased the reimbursement. Doctor’s Choice received from Medicare in the absence of these unnecessary services.

“The Department of Justice will continue to hold companies and individuals accountable for the payment of illegal remuneration in any form,” said Acting Assistant Attorney General Jeffrey Bosnett Clark of the Department of Justice’s Civil Division. “Improper inducements have no place in our federal healthcare system, which relies on healthcare providers making decisions based on the healthcare needs of their patients and rather than their personal financial interests.”

“Operating an illegal referral scheme and providing medically unnecessary services places patients at risk and jeopardizes millions of taxpayer dollars,” said Special Agent in Charge of the FBI Tampa Division Michael McPherson. “This settlement highlights the FBI’s commitment to protect the integrity of the federally funded healthcare system.”
Provident Home Health & Hospice

- $1.05M settlement by former owner
- Medical Directorship payments exceeded fair market value
- Period of 2 years
- Induce referrals to Home Health and Hospice
- False claims submitted
  - “Attending physician” was in prison
  - License was suspended
- 5-year period of exclusion
Lessons Learned & Best Practices

- Structure arrangements under available Stark exceptions and AKS safe harbors
  - 42 C.F.R. § 411.357(d) – Stark exception for Personal Service Arrangements
  - 42 C.F.R. § 1001.952(d) – AKS safe harbor for Personal Services and Management Contracts

- Key Considerations for Compliance
  - Written agreement covering services actually provided
  - Arrangement is reasonable and necessary for legitimate business purposes
  - Compensation is consistent with fair market value and does not take into account referrals or business generated between the parties

- Best Practices
  - Documentation of FMV evaluation and need for services
  - Time sheets
Excluded Individuals
Provider-Self Disclosure Protocol

- **2020 Settlements under OIG Provider-Self Disclosure**
  - 63 total settlements
  - 22 arose from the OIG’s allegations that the provider employed or contracted with a person the provider knew or should have known was excluded from participation in federal health care programs
  - Approximately $2,271,044 will be paid as a result of such settlements

- **Settlements between January and May 2021**
  - 4 settlements based on alleged engagement of an excluded person
  - Approximately $515,199 will be repaid
Settlement Agreement (4/12/2021)

- CareCo Medical, Inc. of Waterford, CT
- Employed excluded physical therapist in a management position
- $28,246 to be paid
- HHS-OIG/US DOJ pursued
Lessons Learned

“The OIG may impose a penalty; an exclusion; and, where authorized, an assessment against any person who it determines. . . [a]rranges or contracts (by employment or otherwise) with an individual or entity that the person knows, or should know, is excluded from participation in Federal health care programs for the provision of items or services for which payment may be made under such a program.” 42 C.F.R. 1003.200

- Provider liability arises when “an excluded person participates in any way in the furnishing of items or services that are payable by a Federal health care program.”
Best Practices

- Regularly conduct background screenings and document searches
  - All new employees and independent contractors
  - Periodic screening of current employees and contractors
  - Databases
    - OIG’s List of Excluded Individuals and Entities (LEIE)
    - GSA’s System for Award Management (SAM)

- Include representations and warranties regarding exclusions in contracts

- Ensure submission of accurate and complete information on CMS 855 forms/PECOS and all other enrollments and applications to federal and state health care programs
Cases Involving Coverage Criteria, Medicare Standards & More

Extreme Cases: Criminal Charges & Prison Time
Owner of Texas chain of hospice companies sentenced for $150m health care fraud and money laundering scheme (12/2020) - MERIDA HEALTH CARE GROUP

- Jury trial
- Rodney Mesquias told thousands of patients with Alzheimer’s and dementia that they had less than 6 months to live
- Enrolled them in hospice
- 240 months in federal prison
- $120M in restitution

“Financial healthcare fraud is abhorrent enough, but to fraudulently diagnose patients with dementia or Alzheimer’s is the pinnacle of medical cruelty to both the patient and their family. They falsely gave patients life ending diagnosis and they will pay the price with years behinds bars.”

