Page 1 1 IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT 2 3 ) Case No. 21-3167 SANOFI AVENTIS US LLC, ) 4 Appellant, ) 10:00 a.m. ) 5 ) November 15, 2022 v. UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT б ) OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ) 7 et al., 8 Appellees. 9 NOVO NORDISK INC; NOVO NORDISK ) Case No. 21-3168 PHARMA INC, 10 Appellants, 11 v. 12 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT 13 OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ) et al., ) 14 ) Appellees. ) 15 SANOFI AVENTIS US LLC, ) Case No. 21-3379 16 ) Appellant, 17 v. 18 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT 19 OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ) et al., ) 20 ) Appellees. ) 21 22 (CONT'D ON NEXT PAGE) 23 24 25

Page 2 1 Nos. 21-3167/21-3168/21-3379/22-1676/21-3380 (Cont'd) ASTRAZENECA PHARMACEUTICALS, ) Case No. 22-1676 2 LP3 Appellant, 4 v. 5 SECRETARY UNITED STATES 6 DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES; et al., 7 Appellees. 8 NOVO NORDISK INC; NOVO NORDISK ) Case No. 21-3380 9 PHARMA INC, 10 Appellants, 11 v. 12 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, 13 et al., 14 Appellees. 15 ON APPEAL FROM THE 16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY 17 CASE NO. 3:21-cv-00634-FLW-LHG 18 BEFORE APPELLATE PANEL: 19 HON. THOMAS L. AMBRO, Circuit Judge HON. CHERYL A. KRAUSE, Circuit Judge 20 HON. STEPHANOS BIBAS, Circuit Judge APPEARANCES (see next page) 21 22 23 Veritext National Court Reporting Company 1801 Market Street 24 Suite 1800 Philadelphia PA 19103 (888)777-6690 25

```
Page 3
```

1	APPEARANCES:
2	For the Appellants:
3	NOEL J. FRANCISCO, ESQ.
	[ARGUED FOR SANOFI-AVENTIS U.S., LLC]
4	JONES DAY
	51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
5	Washington, DC 20001
6	ASHLEY C. PARRISH, ESQ.
	[ARGUED FOR NOVO NORDISK, INC./
7	NOVO NORDISK PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.]
	KING & SPALDING
8	1700 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
	Suite 900
9	Washington, DC 20006
10	ALLON KEDEM, ESQ.
	[ARGUED FOR ASTRAZENECA PHARMACEUTICALS, LP]
11	ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER
	601 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
12	Suite 1121
	Washington, DC 20001
13	
14	For Appellees:
15	DANIEL J. AGUILAR, ESQ. (ARGUED)
1.0	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE
16	Civil Division
1 17	Room 7266
17	950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20530
18	Washington, DC 20550
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
-	

Page 4 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 HON. AMBRO: We have one case this morning. It's numbers 21-3176 -- 3167 -- excuse me --3 3168, 21-3379 and 3380 and also 22-1676, Sanofi 4 5 Aventis, et al. v. the Secretary United States Department of Health and Human Services. 6 7 We have given a significant amount of time for oral argument. And I'm not sure we're going 8 9 to need it all but nonetheless, we set it out this 10 way. I would ask at the outset that once 11 12 we're done today that a transcript be prepared of this 13 oral argument and that it be split that side and that side, so split it in half. 14 15 And then also, if there were any issues 16 that are duplicative of something that someone else 17 has said, perhaps -- unless you have something new to 18 add to that particular issue, if you would just hold off and, again, unless there was something that was 19 20 not said earlier that you think you need to add. 21 Final point is on the mootness issue, 22 I'm not sure that we have any questions on that 23 particular issue. So if, again, unless you think 24 there's something new to be added beyond what was 25 stated in the briefs then you can let us know.

Page 5 1 And with that, I invite Mr. Francisco 2 to come on up and --3 MR. FRANCISCO: Judge Ambro, may it please the Court. Noel Francisco for Sanofi Aventis. 4 5 And if I could reserve five minutes for rebuttal? HON. AMBRO: Yes, sir. 6 7 MR. FRANCISCO: Your Honors, Section 8 340(b) requires Sanofi to do one thing: offer its 9 drugs to covered entities at the ceiling price. Ιt 10 clearly does that. They can purchase as much as they 11 want at the ceiling price and will deliver it to their 12 in-house pharmacy if they have one, to a contract 13 pharmacy if they don't and, in addition to that, to an 14 unlimited number of contract pharmacies if they 15 provide us with limited claims data. It takes them 16 five minutes every other week to comply with that last 17 part of our policy. That's plainly an actual 18 offering. Indeed, it's more generous than the 19 government itself required for the majority of the 20 operation of this program. 21 The government's only response is to 22 say that manufacturers can't impose any condition on their offers no matter how reasonable. But there's no 23 24 basis for that in the statutory text which requires 25 just one thing: that we make an offer at the ceiling

Page 6 1 price. 2 As a private entity, manufacturers like 3 Sanofi generally are allowed to do what they want unless there's a statute or other law --4 5 HON. AMBRO: One of the things that I would like perhaps to explore, the advisory opinion 6 7 and the violation letters, do you consider them -- or is it a primary argument that you consider them 8 9 arbitrary and capricious under the Administrative 10 Procedure Act? 11 MR. FRANCISCO: Yes, we do, Your Honor. 12 And the principal reason we think they're arbitrary 13 and capricious is because they're contrary to law. 14 They're contrary to the 340B statute. Again, as 15 private entities, we're generally allowed to do what 16 we want unless a statute prohibits our conduct. 17 HON. AMBRO: That would certainly get 18 you there if that's how we come out. Are they also --19 is there an argument that there's a change in 20 direction from '96 to 2020 without any adequate 21 explanation? 22 MR. FRANCISCO: Oh, absolutely. And I 23 think Judge Stark's opinion on this is very persuasive 24 on the various ways that it's arbitrary and capricious 25 wholly apart from the violation of law language.

Here, we've seen a constantly evolving set of positions on the part of the government. It used to be that only one contract pharmacy was allowed. Now an unlimited number of contract pharmacies are required.

It used to be that covered entities had 6 7 to maintain title to the drug until it fell into the pocket of their patients. That seems to have gone by 8 9 the wayside and under the replenishment model. If you 10 look at the advisory opinion, we only had to honor a 11 contract pharmacy to the extent that they operated as 12 the "agent" of the covered entity. That seems to have 13 gone away under the violation letter as well. Judge 14 Stark sets all of these changes out. But the 15 government has never explained any of them.

16 So I do think that, wholly apart, from 17 our contrary to law language, it is arbitrary and 18 capricious. But again, we think it is also plainly contrary to law because there is simply nothing in the 19 20 statute that prohibits Sanofi's program. We make an 21 They can buy as much as they want at the offer. 22 ceiling price. We'll deliver it right to their 23 doorstep. We'll deliver it to a contract pharmacy if 24 they don't have that proverbial doorstep because 25 they're not set up.

1	HON. KRAUSE: But, counsel, is that
2	because you interpret the term "offer" to mean at
3	least that there is delivery to the covered entity?
4	MR. FRANCISCO: No, Your Honor. But
5	it's that delivery obligation that makes this such a
6	relatively straightforward case. I actually don't
7	think offer encompasses delivery. They're separate.
8	But here, we actually do agree to deliver it right to
9	their doorstep, to another contract pharmacy if they
10	don't have that doorstep, or, frankly, to an unlimited
11	number of contract pharmacies if they provide us with
12	seven data fields that they already collect and
13	provide to all of the insurance companies in the
14	government for other purposes.
15	HON. KRAUSE: And you're doing that
16	just your clients are doing that simply as a
17	charitable matter and not because it's required by the
18	statute?
19	MR. FRANCISCO: Yes, Your Honor. And I
20	think if you look at the underlying history of this
21	program, it makes perfect sense. Remember, the 340B
22	program was meant to restore a set of voluntary
23	discounts that we were all providing the social safety
24	net providers prior to 1990. We were doing that as
25	good corporate citizens. In 1990, Congress passed a

1 statute called the Medicaid Rebate Act that had the 2 unintended consequence of eliminating those voluntary 3 discounts. Well, if you look at what those voluntary discounts were at the time, they weren't going to 4 5 commercial pharmacies, to contract pharmacies. They didn't even exist at the time. They were going to 6 7 social safety net providers who were buying drugs out of pocket for use at their facilities, to the poor and 8 9 uninsured, that they were serving at their facilities. 10 I think it shows how far we've come from the actual 11 purpose of the program to now where the government is 12 arguing for this massive multi-billion dollar cross-13 subsidy from one commercial for-profit industry, the 14 manufacturers, to another for-profit industry, the 15 commercial pharmacies. There's simply no basis for 16 that conception of the 340B program.

17 HON. KRAUSE: Wasn't the key issue that 18 they were then buying out of pocket -- I mean, your 19 theory is that this was directed to them in bringing 20 these pharmaceuticals in for their in-house pharmacy. 21 So times have evolved. There's this massive use at this point of contract pharmacies. But if it is, in 22 fact, the case that the covered entities are still 23 24 doing the purchasing, why isn't it their out of pocket 25 expense and they're still getting some funds back even

Page 10 1 if there is a fee that's taken off by the contract 2 pharmacy? 3 MR. FRANCISCO: Sure. And, Your Honor, frankly, we could have a very good and robust debate 4 5 in this country about how best to subsidize covered entities. And I think that debate would include 6 commercial pharmacies. It would include the 7 manufacturers. It would include the insurance 8 9 companies. It would include the covered entities and 10 would probably include many others. 11 But one thing I'm quite certain of is 12 that that debate is not resolved by the meaning of the 13 word "offer" because that's all that this statute requires us to do is to make an offer. And our 14 15 conception of "offer" makes perfect sense when you 16 actually do look at the history of this program where 17 the purpose of it was much more modest than what the government thinks that it has evolved into today where 18 it's now this massive multi-billion dollar subsidy 19 20 where billions of dollars are falling into the pockets 21 of commercial pharmacies. I don't think there's any 22 conception of this program that says it has to justify that level of a subsidy. 23 24 HON. KRAUSE: Didn't this purpose 25 extend to the interest of individual patients

1	receiving drugs at a discount or sometimes for no cost
2	at all? And if that's the case then to the extent at
3	this point patients are using the contract pharmacies
4	it's certainly more convenient for them but that's
5	where the largest use is why shouldn't we interpret
6	the statute to require that there be production of
7	pharmaceuticals
8	MR. FRANCISCO: Sure.
9	HON. KRAUSE: to those locations as
10	well?
11	MR. FRANCISCO: Well, several
12	responses, Your Honor. The first one is the text.
13	But I'll put that to the side because I think you
14	understand our textual argument.
15	The other point I would make is that
16	very few very little of the discount is actually
17	passed on to any customer at all. My understanding is
18	that there's only 25 percent of hospitals that pass
19	any of the discount on to their customers. And even
20	then, it's only to a subset of the customers and only
21	part of the discount. And there was one recent white
22	paper that pegged the number of people who showed up
23	at contract pharmacies with what's called a 340B
24	discount card which is what entitles the person to get
25	the discount. It was about one and a half percent

according to this white paper that showed up with that
 card.

3 The fact of the matter is that under the replenishment model, the commercial pharmacies 4 5 don't distinguish between 340B drugs and other drugs. They don't distinguish between 340B patients and other 6 7 Basically, a patient walks in the door. patients. They purchase the drug for generally whatever their 8 9 insurance company is going to pay for it. And then 10 the contract pharmacy and the commercial -- and the 11 covered entity reverse engineer the discount and split 12 the difference. It's basically this massive arbitrage 13 opportunity where the vast majority of the difference is being shared not by the patients but by the 14 15 commercial pharmacies and the covered entity. And I 16 think it just underscores how far we've come from the 17 actual purpose of this program.

18 I think that the best Supreme Court case to look at is the decision that the Court 19 20 rendered in Christensen v. Harris County. Now that 21 was a case involving the Fair Labor Standards Act 22 where the FLSA basically said employees could use 23 their comp time whenever they wanted to as long as it 24 was reasonable to use that comp time. An employer 25 then adopted an additional policy that said that in

1 addition to that, we're going to require you to use 2 your comp time in certain circumstances so that we 3 don't have to pay cash wages in lieu of unused comp And the Supreme Court held that that was 4 time. 5 squarely allowed precisely because there was nothing 6 in the statute, the FLSA, that prohibited that 7 additional policy. Here, there is simply nothing in 340B 8 9 that prohibits Sanofi's policy which, again, allows 10 covered entities to buy as much as they want and we 11 will deliver it right to their doorstep. And if they 12 don't have that doorstep, we'll allow them to 13 designate an alternative doorstep by virtue of 14 designating a contract pharmacy. And then we even go 15 substantially further to allow them to use an 16 unlimited number of contract pharmacies making it far 17 more generous than the agency itself allowed for the 18 first 20 years of this program. 19 HON. KRAUSE: But you and your 20 colleagues have asked us to go much further than that 21 and to say as a blanket matter that there can be any 22 conditions you wish and that there can't be, on the 23 part of the government, this requirement.

24 MR. FRANCISCO: Yeah. Well, first, 25 Your Honor, I don't think that we are asking you to

1 say that there can't be any conditions. What we're 2 saying is that there has to be an actual offer. And 3 there are certainly conditions that can be imposed that render the offer an illusory one. We don't 4 5 dispute that at all. The second point is we're not anywhere 6 7 near whatever the outer boundaries of "offer" is because here, we'll deliver it -- all of us will 8 9 deliver an unlimited amount to their doorstep and an 10 unlimited amount to an alternative doorstep if they 11 don't have a doorstep. And for Sanofi, we go 12 substantially further. So whatever the outer bounds 13 of that are, I don't think we're anywhere close to it in this case. 14 15 HON. BIBAS: Mr. Francisco, help us to 16 think through how we would write an opinion and draw a 17 line here because UCC says you don't even have to 18 deliver things. But you appear to be agreeing, yes, delivery is one of those things that is commercially 19 20 expected. So what body of law do we to to figure out 21 what's a bona fide offer and what makes it illusory? 22 MR. FRANCISCO: Yeah. The first point I want to make, Your Honor, is that I don't agree that 23 24 delivery is part of the offer obligation. 25 HON. BIBAS: Okay.

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 15 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 15

1	MR. FRANCISCO: But I think you don't
2	have to get to it here. I'll put that to the side.
3	Here, we've got you know, it's not
4	like the word "offer" is new to commercial law. The
5	word "offer" is as old as the hills and courts applied
6	essentially on a case by case basis. Have you made an
7	actual offer?
8	In writing your opinion, assuming you
9	write it favorably to us, I don't think you have to be
10	the first Court ever that tried to come up with a
11	comprehensive all-encompassing definition of what an
12	actual offer is. I think it's enough to say that what
13	the statute requires is an offer. That precludes the
14	government's position taken in the violation letter
15	which says that absolutely no condition can be imposed
16	on that offer. So presumably, we couldn't limit our
17	offers to delivery on the planet Earth because that
18	would be an impermissible condition that we've imposed
19	on the offer.
20	So you just need to say that it
21	requires an offer. It doesn't impose any a flat
22	out prohibition on all conditions. And that the
23	conditions we have imposed clearly constitute an
24	actual offer because we're willing to deliver an
25	unlimited number of drugs right to their doorstep.

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 16 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 16 1 HON. BIBAS: I understand that but --2 HON. AMBRO: Even if it was on the lunar surface? 3 Excuse me, Your Honor? 4 MR. FRANCISCO: 5 HON. AMBRO: I'm sorry. Just teasing. Even if it's on the lunar surface? 6 7 MR. FRANCISCO: Exactly. HON. BIBAS: It's not true of any of 8 9 the three manufacturers here but there are other 10 manufacturers out there who do not provide to any 11 contract pharmacies. And so we have this issue when 12 we write about a rule how should we think about that. 13 Maybe we don't have to resolve that but how do we gesture it where the line is? 14 15 MR. FRANCISCO: Sure. I would look, 16 first, to the plain meaning of "offer". Right? We 17 look at dictionary definitions of the meaning of the 18 word "offer". I think then we look at background 19 common law principles, UCC principles, to determine 20 what is encompassed by an offer. And I think one of those is that, in general, there's not a delivery 21 22 obligation. 23 I actually don't think it's that high 24 of a standard to make an actual offer. I also don't think you have to come anywhere close to what those 25

1	outer boundaries are in this case. I think it's
2	enough to lay out what the plain text says, what the
3	background principles are that go into interpreting
4	that plain text, then apply it to the facts of this
5	case under which I think every one of our policies
6	easily meets the standard. And then you leave it to
7	future courts to decide in that context whether
8	programs different from ours likewise constitute an
9	offer.
10	HON. BIBAS: We're going to be back
11	here deciding a whole string of cases. If we think,
12	no, we need to think a few steps ahead to the next few
13	cases
14	MR. FRANCISCO: Sure.
15	HON. BIBAS: what should we do in a
16	case where we get no contract where they say we'll
17	deliver it to you but you don't have a contract
18	pharmacy, tough. Right? Go deliver develop an
19	in-house pharmacy.
20	MR. FRANCISCO: Right. So two
21	responses, Your Honor. First, if you made clear that
22	our policies meet the offer requirement, as I very
23	strongly believe that they all do, I actually don't
24	think you're going to get a lot of other cases. I
25	think that what you're going to have manufacturers do

1	is look at this and say, all right, we now have
2	this we now at least have this safe harbor. And so
3	we're going to adopt that safe harbor. So I doubt
4	you're going to have that problem.
5	Secondly, I think it's very difficult,
6	and I wouldn't urge you to try to resolve hypothetical
7	future cases based on some general abstract
8	all-encompassing definition of the word "offer". I
9	don't think that's how courts have ever approached
10	that kind of question because it's just impossible to
11	figure out what the various future permutations are.
12	I think you set out the plain text and the
13	principles
14	HON. AMBRO: But doesn't
15	MR. FRANCISCO: you apply
16	HON. AMBRO: Go ahead. Doesn't it
17	become why don't you finish and I'll go.
18	MR. FRANCISCO: Well, and you apply it
19	to this case. And then, yes, you leave it to future
20	courts to apply those principles to future cases.
21	HON. AMBRO: Don't offer and I call
22	it shipping or slash delivery merge in effect? If you
23	say I offer you on the condition that I will ship to
24	only one location of if you don't have an in-house
25	pharmacy, only to one location of a contract pharmacy.

Page 19 1 And let's say it's Walgreens and Walgreens has myriad 2 locations in a rural area but they're miles and miles 3 apart. So if you put that condition, I'll deliver it only to Omaha but I'm not going to deliver it to 4 5 Lincoln and other places in Nebraska, you're saying that's okay? 6 7 MR. FRANCISCO: Yes, Your Honor. And I'd like to explain. 8 9 HON. AMBRO: Go ahead. 10 MR. FRANCISCO: But may I also reserve 11 the balance of my time for rebuttal after? 12 HON. AMBRO: You're on our time. Go 13 ahead. 14 MR. FRANCISCO: Okay. Thank you, Your 15 Honor. 16 I don't think that -- frankly, I Yes. 17 don't think that "offer" and "delivery" merge at all. 18 I think that they are separate concepts. 19 Secondly, even if you do think that 20 they merge to some extent, I think it is fully 21 sufficient to say that it's okay that if we offer to 22 deliver to their doorstep and also, if they aren't set 23 up to accept delivery themselves, to designate one 24 other place that essentially functions as their in-25 house pharmacy. I don't think there's any basis in

1	the text or the history of this to go any further and
2	say that in addition, we have to honor this massive
3	network of contract pharmacies the purpose of which is
4	to exploit a gigantic arbitrage scheme where you end
5	up transferring billions of dollars from one
6	commercial entity, the manufacturers, to another
7	commercial entity, the commercial pharmacies. There's
8	just no basis for that. If you go back to the history
9	of the program, for the first majority of the
10	operation of the program, the first 20 years, they
11	were only even allowed to use one contract pharmacy.
12	So even if you want to look at those
13	kind of background principles, I think it's quite easy
14	to say that, at the very least, they can't be required
15	to deliver to more than just the doorstep or the
16	alternative doorstep in the form of one contract
17	pharmacy. That's how the government itself understood
18	this program for the first 20 years.
19	I would submit then for my client,
20	Sanofi, it's even much easier, because for Sanofi, we
21	go beyond those two things and also allow delivery to
22	an unlimited number of pharmacies as long as they
23	provide us with those seven data fields that they're
24	already providing to all the insurance companies and
25	the government for other purposes.

1	HON. KRAUSE: We look at it as
2	arbitrage but the government looks at it as
3	accessibility to patients for it to be meaningful in
4	terms of fulfilling the statutory purpose. If we were
5	to go as far as saying if not an in-house pharmacy
б	then at least one outside pharmacy, what is the
7	principal what is it about the characteristics of
8	your policy that provides some standard that could be
9	applied more broadly?
10	MR. FRANCISCO: I mean, I think the
11	characteristic to the extent that I understand the
12	question and I hate to sound like I keep repeating
13	myself it would go back to the meaning of the word
14	"offer". Are we actually offering our drugs to them
15	at the ceiling price?
16	To take a step back in terms of the
17	policy, I get that their view of the policy is that we
18	want to have this enormous subsidy to covered entities
19	to provide services all across the country to the poor
20	and uninsured and in rural areas and that they're
21	willing to tolerate the fact that that means billions
22	of dollars in arbitrage revenue going to commercial
23	pharmacies, something that was never encompassed
24	within this program at the outset.
25	I would respectfully submit that

1 there's no statute that pursues a single objective to 2 the exclusion of all others. And I don't think it's 3 reasonable to look at the history of the statute and say that that was its overall purpose. Rather, 4 5 instead, if we want to have that kind of subsidization of health insurance for the poor, uninsured and rural 6 7 areas, an extraordinarily important issue that this country does need to grapple with, that simply hasn't 8 9 been resolved in this statute which imposes one 10 obligation only, an offer. That's the type of debate 11 that Congress should be undertaking in the future and 12 it should bring all of the relevant stakeholders to 13 the table. And those stakeholders extend far beyond the manufacturers, on the one hand, and commercial 14 15 pharmacies on the other. That's a problem that 16 Congress ought to be dealing comprehensively. But the 17 one thing I know for sure is that they didn't resolve that debate in the meaning of the word "offer". 18 19 Is there anything you HON. AMBRO: 20 wanted to note on your opening with respect to the ADR 21 challenge that you've put in here? 22 MR. FRANCISCO: Ahh. You know, it's a 23 very simple argument and I'm happy to rely on our 24 briefs. But the basic point is that the ADR is a new 25 They withdrew the old rule. They put forward a rule.

1	new rule and a new rule requires new notice and
2	comment. The Supreme Court has repeatedly made clear
3	that we've got to cut square corners with them.
4	They've got to cut square corners with us. The sine
5	qua non of the square corner under the APA is notice
6	and comment ruling.
7	HON. AMBRO: Usually, the thing is
8	the understanding is that there's a formal way of
9	withdrawing a rule and that's in the Federal Register
10	and that wasn't done here.
11	MR. FRANCISCO: Well, Your Honor, I
12	don't think
13	HON. AMBRO: And your response to that
14	would be?
15	MR. FRANCISCO: Yeah. I don't think
16	that there's a single formal way of doing it. But
17	what I do know is that the principal way that you
18	withdraw a rule is by saying that the rule is
19	withdrawn. And that is precisely what they did here.
20	They said it was withdrawn. They then issued a new
21	rule under a new rule number reflecting the fact that
22	the prior rule was withdrawn. And I presume that
23	agencies speak English the way that the rest of us
24	speak English and "withdrawn" for them means the same
25	thing as it means for us.

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 24 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 24 1 HON. AMBRO: The problem that we're 2 having, there's not a whole lot of case law. 3 MR. FRANCISCO: Yeah. The best case law I think you have on an issue like that is the 4 5 dictionary. HON. AMBRO: Thank you very much. 6 7 We'll get you back on rebuttal. 8 MR. FRANCISCO: Thank you, Your Honor. 9 HON. AMBRO: Mr. Parrish? 10 MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Your Honors. 11 May it please the Court. Ashley Parrish on behalf of 12 Norvo Nordisk. I'd like to request five minutes for 13 rebuttal. 14 HON. AMBRO: Absolutely. 15 MR. PARRISH: So what I thought I would 16 do in light of your questions is three things. One 17 is, I'd like to frame the question before the Court because I think it'll help, Your Honor, with your 18 question about what the relief is. 19 20 Second, I'd like to remind the Court of 21 three administrative law principles that, if you keep 22 in mind, make this an even easier case than just 23 looking at the text. 24 And third, I want to respond to just a 25 few of the government's arguments that weren't

addressed in Mr. Francisco's argument in case that's
 helpful to the Court.

