

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA  
INDIANAPOLIS DIVISION

ELI LILLY AND COMPANY, and  
LILLY USA, LLC

Plaintiffs,

v.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES, *et al.*,

Defendants.

No. 1:21-cv-81-SEB-MJD

**NOTICE**

Defendants hereby respectfully notify the Court and other parties to this action that the United States Department of Health and Human Services' Office of the General Counsel has withdrawn Advisory Opinion 20-06 on Contract Pharmacies under the 340B Program. *See* Notice of Withdrawal (June 18, 2021), attached as Ex. 1. It is Defendants' position that such withdrawal renders claims challenging the Advisory Opinion moot. Defendants will address the impact of the decision in *AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP v. Becerra, et al.*, No. 1:21-CV-27 (D. Del.) in its brief due June 23, 2021.

Dated: June 18, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

BRIAN NETTER  
Deputy Assistant Attorney General

MICHELLE R. BENNETT  
Assistant Branch Director

*/s/ Kate Talmor*

KATE TALMOR  
RACHAEL WESTMORELAND  
JODY LOWENSTEIN  
Trial Attorneys  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
1100 L Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 305-5267  
kate.talmor@usdoj.gov  
*Attorneys for Defendants*

# Exhibit 1



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of the Secretary

Office of the General Counsel  
Washington, D.C. 20201

**NOTICE OF WITHDRAWAL**  
**JUNE 18, 2021**

***Withdrawing Advisory Opinion 20-06 on Contract Pharmacies under the 340B Program  
(issued December 30, 2020)***

The Office of the General Counsel (OGC) is withdrawing Advisory Opinion 20-06 (Opinion) in light of ongoing confusion about the scope and impact of the Opinion.

The Opinion has been challenged in lawsuits brought by various drug manufacturers. See *AstraZeneca Pharma. LP v. Becerra et al.*, 21-cv-27 (D. Del.); *Eli Lilly and Co. et al. v. Becerra et al.*, 21-cv-81 (S.D. Ind.); *Sanofi-Aventis U.S. LLC v. HHS et al.*, 21-cv-634 (D.N.J.); *Novo Nordisk Inc. et al. v. HHS et al.* (D.N.J.). The Opinion was never intended to do what plaintiffs in those suits allege: to create new, binding obligations on plaintiffs or to serve as the predicate for enforcement against those plaintiffs. As stated in the Opinion, it was meant to “set forth the current views of [OGC]” on the proper interpretation of the statute without “the force or effect of law.” Opinion at 8.

OGC maintains that the Opinion was not intended to impose new, binding obligations on regulated entities, and we respectfully disagree with the decision of the District Court in *AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals*. However, in the interest of avoiding confusion and unnecessary litigation, OGC withdraws the Opinion.

OGC notes that its withdrawal of the Opinion does not impact the ongoing efforts of the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA) to enforce the obligations that 42 U.S.C. § 256b places on drug manufacturers, including HRSA’s May 17, 2021 violation letters concerning restrictions placed on contract pharmacy arrangements. HRSA’s enforcement process operated independently from the issuance of the Opinion, and operates independently from the Opinion’s withdrawal.

*Daniel J Barry*

Daniel J. Barry  
Acting General Counsel