Hospice administrator sentenced for role in hospice fraud scheme (2/19/2021)

- Overruled clinical staff who determined beneficiary referrals did not qualify for hospice
- Paid kickbacks to recruiters
- $2.2 M in restitution
- 30 months in prison
Common Allegations Against Hospice Providers

- Incorrect diagnosis of patient as terminally ill
- Failure to document a bona fide face-to-face exam of patient took place
- Shortfalls in physician certification documentation and medical records so that care does not appear to be warranted
- Illegal marketing practices
- Incorrect level of care
Common Allegations Against Home Health Providers

- Beneficiaries not meeting the definition of “confined to the home”
- Beneficiaries not in need of skilled services
- Failure to submit OASIS data in timely manner
- Failure to adequately document services
- OASIS data does not support HIPPS payment code
- Plan of care not followed
- Plan of care not properly certified and recertified (not under care of physician)
Best Practices

- Conduct internal and external audits
  - Implement ongoing, routine process for regular audits and appropriate corrective actions
  - Identify and audit areas of potential non-compliance within organization
    - Issues identified in payor audits
    - Available data comparing organization’s performance to peers
  - Review areas deemed high risk by governmental agencies
Best Practices

- Implement effective compliance program
  - Identify potential compliance issues
    - Hotline
    - Exit interviews
  - Log compliance concerns, investigate, and track responsive actions
OIG Medicare Provider Compliance Audits
Late 2020 - Present
## OIG Audits In Late 2020 - Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Claims at Issue</th>
<th>Associated Amount</th>
<th>Extrapolated Amount</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VNA of Maryland</td>
<td>4/27/21</td>
<td>36/100 19/100</td>
<td>$25,295</td>
<td>$2.1M</td>
<td>Beneficiaries not homebound and did not need skilled services; incorrect payment codes; services not rendered in accordance with plan of care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookdale Home Health</td>
<td>2/25/21</td>
<td>46/100</td>
<td>$132,500</td>
<td>$3.3M</td>
<td>Beneficiaries not homebound and did not need skilled services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tidewell Hospice</td>
<td>2/22/21</td>
<td>18/100</td>
<td>$46,569</td>
<td>$8.3M</td>
<td>Terminal prognosis not supported; level of care not supported; services not eligible for reimbursement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE Home Health Services</td>
<td>1/13/21</td>
<td>29/100 18/100</td>
<td>$46,404</td>
<td>$1.8M</td>
<td>Beneficiaries not homebound and did not need skilled services; incorrect payment codes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tender Touch Health Care Servs</td>
<td>12/22/20</td>
<td>27/100 21/100</td>
<td>$42,229</td>
<td>$478,780</td>
<td>Beneficiaries not homebound and did not need skilled services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospice Compassus</td>
<td>12/16/20</td>
<td>68/100 35/100</td>
<td>$80,307</td>
<td>$3.4M</td>
<td>Terminal prognosis not supported; services not documented; NOE not timely filed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Best Practices – Responding To OIG Audits

- Hire a lawyer **AND** an expert
- Dispute claims that you disagree with
  - Explain why
  - Supply additional medical records
  - Medical review contractor will review and often change at least some claims
  - Reduce basis for extrapolation
- Understand your obligations after an audit
  - Obligations under 60-day rule
Where We’re Headed In 2021

OIG Work Plan
OIG FY 2021 Work Plan

- Joint Work with State Agencies (expected FY 2021)
  - OIG will partner with state auditors and others to provide effective methods that address improper payments in Medicaid programs such as home health, hospice, DME.

- Home Health Agencies’ Challenges and Strategies in Responding to the COVID-19 Pandemic (expected FY 2022)
  - This study is expected to provide insights into the strategies that HHAs have used to address the challenges presented by COVID-19, including how well emergency preparedness plans served HHAs during the pandemic.

- Audit of Home Health Services Provided as Telehealth During the COVID-10 Public Health Emergency (expected FY 2022)
  - OIG to evaluate if services furnished via telehealth were billed in accordance with Medicare rules.
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