3 So the question before the Court, the precise question is: is the government's 4 5 interpretation reflected in its May letter and in its December advisory opinion -- is that contrary to law 6 7 or arbitrary and capricious? So the only thing that's before the Court is that the government has said that 8 9 the 340B statute includes this extra delivery 10 obligation not to covered entities but to third party 11 contract pharmacies anywhere in the country. So the 12 simple statutory question before the Court is: is 13 that a legal interpretation of the statute. Does the 14 statute include that additional delivery obligation to 15 third parties?

16 The Court obviously will have to 17 explain its reasoning as it gets there but in terms of 18 the declaratory language that the Court needs to do, 19 just like any administrative law case, Your Honor, is 20 it just strikes down and vacates the government's 21 actions as unlawful. That avoids a lot of the 22 complexities in terms of what you're trying to do. 23 We're not asking you to bless these policies in an 24 abstract sense. What we're saying is that the 25 government has taken a very specific position for the

1 very first time that the statute imposes a binding 2 obligation for us to deliver to third parties at other 3 locations. Our position is that that's not in the statute. All the Court has to do is say that we're 4 5 right about that and it can vacate the government's 6 position. 7 Your Honors, as I said, my next point was to lay out three administrative law principles 8 9 because I do think it is helpful for the Court to keep 10 this in mind in terms of thinking about what type of 11 statute that you're interpreting and how you should 12 approach it. 13 The first thing is to recognize is that the government can only address ambiguities in a 14 15 statute or things that lack clarity or fill in gaps if 16 it's been granted rulemaking authority and if it 17 exercises that authority. So we know, here, that the 18 government, first of all, says that it doesn't have rulemaking authority and, second, said --19 20 HON. AMBRO: But they're basing the 21 violation letters on the statute as opposed to their 22 rulemaking authority. 23 MR. PARRISH: That is exactly right, That sort of takes 24 Your Honor. I completely agree. 25 me to my next point about --

1	HON. AMBRO: Go ahead.
2	MR. PARRISH: the private right
3	baseline which is it's really important to recognize
4	that these drugs belong to manufacturers. And I'm
5	sure you noticed in the government's brief and this
б	is what Mr. Francisco was talking about in terms of
7	the Christensen case by the Supreme Court. The
8	government just flips that. It's like as if these
9	drugs do not belong to manufacturers. And the common
10	law baseline and you can see this in any number of
11	Supreme Court cases that we've cited, the Horne case,
12	of course, talks about raisins and so forth, but any
13	number of those cases. The right to exclude, the
14	right to decide who gets your products, where you will
15	deliver them to, that's all a matter of common law
16	that exists unless it's displaced by a federal
17	statute. So you have to look at the language of the
18	statute to see if those common law rights are
19	displaced.
20	And the third point that I would make
21	about that is because the Supreme Court has been very
22	clear that if Congress wants to displace those private
23	law rights, it has to do so clearly what the Court has
24	recently said in "exceedingly clear language".
25	You take those three principles and
25	

1 what it means is the following is that if the statute 2 is not clear in the government's favor, if you can't 3 read the statute to say they clearly win, then they 4 have to lose. If we're right in terms of applying 5 everything, then --HON. BIBAS: But why is that? 6 I mean, 7 if it's not rulemaking authority, we just parse the statute de novo ourselves. We don't have to --8 9 there's not a clear statement requirement here. 10 MR. PARRISH: Well, there is, Your 11 Honor, in the sense that there is a clear statement 12 requirement for the Congress to replace the private 13 rights. So what you would say is -- you're absolutely 14 right. If you --15 HON. BIBAS: What's your best authority 16 for that proposition? 17 MR. PARRISH: Well, Your Honor, we cite in our briefs the Texas v. United States case. 18 We cite the recent eviction case where the Court -- the 19 20 Alabama case where the Court addresses that. 21 But, Your Honor, what I would say is 22 that it depends on how you think about statutory 23 interpretation. Some judges would say I apply 24 traditional tools of statutory construction and I will 25 get the best interpretation of the statute. We think

1 if you do that, we clearly win. But that's for you to 2 do. 3 If you decide there's some residual ambiguity after that, you've applied traditional 4 5 tools, my point is then we still win because that ambiguity would have to be resolved through 6 7 rulemaking. It can't be -- that ambiguity can't be 8 resolved in the ether. And the default is the common 9 law rights which is they're our drugs and we can do 10 what we want with them unless someone says something 11 else. 12 HON. KRAUSE: But the default also 13 includes agency law. And they're taking the 14 perspective that these contract pharmacies are just 15 being designated as agents. So if "offer" -- if we 16 conclude "offer" does include some delivery obligation 17 then what -- are we really arguing here about who pays 18 for the mailing? Because if it needs to go to them and they say, okay, send it to our agent instead, is 19 20 the objection that there's just too many agents so 21 that's raising the cost? 22 MR. PARRISH: So I would say it's two 23 things, Your Honor. One, let me give you an analogy 24 so that -- which I think is helpful in terms of 25 thinking about delivery. And second, let me address

1 the agency point because the government isn't relying 2 on that anymore because it's never made a true agency 3 showing.

But on the first point, Your Honor, the 4 5 analogy we use in the brief is that if you were a supermarket and you had a 50 percent discount off of 6 7 milk and it said you could get milk for 50 percent, you could have an argument as to whether the 8 9 supermarket might deliver it to you or whether you're 10 going to pick it up. But no one would think -- no one 11 would think -- that that means that you can call up 12 and say I'd like you deliver it to my grandmother in 13 New York and my cousin in California and, you know, my 14 friends in Indiana.

15 And that's the argument that the 16 government has to rely on. And you'll notice that the 17 government doesn't identify anything in the statutory 18 text that supports that. Instead, the only way the 19 government can have a textual argument is to flip 20 Christensen on its head. So the only argument the 21 government makes is to say, well, these drugs are not 22 the manufacturers drugs but say that implicitly and therefore the manufacturers don't have any control 23 over them. But the truth is, is that once you get rid 24 25 of that, there's nothing they've identified in the

statute that's ambiguous. There's nothing about the word "offer" that's ambiguous that they rely on. You can read their brief. They just don't parse the language.

5 Your Honor, on the agency point, the problem that the government has there is that in the 6 7 1996 guidance, the theory was that we could read into the statute an agency relationship because one 8 9 contract pharmacy would be acting as equivalent to an 10 in-house. And at that time, you'll note that for 14 11 years, the statute operated that way. And we would 12 say, as a first point, is if the government is right 13 now then that meant that for 14 years the government 14 was interpreting the statute in a way it now says was 15 plainly wrong. That can't be the case.

16 But on top of that, Your Honor, there's 17 none of the things that are an agency relationship. 18 An agency relationship would suggest that you have control -- the principal has control over the agent. 19 20 There's no suggestion that these hospitals have 21 controls over the CVSs and the Walgreens of the world. 22 It would be a fiduciary relationship. There's nothing like that either. And also, there would be title that 23 24 would be held by the covered --

25

HON. AMBRO: But let's say that

1	Walgreens is the contract pharmacy for a covered
2	entity. And Walgreens has myriad locations, back to
3	some extent my prior question. Are you saying that
4	you will only deliver to Walgreens in one place even
5	though it has 100 locations in a particular state, 200
6	locations?
7	MR. PARRISH: So what just to be
8	clear, Your Honor, what we're saying is that if the
9	covered we only will we'll only offer the drugs
10	to the covered entity and give it to the covered
11	entity. Under our policy, if the covered entity has
12	an in-house contract pharmacy, we will deliver to that
13	in-house pharmacy.
14	HON. AMBRO: Understood. But most of
15	them don't.
16	MR. PARRISH: Most of them don't. So
17	if they don't, what we will do under our policy, at
18	the start of the case, we would deliver it to one
19	contract pharmacy. We now agree to deliver it to two
20	of their choosing. But it's not every Walgreens
21	across the country.
22	HON. AMBRO: When I say contract
23	pharmacy, let's say Walgreens was the contract
24	pharmacy. Are you saying you'll only deliver to how
25	many locations?

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 33 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 33 1 MR. PARRISH: Two locations. Not every 2 location of -- that Walgreens might have. 3 HON. AMBRO: So that Walgreens would have to do the dispersing out from that particular 4 5 location. MR. PARRISH: For the covered entity, 6 7 yeah. But there's nothing weird about that. If you think about the statute, what the purpose was is that 8 9 these are disproportionate shared hospitals that are 10 serving local communities that have people that walk 11 in who are uninsured. Those are the patients they're 12 supposed to benefit. What Mr. Francisco said is 13 absolutely right. The problem about this expansion is that it's not helping the patients. There's lots of 14 15 reports on that. What it's doing is it's creating 16 extra money for the contract pharmacies who aren't 17 even supposed to be part of the program. 18 HON. AMBRO: Isn't part of the problem from the government's perspective that you've got, in 19 20 the DC circuit, the Seventh Circuit here, you've got 21 five different manufacturers. 22 MR. PARRISH: Yeah. HON. AMBRO: And they all seem to have 23 24 different ways of addressing this perceived problem. 25 How do you go about trying to get something that's at

1 least semi uniform?

2 MR. PARRISH: So what you do, Your 3 Honor, is you say the statute imposed one thing. Ιt imposed an offer obligation. The second thing you say 4 5 is it did not displace any other common law rights that manufacturers have over their drugs just like if 6 7 you were to make something yourself, unless a statute told that you couldn't do something with it, you would 8 9 be free to sell it and to whomever, wherever you want. 10 And you say those two principles stay in place. And 11 therefore what you say is that you say Congress 12 understood that this was a charitable program that 13 manufacturers have always provided. It was for the benefit of those patients that visit the covered 14 15 entities themselves not those patients -- not the Bill 16 Gates that come in and then go off to a contract 17 pharmacy a hundred miles away but the patients that 18 come in to the covered entity itself. You say those three things and the case is over. And all you have 19 20 to do, Your Honor, for in terms of your language as 21 you say, the government's legal position that's taken 22 the letter and the advisory opinion is contrary to 23 law. It's also arbitrary and capricious. 24 HON. KRAUSE: But where do you get that 25 restriction that this was focused just on the patients

Page 35 1 who were local on site? 2 MR. PARRISH: Because when the statute 3 was enacted, it -- first of all, it has all of these provisions. The first one is it's only to a covered 4 5 entity. Then what it says, it says there shall be no diversion to anybody other than the patient. 6 7 HON. KRAUSE: These are patients, right? They're patients who were getting a 8 9 prescription from the covered entity. It's just that 10 they're going to fill it not at the pharmacy 11 downstairs in the covered entity but at the Walgreens 12 that's 40 miles away. 13 MR. PARRISH: Right. But the imposition -- so the key point that Mr. Francisco was 14 15 making is that when they do that, the patient is no 16 different off because what happens is the patient pays 17 in the vast majority of the case, like 99 percent of 18 the time, the patient pays the full price. And what's 19 happening is, is that the contract pharmacy and the 20 covered entities are pocketing the spread. What 21 Congress intended originally --22 HON. BIBAS: Even if the patient's uninsured? 23 24 MR. PARRISH: Even -- yes. That's --25 I'm sorry, Your Honor. That's the frustration that we

1	have with this program is that what's going on is, is
2	that the uninsured patients that would used to come
3	into the hospital and then the hospital would say I
4	have drugs that have been provided at a discount, I'll
5	give them to you, those patients aren't being treated
6	that way anymore. And both what's happening
7	instead, the patients that are getting are both the
8	insured and the uninsured are not being treated
9	differently unless they have that card which is the
10	1.4 percent that Mr. Francisco talked about. And so,
11	the problem is it's not helping the patients.
12	And if I can, you notice in our brief,
13	there's a real takings problem that underlies this
14	which is that as long as you are transferring to
15	covered entities, it has a nexus to the program which
16	is to help the patients.
17	HON. BIBAS: Those (indiscernible) take
18	part in the program you take the conditions that come
19	with it, it's not a taking.
20	MR. PARRISH: Your Honor, only if
21	only if the statute is not read the way that we think
22	it is. So if you want to make that argument, you have
23	to say that the statute in the first place is clear.
24	But the reason why you wouldn't interpret the statute
25	adventurously is because

HON. BIBAS: That anything. Either you're right on the statute or you're wrong on the statute.

MR. PARRISH: Well, Your Honor, what I 4 5 would say, Your Honor, is it would be odd to read a statute that doesn't talk at all about delivery and 6 7 then say that the point of it is to transfer for the private benefit of these contract pharmacies which is 8 9 what is happening. The contract pharmacies are not 10 part of the statute. But they're making a windfall in 11 the profits from the sale of these drugs.

12 HON. KRAUSE: But why isn't that just 13 incidental? Because these are covered entities that 14 happened not to have an in-house pharmacy and there 15 would be a lot of expense and burden that would go 16 along with setting that up or running it, so there's a 17 cost associated with that. It's a cost that is -- and 18 the effort is being taken on by the contract pharmacy 19 so they get a fee for the work that they're doing.

20 MR. PARRISH: So, Your Honor, you saw 21 what was in the briefs which is that we're talking 22 about, depending on the year, 3.6 billion that's being 23 pocketed by the contract pharmacies which is not at 24 all associated with the cost. It's entirely extra 25 spread or revenues. And we've seen a growth in the

1	program without any growth in uninsured patients from
2	9 billion in 2010 to 38 billion in 2020. All of this
3	growth is explained not by helping indigent patients.
4	It's all explained by the arbitrage that's happened by
5	sending these drugs across the country in a way that
6	allows them to sell drugs to fully insured patients
7	and then pocket the difference.
8	HON. KRAUSE: How is there any
9	different benefit to patients who are going to get
10	their drugs from their contract pharmacies than if it
11	were an in-house pharmacy?
12	MR. PARRISH: Well I'm
13	HON. KRAUSE: Well, you seem to be
14	saying that these contract pharmacies aren't helping
15	the patients. They were intended to help patients.
16	They're not helping the patients. But how is the
17	benefit any different when the patient goes downstairs
18	to the in-house pharmacy? They still have their
19	insurance, right? And
20	MR. PARRISH: Your Honor, what we would
21	say is this. As long as the program is interpreted as
22	Congress intended, which is that the offer imposes
23	just that obligation and you can't divert to third
24	parties so only the covered entities
25	HON. AMBRO: No. But she's asking a

1 practical question.

2 MR. PARRISH: Well, what I'm saying is 3 if you do that, then the patient -- the patients that need the medications will go to the hospital and they 4 5 will get the medications they need. The patients that are located at CVS a hundred miles away, they'll still 6 7 get the medications they need. Their insurance will still pay for the medication. The only difference is, 8 9 is that the pharmacy won't be able to then get the 10 discount through the covered entity and then pocket it 11 for themselves. So this is not impacting the 12 patients. You're right. The patients see it the 13 The difference is, is that all of these same. patients that are now going to these distance 14 15 pharmacies are, as an accounting mechanism, being 16 treated as if they're entitled to a discounted price. 17 They're not getting it. But the discount is then 18 going in the pockets of the pharmacies and the covered That's why it's grown from 9 billion to 38 19 entities. 20 billion. And that's why it's not incidental because 21 these contract pharmacies, like the CVS and Walgreens, 22 they say this is material to their profits and the revenues because we're talking about three plus 23 24 billion a year that doesn't have anything to do with 25 the patients. It's just a question of pocketing the

Page 40 1 money. 2 HON. AMBRO: But if we read the statute 3 your way of that 3.6 billion that was going to the pharmacies, would all -- would any portion of that 4 5 come back to you if it were not given -- if they didn't get the advantage of that particular amount of 6 7 money? MR. PARRISH: Well, presumably, it 8 9 would, yes, because --10 HON. AMBRO: How --11 MR. PARRISH: -- instead of that --12 HON. AMBRO: How would it work out 13 practically? 14 MR. PARRISH: Well, Your Honor, so if 15 all -- I guess the point is, if the drug is usually 16 \$100 and then it's being sold at a penny, that 99.99 17 difference is what's making up that billion. And the 18 question is, is that appropriately -- can you read 19 "offer" so broadly that it means that we have this 20 obligation to deliver to the pharmacies. And our 21 submission is, is that's not in the statute. And the 22 background principal on that is that it shouldn't be 23 in the statute because Congress hasn't spoken to that. 24 HON. AMBRO: But I thought what the 25 pharmacies were doing for purposes -- if acting in

Page 41 1 effect as the agent for the covered entity, they're 2 charging some fee. Correct? 3 MR. PARRISH: The full price, yeah. HON. AMBRO: 4 Oh. They're --5 MR. PARRISH: They're charging the customer the full price of the drug. And then what 6 7 they're doing is they're going back to the covered entity and said there's somebody here that we think at 8 9 one time was connected to you that we're going to call 10 them a patient and therefore please replenish the drug 11 at the discounted price. And then the spread, which 12 is the difference between the regular price and the 13 discounted price, that gets pocketed and shared between the covered entity and the contract pharmacy. 14 15 And our point -- and this is why -- Judge, I don't 16 mean to argue about the takings point. But the reason 17 why it's important that the original program was confined to covered entities and to their patients and 18 prohibited diversion was to stop others from 19 20 benefiting from the program because there's a huge 21 problem when you're trying to take money from one 22 preferred group and give it to another. So they wanted it tied to benefiting the patients. 23 And the 24 problem is, is it's lost track of that because it's 25 now just a matter of making money for the pharmacies.

1 HON. KRAUSE: But the primary focus 2 seems to be the benefit of the covered entity and the 3 patients not precluding others. I mean, there are -there's the prime vendor. There are third parties 4 5 that were contemplated are going to make some profit off the transactions. Right? So if we look at the --6 7 if we're looking at the benefit to the covered entity, the covered entity from the contract pharmacies is 8 9 still getting a benefit. Perhaps less because of 10 what's shared with the contract pharmacy. But the 11 covered entity is still getting some benefit and the 12 patient is getting some benefit. So why doesn't it 13 serve that very modest purpose that the original 14 program did? MR. PARRISH: Well, what I would say, 15 16 Your Honor -- and I'm sorry. I notice my time's up 17 but if I could save a little time for rebuttal. But 18 let me answer this. 19 HON. AMBRO: No. We're not going to --20 MR. PARRISH: Okay. Thank you. 21 HON. AMBRO: -- affect your time for 22 rebuttal. 23 MR. PARRISH: All I would say is that 24 that's sort of the Christensen problem in the sense 25 that I realize that statutes have lots of purposes.

1 But it's a mistake to say just because it furthers one 2 purpose. Congress made a tradeoff which is it said 3 this is a little odd that we're going to force a charitable obligation to transfer essentially your 4 5 property to somebody else. But we will do it within confines because it benefits the patients. And then 6 7 we'll allow the covered entities within those confines 8 of getting the drugs themselves to actually keep the 9 spread rather than passing the discount on to the 10 patient because we think they'll reinvest. And what's 11 happened over the years is that they're not doing that 12 anymore. It's not helping the patients. 13 And what we would say is that although that's all helpful background to the Court, the Court 14 15 doesn't need to get there. All the Court needs to do 16 is say does the obligation to offer at a price include 17 the obligation to deliver to third parties at third 18 party locations. There's no argument that it does. 19 The government's only argument is to flip it and say 20 that you don't have your common law rights. And 21 Christensen says that's wrong. And then the Court can 22 just rest there. 23 HON. KRAUSE: So if I can just --24 MR. PARRISH: Yeah. 25 HON. KRAUSE: Say that a covered entity

1	has sets up a third party administrator. And it
2	has these patients that are working contract
3	pharmacies all over the country. You don't have any
4	objection to the order being placed by the covered
5	entity the full amount of the pharmaceutical drugs
6	being delivered to them and for their third party
7	administrator to then distribute it to all the
8	pharmacies.
9	MR. PARRISH: Yeah. So they
10	HON. KRAUSE: Is that right?
11	MR. PARRISH: They can't do that. So
12	there have been cases in the past where this problem
13	of diversion is where the covered entity has set
14	itself up like a wholesaler where they're going to
15	take the drugs and then sell them around the country.
16	And the reason why they can't do that is the law is
17	very clear that they don't have wholesale licensing
18	rights. And that would be the type of diversion that
19	the statute's supposed to prohibit.
20	HON. KRAUSE: But it's not diversion
21	until it gets into the hands of the wrong patient. If
22	it's going to their patient at a contract pharmacy, a
23	prescription that was written by one of their
24	providers, there's no diversion there. Right?
25	MR. PARRISH: Well, Your Honor, I think

1 there is in the sense that I think the correct reading 2 of the diversion is particularly if that contract 3 pharmacy was making any profit off of it beyond bona fide cost of providing the service. 4 5 But what I'm saying is there's not under the 340B program but there's other laws out 6 7 there that limit when you can actually transfer like that which is why this program has developed. One of 8 9 the things to recognize is that this does not exist in 10 These types of replenishment models, the idea nature. 11 that we would be -- we don't ship to any other 12 pharmacies on the request of a customer like this. 13 This is all just for the 340B program. It's been made up by consultants that realize that if you did it this 14 15 way, contract pharmacies, and then in turn covered 16 entities, could generate more money. But that's way 17 beyond what the program was ever intended. We don't need to convince the Court of 18 We just need to convince the Court that 19 all that. 20 offering does not include delivering to third parties. 21 HON. AMBRO: Thank you. We'll get you 22 back for rebuttal. 23 MR. PARRISH: Thank you very much. 24 HON. AMBRO: I don't want to 25 mispronounce your name as Kedem [Keh-dem] or Kedem

Page 46 1 [Ka-deem]? 2 It's Kedem [Keh-dem]. MR. KEDEM: 3 HON. AMBRO: Kedem [Keh-dem]. Thank 4 you, sir. 5 MR. KEDEM: Thank you, Your Honor. Allon Kedem on behalf of AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals. 6 7 If I could reserve five minutes for rebuttal. HON. AMBRO: That's fine. 8 9 MR. KEDEM: Perhaps a good place to 10 start would be with the two district court decisions 11 you have in front of you because although they reach 12 different results, I actually think there is a fair 13 amount of overlap on the central issue that we take to 14 be at the heart of this case. Both Judge Stark and 15 Chief Judge Wolfson took a look at Section 340B and 16 determined that there was no requirement to deliver 17 discounted drugs to third party contract pharmacies contained in the statute. Where they differ is that 18 Chief Judge Wolfson then went on to say there's 19 20 nothing that affirmatively authorizes manufacturers to 21 restrict distribution and therefore they're forbidden 22 from doing so whereas Judge Stark looked at the May 17th violation letter and its accusation that 23 24 AstraZeneca had directly violated its obligations 25 under 340B and said that can't be right. If there's

no such requirement in the statute then there can't be a direct violation.

1

2

3 And we respectfully suggest that Judge Stark's way of looking at things is correct, both as a 4 5 matter of administrative law in which agency action has to be judged on the grounds articulated by the 6 7 agency itself, but also as a matter of constitutional principle under which private parties retain the right 8 9 to structure their affairs as they see fit unless there's something in the law that says that they 10 11 can't. But they don't need affirmative authorization 12 to act the way that a federal agency would. And I 13 think it's that APA overlay that actually makes this quite an easy case. And I agree with my friends from 14 15 Sanofi and Novo that the only question before the 16 Court is whether the May 17 violation letters and, to 17 the extent that you're going to consider it, the advisory opinion as well, is correct that there is an 18 19 obligation in the statute itself to deliver unlimited 20 amounts of discounted drugs to third party contract 21 pharmacies. And since we're so focused on the statute 22 and the must-offer provision, I'd like to just put on the table, at the risk of being a little bit tedious, 23 24 some additional textual arguments as to why there is 25 no such third party delivery obligation in the must-

1 offer provision.

2	So we've talked about what the word
3	"offer" means. The manufacturers provide some
4	dictionary definitions. Perhaps our friend from the
5	government, Mr. Aguilar, will tell you what the
6	government thinks the word "offer" means, but there is
7	no connotation of delivery included in the word
8	"offer". But it's actually quite a bit stronger than
9	that because it's not just a generic offer. The
10	statute refers to an offer for purchase. And it's an
11	offer for purchase at a particular price. So the
12	combination
13	HON. AMBRO: Again, maybe it's semantic
14	games but isn't it aren't we dealing with offers
15	with conditions from, in this case, three different
16	manufacturers, then you add the other Novartis and Eli
17	Lilly and you have five different manufacturers?
18	MR. KEDEM: So the conditions are
19	placed on delivery. But I think there's a threshold
20	question whether that's a condition on an offer. You
21	have to figure out whether an offer includes any
22	representation with respect to delivery in the first
23	place. And we're simply submitting that when you're
24	talking about an offer for purchase at a price
25	HON. AMBRO: But I can say to you I

Page 49 1 offer you X on the condition that I deliver it to you 2 only at position A. 3 MR. KEDEM: Sure. And I think if there were those additional textual elements in the statute 4 5 then I think we would then lead them back into what it means to be an offer. Since there is nothing of the 6 7 sort in the statute, I think we can assume that offer 8 just has its sort of generic definition. 9 HON. AMBRO: But my question is -- my 10 hypothetical is there is an offer with a condition. 11 And --12 MR. KEDEM: Right. 13 HON. AMBRO: -- we see five different types of conditions here. 14 15 MR. KEDEM: Right. But --16 HON. AMBRO: Why isn't that considered 17 part of the offer? So I think the offer is to 18 MR. KEDEM: 19 the covered entities for purchase at the ceiling price 20 in unlimited amounts. And that is the element of the 21 offer --22 HON. AMBRO: At or below the ceiling --23 MR. KEDEM: -- that the statute speaks 24 to. 25 HON. AMBRO: -- price, right?

Page 50 1 MR. KEDEM: Pardon? HON. AMBRO: At or below the ceiling 2 price, right? 3 MR. KEDEM: At or below the ceiling 4 5 price, that's correct. And those are the elements 6 that the statute speaks to. The only question is 7 whether, in talking about an offer for purchase, the statute also includes some additional condition or 8 9 requirement with respect to delivery. And based on 10 the dictionary definition plus the combination of 11 purchase and the price, we're suggesting that it does 12 not. But in addition, it's an offer to each 13 14 covered entity, a term that Congress defined with 15 incredible specificity going so far as to distinguish 16 different parts of the same hospital, giving 340B 17 treatment for one and not another. As Judge Stark 18 pointed out, it is deeply implausible to think that 19 the same Congress which defined covered entity with 20 such exquisite specificity nevertheless implicitly included distribution requirements to unnamed third 21 22 parties. 23 Third, there are other provisions in 24 Section 340B that specifically deal with third party 25 arrangements including distribution. For instance,

1	subsection (a)(8) is the prime vendor program. And it
2	applies to prime vendors under which "covered entities
3	may enter into contracts with prime vendors for the
4	distribution of covered outpatient drugs". So exactly
5	this sort of third party contract distribution
6	language we don't have in subsection (a)(1). We also
7	have (d)(2) which talks about distributors and (d)(3)
8	which talks about representatives of covered entities.
9	And then we have the broader context of
10	the Veterans Health Care Act which created the 340B
11	program. We point you to section 603 which talks
12	about discounted drugs purchased by a federal agency
13	but "delivered through a commercial entity operating
14	under a contract through such agency". So again,
15	third party distribution contract language that we
16	don't have. The reason 603 is so notable is because
17	the immediately preceding section, section 602, is the
18	one that created the 340B program.
19	So I think when you put all of those
20	together, I think it thoroughly rebuts the idea that
21	there's some sort of implicit delivery obligation.
22	HON. KRAUSE: Judge Stark accepted the
23	argument that there was this about face and change in
24	the agency's policy. But when you look back at what
25	they were saying in '93, in '94, in '96, '97, 2001,

Page 52 1 there is repeatedly this expression of -- or repeated 2 rejection of the argument that you can't -- that 3 there's not a requirement to give to the contract 4 pharmacies. 5 MR. KEDEM: So --6 HON. KRAUSE: Right? 7 MR. KEDEM: Yeah. 8 HON. KRAUSE: There's commentary saying 9 we'd like the specificity that there's no requirement 10 to give these drugs to anything other than the covered 11 entity itself and the agency is rejecting that 12 explicitly as early as '94. 13 MR. KEDEM: So I think that that's right but with a pretty significant caveat because 14 15 what you'll see, for instance, looking at the 1994 16 quidance, what they said is that covered entities 17 could use purchasing agents so long as the drugs were delivered to the covered entities themselves which is 18 flatly inconsistent with the idea of contract pharmacy 19 20 It was only in '96 that they endorsed the idea use. 21 of contract pharmacy use. But again, they imposed all 22 sorts of conditions which are no longer being met. For instance, that the covered entity had to retain 23 title. 24 And, for instance, they had to be the ones to 25 set the price for the drugs. That was maintained as

1 well in 2010 when they opened things up. But even in 2 2010, they never said that this was imposed as a 3 statutory requirement. That's the key element, we think, that the government has never even acknowledged 4 5 much less explained which is that it was only in December 30th of 2020 that the government, in the form 6 7 of the advisory opinion, for the very first time said that there was an actual statutory obligation that 8 9 manufacturers would violate if they failed to deliver 10 to third party contract pharmacies. That does not 11 appear at any previous point. And that is, by itself, 12 a sufficient basis to conclude that there's an APA 13 violation. 14 But even if you don't believe our 15 textual argument and you do think that maybe there is 16 some sort of implicit connotation within the word 17 "offer" that includes something about delivery, I want 18 to give you a few different ways --19 HON. AMBRO: Let me go back to what you 20 just said that you believe there is an APA violation 21 and your co-counsel believe that there is as well. 22 If there is an APA violation, do we 23 need to go into the merits of the statutory 24 construction arguments? 25 So I think technically you MR. KEDEM:

probably wouldn't. It would suffice just to point
that out and send it back to the agency. Both sides,
though, I think are urging you to at least start with
the text to provide a little bit of clarity as to what
it is that we're talking about. I think it would be
appropriate to do so. And we've laid out what we
think is a pretty good textual argument.
Let me give you a few additional ways
to look at the must-offer requirement even if you
don't buy our primary textual submission that there's
just no distribution requirement contained in it.
One thing is, you could consider that
it's the type of offer that the other side can accept.
Now we don't think that that's textually what "offer"
means. But even if you thought that, all the
means. But even if you thought that, all the
means. But even if you thought that, all the manufacturers that you have before you have made that
means. But even if you thought that, all the manufacturers that you have before you have made that type of offer because all of us allow distribution
means. But even if you thought that, all the manufacturers that you have before you have made that type of offer because all of us allow distribution either to the covered entity itself through its own
means. But even if you thought that, all the manufacturers that you have before you have made that type of offer because all of us allow distribution either to the covered entity itself through its own in-house pharmacy or through some contract pharmacy if
means. But even if you thought that, all the manufacturers that you have before you have made that type of offer because all of us allow distribution either to the covered entity itself through its own in-house pharmacy or through some contract pharmacy if they don't have one.
means. But even if you thought that, all the manufacturers that you have before you have made that type of offer because all of us allow distribution either to the covered entity itself through its own in-house pharmacy or through some contract pharmacy if they don't have one. You might think it's the type of offer
<pre>means. But even if you thought that, all the manufacturers that you have before you have made that type of offer because all of us allow distribution either to the covered entity itself through its own in-house pharmacy or through some contract pharmacy if they don't have one. You might think it's the type of offer that's typical in the marketplace. Again, all of the</pre>

unknown outside of the 340B program. And the only
 reason that it's used in the 340B program is because
 of this replenishment model arbitrage that we've been
 talking about.

5 You could also think that perhaps there is some sort of equal treatment or most favored nation 6 7 principle inherent in the word "offer". It's the type of offer that's at least as good as the one made 8 9 available. Again, we all satisfy that and more than 10 satisfy that because covered entities, unlike any 11 other purchaser, are allowed to designate at least one 12 contract pharmacy -- to designate a contract pharmacy 13 if they don't have their own in-house pharmacy. It's something no one else is offered. 14

 15
 HON. AMBRO: You want to take away the

 16
 "at least"?

 17
 MR. KEDEM: Pardon?

18HON. AMBRO: You want to just take away19the "at least"?20MR. KEDEM: For us, it is just one.

21 That is correct. I think for some of the other 22 manufacturers, maybe they allow it if you provide 23 claims data. You're correct, though. For 24 AstraZeneca, it is just one designation. 25 And that's really just the final way of

1	looking at it is, it is an offer if it's the type of
2	offer that the agency itself was endorsing for the
3	majority of the program's lifespan. Obviously, the
4	agency did not think that it was illusory to offer
5	directly to the covered entity itself if it has an in-
6	house pharmacy or to a to one contract pharmacy
7	because that's the model that the agency itself was
8	endorsing up through 2010.
9	So I think any of those ways would
10	still lead you to the same conclusion if you just
11	didn't want to base it solely on the dictionary
12	definition.
13	Judge Krause, you had a question about
14	patient access and why is it any different when you're
15	providing drugs through your own in-house pharmacy
16	versus externally. And there is, in fact, a pretty
17	big difference and it's reflected in the statistics.
18	If you are a patient of the covered entity and then
19	you go downstairs to the pharmacy, they know that
20	you're a patient of the covered entity. And so
21	they're much more likely to be able to give you the
22	discount from 340B at the point of sale.
23	If, however, you were just walking
24	across the street to the CVS and the CVS has a
25	contract arrangement with the covered entity and

1 they're using the replenishment model, the drugs have 2 already been shipped to that CVS. They've been placed on the store shelves alongside all of the other drugs. 3 There's no differentiation made. And the CVS is 4 5 serving not just patients of the covered entity but anyone who walks in the door. And so they don't know 6 7 at the point of sale whether you are a patient of the covered entity or someone else. And so they charge 8 9 you full price or your insurer they charge full price. 10 And then there is some retrospective process that goes 11 on weeks, months, sometimes even as much as a year 12 later where the contract pharmacy decides whether some 13 number of the patients from the prior period were patients of the covered entity. Usually, they 14 15 outsource this job to what's called a third party 16 administrator which uses some sort of algorithm to 17 basically give an educated guess. Often, what they'll 18 say is, well, it seems as if this patient had an 19 appointment with the covered entity in the prior month 20 and therefore we're going to assume that that prior 21 appointment was where they got the prescription that 22 was filled at the CVS. Maybe that's true; maybe it's 23 not. But by that time, the patient is long gone and so sees none of the benefit. And what the statistics 24 25 show is that although covered entities who provide

1 services through their own in-house pharmacies often 2 provide discounts directly to the patient, it is very, 3 very rare for them to do so through third party contract pharmacies. It is only the instance that my 4 5 friend, Mr. Francisco, talked about where they give them essentially a 340B card so that when they go to 6 7 the CVS, they can present it at the point of sale and get the discount then. But it is roughly two percent 8 9 of the time according to a recent industry study. And 10 that's why -- what the Government Accountability 11 Office and the agency itself have determined is that 12 discounts are just not passed on to patients when the 13 contract pharmacy model is used. 14 HON. KRAUSE: Where do we have in the 15 record, in the GSA study or elsewhere the comparison 16 of that benefit to the benefit to the patient from 17 contract pharmacies versus in-house pharmacies? 18 MR. KEDEM: So I can take a look at which GAO study I'm referring to and see where in the 19 20 briefs. It's not in the administrative record and I 21 think that's the key point because it doesn't matter 22 to the statutory question that's embedded in the May 23 17th violation letter. The agency, although they include a lot of factual material in the 24

25 administrative record, they don't actually rely on it

1	in the May 17th letter because it's sort of irrelevant
2	to the statutory question that you have before you.
3	And so, I agree with you. This is all very useful
4	context and I think we all understand their important
5	policy concerns. But as Judge Stark put very
6	eloquently, those policy concerns are ones that
7	Congress can deal with. The only question that you
8	have before you is a question as to whether the May
9	17th letter was correct that the statute itself
10	imposes this third party distribution requirement on
11	manufacturers. If it doesn't, that is sufficient to
12	determine that the letter is invalid and set it aside
13	on that basis.
14	HON. AMBRO: Thank you.
15	MR. KEDEM: Thank you.
16	HON. AMBRO: We'll get you back on
17	rebuttal.
18	Mr. Aguilar?
19	MR. AGUILAR: May it please the Court.
20	Daniel Aguilar for the federal defendants.
21	So I think there are two
22	HON. AMBRO: The third rodeo on this
23	one?
24	MR. AGUILAR: The second, Your Honor.
25	Unfortunately, I was sick for the Seventh Circuit so

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 60 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 60 1 my colleague took it over which I --2 HON. AMBRO: That was probably a good 3 day --4 MR. AGUILAR: -- greatly appreciated. 5 HON. AMBRO: -- for you. MR. AGUILAR: Except for the sickness. 6 7 HON. AMBRO: That was a rough oral 8 argument. 9 MR. AGUILAR: To be fair, I'd rather be 10 talking with you all than cooped up with the flu. But 11 12 So I think there have been two strands 13 of discussion that have been going on today. One is the legal question that's before the Court, statutory 14 15 construction, the text and structure of the statute, 16 et cetera, and the agency's position in construing 17 that over a number of years. And then additionally, a 18 question about how the 340B program works as a whole, how it works with the manufacturers, the agency, the 19 20 covered entities and their patients. 21 And so, I know the Court has thought a lot about this and we've heard a lot about this. I'm 22 23 happy to answer your questions. But just for --24 HON. AMBRO: Just as a factual 25 question, how many --

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 61 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 61

1 MR. AGUILAR: Sure. 2 HON. AMBRO: -- contract pharmacies is 3 each covered entity actually using right now. Do you know? 4 5 MR. AGUILAR: That I don't know. Ι know there are several thousand covered entities 6 7 currently in the program and several thousand contract pharmacies that work with them. There are 734 drug 8 9 manufacturers who also participate in the 340B 10 program. And so at least from the practical 11 standpoint of how the program is administered, if each 12 manufacturer is permitted to set conditions at the 13 outset about whether and how you must comply before we will get your drugs to the pharmacy that will dispense 14 15 them, then covered entities need to navigate a web of 16 hundreds of potentially different policies with either 17 radius of how far the contract pharmacy is to the 18 covered entity, with whether or not the manufacturer deems it within their discretion to deliver it to that 19 20 contract pharmacy, whether they need to update claims 21 data to one particular third party server or another, et cetera. And that really goes to the question of 22 whose program this is to administer. And what this --23 24 HON. AMBRO: Actually, there's an easy 25 response to that. It's just -- let's have a Court

1	tell us or Courts, if they're in unison, tell us
2	exactly how the statute is to be interpreted.
3	MR. AGUILAR: And so just going to that
4	statutory question, Your Honor, I think both the text
5	of subsection (a) and the statutory structure as a
6	whole support the government's reading which is why
7	the District Court for New Jersey came up with that.
8	And if you want to go into the merits of this as well,
9	so subsection (a), which is at page 1 of our addendum,
10	lays out an unqualified obligation.
11	HON. BIBAS: Which language in (a)(1)
12	here supports your case?
13	MR. AGUILAR: So it's both the first
14	sentence and the last sentence. And the relevant
15	HON. BIBAS: The "purchased by" phrase?
16	MR. AGUILAR: "The Secretary shall
17	enter into an agreement with each manufacturerunder
18	which the amountto be paidfor covered outpatient
19	drugspurchased by a covered entity"
20	HON. BIBAS: A covered entity,
21	singular.
22	MR. AGUILAR: Yes.
23	HON. BIBAS: Okay.
24	MR. AGUILAR: Because they're
25	individually doing the purchasing does not exceed

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 63 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 63 1 the ceiling price. 2 HON. BIBAS: Okay. 3 MR. AGUILAR: And then at the end, it "shall require that the manufacturer offer each 4 5 covered entity covered outpatient drugs for purchase at or below the applicable ceiling price". 6 7 Okay. So what in these HON. BIBAS: words are the three drug companies here violating? 8 MR. AGUILAR: They are not selling the 9 10 drugs at the 340B price if --11 HON. BIBAS: They are selling them --12 offering them for sale. 13 MR. AGUILAR: -- if the covered entity does not comply with their conditions at the outset. 14 15 So --16 HON. BIBAS: Okay. So they're required 17 to sell it on the moon or in low Earth orbit. 18 MR. AGUILAR: No, Your Honor. 19 HON. BIBAS: No. They're not. Why 20 not? 21 MR. AGUILAR: Because drugs have to be 22 dispensed pursuant to a prescription as set out in federal and state law which usually means dispensation 23 24 in the doctor's office or at a pharmacy. 25 HON. BIBAS: And there's the Otsuka

1	brief which says that your current position conflicts
2	with requirements that they have to supervise
3	pharmacies dispensing these kidney medicine, JYNARQUE.
4	And yet, your position suggests, no, they can't put
5	any conditions on dispensing these medications.
6	MR. AGUILAR: So I think in terms of
7	the dispensation requirement, one, that's why the
8	pharmacies are in the business of being able to
9	dispense drugs generally because as Congress knew when
10	it enacted the 340
11	HON. AMBRO: Yeah. But on that point
12	that Judge Bibas makes, you need specialized training
13	for that particular drug. And are you saying to us
14	that if you go to a particular location, they'll say,
15	look, we don't have people with that specialized
16	training. You can get this but you're going to have
17	to go to this particular other place.
18	MR. AGUILAR: So I know
19	HON. AMBRO: What's wrong with that?
20	MR. AGUILAR: For particular
21	specialized drugs and this is reflected in the 2018
22	Government Accountability Office report. There are
23	specialized pharmacies that deal with that that have
24	people who have particular training and particular
25	knowledge on how to dispense those and for particular

-	
1	specialty drugs, as I understand it, that's how
2	they're dispensed. Many of these drugs don't
3	necessarily require that same sort of specialization,
4	insulin, for example. But it is the kind of thing
5	where people need it. And they need it on
6	HON. AMBRO: But the manufacturer is
7	saying, look, we're concerned about lives just as
8	everybody else is. And we're telling you we are only
9	going to offer this to the covered entity provided
10	that it be distributed at a place that has specialized
11	personnel. There's nothing wrong with that, is there?
12	MR. AGUILAR: So I think so, one,
13	obviously, that's not this case. But, two, what the
14	agency
15	HON. AMBRO: Well, I mean, that's why
16	it's a hypothetical.
17	MR. AGUILAR: I know. I was just
18	flagging that because I think the dispute here really
19	does turn on contract pharmacies and their history.
20	But just going to your question, Your Honor, what the
21	agency has consistently stated and what's been our
22	consistent position since the 1993 guidance was where
23	manufacturers said we want, as part of our contracts
24	with the covered entities, to sell these drugs to
25	require assurances that they're complying with the

Page 66 1 statutory requirements of the 340B program. And what 2 the agency said was that's not permissible at the 3 outset. The covered entities do need to comply with those statutory obligations. And it is our 4 5 responsibility -- it is the federal responsibility to ensure that those are --6 7 HON. AMBRO: But my question to you is --8 9 MR. AGUILAR: -- enforced. 10 HON. AMBRO: -- are they -- the example 11 -- the hypothetical that I gave is the covered entity 12 to the contract pharmacy complying or not complying? 13 MR. AGUILAR: By selling their 14 particular drug that needs specialized care? 15 HON. AMBRO: Correct. 16 MR. AGUILAR: I think it would depend 17 on the state law or the federal law that is requiring 18 that particular dispensation. I don't know enough 19 about the particular fact pattern but it would say you 20 would need to look --21 HON. AMBRO: Let's say --22 MR. AGUILAR: -- to the applicable --23 HON. AMBRO: Let's say that the state law or the federal law, whatever law applies, is 24 25 saying that you can only dispense generic, for

1 example, at certain specialized -- certain locations 2 where you have specialized personnel who are trained 3 in how this drug is to be dispensed. My question to vou is --4 5 MR. AGUILAR: Yes. HON. AMBRO: -- does HHS view that as a 6 7 violation of the 340B program. MR. AGUILAR: I don't think it would be 8 a violation of the 340B program. I think it would 9 10 potentially come into question of whether or not it's 11 a violation of that applicable law regarding the 12 dispensing of that particular medication. 13 HON. AMBRO: But let's assume for a moment it's not a violation of the applicable law 14 under state law, for example. So now I'm asking you 15 16 is it a violation of the 340B program. 17 MR. AGUILAR: So I'm going to repeat 18 the question to make sure that I'm understanding it. 19 There is dispensing of a particular medication that 20 complies with state law? 21 HON. AMBRO: The manufacturer is saying 22 that I will distribute generic -- I will offer it to you only if you distribute it to locations -- or a 23 24 location that has specialized trained personnel. Does 25 HHS view that condition as a violation of the 340B

Page 68 1 program? 2 MR. AGUILAR: Yeah. That would be a 3 unilateral requirement that the manufacturer is imposing at the outset about whether or not --4 5 HON. AMBRO: Is it a violation? Yes 6 or --7 I was trying to say MR. AGUILAR: Yes. yes, Your Honor --8 9 HON. BIBAS: Let's say the 10 manufacturer --11 MR. AGUILAR: -- and explain. 12 HON. BIBAS: -- has noticed a pattern 13 of unusual kidney cysts that emerged from the use of this drug. But the FDA has not yet put a black box on 14 15 it or limited it. You're saying the manufacturer has 16 to continue to distribute it through all these 17 different pharmacies when they might get sued in tort 18 for not narrowing this down to the list of people who are getting the right kind of counseling and diagnosis 19 20 through the pharmacy. You're saying 340B -- they're 21 going to be liable under 340B. 22 MR. AGUILAR: I'm saying that 340B 23 statute sets out a system by which when manufacturers 24 or covered entities have complaints or concerns about 25 how the program is operating, there is a reticulated

Page 69 1 scheme --2 HON. BIBAS: Okay. 3 MR. AGUILAR: -- for addressing those. HON. BIBAS: A reticulated scheme that 4 5 does not give your agency rulemaking authority. You agree. We're not in Chevron land here. 6 7 MR. AGUILAR: Yes, Your Honor. HON. BIBAS: Well, then why is it that 8 9 several pages later in the same statute, we have 10 subsections that deal with distribution? We have 11 subsections that deal with the depos in the next 12 section, the Veterans Health Care Act. And yet, there's no mention of distribution networks in this 13 Why should we read back to (a)(1) the 14 one. 15 distribution limitations that Congress spelled out 16 later in the same section and also in the next section, Section 603? 17 18 MR. AGUILAR: So in 603, as I understand it, that's dealing with the program whereby 19 20 the discounted price was applicable if it dealt with 21 the particular depo and warehouse system. And we're 22 saying if you're working outside of that system, the 23 discount is not applicable. So it's setting up a 24 closed system of distribution. There's no similar 25 restriction here. And what happens is, is if a

1 patient has a prescription and tries to fill it 2 outside of the covered entity or just at a pharmacy 3 generally, similarly, they do not receive any statutory discount. 4 5 HON. BIBAS: Now that sounds like a reticulated scheme. I don't see that reticulation 6 7 back in (a)(1). MR. AGUILAR: So (a)(1) sets out the 8 9 ungualified obligation that we're saying. I think the 10 reticulated scheme is in those follow-on subsections 11 and paragraphs. What it says is if a manufacturer is 12 concerned that there are being duplicative discounts 13 or diversions to nonpatients, it first must conduct an audit of the covered entity. And then after that 14 15 audit, then the secretary, based on the findings or 16 based on HHS' own audit, can bring an enforcement 17 action. And the result of that enforcement action, if a violation is demonstrated, is that the covered 18 entity has to pay back the discount to the 19 And then additionally, later on --20 manufacturer. 21 HON. BIBAS: The covered entity in 22 (a)(4) has 15 specific categories. 23 MR. AGUILAR: Yes. 24 HON. BIBAS: Contract pharmacies are 25 not one of them. Yet, the contract pharmacy appears

1 to be taking title to the pills, at least under some 2 of these distribution schemes, and then winding up with some rebate later. So isn't the -- if there's 3 any violation, is the violation using the contract 4 5 pharmacy when it's not listed in (a)(4)? MR. AGUILAR: So HHS' consistent 6 7 quidance has been that covered entities need to take 8 title to the purchased drugs. They need to ensure 9 that when they're at a contract pharmacy for 10 dispensing to patients that all of the 340B statutory 11 obligations (indiscernible) are still being carried 12 out there. And I think that in terms of if we're 13 talking about how the 340B accounting works, I think 14 the 2018 GAO report is generally helpful on this. In 15 addition, the 2020 goes along with this, too -- is 16 that the contract pharmacy has the drugs on site. And 17 then they need to match up the 340B drugs dispensed to the patients of 340B covered entities. Those need to 18 19 match one to one. If there is a discrepancy or if 20 they don't net out, then there is potential diversion. 21 And then there is -- we conduct audits. And HHS 22 conducts about 200 audits of covered entities a year in trying to make sure that we have a good 23 24 understanding of what's happening out there in the 25 real world.

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 72 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 72

1 HON. KRAUSE: How is the covered entity 2 in that situation taking title? 3 MR. AGUILAR: So it's a bill to/ship to arrangement. So the title resides with the covered 4 5 entity. That's why they're allowed to then dispense the drugs to the patients at the 340B price. But many 6 7 covered entities, as Congress knew at the time that it enacted the 340B program, do not have onsite 8 9 pharmacies. They're costly to construct. It needs 10 people with specialized knowledge. And a lot of these 11 covered entities operate on pretty thin margins. 12 So Congress knew at the time -- I think 13 it was about five percent of covered entities had in-14 house pharmacies. The remainder, the vast majority, 15 used outside pharmacies for dispensing these 16 medications. And so what HHS has consistently said 17 here is that's a real world scenario. And it was 18 understood that these drugs were going to be dispensed 19 at outside pharmacies. That's how they get to the 20 patients. 21 HON. KRAUSE: But I'm asking about the 22 replenishment model and how in that scenario there is title that is retained with the covered entity when 23 24 we're talking about pharmaceuticals that are on the 25 shelf in the contract pharmacy to begin with.

1 MR. AGUILAR: So I think the Community 2 Health Clinics' brief is helpful on this as well as 3 the 1996 guidance which explains that there's no requirement in the statute for separate inventory 4 5 requirements. These drugs are essentially fungible. The pills are identical to each other. The bags are 6 7 identical to each other. And so what we want to do is match this up at the backend to make sure that these 8 9 discounted drugs are going to the covered entities and 10 the covered entities' patients, the people that 11 Congress intended for them to use. But having a 12 separate inventory requirement saying we're going to 13 shove off these particular medications here and these are only for 340B covered entities and separate them 14 15 out, that raises practical problems. They might 16 expire. You have to develop additional storage space 17 for them, et cetera. And so, what HHS has consistently explained here as well, and I don't think 18 that anybody seriously contested it since 1996, is 19 20 that so long as the drugs are going to the patients 21 and you're stretching scarce federal resources across 22 a broader area, that's the point of the 340B program. 23 And so, to the extent that they're 24 saying this is -- I've heard a lot of discussion of 25 arbitrage to contract pharmacies. If you look to

1 pages 51 through 54 of 2019 GAO report, those are the 2 administrative fees that the GAO analyzed for various 3 contract pharmacies. They're \$3 a pill, 20 percent of if it's covered by insurance or uninsured. 4 And at 5 pages 31 to 32 of that same report, they demonstrate that for a majority of the covered entities, both 6 7 hospitals and clinics are passing on those savings to their patients. And as the State's brief outlines 8 9 here and as the 1996 guidance does as well, if the 10 covered entity is retaining some of those savings, 11 they're reinvesting it. They're expanding services to 12 the dental care, OB-GYNs, mobile clinics for rural 13 populations or vaccine drives, et cetera, trying to 14 expand those services to poor and medically 15 underserved populations. 16 HON. BIBAS: Now looking back at the 17 1996 guidance, if these manufacturers, these very same conditions back in 1996, we wouldn't be here. You 18 19 would not have been challenging their actions as 20 unlawful or violating any terms of the '96 guidance, 21 would you? 22 MR. AGUILAR: I think what we would say is consistent with both the '96 guidance and the 23 24 '93-'94 guidance, is that it's -- the 340B statute 25 does not leave any room for the manufacturers to

1 restrict their delivery obligations at the outset. 2 HON. BIBAS: But the '96 guidance did 3 not require using contract pharmacies, let alone unlimited ones. 4 5 MR. AGUILAR: So you're correct. What the '96 guidance said, though, is that we're -- the 6 7 contract pharmacy here is essentially almost (indiscernible) generous to the 340B program because 8 9 it's the entity required to purchase it, take title to 10 it and dispense it to its patients but they don't have 11 the facility to do that. And so what the '96 guidance 12 -- sorry -- at page 25110, said is that drug 13 manufacturers often sell to intermediaries and wholesalers and contract pharmacies. And we expect 14 15 that to continue. And we're rejecting your comment to 16 say that you don't even have to make that delivery 17 obligation at the outset. There's a number in the 18 HON. BIBAS: record -- forgive me for blanking on where it is, but 19 20 I believe the average -- I don't know if this is mean 21 or median distance between the patient and the 22 pharmacy is somewhere upwards of 300 miles. What should we make of that? Does that just suggest that 23 24 national chains like CVS and Walgreens are just making 25 boatloads of money on this and it's not really about

1 serving people in local communities? 2 Well, I think what you MR. AGUILAR: 3 can make from it that is in the administrative record is the affidavits and declarations that we have from 4 5 the people who work at these covered entities who explain that we run a covered entity up in the Upper 6 7 Peninsula of Michigan and we cover 10,000 square miles. Or I know there is an affidavit from -- I 8 9 think it's North County Health Clinic in rural Arizona 10 where they explained one of our patients is a 11 diabetic. He lives very far away from our Flagstaff 12 clinic where we have an onsite pharmacy so we need to 13 use contract pharmacies to get him his insulin. Ιf we're not allowed to use multiple contract pharmacies, 14 15 he's very likely going to have to drive about 280 16 miles in order to get his insulin. Now it's true that 17 he could try to purchase that somewhere that's not a 18 contract pharmacy but then he's not going to get the discount for that because he's purchasing it not from 19 20 the covered entity. Right? 21 And so, I think that that's why in building up (indiscernible) to -- and the '96 guidance 22 23 said because the contract pharmacies are fairly new, 24 we're going to -- as nonbinding guidance say covered 25 entities use one. We've heard concerns from drug

1	manufacturers about duplicate diversions duplicate
2	discounts or diversions. So we're going to study this
3	problem. And as our brief explains, for the next five
4	years, HHS conducted a number of audits and said we
5	aren't seeing many problems here, let's start a pilot
6	program to allow covered entities to use multiple
7	contract pharmacies. They continued that and then in
8	2007, it said we still aren't seeing any problems. We
9	think that we can advise people to use multiple
10	contract pharmacies so long as they're still retaining
11	title, still using these contract sort of guidance
12	contract forms to make sure that they are supervising
13	their
14	HON. BIBAS: Evolution
15	MR. AGUILAR: pharmacies.
16	HON. BIBAS: would make perfect
17	sense in a world in which you had regulatory authority
18	and we were in Chevron land. But you concede we're
19	not. So why are we looking at the gradual evolution
20	of these programs? We have to look at what the
21	statute just means and means is the time that it
22	passed.
23	MR. AGUILAR: So two things, Your
24	Honor. One is, I think that this explanation of the
25	agency's views and explanation for them goes to the

1 arbitrary and capriciousness discussion we were having 2 earlier and particularly Judge Stark's opinion where 3 he assumed that the agency had changed views over time 4 without adequate explanation. So I'm explaining why 5 that's incorrect.

But then also, it just goes to show 6 7 that these sorts of objections were raised at the beginning of the program saying we ought not have to 8 9 deliver to any contract pharmacy. So the agency said 10 we think that's an incorrect interpretation of the 11 statute. And nobody sued over that. I've heard a lot 12 of talk from Plaintiff's counsel that this a new 13 position from the government, that this has never happened before. But it is equally true that before 14 15 the summer of 2020, no manufacturer had ever refused 16 to sell these drugs at the statutory discounts based 17 on the use of contract pharmacies. That was a new They started with Eli Lilly and it spread to 18 problem. other manufacturers that developed in these policies. 19 20 And the government, for a while, encouraged the 21 manufacturers to relinguish these policies. It issued an advisory opinion and received letters from 22 concerned covered entities and ultimately issued the 23 24 violation letter saying we've had this consistent view 25 of the statute for a long time. And we do think this

is a statutory violation to impose these unilateral - sorry, Your Honor.

3 HON. AMBRO: A question on the consistency is there are, obviously, nuances as Judge 4 5 Krause has noted from '93-'94. But looking at it maybe overly simplistically, it looks like there was a 6 7 nonbinding guidance, '96, that covered entities -that they may use one contract pharmacy to nonbinding 8 9 quidance in 2010 that they may use more than one 10 contract pharmacy to binding enforceable guidance in 11 2020 that manufacturers have to deliver to multiple 12 contract pharmacies. And they backed that up by a 13 violation letter. So it looks to me, maybe simplistically, as if the position has changed pretty 14 15 dramatically over the course of 24 years.

16 MR. AGUILAR: I disagree, Your Honor. 17 The nonbinding guidance that we've issued regarding contract pharmacies has always been advising covered 18 19 entities how to use them and how to address concerns 20 about duplicate discounts or diversion. What HHS has 21 consistently said at the same time, and for even 22 longer back to the '93 and '94 guidance, is that manufacturers cannot impose unilateral obligations 23 24 even if they're entirely consistent with the statutory 25 obligations that the covered entities already have.

1 And the reason for that, I think, which is instructive 2 here, is the Supreme Court's decision in Astra USA v. 3 Santa Clara County which addressed the 340B program. And there, covered entities were trying to sue to 4 5 enforce the contracts between the manufacturers and the secretary saying we think there have been 6 7 violations here, we're bringing a private suit. And the Supreme Court said the 340B statute doesn't leave 8 9 room for you to try to pursue those private 10 enforcement schemes. And the relative -- the 11 important language here is on page 120 of the opinion: 12 "Far from assisting HHS, suits [like 340B entities] 13 would undermine the agency's efforts to administer 14 both Medicaid and 340B harmoniously and on a uniform, 15 nationwide basis and they could spawn a multitude of 16 dispersed and uncoordinated lawsuits." And I think 17 that that central reasoning that this is a federal 18 enforcement priority, it's supposed to be uniform, it's supposed to allow covered entities and 19 20 manufacturers all to play by straightforward clear 21 rules at the outset is exactly why the covered entities can't bring private suits and it's exactly 22 23 why the manufacturers can't say --24 So basically, what you're HON. AMBRO: 25 saying is that -- I mean, what you answer does spawn a

1	number of questions, additional questions. But I come
2	back to the question I had asked you before. So it's
3	so blackline in terms of what the manufacturers can do
4	by way of conditions that there can't be any
5	conditions even if you said it would be a violation of
6	a 340B program if JANARQUE, for example, were limited
7	by a manufacturer to only those locations or contract
8	pharmacies with locations having specialized
9	personnel.
10	MR. AGUILAR: So I think, again I'm
11	just focusing on the contract pharmacy issue here.
12	But to answer your question, yes. They can't impose
13	that kind of condition at the outset.
14	HON. AMBRO: Doesn't that seem like
15	I mean, maybe technically that's right but in the real
16	world, somebody could die by not getting specialized
17	personnel advising them at the particular pharmacy
18	that they go to.
19	MR. AGUILAR: And that's why there
20	should be, practically speaking, good policy decisions
21	being made here by everybody. Right? Covered
22	entities should be
23	HON. AMBRO: Yeah. Well
24	MR. AGUILAR: making sure that they
25	are giving patients

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 82 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

Page 82

1	HON. AMBRO: if that were to happen,
2	if we'd all have a (indiscernible) would be happy
3	holidays for all of us. Ain't going to happen.
4	MR. AGUILAR: I and, Your Honor,
5	we're here today based on the meaning of the 340B
6	statute. And what the
7	HON. AMBRO: But it sounds like
8	basically, what it sounds like is you're taking a
9	position that's significantly out there on the
10	spectrum, so it's either going to be a homerun or a
11	strikeout. Is that where you really want to be?
12	MR. AGUILAR: I don't think so, Your
13	Honor, because as I tried to say at the outset, I
14	think we are focused here just on the contract
15	pharmacy. That's where all the manufacturers'
16	policies are. That's where our enforcement letter is.
17	That's the question before the Court is whether or not
18	these policies, these particular policies that they've
19	enacted, are violations of the statute.
20	HON. AMBRO: But when you play out your
21	interpretation of the statute, you seem to be digging
22	a hole that says that, practically speaking, taking
23	into account the consequences of our decision, that if
24	we go your way, there's going to be a lot of chaos
25	within the system and possibly tort suits brought, for

1 example, in connection with the question that was 2 asked you by Judge Bibas and me. 3 MR. AGUILAR: I think, Your Honor, what the administrative record here demonstrates is the 4 5 chaos that has already occurred because of these particular policies. If you look at pages JA900 6 7 through 901 --HON. AMBRO: And I come back to there's 8 9 an easy answer to that as I said before. Just say 10 that there's either in-house and/or one contract 11 pharmacy and that's it. 12 MR. AGUILAR: I think their view of the statute is broader than that. As I've heard, I think, 13 14 from all three Plaintiffs' counsel today, their 15 reliance on that word "offer" and focus on it doesn't 16 with a delivery obligation. And so, I think the 17 result of their position, similar to that of Eli 18 Lilly, is that we don't have any obligation to deliver to you. We can make you come and pick it up from our 19 20 corporate headquarters. 21 HON. BIBAS: We could disagree with 22 that. We could say that what's commercially reasonable practice in the field of Pharma is to 23 24 deliver by an ordinary commercial method that 25 preserves the integrity of the drugs. But that's just

1	we're arguing about a borderline case about what
2	the word "offer" means in this context. We don't then
3	have to go to your position.
4	MR. AGUILAR: But I think, Your Honor,
5	the beginning of your question there, I think,
6	demonstrates why Congress knew what the commercially
7	appropriate practice was at the time it enacted the
8	340B program. It knew that many of these covered
9	entities
10	HON. BIBAS: Except this runs the other
11	way. If the contract pharmacies didn't exist until
12	this program, how can you impute a requirement that
13	there be contract pharmacies when it's this program's
14	enactment that gives rise to the contract pharmacy
15	phenomenon.
16	MR. AGUILAR: So let me explain that.
17	The contract pharmacy is solely to ensure that the
18	covered entity retains title of this so that it will
19	qualify for a discount when it's dispensed to a
20	patient through an outside pharmacy. Prior to the
21	340B program, many of these covered entities used
22	outside pharmacies. But there wasn't the same type.
23	You needed to retain title. That's why they had a
24	contractual relationship to both as a result of the
25	program to comply with its statutes. But they were

1 still using outside pharmacies.

2 So if we interpret the HON. KRAUSE: 3 statute against the backdrop of what was going on before 1992, what do you say to the history that we've 4 5 heard from your colleagues on the other side of the aisle that at that point, this was restoration of what 6 7 had been the status quo in terms of the Medicaid floor 8 that was set? And that there was provision of 9 discounts to the covered entities but there was 10 nothing about providing discounts to the outside 11 pharmacies at that point. If that's the case, and 12 we're looking at the statute as, in effect, restoring 13 that status quo, why should we take it as this vast 14 expansion to provide discounts to all of the contract 15 pharmacies?

MR. AGUILAR: So again, I don't think 16 17 it's providing any discounts to the contract 18 pharmacies. Right? The contract pharmacies are not 19 the one that get the discount. The covered entity is. 20 Now in their contractual relationship, the contract 21 pharmacy is doing a useful thing. They are dispensing 22 the drugs in the way that they can to patients who 23 need it.

HON. KRAUSE: I understand thedifferent ways to frame that. But I'd ask you to

1	focus on what was going on before '92. And if we're
2	looking at Congress' enactment as understanding that
3	as the backdrop and there weren't at that point
4	discounted pharmaceuticals going to the outside
5	pharmacies, why should we think that they intended a
б	different model with the statute here?
7	MR. AGUILAR: Because at the time that
8	the 340B statute was enacted, Congress considered a
9	different bill that would have restricted the 340B
10	drugs and their savings to ones that were dispensed on
11	site. And Congress chose not to enact that
12	limitation. Instead, it just said these are for the
13	covered entities knowing
14	HON. BIBAS: (Indiscernible) to rely on
15	unenacted bills. The inference could be that they
16	thought it was already in there or that they
17	consciously rejected it. But we avoid, and the
18	Supreme Court generally avoids, resting on unenacted
19	legislation.
20	MR. AGUILAR: I think that's true for
21	legislative attempts that were made that postdate the
22	actual statute. But where you have Congress actually
23	considering between a menu of options and selecting
24	one that does not have a restriction that appears in
25	another, I think that is shedding some light here.

1	And more to the point, the statute, I
2	think as everyone says, doesn't express
3	HON. AMBRO: Maybe. But so little
4	light we don't really know. I mean, they you know,
5	a committee may be considering option A, option B,
6	option C and ultimately goes and somebody drafts up
7	a a staff person drafts up option A but they go
8	with option B. It doesn't necessarily mean that they
9	have made a firm decision on how they want to approach
10	option A. They just think option B happens to be
11	better in that circumstance. We just don't know.
12	MR. AGUILAR: What we do know is that
13	Congress chose not to expressly address contract
14	pharmacies at the initial out point even though many
15	of these covered entities relied on outside
16	pharmacies. And then as the program evolved over the
17	course of the '90s and the 2000s, which Congress was
18	well aware of as well because it was a major federal
19	program, right, it then chose, in 2010, to further
20	make amendments to the statute and impose no
21	additional restrictions on the use of outside
22	pharmacies or contract pharmacies. Or instead, what
23	it did was further strengthen the particular
24	reticulated enforcement scheme where it says you can
25	bring these complaints in formally to HHS or you can

1 even use this administrative dispute resolution system 2 which we have enacted. And if there is demonstrated 3 to be a violation either on the part of the covered entities or the manufacturers, there is a remedy at 4 5 the backend. Since you brought up ADR 6 HON. BIBAS: 7 scheme -- I mean, my colleagues may want to stay on this longer, but I do want you at some point to 8 9 address how we should understand the withdrawal with 10 the effect of the notice of proposed rulemaking and 11 So, you know, get there at some the comments. 12 point.112826 Yeah. We can do that now 13 HON. AMBRO: or you can do it later, whatever you'd like. 14 15 MR. AGUILAR: I'm happy to --16 HON. AMBRO: We're going to hit it 17 before you leave. 18 MR. AGUILAR: Sure. Let's go to it 19 So I think there was a pause on a number of now. 20 different regulatory initiatives across the government 21 of the change of administration. And we cited a Tenth 22 Circuit case where there was a similar pause based on 23 this memoranda. The agency reconsidered it over a 24 number of months and then eventually withdrew the rule 25 as published in the Federal Register. And then there

1	was a challenge to that withdrawal which the Tenth
2	Circuit ended up denying on the merits.
3	Here, there was a notice that we paused
4	on this. We're not going to go further on it right
5	now. There was no further notice on the Federal
6	Register or anything else. And then the agency said,
7	right, we're promulgating the final rule after this.
8	I think what Plaintiffs' theory rests
9	on is both a passage of time and the fact that in the
10	unified agenda, which is not binding on the agency,
11	right? It's prospective looking forward giving
12	advice
13	HON. AMBRO: Yeah. It's looking
14	forward 12 months. But you removed it from the
15	unified agenda. It was listed as "withdrawn" and
16	"completed action". An HRSA official said the agency
17	was not wasn't going to act. And the final rule
18	had a different RIN on the 2016 proposal.
19	MR. AGUILAR: And so I think that
20	that's their argument there is relying on
21	particular indicia that are unique to the Office of
22	Management and Budgets Control System and OIRA. But
23	what the district court noted and what's also
24	perfectly clear is that the APA sets forth the maximum
25	requirements that the agency has to comply with. I

1 think their best case for their argument is the D.C. 2 Circuit's decision in Mobile Oil where it dealt with a 3 particular rule that had been vacated by the D.C. 4 Circuit that was then repromulgated by the agency 5 without any notice and comment. And what the D.C. Circuit said was, no, we vacated that rule. 6 It's 7 gone. You need to start over again from the very 8 beginning of 5 U.S.C 553 and go through notice and 9 comments. 10 HON. AMBRO: But what is the average 11 person supposed to do when somebody says that it's not 12 It's withdrawn. in the unified agenda? It's out of 13 here. We're not going to rely on it. And when we do some type of proposal, we have a different --14 15 completely different number that relates to it. What 16 is that person supposed to do? 17 MR. AGUILAR: I think they would need 18 to ask the agency on like is this going to happen 19 because, indeed, when Congress amended the statute, it 20 directed you that you need to pass a rulemaking here. 21 So what's going on and what the agency eventually did 22 \_ \_ HON. AMBRO: But that was in 2010. 23 Ι 24 mean, nothing's happened yet, has it? 25 MR. AGUILAR: The final rule was

Page 91 1 published in 2020. And that's why they've challenged 2 it as a final agency action that didn't comply with 3 notice and comment. And I'd also note that the agency right now is in the process of issuing another notice 4 5 of proposed rulemaking to further refine the ADR 6 process. 7 HON. AMBRO: But the rule in 2020 is 8 based on a statutory interpretation, correct? 9 MR. AGUILAR: The final rule in 2020 is 10 setting forth the ADR process. 11 HON. AMBRO: Oh, okay. 12 MR. AGUILAR: Yes. And so that's --13 it's saying that this is how we have hearings and 14 evidence and come to a decision and issue the ADR 15 panel's decision. And then you can challenge that in 16 court. And it's just laying the regulatory mechanisms 17 for having that happen. And in their opening brief, Sanofi says a lot of things that we don't think this 18 19 complies with notice and comment. I think that's 20 based on, again, the unified agenda theory and the 21 passage of time which I know that we've discussed --22 HON. AMBRO: But because there's so 23 little case law here, to rule in your favor here seems 24 to me the consequence is we're going to set a 25 precedent that undermines the notice requirement.

1 MR. AGUILAR: I disagree, Your Honor. 2 I don't think that this particular fact pattern is 3 going to happen very often. But what I do worry about is a rule that particular statements made outside of 4 5 the federal register in the unified agenda, which I don't know who's necessarily issuing them or making 6 7 them, bind the agency and result in final agency action that can be challenged in court even if the 8 9 agency, as here, was further contemplating possible 10 modifications to the rule, responding to comments and 11 then indeed did issue a final rule that responded to 12 all of the comments that it had received during the 13 notice of proposed rulemaking. I don't think that that's -- I don't see anything in the text of the APA 14 15 that says that the agency violated any of this. Ιt 16 responded to the comments. And as I was saying, I 17 think it's notable that in Sanofi's opening brief, 18 they don't identify any particular substance. And indeed, they haven't challenged any other substance of 19 20 the rule that they say they were prejudiced by this. 21 HON. KRAUSE: Is there some period of 22 time where it's presumptively withdrawn? We've had 23 four years here of an action. 24 MR. AGUILAR: So as we noted, sometimes 25 agencies do take time with particularly -- with

1 particular rules. We noted some instances in our 2 brief. But the mere passage of time, I don't think by 3 itself stands for a proposition. I do know of cases where after --4 5 HON. AMBRO: But there's a plus factor It's withdrawn. It's completed action. 6 here. 7 MR. AGUILAR: And with --HON. AMBRO: We ain't coming back, as 8 someone says, in effect. 9 MR. AGUILAR: So I think if that 10 11 happens in the Federal Register, which is how the 12 government usually operates in this area, I would take 13 that at face value. But again, I don't know who's operating the particular buttons or whatever they are 14 15 on unified agendas that exist on the internet. But 16 what I do know is that there are cases where if the 17 agency hasn't acted in a period of time, we do get petitioners who seek review and the courts of appeal 18 19 saying we want to compel unlawfully withheld agency 20 action. We want the agency to go ahead and issue this 21 rule. And usually, what the D.C. Circuit has said is 22 in that time, usually we don't think of that as 23 necessarily ripe for review if there is indicia that 24 the agency is considering on. But those could be 25 challenges. But they don't think the mere passage of

Page 94 1 time by itself stands for it. And I don't know of any 2 precedent standing for the proposition that comments 3 and unified agenda are binding on the agency or the secretary of HHS who can promulgate the rule. 4 5 HON. AMBRO: But as I just said, one could make an argument that there -- a good or 6 7 plausible argument it's not just passage of time but the passage of time plus, plus, plus, plus. 8 9 MR. AGUILAR: I think the only other 10 plus that they have identified is the unified agenda. 11 I don't think that we --12 HON. AMBRO: No. They've said that 13 people -- statements have been made that it's 14 withdrawn. MR. AGUILAR: I -- and if I'm 15 16 remembering correctly --17 HON. AMBRO: And when you put it out in 2020, there is a different RIN. 18 19 I don't know of any MR. AGUILAR: 20 precedent saying that different RINs result in 21 different substantive rules, that issuing an RIN means 22 that we're not responding to the comments that we received before. And as I said, again, I don't see 23 24 that they've actually been prejudiced by this. Their 25 opening brief doesn't identify anything that they

1 think ought to have changed other than the number of 2 contract pharmacies which the agency had been aware 3 of. HON. AMBRO: Again, my point is, it may 4 5 not be necessarily this case. There may not be a whole lot of surprise. But the question is how is 6 7 this case going to be interpreted for the next case. MR. AGUILAR: So I think what you can 8 9 say is that there is no precedent setting forth that this results in a withdrawal of a rule and whereas 10 11 Plaintiff -- the only plaintiff in the case who's 12 challenging the notice and comment requirements has 13 not demonstrated any prejudice which the Administrative Procedure Act says the Court needs to 14 15 take into account of --16 HON. AMBRO: Well, clearly, there's no 17 precedent. MR. AGUILAR: -- that there is not 18 reversible error. 19 HON. AMBRO: But after we decide it, 20 21 that will be a precedent. 22 MR. AGUILAR: Yes, Your Honor. And 23 we're asking you to decide it in that way because we 24 think that that's the correct way to adjudicate that 25 case.

HON. AMBRO: And I'm saying to you what are the consequences and you're saying, don't worry, it won't appear again.

MR. AGUILAR: No. I don't think that 4 5 this fact pattern usually happens. Usually, either the agency is going to be able to respond faster after 6 7 a regulatory pause or it's going to officially withdraw the rule as it did in the Tenth Circuit case 8 9 which we cited. And I think there, when the rule has 10 been withdrawn, then you actually get a legal 11 challenge to it as the Tenth Circuit adjudicated. And 12 I think that that's the usual course that the 13 government operates in. We want to be able to take 14 definitive action when we have decided to withdraw a 15 rule. But where we haven't taken that step, it 16 usually means it's still under consideration at the 17 agency as was the case here. HON. AMBRO: All right. Any further 18 19 questions? 20 HON. KRAUSE: I'd like to just go back 21 for a second and make sure we understand your position

23 MR. AGUILAR: So as I understand the 24 status quo before '92 was that there were some 25 programs by which there were discounted prices given

on what the status quo was before '92.

22

Page 97 1 out to drugs -- for drugs sold to covered entities and 2 that the covered entities many times -- or I think in 3 an overwhelming majority of them, did not have inhouse pharmacies and had to rely on --4 5 HON. AMBRO: Well, 95 percent of them didn't. 6 7 MR. AGUILAR: I'm sorry, Your Honor? HON. AMBRO: Ninety-five percent of 8 9 them did not. 10 MR. AGUILAR: Yes, Your Honor. 500 out 11 of 11,500. And so, there, they needed outside 12 pharmacies to be able to dispense those drugs. And that was the real world circumstance that Congress was 13 14 mapping on to. It was taking --15 HON. KRAUSE: And were manufacturers 16 providing those same discounts to the outside 17 pharmacies at that time? MR. AGUILAR: I don't know the factual 18 19 answer to that, Your Honor. But I think that --20 again, the discount here really is going to the 21 covered entity. You can see that in the affidavits that were received where the covered entities are 22 23 saying -- I think it's at page 1179 of the Sanofi 24 joint appendix. Federal grants only make up about 28 25 percent of our revenue. We rely on the 340B savings

1 to make up 41 percent of our operating expenses. And 2 if we can't get those discounts because we rely on 3 outside pharmacies and we rely on multiple ones of them to get to our patients, we're going to lose 4 5 operating revenue. And that's why in the administrative record, time and again, and many of the 6 7 affidavits that are cited by the Community Health Clinics' brief, people are explaining that we might 8 9 need to cut services. We might need to not be able to 10 cover our patients' copays. We might not be able to 11 pass on all the discount that we are currently doing, 12 et cetera. This is going to cause real world harm. 13 And that's why the administrative record, too, just within a couple of months of these 14 15 policies being enacted, the 340B sales dropped 16 precipitously by about 60 to 90 percent for each of 17 the plaintiffs here and that the number of savings lost in just a couple of months was somewhere between 18 19 \$46 million and \$100 million which HHS projected to be 20 about \$3 billion over the course of a year. And those 21 are savings that largely are going to the covered 22 entities and their patients to provide these services. HON. BIBAS: But how do we know that? 23 24 I mean, we hear from the other side that a lot of this 25 is being pocketed by CVS and Walgreens and Rite-Aid

1	and Walmart. So how do we know that, in fact, this is
2	all going the way you say it's supposed to go?
3	MR. AGUILAR: Sure. So I think the
4	2018 GAO report and the state's amicus brief is
5	particular enlightening on this. The 2018 GAO report,
б	at page 51 to 54, lays out a lot of the administrative
7	fees that the contract pharmacies charge for this
8	which created six dollars I note in one case it's
9	particularly large for a brand name Hepatitis C drug.
10	For the generic version of that drug, it's zero
11	dollars. And a lot of times it'll even be no charge
12	if the patient's uninsured.
13	And then, again, you can look at the
14	GAO report where it's talking about this. It
15	identifies problems potentially with covered entities
16	being able to truly monitor everything and HHS needs
17	to take additional action on that. But there is no
18	speculation here that the covered entities are being
19	coerced to pay an inordinate amount to the contract
20	pharmacies or the third party administrators. It's
21	explained that this is a system that works for that
22	point. And then you have all of the affidavits and
23	declarations in the administrative record to
24	demonstrate we are using this money to either pass it
25	on directly to our patients or to provide additional

services to more people, like OB-GYN or dental
 services or vaccine drives or mobile clinics or
 translation services.

And so, for these -- and they further 4 5 note -- the outside pharmacies are a real world necessity. A lot of times their populations are 6 7 either rural and can't get to the clinic. They work 9 to 5 jobs when any on site pharmacy might be open. 8 Or 9 the people they're serving are homeless and don't necessarily have said addresses or clear ways that 10 11 they can get back to the clinic if they need to. But 12 going to a contract pharmacy certainly helps.

And those are real world circumstances that Congress was aware of both when it enacted the statute and when it amended it. And there's nothing to say that it sought to disrupt the way that that was working.

18 HON. KRAUSE: But if Congress had anticipated that there would be this level of 19 20 involvement of outside pharmacies, wouldn't you expect 21 to see something in the statute that also regulated 22 their ability to charge the fees that they do? So if that's a measure 23 MR. AGUILAR: 24 for concern, that's a measure for concern that 25 Congress probably should act on saying we want to add

additional authority here in the statute for
 controlling what we think are reasonable fees either
 for contract pharmacies or third party administrators
 or something. That is something that Congress could
 address.

6 HON. KRAUSE: Hasn't Congress done that 7 elsewhere?

MR. AGUILAR: I'm not certain about 8 9 that, Your Honor, potentially. But I think that is 10 something where that's really in Congress' wheelhouse. 11 If you want to add further regulation on here to 12 further refine the program and direct it in the way 13 you want, you certainly can. But there's nothing to 14 say that that rule which Congress can weigh the 15 competing interest of the covered entities and the 16 patients and the manufacturers and everybody else 17 involved, that those kind of decisions should instead 18 be being made by private drug companies who then 19 determine whether or not they'll sell this to the 20 covered entities.

And I note that they say that they're going to sell an unlimited amount to them. But it's notable that the statute also doesn't talk about quantity. It doesn't say that, you know, at 100 or 1000 pills a month is sufficient. But what HHS has

1	said since the '93-'94 guidance is, obviously, just
2	reading the statute on its face, you can't say that a
3	covered entity needs to make a minimum quantity
4	purchase in order to be eligible for the statutory
5	discount. There's nothing in the statute that
6	expressly prohibits it. But it's understood from the
7	unqualified obligation in section (a) and the
8	reticulated scheme as a whole that that's how the
9	statute does operate. And it doesn't leave room for
10	the manufacturers to impose those unilateral
11	conditions.
12	HON. AMBRO: Any further questions?
13	Thank you very much.
14	MR. AGUILAR: Thank you, Your Honors.
15	HON. AMBRO: Mr. Francisco?
16	MR. FRANCISCO: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	Just a few quick points.
18	On my friend's very last point, the
19	statute does actually answer the minimum requirement.
20	It's just not in the "offer" language. It's in the
21	very last phrase of the provision that says that we
22	have to offer each covered entity the drug at the
23	ceiling price if such drug is made available to any
24	other purchaser at any price. If we sell 500 pills to
25	somebody else at any other price, we got to sell 500

pills to covered entities, too. So I'll put that to the side.

3 My first major point, Judge Ambro, is on your line of questioning about specialty 4 5 pharmaceuticals, I would direct you to the amicus brief filed by Otsuka America in connection with the 6 7 AstraZeneca case. I think they did a very nice job of explaining how it is essential for the safety of their 8 drugs to go to specialty pharmacists who know how to 9 10 handle them and advise patients. They also explain 11 how they received a letter from the government asking 12 them to justify how that complies with 340B. I think 13 we've just heard the answer from the government, that it doesn't comply with 340B. And that's fairly 14 absurd, and it's not a word I use lightly. 15

16 Point number 2. And again, Judge 17 Ambro, we understand that there are a lot of covered entities that don't have in-house pharmacies. And 18 19 that's why every one of our programs solves that 20 problem by allowing them to use a contract pharmacy 21 that serves as a stand-in for an in-house pharmacy. 22 So if you're not set up to do it yourself, you get at least one to stand in for your in-house pharmacy. And 23 24 for Sanofi, at least, you get a lot more than that. 25 You get an unlimited number of contract pharmacies if

Case: 22-1676 Document: 69 Page: 104 Date Filed: 11/29/2022

1	you provide us with this minimal amount of claims
2	data. So I think that there's no world in which that
3	is not an offer within the meaning of the statute.
4	Third point, having to do with the
5	notice and comment
6	HON. AMBRO: One question on the second
7	point.
8	MR. FRANCISCO: Yes.
9	HON. AMBRO: To what extent I mean,
10	there are audit requirements, et cetera. To what
11	extent do the manufacturers or, in this case, Sanofi,
12	do you think you need to go beyond that in order to
13	find out if there's been duplication or some type of
14	diversion? What makes you think that has to be done
15	by the manufacturers as a condition at times?
16	MR. FRANCISCO: I'm not a hundred
17	percent sure I'm following.
18	HON. AMBRO: In other words, there
19	are when you have this program, there are some that
20	may wish to take advantage of the program in a way
21	that both the government and the manufacturer thinks,
22	nope, that's not (indiscernible). And the government
23	does have certain audit requirements that the GAO
24	does. Why do the manufacturers think they need to do
25	more than that?

For a few reasons, 1 MR. FRANCISCO: Oh. 2 Your Honor. So one is that we also have the ability 3 to do an audit and to trigger the ADR process. But under the regulations that HHS has put out under the 4 5 guidance documents that they've put out, we're not even allowed to trigger that audit process unless we 6 7 have evidence that there's a problem going on. This is at 61 Federal Register 65,410. And what it says is 8 9 that in order to initiate an audit, first we have to 10 submit a work plan that "sets forth a clear 11 description of why we have reasonable cause to believe 12 that a violation has occurred along with sufficient 13 facts and evidence." And then in addition, it says, we have to submit "copies of any documents supporting 14 15 our claim". So we can't even trigger that process 16 unless we have evidence of wrongdoing. That's one of 17 the purposes of Sanofi's collection of the claims data 18 is to decide whether or not to trigger the audit 19 process. 20 But the other thing I'd emphasize is --21 and this is in response to my friend's suggestion that 22 Astra somehow has anything to do with this case when 23 it doesn't. Sanofi's program is not an enforcement policy. If you provide us -- if they -- if the 24 25 covered entity provides us with the claims data, they

1	can purchase an unlimited amount of drugs and we'll
2	send it to an unlimited number of contract pharmacies
3	even if that data shows rampant diversion and rampant
4	duplicate of discounts. It's not a mechanism for
5	enforcing the statute. It's simply a mechanism for
6	identifying whether there's a problem in the first
7	place so we can prevent it from happening.
8	HON. BIBAS: I did want to ask you to
9	get to the notice of proposed rulemaking.
10	MR. FRANCISCO: Yes.
11	HON. BIBAS: You can finish your other
12	substantive point but make sure to get there.
13	MR. FRANCISCO: I'm going that's
14	exactly where I was going, Your Honor.
15	HON. BIBAS: Okay. So why shouldn't we
16	have a formal bright line rule that says, look, if
17	there's a withdrawal of the Federal Register, it's off
18	the table; otherwise it's on. It seems like a clear
19	neat rule. Instead, we're supposed to be like gauging
20	other statements that people make or things on the
21	website. How are we to know how withdrawn is
22	withdrawn enough?
23	MR. FRANCISCO: I think that you're
24	exactly right. And the only way to know or at least
25	the easiest way to know if something is withdrawn is

Page 107 1 if the agency tells you it was withdrawn. 2 Now my friend suggested that there's no 3 prejudice. Well, of course there's prejudice. We were deprived of our ability to comment on the rule. 4 5 The very substantive thing that the APA give us, the most important substantive thing, is the ability to 6 7 comment on a new rule. And we were completely deprived of the ability to comment on this new rule. 8 9 So that's the prejudice. 10 I --11 HON. KRAUSE: What additional comments 12 would you have made beyond those that were submitted? 13 MR. FRANCISCO: Sure, Your Honor. Well, the first thing I'll say is that, you know, I 14 15 don't know the full range of them because we were 16 never given the opportunity. 17 But the second point I'd make is that 18 our trade association, Pharma, actually did, in November 2020, before the new final rule was issued, 19 20 submit a notice of -- a petition for a new rule in 21 which it explained at length why it didn't think --22 why there were changes that occurred between 2016 and 2020 that needed to be taken into account. 23 24 Just to give you a couple of examples, 25 one was didn't think that the old proposed withdrawn

1 rule sufficiently took into account the growth of the 2 use of the use of contract pharmacies in that four-3 year period.

Secondly -- and this goes to one of 4 5 your other lines of questions, Judge Bibas, as to, you know, how you have a patient 300 miles away from the 6 7 covered entities. Because of the regulatory definition of the word "patient". A patient of a 8 9 covered entity only has to be very quite loosely 10 affiliated with the covered entity. And that's why 11 you could have somebody that's a patient 300 miles 12 away that really isn't in any meaningful way being 13 served by the covered entity. So we also -- the Pharma comments also said that you ought to address 14 15 the problematic definition of the word "patient". So 16 I think that there's clear prejudice there.

17 My final point just goes to what the overall purpose of 340B is, wholly apart from the 18 text. And, look, I would agree that one purpose of 19 20 the statute is to provide a subsidy to covered 21 entities of some level in the form of discounted 22 drugs. But as the Supreme Court has repeatedly made 23 clear, no statute pursues a single purpose to the 24 objective of all others. And there's no way that you 25 can get out of this language an attempt to address a

1	very important social question as to how you address
2	health care for poor uninsured in the rural areas.
3	There's no way you can say that the word "offer" was
4	meant to resolve that very important social question.
5	Rather, the offer simply requires one thing about
6	clients and that is to make an offer of the drugs at
7	the ceiling price. Every single one of them does
8	that.
9	HON. AMBRO: Thank you very much.
10	MR. FRANCISCO: Thank you, Your Honor.
11	HON. AMBRO: Mr. Parrish?
12	MR. PARRISH: Thank you, Your Honors.
13	I'd like to just make three points.
14	One, I do want to underscore the 1996
15	guidance point, Judge Bibas. If they're right about
16	that, the government extinguished a right that they
17	say that the covered entities always had which was to
18	demand delivery to unlimited contract pharmacies.
19	That just doesn't make any sense that for 14 years no
20	one noticed that.
21	Judge Krause, related to that, I won't
22	go into detail but your questions are in the right
23	direction of 1992. It's been a world change since
24	then. But even today, you should know that the
25	majority of covered entities don't use contract

1	pharmacies. This is abuse by a very small group. So
2	a third of covered entities have contract pharmacies.
3	Of that third, 75 percent only have five or less
4	contract pharmacies. So what we're talking about is a
5	few covered entities that are causing all the problems
б	in this program. And you can take a look at JA585 and
7	JA534. One's the GAO report and one's a private
8	report.
9	My two other points this is clearly
10	arbitrary and capricious. My opposing counsel keeps
11	referring to the administrative record. I'm sorry.
12	He doesn't get to do that. He only can rely on what
13	statements are made in the May letter. And if he
14	wants to say it's not moot, the advisory opinion, he
15	hasn't done that. So at a minimum, it's unreasoned
16	and it's unexplained. It hasn't responded to
17	objections.
18	But, Your Honors, we urge you to get to
19	the statutory question because all of the arbitrary
20	and capricious errors here stem from that
21	misunderstanding of the statute. Judge Bibas, he was
22	unable to identify any statutory language that
23	actually supports his position. And remember, his
24	position is that it's unambiguously clear that he's

right not that it's ambiguous. That causes a lot of

25

Page 111 1 problems because we're not in Chevron land. This is 2 not a case where they're engaged in rulemaking. So 3 you don't look at legislative history. You don't look 4 at purposes. You just look at the text. 5 He keeps saying it's an unqualified I guess the idea is that everything is 6 obligation. 7 prohibited unless it's permitted. That's not right. We know that's not right. Christensen is so clear on 8 9 that. He has no answer to the Supreme Court case. 10 And then I would just say this, is that 11 all the issue before the Court is, is the May 17th --12 HON. AMBRO: So what you're doing is 13 you're flipping it around. 14 MR. PARRISH: I'm --15 HON. AMBRO: If there's silence, 16 everything's permitted. 17 MR. PARRISH: I'm sorry, Your Honor? 18 HON. AMBRO: Isn't what you're saying the inverse of that? 19 20 MR. PARRISH: What I'm saying is, is 21 that your common law rights over your own property 22 exist until Congress takes it away and that it takes 23 it away to the extent that it does which is, here, 24 there's an offer. There is no idea which he's trying 25 to suggest that because it's an offer that we then say

anything else that you might do is prohibited. It's not true. You have to read into the offer. Is there an obligation to deliver to third parties at third party locations? That doesn't exist. And therefore, the private right baseline remains. It hasn't been taken away.

7 And then I would just say that in terms of answering Your Honors' key questions, what does 8 9 this Court need to do, all the Court needs to do is 10 say that the May 17th letter has interpreted the offer 11 requirement and the purchased-by language in the 12 statute to impose an obligation on manufacturers that 13 they must deliver to contract pharmacies wherever 14 covered entities want. That is wrong as a matter of 15 law. And you should strike that down and vacate the 16 And we also think you should do the same for letter. 17 the advisory opinion but I won't get into mootness. But that's all the Court needs to do in order to set 18 19 this program back on the pace where Congress wanted 20 it. 21 Thank you for your time. Okav. 22 HON. AMBRO: Thank you very much. 23 Mr. Kedem? 24 Thank you, Your Honor. MR. KEDEM: Α 25 few quick points.

1	Judge Krause, you had asked me where in
2	the record you could see the fact that most patients
3	are paying full price when they use contract
4	pharmacies. I point you to footnote 8 of our brief.
5	One of the sources cited there is in the
6	administrative record. It's an agency report. The
7	other is from the Government Accountability Office.
8	And you'll see that they validate the representation.
9	My friend from the government makes a
10	different representation that there's been up to a 90
11	percent decrease in 340B sales as a result of these
12	policies. That is just deeply misleading, at best.
13	The data which the government has never shown us
14	actually comes from a company called Apexus whose
15	parent, Vizient, profits directly from contract
16	pharmacy sales. They cherrypick four months
17	immediately after AstraZeneca's policy went into
18	effect by which time a number of covered entities
19	hadn't designated a contract pharmacy even though they
20	were eligible to do so. It doesn't take account of
21	the fact that 340B sales are seasonal. The bottom
22	line is I can represent to you that 340B sales for
23	AstraZeneca are now higher than they were before this
24	policy was implemented.
25	Judge Krause, you've been very focused

1 on what this policy was originally for. There were a 2 small minority of covered entities who were providing 3 drugs for free or at a discount to their uninsured or indigent patients. Those were the covered entities 4 5 that Congress was concerned about and wanted to make sure that they didn't have to go to the market and be 6 7 out of pocket a lot of money. You asked exactly the right question when my friend pointed out that 95 8 9 percent of those covered entities didn't have their 10 own in-house pharmacy. You asked, well, when people 11 went to the neighborhood CVS, were the 340B -- were 12 discounts being provided there. To my knowledge, the 13 answer was no. They were outside of Congress' concern. Yes, it was a small minority relatively 14 15 speaking who -- but those were the exact minority that 16 Congress was concerned about.

17 My friend brought up a number of times the questions of diversion or agency action. We don't 18 19 have the contracts between the covered entities and 20 the contract pharmacies. They're not in the record. 21 They're not public. But every once in a while, some 22 of them do become public. Usually because the covered 23 entity is a governmental entity that has to post these 24 sorts of things. And what we see, and this is cited 25 in briefs that AstraZeneca filed in the district

1 court, is that they actually don't maintain title and 2 it's not an agency relationship. It's a contractual 3 relationship which is exactly as you would expect. And it's validated by evidence that the government 4 5 itself submitted in the Sanofi case which we cite on page 13 of our appellate brief. What you see is 6 7 there's a declaration from Rear Admiral Pedley, who is the Office of Pharmacy Affairs director, and what she 8 9 says is that the drugs are taken and assimilated into 10 the contract pharmacies' own stock and treated just 11 like its own property. And so title is taken by the 12 contract pharmacy itself.

13 My friend liked to talk a lot about how this is a reticulated scheme. But this is just a form 14 15 -- and that there's no room for manufacturers to restrict their offers or restrict their sales. But 16 17 again, this is just a form of verbal Jiu Jitsu. He is 18 assuming his own conclusion or what some people refer to as begging the question. The question is, is there 19 20 an obligation there in the first place. If there's no 21 such obligation, then yes. It would be improper 22 self-help. But if there's no such obligation then all it is, is manufacturers structuring their affairs as 23 24 they have a right to do.

25

And the most remarkable thing about

1	this case is after four briefs and 60 minutes of
2	argument, the government has yet to tell the Court
3	what an offer is and what it thinks that offer the
4	word "offer" means. Instead, we hear about unenacted
5	legislative history. Judge Stark had a great answer
6	to this. In footnote 9 of his second summary judgment
7	opinion, you can look at it there. But the point is,
8	unenacted legislative history essentially tells us
9	nothing.
10	Finally, there have been a lot of
11	difficult hypotheticals in this case to both sides.
12	And as much as we litigants fear them, they are an
13	appropriate way to sort of suss out the limits of a
14	litigant's position. But all of the hypotheticals on
15	our side are just hypotheticals. No manufacturer has
16	ever restricted 340B sales to covered entities in a
17	way that they don't at least provide to the
18	marketplace generally. In fact, they all go well
19	beyond the offer that's made to anyone else in the
20	marketplace.
21	But the difficult hypotheticals on the
22	government's side aren't hypotheticals at all. They
23	are this case. Although most covered entities don't
24	use contract pharmacies, there is a very small
25	minority that are using hundreds of them scattered

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Page 117 around the country which is why, as, Judge Bibas, you pointed out sometimes the distance that you have to travel to get to one of those contract pharmacies is as much as or more than 300 miles. The basic point here is the only thing that you have to decide, was the May 17th violation letter correct when it said that our policies were in direct violation of some requirement contained in the statute. Because there is no such requirement, those letters were incorrect and should be set aside. Thank you. HON. AMBRO: Thank you very much. Thank you to all counsel for very well presented briefs and also well presented arguments. We'll take the matter under advisement and --MR. AGUILAR: Your Honor, could I correct a misstatement that I made? HON. AMBRO: Sure. You sure can. I'm sorry. This was --MR. AGUILAR: This was a misstatement that I I'm sorry, Your Honor. made in my argument. And I realize I didn't understand the question until Mr. Francisco raised it back and then I understood. If there's a generally applicable requirement for all manufacturers on how to distribute

Page 118 a particular drug that's not unique to the 340B 1 2 program, the 340B program doesn't grab it in. And I misstated our position that that would be a violation. 3 If it's generally applicable then that's not. 4 5 HON. AMBRO: Okay. Thank you very 6 much. 7 MR. AGUILAR: I'm sorry, Your Honor. HON. AMBRO: Thank you very much for 8 9 that clarification. 10 Again, thank you to all counsel and 11 appreciate you being here today. We'll take --12 (Proceedings end mid-sentence) 13 (End of oral argument) 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

		Page 119
1	INDEX	
2		
3	ARGUMENT	
4		
5	PARTY	PAGE
б	Mr. Francisco (for Appellant Sanofi)	5
7	Mr. Parrish (for Appellant Novo Nordisk)	24
8	Mr. Kedem (for Appellant AstraZeneca)	46
9	Mr. Aguilar (for Appellee)	59
10	Mr. Francisco (rebuttal)	102
11	Mr. Parrish (rebuttal)	109
12	Mr. Kedem (rebuttal)	112
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

Page 120 CERTIFICATION I, Lisa Beck, certify that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of the proceedings. б Lisa Beck Date: November 20, 2022 

) Page: 121

[& - 777-6690]

	1001		
&	<b>1994</b> 52:15	<b>21-3380</b> 2:8	98:15 103:12,14
<b>&amp;</b> 3:7,11	<b>1996</b> 31:7 73:3	<b>22-1676</b> 2:2 4:4	108:18 113:11
0	73:19 74:9,17,18	<b>24</b> 79:15 119:7	113:21,22
	109:14	<b>25</b> 11:18	114:11 116:16
<b>00634</b> 2:17	2	<b>25110</b> 75:12	118:1,2
1	<b>2</b> 51:7 103:16	<b>28</b> 97:24	<b>38</b> 38:2 39:19
<b>1</b> 51:6 62:9,11	<b>20</b> 13:18 20:10	<b>280</b> 76:15	<b>3:21</b> 2:17
69:14 70:7,8	20:18 74:3	3	4
<b>1.4</b> 36:10	120:11	<b>3</b> 51:7 74:3	<b>4</b> 70:22 71:5
<b>10,000</b> 76:7	<b>200</b> 32:5 71:22	98:20	<b>40</b> 35:12
<b>100</b> 32:5 40:16	<b>20001</b> 3:5,12	<b>3.6</b> 37:22 40:3	<b>41</b> 98:1
98:19 101:24	<b>20006</b> 3:9	<b>300</b> 75:22 108:6	<b>46</b> 98:19 119:8
<b>1000</b> 101:25	<b>2000s</b> 87:17	108:11 117:4	5
<b>102</b> 119:10	<b>2001</b> 51:25	<b>30th</b> 53:6	
<b>109</b> 119:11	<b>2007</b> 77:8	<b>31</b> 74:5	<b>5</b> 90:8 100:8
<b>10:00</b> 1:4	<b>2010</b> 38:2 53:1,2	<b>3167</b> 4:3	119:6
<b>11,500</b> 97:11	56:8 79:9 87:19	<b>3168</b> 4:4	<b>50</b> 30:6,7
<b>112</b> 119:12	90:23	<b>32</b> 74:5	<b>500</b> 97:10 102:24
<b>1121</b> 3:12	<b>2016</b> 89:18	<b>3380</b> 4:4	102:25
<b>1179</b> 97:23	107:22	<b>340</b> 5:8 64:10	<b>51</b> 3:4 74:1 99:6
<b>12</b> 89:14	<b>2018</b> 64:21 71:14	<b>340b</b> 6:14 8:21	<b>54</b> 74:1 99:6
<b>120</b> 80:11	99:4,5	9:16 11:23 12:5	<b>553</b> 90:8
<b>13</b> 115:6	<b>2019</b> 74:1	12:6 13:8 25:9	<b>59</b> 119:9
<b>14</b> 31:10,13	<b>2020</b> 6:20 38:2	45:6,13 46:15,25	6
109:19	53:6 71:15	50:16,24 51:10	<b>60</b> 98:16 116:1
<b>15</b> 1:5 70:22	78:15 79:11	51:18 55:1,2	<b>601</b> 3:11
<b>17</b> 47:16	91:1,7,9 94:18	56:22 58:6	<b>602</b> 51:17
<b>1700</b> 3:8	107:19,23	60:18 61:9	<b>603</b> 51:11,16
<b>17th</b> 46:23 58:23	<b>2022</b> 1:5 120:11	63:10 66:1 67:7	69:17,18
59:1,9 111:11	<b>20530</b> 3:17	67:9,16,25 68:20	<b>61</b> 105:8
112:10 117:6	<b>21-3167</b> 1:3	68:21,22 71:10	<b>65,410</b> 105:8
<b>1800</b> 2:24	21-3167/21-31	71:13,17,18 72:6	7
<b>1801</b> 2:23	2:1	72:8 73:14,22	
<b>19103</b> 2:24	<b>21-3168</b> 1:9	74:24 75:8 80:3	<b>7266</b> 3:16
<b>1990</b> 8:24,25	<b>21-3176</b> 4:3	80:8,12,14 81:6	<b>734</b> 61:8
<b>1992</b> 85:4 109:23	<b>21-3170</b> 4.3 <b>21-3379</b> 1:15 4:4	82:5 84:8,21	75 110:3
<b>1993</b> 65:22		86:8,9 97:25	<b>777-6690</b> 2:25
		00.0,7 71.23	

## [8 - advisory]

0	a <b>b</b> a <b>t</b> a <b>a b</b> a <b>t</b> a <b>c b</b> a <b>t</b> a <b>c c t</b> a <b>c t</b> a <b>c c t</b> a <b>c c c c c c c c c c</b>	a staral 5,17,0,10	a daastastada aa d
8	abstract 18:7	<b>actual</b> 5:17 9:10 12:17 14:2 15:7	administered
<b>8</b> 51:1 113:4	25:24		61:11
<b>888</b> 2:25	<b>absurd</b> 103:15	15:12,24 16:24	administration
9	abuse 110:1	53:8 86:22	88:21
<b>9</b> 38:2 39:19	accept 19:23	add 4:18,20	administrative
100:7 116:6	54:13	48:16 100:25	6:9 24:21 25:19
<b>90</b> 98:16 113:10	accepted 51:22	101:11	26:8 47:5 58:20
	access 56:14	added 4:24	58:25 74:2 76:3
<b>900</b> 3:8	accessibility	addendum 62:9	83:4 88:1 95:14
<b>901</b> 83:7	21:3	addition 5:13	98:6,13 99:6,23
<b>90s</b> 87:17	<b>account</b> 82:23	13:1 20:2 50:13	110:11 113:6
<b>92</b> 86:1 96:22,24	95:15 107:23	71:15 105:13	administrator
<b>93</b> 51:25 74:24	108:1 113:20	additional 12:25	44:1,7 57:16
79:5,22 102:1	accountability	13:7 25:14	administrators
<b>94</b> 51:25 52:12	58:10 64:22	47:24 49:4 50:8	99:20 101:3
74:24 79:5,22	113:7	54:8 73:16 81:1	admiral 115:7
102:1	accounting	87:21 99:17,25	adopt 18:3
<b>95</b> 97:5 114:8	39:15 71:13	101:1 107:11	adopted 12:25
<b>950</b> 3:17	accurate 120:4	additionally	<b>adr</b> 22:20,24
<b>96</b> 6:20 51:25	accusation 46:23	60:17 70:20	88:6 91:5,10,14
52:20 74:20,23	acknowledged	address 26:14	105:3
75:2,6,11 76:22	53:4	29:25 79:19	advantage 40:6
79:7	<b>act</b> 6:10 9:1	87:13 88:9	104:20
<b>97</b> 51:25	12:21 47:12	101:5 108:14,25	adventurously
<b>99</b> 35:17	51:10 69:12	109:1	36:25
<b>99.99</b> 40:16	89:17 95:14	addressed 25:1	<b>advice</b> 89:12
a	100:25	80:3	advise 77:9
<b>a.m.</b> 1:4	acted 93:17	addresses 28:20	103:10
<b>ability</b> 100:22	acting 31:9	100:10	advisement
105:2 107:4,6,8	40:25	addressing	117:15
<b>able</b> 39:9 56:21	action 47:5	33:24 69:3	advising 79:18
64:8 96:6,13	70:17,17 89:16	adequate 6:20	81:17
97:12 98:9,10	91:2 92:8,23	78:4	advisory 6:6
99:16	93:6,20 96:14	adjudicate 95:24	7:10 25:6 34:22
absolutely 6:22	99:17 114:18	adjudicated	47:18 53:7
15:15 24:14	actions 25:21	96:11	78:22 110:14
28:13 33:13	74:19	administer	112:17
20.13 33.13		61:23 80:13	

## [affairs - america]

#### Page 3

affairs 47:9	agendas 93:15	117:19 118:7	18:21 19:9,12
115:8,23	agent 7:12 29:19	119:9	22:19 23:7,13
<b>affect</b> 42:21	31:19 41:1	<b>ahead</b> 17:12	24:1,6,9,14
affidavit 76:8	agents 29:15,20	18:16 19:9,13	26:20 27:1
affidavits 76:4	52:17	27:1 93:20	31:25 32:14,22
97:21 98:7	<b>agree</b> 8:8 14:23	<b>ahh</b> 22:22	33:3,18,23 38:25
99:22	26:24 32:19	aid 98:25	40:2,10,12,24
affiliated 108:10	47:14 59:3 69:6	<b>ain't</b> 82:3 93:8	41:4 42:19,21
affirmative	108:19	<b>aisle</b> 85:6	45:21,24 46:3,8
47:11	agreeing 14:18	<b>al</b> 1:7,13,19 2:6	48:13,25 49:9,13
affirmatively	agreement 62:17	2:13 4:5	49:16,22,25 50:2
46:20	aguilar 3:15	alabama 28:20	53:19 55:15,18
agencies 23:23	48:5 59:18,19,20	algorithm 57:16	59:14,16,22 60:2
92:25	59:24 60:4,6,9	<b>allon</b> 3:10 46:6	60:5,7,24 61:2
<b>agency</b> 13:17	61:1,5 62:3,13	<b>allow</b> 13:12,15	61:24 64:11,19
29:13 30:1,2	62:16,22,24 63:3	20:21 43:7	65:6,15 66:7,10
31:5,8,17,18	63:9,13,18,21	54:17 55:22	66:15,21,23 67:6
47:5,7,12 51:12	64:6,18,20 65:12	77:6 80:19	67:13,21 68:5
51:14 52:11	65:17 66:9,13,16	<b>allowed</b> 6:3,15	79:3 80:24
54:2 56:2,4,7	66:22 67:5,8,17	7:3 13:5,17	81:14,23 82:1,7
58:11,23 60:19	68:2,7,11,22	20:11 55:11	82:20 83:8 87:3
65:14,21 66:2	69:3,7,18 70:8	72:5 76:14	88:13,16 89:13
69:5 78:3,9	70:23 71:6 72:3	105:6	90:10,23 91:7,11
88:23 89:6,10,16	73:1 74:22 75:5	<b>allowing</b> 103:20	91:22 93:5,8
89:25 90:4,18,21	76:2 77:15,23	<b>allows</b> 13:9 38:6	94:5,12,17 95:4
91:2,3 92:7,7,9	79:16 81:10,19	alongside 57:3	95:16,20 96:1,18
92:15 93:17,19	81:24 82:4,12	alternative	97:5,8 102:12,15
93:20,24 94:3	83:3,12 84:4,16	13:13 14:10	103:3,17 104:6,9
95:2 96:6,17	85:16 86:7,20	20:16	104:18 109:9,11
107:1 113:6	87:12 88:15,18	ambiguities	111:12,15,18
114:18 115:2	89:19 90:17,25	26:14	112:22 117:12
agency's 51:24	91:9,12 92:1,24	ambiguity 29:4	117:18 118:5,8
60:16 77:25	93:7,10 94:9,15	29:6,7	amended 90:19
<b>agency's</b> 80:13	94:19 95:8,18,22	ambiguous 31:1	100:15
<b>agenda</b> 89:10,15	96:4,23 97:7,10	31:2 110:25	amendments
90:12 91:20	97:18 99:3	<b>ambro</b> 2:19 4:2	87:20
92:5 94:3,10	100:23 101:8	5:3,6 6:5,17	<b>america</b> 103:6
	102:14 117:16	16:2,5 18:14,16	
7	•		

## [amicus - audit]

amicus 99:4	appearances	arbitrage 12:12	<b>aside</b> 59:12
103:5	2:21 3:1	20:4 21:2,22	117:10
<b>amount</b> 4:7 14:9	appears 70:25	38:4 55:3 73:25	<b>asked</b> 13:20 81:2
14:10 40:6 44:5	86:24	arbitrary 6:9,12	83:2 113:1
46:13 62:18	appellant 1:4,16	6:24 7:17 25:7	114:7,10
99:19 101:22	2:3 119:6,7,8	34:23 78:1	asking 13:25
104:1 106:1	appellants 1:10	110:10,19	25:23 38:25
amounts 47:20	2:10 3:2	<b>area</b> 19:2 73:22	67:15 72:21
49:20	appellate 2:18	93:12	95:23 103:11
analogy 29:23	115:6	<b>areas</b> 21:20 22:7	assimilated
30:5	appellee 119:9	109:2	115:9
analyzed 74:2	appellees 1:8,14	<b>argue</b> 41:16	assisting 80:12
<b>answer</b> 42:18	1:20 2:7,14 3:14	<b>argued</b> 3:3,6,10	associated 37:17
60:23 80:25	appendix 97:24	3:15	37:24
81:12 83:9	applicable 63:6	arguing 9:12	association
97:19 102:19	66:22 67:11,14	29:17 84:1	107:18
103:13 111:9	69:20,23 117:24	argument 4:8,13	assume 49:7
114:13 116:5	118:4	6:8,19 11:14	57:20 67:13
answering 112:8	applied 15:5	22:23 25:1 30:8	assumed 78:3
anticipated	21:9 29:4	30:15,19,20	assuming 15:8
100:19	applies 51:2	36:22 43:18,19	115:18
anybody 35:6	66:24	51:23 52:2	assurances
73:19	apply 17:4 18:15	53:15 54:7 60:8	65:25
anymore 30:2	18:18,20 28:23	89:20 90:1 94:6	astra 80:2
36:6 43:12	applying 28:4	94:7 116:2	105:22
<b>apa</b> 23:5 47:13	appointment	117:21 118:13	astrazeneca 2:2
53:12,20,22	57:19,21	arguments 24:25	3:10 46:6,24
89:24 92:14	appreciate	47:24 53:24	55:24 103:7
107:5	118:11	117:14	113:23 114:25
apart 6:25 7:16	appreciated 60:4	arizona 76:9	119:8
19:3 108:18	approach 26:12	arnold 3:11	astrazeneca's
apexus 113:14	87:9	arrangement	113:17
appeal 2:15	approached 18:9	56:25 72:4	attempt 108:25
93:18	appropriate	arrangements	attempts 86:21
appeals 1:1	54:6 84:7	50:25	audit 70:14,15
appear 14:18	116:13	articulated 47:6	70:16 104:10,23
53:11 96:3	appropriately	<b>ashley</b> 3:6 24:11	105:3,6,9,18
	40:18		

Page: 125

## [audits - bright]

#### Page 5

audits 71:21,22	backed 79:12	38:17 42:2,7,9	98:20
77:4	backend 73:8	42:11,12 57:24	billions 10:20
authority 26:16	88:5	58:16,16	20:5 21:21
26:17,19,22 28:7	background	benefiting 41:20	<b>bills</b> 86:15
28:15 69:5	16:18 17:3	41:23	<b>bind</b> 92:7
77:17 101:1	20:13 40:22	<b>benefits</b> 43:6	binding 26:1
authorization	43:14	<b>best</b> 10:5 12:18	79:10 89:10
47:11	<b>bags</b> 73:6	24:3 28:15,25	94:3
authorizes 46:20	balance 19:11	90:1 113:12	<b>bit</b> 47:23 48:8
available 55:9	<b>base</b> 56:11	<b>better</b> 87:11	54:4
102:23	<b>based</b> 18:7 50:9	beyond 4:24	<b>black</b> 68:14
<b>aventis</b> 1:3,15	70:15,16 78:16	20:21 22:13	blackline 81:3
3:3 4:5 5:4	82:5 88:22 91:8	45:3,17 104:12	<b>blanket</b> 13:21
<b>avenue</b> 3:4,8,11	91:20	107:12 116:19	blanking 75:19
3:17	<b>baseline</b> 27:3,10	<b>bibas</b> 2:20 14:15	<b>bless</b> 25:23
average 75:20	112:5	14:25 16:1,8	boatloads 75:25
90:10	<b>basic</b> 22:24	17:10,15 28:6,15	<b>body</b> 14:20
<b>avoid</b> 86:17	117:5	35:22 36:17	<b>bona</b> 14:21 45:3
<b>avoids</b> 25:21	basically 12:7,12	37:1 62:11,15,20	borderline 84:1
86:18	12:22 57:17	62:23 63:2,7,11	<b>bottom</b> 113:21
<b>aware</b> 87:18	80:24 82:8	63:16,19,25	boundaries 14:7
95:2 100:14	<b>basing</b> 26:20	64:12 68:9,12	17:1
b	<b>basis</b> 5:24 9:15	69:2,4,8 70:5,21	<b>bounds</b> 14:12
<b>b</b> 5:8 87:5,8,10	15:6 19:25 20:8	70:24 74:16	<b>box</b> 68:14
<b>b</b> 5.8 87.5,8,10 <b>back</b> 9:25 17:10	53:12 59:13	75:2,18 77:14,16	brand 99:9
20:8 21:13,16	80:15	83:2,21 84:10	<b>brief</b> 27:5 30:5
24:7 32:2 40:5	<b>beck</b> 120:3,7	86:14 88:6	31:3 36:12 64:1
41:7 45:22 49:5	<b>begging</b> 115:19	98:23 106:8,11	73:2 74:8 77:3
51:24 53:19	beginning 78:8	106:15 108:5	91:17 92:17
54:2 59:16	84:5 90:8	109:15 110:21	93:2 94:25 98:8
	<b>behalf</b> 24:11	117:1	99:4 103:6
69:14 70:7,19 74:16,18 79:22	46:6	<b>big</b> 56:17	113:4 115:6
81:2 83:8 93:8	<b>believe</b> 17:23	<b>bill</b> 34:15 72:3	briefs 4:25 22:24
	53:14,20,21	86:9	28:18 37:21
96:20 100:11	75:20 105:11	billion 9:12	58:20 114:25
112:19 117:23	<b>belong</b> 27:4,9	10:19 37:22	116:1 117:14
backdrop 85:3	benefit 33:12	38:2,2 39:19,20	bright 106:16
86:3	34:14 37:8 38:9	39:24 40:3,17	
		, ,	

## [bring - claims]

bring 22:12	109:2	109:7	charging 41:2,5
70:16 80:22	<b>carried</b> 71:11	<b>central</b> 46:13	charitable 8:17
87:25	case 1:3,9,15 2:2	80:17	34:12 43:4
bringing 9:19	2:8,17 4:2 8:6	<b>certain</b> 10:11	cherrypick
80:7	9:23 11:2 12:19	13:2 67:1,1	113:16
broader 51:9	12:21 14:14	101:8 104:23	cheryl 2:19
73:22 83:13	15:6,6 17:1,5,16	certainly 6:17	chevron 69:6
broadly 21:9	18:19 24:2,3,22	11:4 14:3	77:18 111:1
40:19	25:1,19 27:7,11	100:12 101:13	<b>chief</b> 46:15,19
brought 82:25	28:18,19,20	certify 120:3	choosing 32:20
88:6 114:17	31:15 32:18	<b>cetera</b> 60:16	<b>chose</b> 86:11
budgets 89:22	34:19 35:17	61:22 73:17	87:13,19
building 76:22	46:14 47:14	74:13 98:12	christensen
<b>burden</b> 37:15	48:15 62:12	104:10	12:20 27:7
business 64:8	65:13 84:1	chains 75:24	30:20 42:24
<b>buttons</b> 93:14	85:11 88:22	challenge 22:21	43:21 111:8
<b>buy</b> 7:21 13:10	90:1 91:23 95:5	89:1 91:15	<b>circuit</b> 1:1 2:19
54:10	95:7,7,11,25	96:11	2:19,20 33:20,20
<b>buying</b> 9:7,18	96:8,17 99:8	challenged 91:1	59:25 88:22
с	103:7 104:11	92:8,19	89:2 90:4,6
<b>c</b> 3:6 4:1 87:6	105:22 111:2,9	challenges 93:25	93:21 96:8,11
99:9 120:1,1	115:5 116:1,11	challenging	circuit's 90:2
california 30:13	116:23	74:19 95:12	circumstance
call 18:21 30:11	<b>cases</b> 17:11,13	change 6:19	87:11 97:13
41:9	17:24 18:7,20	51:23 88:21	circumstances
called 9:1 11:23	27:11,13 44:12	109:23	13:2 100:13
57:15 113:14	93:3,16	changed 78:3	<b>cite</b> 28:17,19
capricious 6:9	<b>cash</b> 13:3	79:14 95:1	115:5
6:13,24 7:18	categories 70:22	changes 7:14	<b>cited</b> 27:11
25:7 34:23	cause 98:12	107:22	88:21 96:9 98:7
110:10,20	105:11	<b>chaos</b> 82:24 83:5	113:5 114:24
capriciousness	causes 110:25	characteristic	citizens 8:25
78:1	causing 110:5	21:11	<b>civil</b> 3:16
<b>card</b> 11:24 12:2	<b>caveat</b> 52:14	characteristics	claim 105:15
36:9 58:6	<b>ceiling</b> 5:9,11,25	21:7	claims 5:15
<b>care</b> 51:10 66:14	7:22 21:15	charge 57:8,9	55:23 61:20
69:12 74:12	49:19,22 50:2,4	99:7,11 100:22	104:1 105:17,25
	63:1,6 102:23		

[clara - congress]

Page 7

<b>clara</b> 80:3	<b>come</b> 5:2 6:18	companies 8:13	concerned 65:7
clarification	9:10 12:16	10:9 20:24 63:8	70:12 78:23
118:9	15:10 16:25	101:18	114:5,16
clarity 26:15	34:16,18 36:2,18	company 2:23	concerns 59:5,6
54:4	40:5 67:10 81:1	12:9 113:14	68:24 76:25
<b>clear</b> 17:21 23:2	83:8,19 91:14	comparison	79:19
27:22,24 28:2,9	<b>comes</b> 113:14	58:15	conclude 29:16
28:11 32:8	coming 93:8	<b>compel</b> 93:19	53:12
36:23 44:17	<b>comment</b> 23:2,6	competing	conclusion 56:10
80:20 89:24	75:15 90:5 91:3	101:15	115:18
100:10 105:10	91:19 95:12	complaints	condition 5:22
106:18 108:16	104:5 107:4,7,8	68:24 87:25	15:15,18 18:23
108:23 110:24	commentary	completed 89:16	19:3 48:20 49:1
111:8	52:8	93:6	49:10 50:8
clearly 5:10	comments 88:11	completely	67:25 81:13
15:23 27:23	90:9 92:10,12,16	26:24 90:15	104:15
28:3 29:1 95:16	94:2,22 107:11	107:7	conditions 13:22
110:9	108:14	complexities	14:1,3 15:22,23
<b>client</b> 20:19	commercial 9:5	25:22	36:18 48:15,18
clients 8:16	9:13,15 10:7,21	complies 67:20	49:14 52:22
109:6	12:4,10,15 15:4	91:19 103:12	61:12 63:14
<b>clinic</b> 76:9,12	20:6,7,7 21:22	<b>comply</b> 5:16	64:5 74:18 81:4
100:7,11	22:14 51:13	61:13 63:14	81:5 102:11
<b>clinics</b> 73:2 74:7	54:24 83:24	66:3 84:25	conduct 6:16
74:12 98:8	commercially	89:25 91:2	70:13 71:21
100:2	14:19 83:22	103:14	conducted 77:4
<b>close</b> 14:13	84:6	complying 65:25	conducts 71:22
16:25	committee 87:5	66:12,12	confined 41:18
<b>closed</b> 69:24	<b>common</b> 16:19	comprehensive	<b>confines</b> 43:6,7
coerced 99:19	27:9,15,18 29:8	15:11	conflicts 64:1
colleague 60:1	34:5 43:20	comprehensiv	congress 8:25
colleagues 13:20	111:21	22:16	22:11,16 27:22
85:5 88:7	communities	concede 77:18	28:12 34:11
collect 8:12	33:10 76:1	conception 9:16	35:21 38:22
collection	community 73:1	10:15,22	40:23 43:2
105:17	98:7	concepts 19:18	50:14,19 59:7
combination	<b>comp</b> 12:23,24	<b>concern</b> 100:24	64:9 69:15 72:7
48:12 50:10	13:2,3	100:24 114:14	72:12 73:11
1	1	1	1

Page: 128

#### [congress - couple]

Page 8

84:6 86:2,8,11	constitutional	52:3,19,21 53:10	controlling
86:22 87:13,17	47:7	54:19,24 55:12	101:2
90:19 97:13	construct 72:9	55:12 56:6,25	controls 31:21
100:14,18,25	construction	57:12 58:4,13,17	convenient 11:4
101:4,6,10,14	28:24 53:24	61:2,7,17,20	convince 45:18
111:22 112:19	60:15	65:19 66:12	45:19
114:5,13,16	construing 60:16	70:24,25 71:4,9	<b>cooped</b> 60:10
connected 41:9	consultants	71:16 72:25	<b>copays</b> 98:10
connection 83:1	45:14	73:25 74:3 75:3	<b>copies</b> 105:14
103:6	<b>cont'd</b> 1:22 2:1	75:7,14 76:13,14	corner 23:5
connotation 48:7	contained 46:18	76:18,23 77:7,10	<b>corners</b> 23:3,4
53:16	54:11 117:8	77:11,12 78:9,17	corporate 8:25
consciously	contemplated	79:8,10,12,18	83:20
86:17	42:5	81:7,11 82:14	correct 41:2
consequence 9:2	contemplating	83:10 84:11,13	45:1 47:4,18
91:24	92:9	84:14,17 85:14	50:5 55:21,23
consequences	contested 73:19	85:17,18,20	59:9 66:15 75:5
82:23 96:2	context 17:7	87:13,22 95:2	91:8 95:24
consider 6:7,8	51:9 59:4 84:2	99:7,19 100:12	117:7,17
47:17 54:12	<b>continue</b> 68:16	101:3 103:20,25	correctly 94:16
consideration	75:15	106:2 108:2	<b>cost</b> 11:1 29:21
96:16	continued 77:7	109:18,25 110:2	37:17,17,24 45:4
considered	<b>contract</b> 5:12,14	110:4 112:13	costly 72:9
49:16 86:8	7:3,4,11,23 8:9	113:3,15,19	counsel 8:1
considering	8:11 9:5,22 10:1	114:20 115:10	53:21 78:12
86:23 87:5	11:3,23 12:10	115:12 116:24	83:14 110:10
93:24	13:14,16 16:11	117:3	117:13 118:10
consistency 79:4	17:16,17 18:25	contracts 51:3	counseling 68:19
consistent 65:22	20:3,11,16 25:11	65:23 80:5	country 10:5
71:6 74:23	29:14 31:9 32:1	114:19	21:19 22:8
78:24 79:24	32:12,19,22,23	contractual	25:11 32:21
consistently	33:16 34:16	84:24 85:20	38:5 44:3,15
65:21 72:16	35:19 37:8,9,18	115:2	117:1
73:18 79:21	37:23 38:10,14	<b>contrary</b> 6:13,14	<b>county</b> 12:20
constantly 7:1	39:21 41:14	7:17,19 25:6	76:9 80:3
constitute 15:23	42:8,10 44:2,22	34:22	<b>couple</b> 98:14,18
17:8	45:2,15 46:17	control 30:23	107:24
	47:20 51:5,14,15	31:19,19 89:22	
۱	1	1	

## [course - definition]

course 27:12	38:24 39:10,18	creating 33:15	dealing 22:16
79:15 87:17	41:1,7,14,18	<b>cross</b> 9:12	48:14 69:19
96:12 98:20	42:2,7,8,11 43:7	current 64:1	<b>dealt</b> 69:20 90:2
107:3	43:25 44:4,13	currently 61:7	<b>debate</b> 10:4,6,12
<b>court</b> 1:1 2:16,23	45:15 49:19	98:11	22:10,18
5:4 12:18,19	50:14,19 51:2,4	customer 11:17	december 25:6
13:4 15:10 23:2	51:8 52:10,16,18	41:6 45:12	53:6
24:11,17,20 25:2	52:23 54:18,25	customers 11:19	<b>decide</b> 17:7
25:3,8,12,16,18	55:10 56:5,18,20	11:20	27:14 29:3
26:4,9 27:7,11	56:25 57:5,8,14	<b>cut</b> 23:3,4 98:9	95:20,23 105:18
27:21,23 28:19	57:19,25 60:20	<b>cv</b> 2:17	117:6
28:20 43:14,14	61:3,6,15,18	<b>cvs</b> 39:6,21	decided 96:14
43:15,21 45:18	62:18,19,20 63:5	56:24,24 57:2,4	decides 57:12
45:19 46:10	63:5,13 65:9,24	57:22 58:7	deciding 17:11
47:16 59:19	66:3,11 68:24	75:24 98:25	decision 12:19
60:14,21 61:25	70:2,14,18,21	114:11	80:2 82:23 87:9
62:7 80:8 82:17	71:7,18,22 72:1	<b>cvss</b> 31:21	90:2 91:14,15
86:18 89:23	72:4,7,11,13,23	<b>cysts</b> 68:13	decisions 46:10
91:16 92:8	73:9,10,14 74:4	d	81:20 101:17
95:14 108:22	74:6,10 76:5,6	<b>d</b> 4:1 51:7,7	declaration
111:9,11 112:9,9	76:20,24 77:6	119:1	115:7
112:18 115:1	78:23 79:7,18,25	<b>d.c.</b> 90:1,3,5	declarations
116:2	80:4,19,21 81:21	93:21	76:4 99:23
<b>court's</b> 80:2	84:8,18,21 85:9	<b>daniel</b> 3:15	declaratory
<b>courts</b> 15:5 17:7	85:19 86:13	59:20	25:18
18:9,20 62:1	87:15 88:3 97:1	<b>data</b> 5:15 8:12	decrease 113:11
93:18	97:2,21,22 98:21	20:23 55:23	<b>deem</b> 46:1
<b>cousin</b> 30:13	99:15,18 101:15	61:21 104:2	<b>deems</b> 61:19
<b>cover</b> 76:7 98:10	101:20 102:3,22	105:17,25 106:3	<b>deeply</b> 50:18
<b>covered</b> 5:9 7:6	103:1,17 105:25	113:13	113:12
7:12 8:3 9:23	108:7,9,10,13,20	date 120:11	<b>default</b> 29:8,12
10:5,9 12:11,15	109:17,25 110:2	date 120.11 day 3:4 60:3	defendants
13:10 21:18	110:5 112:14	<b>dc</b> 3:5,9,12,17	59:20
25:10 31:24	113:18 114:2,4,9	33:20	<b>defined</b> 50:14,19
32:1,9,10,10,11	114:19,22	de 28:8	definition 15:11
33:6 34:14,18	116:16,23	de 28.8 deal 50:24 59:7	18:8 49:8 50:10
35:4,9,11,20	<b>created</b> 51:10,18		56:12 108:8,15
36:15 37:13	99:8	64:23 69:10,11	

## [definitions - dispensed]

## Page 10

definitions 16:17	demonstrates	<b>die</b> 81:16	12:11 30:6 36:4
48:4	83:4 84:6	<b>differ</b> 46:18	39:10,17 43:9
definitive 96:14	<b>dental</b> 74:12	difference 12:12	56:22 58:8
<b>deliver</b> 5:11 7:22	100:1	12:13 38:7 39:8	69:23 70:4,19
7:23 8:8 13:11	denying 89:2	39:13 40:17	76:19 84:19
14:8,9,18 15:24	department 1:6	41:12 56:17	85:19 97:20
17:17,18 19:3,4	1:12,18 2:6,12	different 17:8	98:11 102:5
19:22 20:15	3:15 4:6	33:21,24 35:16	114:3
26:2 27:15 30:9	<b>depend</b> 66:16	38:9,17 46:12	discounted
30:12 32:4,12,18	depending 37:22	48:15,17 49:13	39:16 41:11,13
32:19,24 40:20	depends 28:22	50:16 53:18	46:17 47:20
43:17 46:16	<b>depo</b> 69:21	56:14 61:16	51:12 69:20
47:19 49:1 53:9	<b>depos</b> 69:11	68:17 85:25	73:9 86:4 96:25
61:19 78:9	<b>deprived</b> 107:4,8	86:6,9 88:20	108:21
79:11 83:18,24	description	89:18 90:14,15	discounts 8:23
112:3,13	105:11	94:18,20,21	9:3,4 58:2,12
delivered 44:6	designate 13:13	113:10	70:12 77:2
51:13 52:18	19:23 55:11,12	differentiation	78:16 79:20
delivering 45:20	designated 29:15	57:4	85:9,10,14,17
<b>delivery</b> 8:3,5,7	113:19	differently 36:9	97:16 98:2
14:19,24 15:17	designating	difficult 18:5	106:4 114:12
16:21 18:22	13:14	116:11,21	discrepancy
19:17,23 20:21	designation	<b>digging</b> 82:21	71:19
25:9,14 29:16,25	55:24	<b>direct</b> 47:2	discretion 61:19
37:6 47:25 48:7	<b>detail</b> 109:22	101:12 103:5	discussed 91:21
48:19,22 50:9	determine 16:19	117:8	discussion 60:13
51:21 53:17	59:12 101:19	directed 9:19	73:24 78:1
75:1,16 83:16	determined	90:20	dispensation
109:18	46:16 58:11	direction 6:20	63:23 64:7
<b>dem</b> 45:25 46:2	<b>develop</b> 17:18	109:23	66:18
46:3	73:16	directly 46:24	dispense 61:14
<b>demand</b> 109:18	developed 45:8	56:5 58:2 99:25	64:9,25 66:25
demonstrate	78:19	113:15	72:5 75:10
74:5 99:24	diabetic 76:11	director 115:8	97:12
demonstrated	diagnosis 68:19	disagree 79:16	dispensed 63:22
70:18 88:2	dictionary 16:17	83:21 92:1	65:2 67:3 71:17
95:13	24:5 48:4 50:10	<b>discount</b> 11:1,16	72:18 84:19
	56:11	11:19,21,24,25	86:10

## [dispensing - emphasize]

Page 11

dispensing 64:3	104:14 106:3	dropped 98:15	e
64:5 67:12,19	114:18	drug 7:7 12:8	
71:10 72:15	diversions 70:13	40:15 41:6,10	e 4:1,1 119:1,3
85:21	77:1,2	61:8 63:8 64:13	120:1 earlier 4:20 78:2
dispersed 80:16	<b>divert</b> 38:23	66:14 67:3	
dispersing 33:4	division 3:16	68:14 75:12	<b>early</b> 52:12 <b>earth</b> 15:17
displace 27:22	<b>doctor's</b> 63:24	76:25 99:9,10	63:17
34:5	documents	101:18 102:22	easier 20:20
displaced 27:16	105:5,14	102:23 118:1	24:22
27:19	doing 8:15,16,24	drugs 5:9 9:7	easiest 106:25
disproportionate	9:24 23:16	11:1 12:5,5	easily 17:6
33:9	33:15 37:19	15:25 21:14	easily 17.0 easy 20:13 47:14
dispute 14:5	40:25 41:7	27:4,9 29:9	61:24 83:9
65:18 88:1	43:11 46:22	30:21,22 32:9	educated 57:17
<b>disrupt</b> 100:16	62:25 85:21	34:6 36:4 37:11	effect 18:22 41:1
distance 39:14	98:11 111:12	38:5,6,10 43:8	85:12 88:10
75:21 117:2	dollar 9:12	44:5,15 46:17	93:9 113:18
distinguish 12:5	10:19	47:20 51:4,12	effort 37:18
12:6 50:15	dollars 10:20	52:10,17,25	efforts 80:13
distribute 44:7	20:5 21:22 99:8	56:15 57:1,3	<b>either</b> 31:23 37:1
67:22,23 68:16	99:11	61:14 62:19	54:18 61:16
117:25	<b>door</b> 12:7 57:6	63:5,10,21 64:9	82:10 83:10
distributed	<b>doorstep</b> 7:23,24	64:21 65:1,2,24	88:3 96:5 99:24
65:10	8:9,10 13:11,12	71:8,16,17 72:6	100:7 101:2
distribution	13:13 14:9,10,11	72:18 73:5,9,20	element 49:20
46:21 50:21,25	15:25 19:22	78:16 83:25	53:3
51:4,5,15 54:11	20:15,16	85:22 86:10	elements 49:4
54:17 59:10	<b>doubt</b> 18:3	97:1,1,12 103:9	50:5
69:10,13,15,24	downstairs	106:1 108:22	<b>eli</b> 48:16 78:18
71:2	35:11 38:17	109:6 114:3	83:17
distributors 51:7	56:19	115:9	eligible 102:4
<b>district</b> 2:16,16	<b>drafts</b> 87:6,7	duplicate 77:1,1	113:20
46:10 62:7	dramatically	79:20 106:4	eliminating 9:2
89:23 114:25	79:15	duplication	eloquently 59:6
diversion 35:6	<b>draw</b> 14:16	104:13	embedded 58:22
41:19 44:13,18	<b>drive</b> 76:15	duplicative 4:16	emerged 68:13
44:20,24 45:2	<b>drives</b> 74:13	70:12	emphasize
71:20 79:20	100:2		105:20

## [employees - expansion]

employees 12:22	enter 51:3 62:17	32:11,11 33:6	everybody 65:8
employees 12:22 employer 12:24	entirely 37:24	34:18 35:5,9,11	81:21 101:16
enact 86:11	79:24	39:10 41:1,8,14	everything's
enacted 35:3	<b>entities</b> 5:9 6:15	42:2,7,8,11	111:16
64:10 72:8	7:6 9:23 10:6,9	43:25 44:5,13	eviction 28:19
82:19 84:7 86:8	13:10 21:18	· · · ·	evidence 91:14
88:2 98:15	25:10 34:15	50:14,19 51:13	
100:14	35:20 36:15	52:11,23 54:18	105:7,13,16 115:4
		56:5,18,20,25	
enactment 84:14	37:13 38:24	57:5,8,14,19	<b>evolution</b> 77:14
86:2	39:19 41:18	61:3,18 62:19,20	77:19
encompassed	43:7 45:16	63:5,13 65:9	evolved 9:21
16:20 21:23	49:19 51:2,8	66:11 70:2,14,19	10:18 87:16
encompasses 8:7	52:16,18 54:25	70:21 72:1,5,23	evolving 7:1
encompassing	55:10 57:25	74:10 75:9 76:6	exact 114:15
15:11 18:8	60:20 61:6,15	76:20 84:18	exactly 16:7
encouraged	65:24 66:3	85:19 97:21	26:23 51:4 62:2
78:20	68:24 71:7,18,22	102:3,22 105:25	80:21,22 106:14
ended 89:2	72:7,11,13 73:9	108:9,10,13	106:24 114:7
endorsed 52:20	73:10,14 74:6	114:23,23	115:3
endorsing 56:2,8	76:5,25 77:6	equal 55:6	example 65:4
enforce 80:5	78:23 79:7,19,25	equally 78:14	66:10 67:1,15
enforceable	80:4,12,19,22	equivalent 31:9	81:6 83:1
79:10	81:22 84:9,21	error 95:19	examples 107:24
enforced 66:9	85:9 86:13	<b>errors</b> 110:20	<b>exceed</b> 62:25
enforcement	87:15 88:4 97:1	<b>esq</b> 3:3,6,10,15	exceedingly
70:16,17 80:10	97:2,22 98:22	essential 103:8	27:24
80:18 82:16	99:15,18 101:15	essentially 15:6	exclude 27:13
87:24 105:23	101:20 103:1,18	19:24 43:4 58:6	exclusion 22:2
enforcing 106:5	108:7,21 109:17	73:5 75:7 116:8	<b>excuse</b> 4:3 16:4
engaged 111:2	109:25 110:2,5	<b>et</b> 1:7,13,19 2:6	exercises 26:17
engineer 12:11	112:14 113:18	2:13 4:5 60:16	<b>exist</b> 9:6 45:9
english 23:23,24	114:2,4,9,19	61:22 73:17	84:11 93:15
enlightening	116:16,23	74:13 98:12	111:22 112:4
99:5	entitled 39:16	104:10	<b>exists</b> 27:16
enormous 21:18	entitles 11:24	ether 29:8	expand 74:14
<b>ensure</b> 66:6 71:8	<b>entity</b> 6:2 7:12	eventually 88:24	expanding 74:11
84:17	8:3 12:11,15	90:21	expansion 33:13
	20:6,7 32:2,10		85:14

## [expect - following]

<b>expect</b> 75:14	extinguished	favored 55:6	<b>firm</b> 87:9
100:20 115:3	109:16	<b>fda</b> 68:14	<b>first</b> 11:12 13:18
expected 14:20	<b>extra</b> 25:9 33:16	<b>fear</b> 116:12	13:24 14:22
expense 9:25	37:24	federal 23:9	15:10 16:16
37:15	extraordinarily	27:16 47:12	17:21 20:9,10,18
expenses 98:1	22:7	51:12 59:20	26:1,13,18 30:4
<b>expire</b> 73:16	f	63:23 66:5,17,24	31:12 35:3,4
explain 19:8	<b>f</b> 120:1	73:21 80:17	36:23 48:22
25:17 68:11	<b>face</b> 51:23 93:13	87:18 88:25	53:7 62:13
76:6 84:16	102:2	89:5 92:5 93:11	70:13 103:3
103:10	<b>facilities</b> 9:8,9	97:24 105:8	105:9 106:6
explained 7:15	facility 75:11	106:17	107:14 115:20
38:3,4 53:5	fact 9:23 12:3	<b>fee</b> 10:1 37:19	<b>fit</b> 47:9
73:18 76:10	21:21 23:21	41:2	<b>five</b> 5:5,16 24:12
99:21 107:21	56:16 66:19	<b>fees</b> 74:2 99:7	33:21 46:7
explaining 78:4	89:9 92:2 96:5	100:22 101:2	48:17 49:13
98:8 103:8	99:1 113:2,21	<b>fell</b> 7:7	72:13 77:3 97:8
explains 73:3	116:18	<b>fide</b> 14:21 45:4	110:3
77:3	<b>factor</b> 93:5	fiduciary 31:22	flagging 65:18
explanation 6:21	<b>facts</b> 17:4 105:13	field 83:23	flagstaff 76:11
77:24,25 78:4	<b>factual</b> 58:24	<b>fields</b> 8:12 20:23	<b>flat</b> 15:21
explicitly 52:12	60:24 97:18	<b>figure</b> 14:20	<b>flatly</b> 52:19
exploit 20:4	<b>failed</b> 53:9	18:11 48:21	<b>flip</b> 30:19 43:19
explore 6:6	<b>fair</b> 12:21 46:12	<b>filed</b> 103:6	<b>flipping</b> 111:13
express 87:2	60:9	114:25	<b>flips</b> 27:8
expression 52:1	<b>fairly</b> 76:23	<b>fill</b> 26:15 35:10	<b>floor</b> 85:7
expressly 87:13	103:14	70:1	<b>flsa</b> 12:22 13:6
102:6	<b>falling</b> 10:20	<b>filled</b> 57:22	<b>flu</b> 60:10
exquisite 50:20	far 9:10 12:16	<b>final</b> 4:21 55:25	<b>flw</b> 2:17
<b>extend</b> 10:25	13:16 21:5	89:7,17 90:25	<b>focus</b> 42:1 83:15
22:13	22:13 50:15	91:2,9 92:7,11	86:1
<b>extent</b> 7:11 11:2	61:17 76:11	107:19 108:17	focused 34:25
19:20 21:11	80:12	<b>finally</b> 116:10	47:21 82:14
32:3 47:17	<b>faster</b> 96:6	<b>find</b> 104:13	113:25
73:23 104:9,11	favor 28:2 91:23	findings 70:15	focusing 81:11
111:23	favorably 15:9	<b>fine</b> 46:8	<b>follow</b> 70:10
externally 56:16		<b>finish</b> 18:17	following 28:1
		106:11	104:17

# [footnote - going]

Page 14

<b>0</b> , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			
footnote 113:4	117:22 119:6,10	<b>gao</b> 58:19 71:14	18:16,17 19:9,12
116:6	francisco's 25:1	74:1,2 99:4,5,14	20:1,8,21 21:5
forbidden 46:21	frankly 8:10	104:23 110:7	21:13 27:1
<b>force</b> 43:3	10:4 19:16	gaps 26:15	29:18 33:25
foregoing 120:3	<b>free</b> 34:9 114:3	<b>gates</b> 34:16	34:16 37:15
<b>forgive</b> 75:19	<b>friend</b> 48:4 58:5	gauging 106:19	39:4 53:19,23
<b>form</b> 20:16 53:6	107:2 113:9	general 16:21	56:19 58:6 62:8
108:21 115:14	114:8,17 115:13	18:7	64:14,17 81:18
115:17	<b>friend's</b> 102:18	generally 6:3,15	82:24 84:3 87:7
<b>formal</b> 23:8,16	105:21	12:8 64:9 70:3	88:18 89:4 90:8
106:16	<b>friends</b> 30:14	71:14 86:18	93:20 96:20
formally 87:25	47:14	116:18 117:24	99:2 103:9
<b>forms</b> 77:12	<b>front</b> 46:11	118:4	104:12 109:22
<b>forth</b> 27:12	frustration	generate 45:16	114:6 116:18
89:24 91:10	35:25	generic 48:9	<b>goes</b> 38:17 57:10
95:9 105:10	fulfilling 21:4	49:8 66:25	61:22 71:15
forward 22:25	<b>full</b> 35:18 41:3,6	67:22 99:10	77:25 78:6 87:6
89:11,14	44:5 57:9,9	generous 5:18	108:4,17
<b>four</b> 92:23 108:2	107:15 113:3	13:17 75:8	<b>going</b> 4:8 9:4,6
113:16 116:1	<b>fully</b> 19:20 38:6	<b>gesture</b> 16:14	12:9 13:1 17:10
<b>frame</b> 24:17	functions 19:24	getting 9:25 35:8	17:24,25 18:3,4
85:25	<b>funds</b> 9:25	36:7 39:17 42:9	19:4 21:22
francisco 3:3 5:1	fungible 73:5	42:11,12 43:8	30:10 35:10
5:3,4,7 6:11,22	<b>further</b> 13:15,20	68:19 81:16	36:1 38:9 39:14
8:4,19 10:3 11:8	14:12 20:1	gigantic 20:4	39:18 40:3 41:7
11:11 13:24	87:19,23 89:4,5	<b>give</b> 29:23 32:10	41:9 42:5,19
14:15,22 15:1	91:5 92:9 96:18	36:5 41:22 52:3	43:3 44:14,22
16:4,7,15 17:14	100:4 101:11,12	52:10 53:18	47:17 50:15
17:20 18:15,18	102:12	54:8 56:21	57:20 60:13
19:7,10,14 21:10	furthers 43:1	57:17 58:5 69:5	62:3 64:16 65:9
22:22 23:11,15	<b>future</b> 17:7 18:7	107:5,24	65:20 67:17
24:3,8 27:6	18:11,19,20	<b>given</b> 4:7 40:5	68:21 72:18
33:12 35:14	22:11	96:25 107:16	73:9,12,20 76:15
36:10 58:5	g	<b>gives</b> 84:14	76:18,24 77:2
102:15,16 104:8	<b>g</b> 4:1 119:3	<b>giving</b> 50:16	82:3,10,24 85:3
104:16 105:1	games 48:14	81:25 89:11	86:1,4 88:16
106:10,13,23	<b>50110</b> 0 TU.17	<b>go</b> 13:14,20	89:4,17 90:13,18
107:13 109:10		14:11 17:3,18	90:21 91:24

## [going - hon]

Page 15

92:3 95:7 96:6,7	grandmother	78:14 90:24	helping 33:14
97:20 98:4,12,21	30:12	happening 35:19	36:11 38:3,14,16
99:2 100:12	granted 26:16	36:6 37:9 71:24	43:12
101:22 105:7	grants 97:24	106:7	helps 100:12
106:13,14	grapple 22:8	happens 35:16	hepatitis 99:9
good 8:25 10:4	great 116:5	69:25 87:10	hhs 67:6,25
46:9 54:7 55:8	greatly 60:4	93:11 96:5	70:16 71:6,21
60:2 71:23	grounds 47:6	happy 22:23	72:16 73:17
81:20 94:6	group 41:22	60:23 82:2	77:4 79:20
government	110:1	88:15	80:12 87:25
5:19 7:2,15 8:14	grown 39:19	harbor 18:2,3	94:4 98:19
9:11 10:18	<b>growth</b> 37:25	harm 98:12	99:16 101:25
13:23 20:17,25	38:1,3 108:1	harmoniously	105:4
21:2 25:8,25	<b>gsa</b> 58:15	80:14	high 16:23
26:14,18 27:8	<b>guess</b> 40:15	harris 12:20	<b>higher</b> 113:23
30:1,16,17,19,21	57:17 111:6	hate 21:12	<b>hills</b> 15:5
31:6,12,13 48:5	guidance 31:7	head 30:20	history 8:20
48:6 53:4,6	52:16 65:22	headquarters	10:16 20:1,8
58:10 64:22	71:7 73:3 74:9	83:20	22:3 65:19 85:4
78:13,20 88:20	74:17,20,23,24	health 1:6,13,19	111:3 116:5,8
93:12 96:13	75:2,6,11 76:22	2:6,12 4:6 22:6	<b>hit</b> 88:16
103:11,13	76:24 77:11	51:10 69:12	<b>hold</b> 4:18
104:21,22	79:7,9,10,17,22	73:2 76:9 98:7	hole 82:22
109:16 113:7,9	102:1 105:5	109:2	holidays 82:3
113:13 115:4	109:15	hear 98:24 116:4	homeless 100:9
116:2	<b>gyn</b> 100:1	heard 60:22	<b>homerun</b> 82:10
government's	<b>gyns</b> 74:12	73:24 76:25	hon 2:19,19,20
5:21 15:14	h	78:11 83:13	4:2 5:6 6:5,17
24:25 25:4,20	half 4:14 11:25	85:5 103:13	8:1,15 9:17
26:5 27:5 28:2	hand 22:14	hearings 91:13	10:24 11:9
33:19 34:21	handle 103:10	<b>heart</b> 46:14	13:19 14:15,25
43:19 62:6	hands 44:21	<b>held</b> 13:4 31:24	16:1,2,5,8 17:10
116:22	happen 82:1,3	help 14:15 24:18	17:15 18:14,16
governmental	90:18 91:17	36:16 38:15	18:21 19:9,12
114:23	92:3	115:22	21:1 22:19 23:7
<b>grab</b> 118:2	happened 37:14	helpful 25:2 26:9	23:13 24:1,6,9
gradual 77:19	38:4 43:11	29:24 43:14	24:14 26:20
		71:14 73:2	27:1 28:6,15

## [hon - imposition]

29:12 31:25	97:8,15 98:23	112:8	identifies 99:15
32:14,22 33:3,18	100:18 101:6	<b>horne</b> 27:11	identify 30:17
33:23 34:24	102:12,15 104:6	hospital 36:3,3	92:18 94:25
35:7,22 36:17	104:9,18 106:8	39:4 50:16	110:22
37:1,12 38:8,13	106:11,15	hospitals 11:18	identifying
38:25 40:2,10,12	107:11 109:9,11	31:20 33:9 74:7	106:6
40:24 41:4 42:1	111:12,15,18	house 5:12 9:20	<b>illusory</b> 14:4,21
42:19,21 43:23	112:22 117:12	17:19 18:24	56:4
43:25 44:10,20	117:18 118:5,8	19:25 21:5	immediately
45:21,24 46:3,8	<b>honor</b> 6:11 7:10	31:10 32:12,13	51:17 113:17
48:13,25 49:9,13	8:4,19 10:3	37:14 38:11,18	impacting 39:11
49:16,22,25 50:2	11:12 13:25	54:19 55:13	impermissible
51:22 52:6,8	14:23 16:4	56:6,15 58:1,17	15:18
53:19 55:15,18	17:21 19:7,15	72:14 83:10	implausible
58:14 59:14,16	20:2 23:11 24:8	97:4 103:18,21	50:18
59:22 60:2,5,7	24:18 25:19	103:23 114:10	implemented
60:24 61:2,24	26:24 28:11,17	<b>hrsa</b> 89:16	113:24
62:11,15,20,23	28:21 29:23	<b>huge</b> 41:20	implicit 51:21
63:2,7,11,16,19	30:4 31:5,16	<b>human</b> 1:6,13,19	53:16
63:25 64:11,19	32:8 34:3,20	2:6,12 4:6	implicitly 30:22
65:6,15 66:7,10	35:25 36:20	hundred 34:17	50:20
66:15,21,23 67:6	37:4,5,20 38:20	39:6 104:16	important 22:7
67:13,21 68:5,9	40:14 42:16	hundreds 61:16	27:3 41:17 59:4
68:12 69:2,4,8	44:25 46:5	116:25	80:11 107:6
70:5,21,24 72:1	59:24 62:4	hypothetical	109:1,4
72:21 74:16	63:18 65:20	18:6 49:10	<b>impose</b> 5:22
75:2,18 77:14,16	68:8 69:7 77:24	65:16 66:11	15:21 79:1,23
79:3 80:24	79:2,16 82:4,13	hypotheticals	81:12 87:20
81:14,23 82:1,7	83:3 84:4 92:1	116:11,14,15,21	102:10 112:12
82:20 83:8,21	95:22 97:7,10,19	116:22	imposed 14:3
84:10 85:2,24	101:9 102:16	i	15:15,18,23 34:3
86:14 87:3 88:6	105:2 106:14	<b>idea</b> 45:10 51:20	34:4 52:21 53:2
88:13,16 89:13	107:13 109:10	52:19,20 111:6	imposes 22:9
90:10,23 91:7,11	111:17 112:24	111:24	26:1 38:22
91:22 92:21	117:16,20 118:7	<b>identical</b> 73:6,7	59:10
93:5,8 94:5,12	honors 5:7 24:10	identified 30:25	imposing 68:4
94:17 95:4,16,20	26:7 102:14	94:10	imposition 35:14
96:1,18,20 97:5	109:12 110:18		
	1	1	1

[impossible - key]

impossible 18:10	initiate 105:9	invalid 59:12	<b>judge</b> 2:19,19,20
improper 115:21	initiatives 88:20	inventory 73:4	5:3 6:23 7:13
<b>impute</b> 84:12	inordinate 99:19	73:12	41:15 46:14,15
incidental 37:13	instance 50:25	<b>inverse</b> 111:19	46:19,22 47:3
39:20	52:15,23,24 58:4	invite 5:1	50:17 51:22
<b>include</b> 10:6,7,8	instances 93:1	<b>involved</b> 101:17	56:13 59:5
10:9,10 25:14	instructive 80:1	involvement	64:12 78:2 79:4
29:16 43:16	insulin 65:4	100:20	83:2 103:3,16
45:20 58:24	76:13,16	involving 12:21	108:5 109:15,21
included 48:7	insurance 8:13	irrelevant 59:1	110:21 113:1,25
50:21	10:8 12:9 20:24	<b>issue</b> 4:18,21,23	116:5 117:1
includes 25:9	22:6 38:19 39:7	9:17 16:11 22:7	judged 47:6
29:13 48:21	74:4	24:4 46:13	judges 28:23
50:8 53:17	insured 36:8	81:11 91:14	judgment 116:6
including 50:25	38:6	92:11 93:20	justice 3:15
inconsistent	insurer 57:9	111:11	justify 10:22
52:19	integrity 83:25	<b>issued</b> 23:20	103:12
incorrect 78:5	intended 35:21	78:21,23 79:17	jynarque 64:3
78:10 117:10	38:15,22 45:17	107:19	k
incredible 50:15	73:11 86:5	issues 4:15	<b>ka</b> 46:1
indiana 30:14	interest 10:25	<b>issuing</b> 91:4 92:6	kaye 3:11
indicia 89:21	101:15	94:21	<b>kedem</b> 3:10
93:23	intermediaries	<b>it'll</b> 24:18 99:11	45:25,25 46:2,2
indigent 38:3			
0	75:13	j	
114:4	75:13 internet 93:15	<b>j</b> <b>i</b> 3·3 15	46:3,5,6,9 48:18
0		<b>j</b> 3:3,15	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23
114:4	internet 93:15	<b>j</b> 3:3,15 <b>ja534</b> 110:7	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13
114:4 indiscernible	internet 93:15 interpret 8:2	<b>j</b> 3:3,15 <b>ja534</b> 110:7 <b>ja585</b> 110:6	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20
114:4 indiscernible 36:17 71:11	internet 93:15 interpret 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2	j 3:3,15 ja534 110:7 ja585 110:6 ja900 83:6	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15
114:4 <b>indiscernible</b> 36:17 71:11 75:8 76:22 82:2	<b>internet</b> 93:15 <b>interpret</b> 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2 <b>interpretation</b>	j 3:3,15 ja534 110:7 ja585 110:6 ja900 83:6 janarque 81:6	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15 112:23,24 119:8
114:4 <b>indiscernible</b> 36:17 71:11 75:8 76:22 82:2 86:14 104:22	internet 93:15 interpret 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2 interpretation 25:5,13 28:23,25	j 3:3,15 ja534 110:7 ja585 110:6 ja900 83:6 janarque 81:6 jersey 2:16 62:7	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15 112:23,24 119:8 119:12
114:4 <b>indiscernible</b> 36:17 71:11 75:8 76:22 82:2 86:14 104:22 <b>individual</b> 10:25	internet 93:15 interpret 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2 interpretation 25:5,13 28:23,25 78:10 82:21 91:8 interpreted	j 3:3,15 ja534 110:7 ja585 110:6 ja900 83:6 janarque 81:6 jersey 2:16 62:7 jitsu 115:17	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15 112:23,24 119:8 119:12 <b>keep</b> 21:12 24:21
114:4 indiscernible 36:17 71:11 75:8 76:22 82:2 86:14 104:22 individual 10:25 individually	internet 93:15 interpret 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2 interpretation 25:5,13 28:23,25 78:10 82:21 91:8	j 3:3,15 ja534 110:7 ja585 110:6 ja900 83:6 janarque 81:6 jersey 2:16 62:7 jitsu 115:17 jiu 115:17	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15 112:23,24 119:8 119:12 <b>keep</b> 21:12 24:21 26:9 43:8
114:4 indiscernible 36:17 71:11 75:8 76:22 82:2 86:14 104:22 individual 10:25 individually 62:25	internet 93:15 interpret 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2 interpretation 25:5,13 28:23,25 78:10 82:21 91:8 interpreted	j 3:3,15 ja534 110:7 ja585 110:6 ja900 83:6 janarque 81:6 jersey 2:16 62:7 jitsu 115:17 jiu 115:17 job 57:15 103:7	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15 112:23,24 119:8 119:12 keep 21:12 24:21 26:9 43:8 keeps 110:10
114:4 indiscernible 36:17 71:11 75:8 76:22 82:2 86:14 104:22 individual 10:25 individually 62:25 industry 9:13,14	internet 93:15 interpret 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2 interpretation 25:5,13 28:23,25 78:10 82:21 91:8 interpreted 38:21 62:2 95:7	<ul> <li>j 3:3,15</li> <li>ja534 110:7</li> <li>ja585 110:6</li> <li>ja900 83:6</li> <li>janarque 81:6</li> <li>jersey 2:16 62:7</li> <li>jitsu 115:17</li> <li>jiu 115:17</li> <li>job 57:15 103:7</li> <li>jobs 100:8</li> </ul>	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15 112:23,24 119:8 119:12 <b>keep</b> 21:12 24:21 26:9 43:8 <b>keeps</b> 110:10 111:5
114:4 indiscernible 36:17 71:11 75:8 76:22 82:2 86:14 104:22 individual 10:25 individually 62:25 industry 9:13,14 58:9	<pre>internet 93:15 interpret 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2 interpretation 25:5,13 28:23,25 78:10 82:21 91:8 interpreted 38:21 62:2 95:7 112:10</pre>	<ul> <li>j 3:3,15</li> <li>ja534 110:7</li> <li>ja585 110:6</li> <li>ja900 83:6</li> <li>janarque 81:6</li> <li>jersey 2:16 62:7</li> <li>jitsu 115:17</li> <li>jiu 115:17</li> <li>job 57:15 103:7</li> <li>jobs 100:8</li> <li>joint 97:24</li> </ul>	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15 112:23,24 119:8 119:12 keep 21:12 24:21 26:9 43:8 keeps 110:10 111:5 keh 45:25 46:2,3
114:4 indiscernible 36:17 71:11 75:8 76:22 82:2 86:14 104:22 individual 10:25 individually 62:25 industry 9:13,14 58:9 inference 86:15	<pre>internet 93:15 interpret 8:2 11:5 36:24 85:2 interpretation 25:5,13 28:23,25 78:10 82:21 91:8 interpreted 38:21 62:2 95:7 112:10 interpreting</pre>	<ul> <li>j 3:3,15</li> <li>ja534 110:7</li> <li>ja585 110:6</li> <li>ja900 83:6</li> <li>janarque 81:6</li> <li>jersey 2:16 62:7</li> <li>jitsu 115:17</li> <li>jiu 115:17</li> <li>job 57:15 103:7</li> <li>jobs 100:8</li> </ul>	46:3,5,6,9 48:18 49:3,12,15,18,23 50:1,4 52:5,7,13 53:25 55:17,20 58:18 59:15 112:23,24 119:8 119:12 <b>keep</b> 21:12 24:21 26:9 43:8 <b>keeps</b> 110:10 111:5

## [key - long]

112:8	58:14 72:1,21	<b>laws</b> 45:6	<b>lilly</b> 48:17 78:18
kidney 64:3	79:5 85:2,24	<b>lawsuits</b> 80:16	83:18
68:13	92:21 96:20	lay 17:2 26:8	<b>limit</b> 15:16 45:7
<b>kind</b> 18:10 20:13	97:15 100:18	laying 91:16	limitation 86:12
22:5 65:4 68:19	101:6 107:11	lays 62:10 99:6	limitations 69:15
81:13 101:17	109:21 113:1,25	<b>lead</b> 49:5 56:10	limited 5:15
<b>king</b> 3:7	1	leave 17:6 18:19	68:15 81:6
<b>knew</b> 64:9 72:7	<b>l</b> 2:19	74:25 80:8	<b>limits</b> 116:13
72:12 84:6,8	labor 12:21	88:17 102:9	lincoln 19:5
<b>know</b> 4:25 15:3	lack 26:15	legal 25:13 34:21	<b>line</b> 14:17 16:14
22:17,22 23:17	laid 54:6	60:14 96:10	103:4 106:16
26:17 30:13	land 69:6 77:18	legislation 86:19	113:22
56:19 57:6	111:1	legislative 86:21	<b>lines</b> 108:5
60:21 61:4,5,6	language 6:25	111:3 116:5,8	<b>lisa</b> 120:3,7
64:18 65:17	7:17 25:18	length 107:21	<b>list</b> 68:18
66:18 75:20	27:17,24 31:4	<b>letter</b> 7:13 15:14	listed 71:5 89:15
76:8 87:4,4,11	34:20 51:6,15	25:5 34:22	<b>litigant's</b> 116:14
87:12 88:11	62:11 80:11	46:23 58:23	litigants 116:12
91:21 92:6 93:3	102:20 108:25	59:1,9,12 78:24	little 11:16 42:17
93:13,16 94:1,19	110:22 112:11	79:13 82:16	43:3 47:23 54:4
97:18 98:23	large 99:9	103:11 110:13	87:3 91:23
99:1 101:24	largely 98:21	112:10,16 117:7	<b>lives</b> 65:7 76:11
103:9 106:21,24	largest 11:5	letters 6:7 26:21	<b>llc</b> 1:3,15 3:3
106:25 107:14	law 6:4,13,25	47:16 78:22	<b>local</b> 33:10 35:1
107:15 108:6	7:17,19 14:20	117:10	76:1
109:24 111:8	15:4 16:19 24:2	<b>level</b> 10:23	located 39:6
<b>knowing</b> 86:13	24:4,21 25:6,19	100:19 108:21	location 18:24
knowledge 64:25	26:8 27:10,15,18	<b>lhg</b> 2:17	18:25 33:2,5
72:10 114:12	27:23 29:9,13	liable 68:21	64:14 67:24
krause 2:19 8:1	34:5,23 43:20	licensing 44:17	locations 11:9
8:15 9:17 10:24	44:16 47:5,10	<b>lieu</b> 13:3	19:2 26:3 32:2,5
11:9 13:19 21:1	63:23 66:17,17	lifespan 56:3	32:6,25 33:1
29:12 34:24	66:24,24,24	light 24:16 86:25	43:18 67:1,23
35:7 37:12 38:8	67:11,14,15,20	87:4	81:7,8 112:4
38:13 42:1	91:23 111:21	<b>lightly</b> 103:15	long 12:23 20:22
43:23,25 44:10	112:15	<b>liked</b> 115:13	36:14 38:21
44:20 51:22		likewise 17:8	52:17 57:23
52:6,8 56:13			73:20 77:10

## [long - medication]

70.05	1 4 00 1 4 40 0 7	00.14.05.4.0	• 00.01
78:25	lots 33:14 42:25	22:14 27:4,9	<b>maximum</b> 89:24
longer 52:22	louisiana 3:4	30:22,23 33:21	mean 8:2 9:18
79:22 88:8	low 63:17	34:6,13 46:20	21:10 28:6
look 7:10 8:20	<b>lp</b> 2:2 3:10	48:3,16,17 53:9	41:16 42:3
9:3 10:16 12:19	<b>lunar</b> 16:3,6	54:16,23 55:22	65:15 75:20
16:15,17,18 18:1	m	59:11 60:19	80:25 81:15
20:12 21:1 22:3	<b>m</b> 119:3	61:9 65:23	87:4,8 88:7
27:17 42:6	mailing 29:18	68:23 74:17,25	90:24 98:24
46:15 51:24	maintain 7:7	75:13 77:1	104:9
54:9 58:18	115:1	78:19,21 79:11	meaning 10:12
64:15 65:7	maintained	79:23 80:5,20,23	16:16,17 21:13
66:20 73:25	52:25	81:3 82:15 88:4	22:18 82:5
77:20 83:6	<b>major</b> 87:18	97:15 101:16	104:3
99:13 106:16	103:3	102:10 104:11	meaningful 21:3
108:19 110:6	<b>majority</b> 5:19	104:15,24	108:12
111:3,3,4 116:7	12:13 20:9	112:12 115:15	<b>means</b> 21:21
<b>looked</b> 46:22	35:17 56:3	115:23 117:25	23:24,25 28:1
looking 24:23	72:14 74:6 97:3	mapping 97:14	30:11 40:19
42:7 47:4 52:15	109:25	margins 72:11	48:3,6 49:6
56:1 74:16	making 13:16	market 2:23	54:15 63:23
77:19 79:5	35:15 37:10	114:6	77:21,21 84:2
85:12 86:2	40:17 41:25	marketplace	94:21 96:16
89:11,13	45:3 75:24	54:22 116:18,20	116:4
looks 21:2 79:6	81:24 92:6	massachusetts	meant 8:22
79:13		3:11	31:13 109:4
<b>loosely</b> 108:9	management 89:22	<b>massive</b> 9:12,21	<b>measure</b> 100:23
lose 28:4 98:4	manufacturer	10:19 12:12	100:24
lost 41:24 98:18	61:12,18 62:17	20:2	mechanism
lot 17:24 24:2	63:4 65:6 67:21	match 71:17,19	39:15 106:4,5
25:21 37:15	68:3,10,15 70:11	73:8	mechanisms
58:24 60:22,22	70:20 78:15	material 39:22	91:16
72:10 73:24	81:7 104:21	58:24	<b>median</b> 75:21
78:11 82:24	116:15	<b>matter</b> 5:23 8:17	medicaid 9:1
91:18 95:6	manufacturers	12:3 13:21	80:14 85:7
98:24 99:6,11	5:22 6:2 9:14	27:15 41:25	medically 74:14
100:6 103:17,24		47:5,7 58:21	medication 39:8
110:25 114:7	10:8 16:9,10 17:25 20:6	112:14 117:15	67:12,19
115:13 116:10	17.23 20.0		
	1		1

## [medications - nope]

<b>1</b> • <i>i</i> •	• 1 1•		00.0.100.11
medications	misleading	<b>multi</b> 9:12 10:19	98:9 100:11
39:4,5,7 64:5	113:12	multiple 76:14	104:12,24 112:9
72:16 73:13	mispronounce	77:6,9 79:11	<b>needed</b> 84:23
medicine 64:3	45:25	98:3	97:11 107:23
<b>meet</b> 17:22	misstated 118:3	multitude 80:15	needs 25:18
<b>meets</b> 17:6	misstatement	myriad 19:1	29:18 43:15
memoranda	117:17,20	32:2	66:14 72:9
88:23	mistake 43:1	n	95:14 99:16
<b>mention</b> 69:13	misunderstand	<b>n</b> 4:1 119:1,3	102:3 112:9,18
<b>menu</b> 86:23	110:21	120:1	neighborhood
<b>mere</b> 93:2,25	<b>mobile</b> 74:12	<b>n.w.</b> 3:4,8,11,17	114:11
<b>merge</b> 18:22	90:2 100:2	name 45:25 99:9	<b>net</b> 8:24 9:7
19:17,20	<b>model</b> 7:9 12:4	narrowing 68:18	71:20
<b>merits</b> 53:23	55:3 56:7 57:1	nation 55:6	network 20:3
62:8 89:2	58:13 72:22	national 2:23	networks 69:13
<b>met</b> 52:22	86:6	75:24	<b>never</b> 7:15 21:23
<b>method</b> 83:24	<b>models</b> 45:10	nationwide	30:2 53:2,4
michigan 76:7	<b>modest</b> 10:17	80:15	78:13 107:16
<b>mid</b> 118:12	42:13	<b>nature</b> 45:10	113:13
<b>miles</b> 19:2,2	modifications	navigate 61:15	nevertheless
34:17 35:12	92:10	near 14:7	50:20
39:6 75:22 76:8	<b>moment</b> 67:14	neat 106:19	<b>new</b> 2:16 4:17,24
76:16 108:6,11	<b>money</b> 33:16	nebraska 19:5	15:4 22:24 23:1
117:4	40:1,7 41:21,25	necessarily 65:3	23:1,1,20,21
<b>milk</b> 30:7,7	45:16 75:25	87:8 92:6 93:23	30:13 62:7
<b>million</b> 98:19,19	99:24 114:7	95:5 100:10	76:23 78:12,17
<b>mind</b> 24:22	<b>monitor</b> 99:16	necessity 100:6	107:7,8,19,20
26:10	<b>month</b> 57:19	need 4:9,20	<b>nexus</b> 36:15
minimal 104:1	101:25	15:20 17:12	<b>nice</b> 103:7
<b>minimum</b> 102:3	<b>months</b> 57:11	22:8 39:4,5,7	ninety 97:8
102:19 110:15	88:24 89:14	43:15 45:18,19	<b>noel</b> 3:3 5:4
minority 114:2	98:14,18 113:16	47:11 53:23	<b>non</b> 23:5
114:14,15	<b>moon</b> 63:17	61:15,20 64:12	nonbinding
116:25	<b>moot</b> 110:14	65:5,5 66:3,20	76:24 79:7,8,17
<b>minutes</b> 5:5,16	mootness 4:21	71:7,8,17,18	nonpatients
24:12 46:7	112:17	76:12 85:23	70:13
116:1	morning 4:3	90:7,17,20 98:9	<b>nope</b> 104:22
		20.7,17,20 20.9	

Date Filed: 11/29/2022

## [nordisk - opinion]

nordisk 1:9,9 2:8	88:24 90:15	offer 5:8,25 7:21	officially 96:7
2:8 3:6,7 24:12	95:1 98:17	8:2,7 10:13,14	<b>oh</b> 6:22 41:4
119:7	103:16,25 106:2	10:15 14:2,4,7	91:11 105:1
<b>north</b> 76:9	113:18 114:17	14:21,24 15:4,5	<b>oil</b> 90:2
<b>norvo</b> 24:12	numbers 4:3	15:7,12,13,16,19	<b>oira</b> 89:22
<b>nos</b> 2:1	0	15:21,24 16:16	okay 14:25 19:6
<b>notable</b> 51:16	<b>o</b> 4:1 120:1	16:18,20,24 17:9	19:14,21 29:19
92:17 101:23	<b>ob</b> 74:12 100:1	17:22 18:8,21,23	42:20 62:23
<b>note</b> 22:20 31:10	objection 29:20	19:17,21 21:14	63:2,7,16 69:2
91:3 99:8 100:5	44:4	22:10,18 29:15	91:11 106:15
101:21	objections 78:7	29:16 31:2 32:9	112:21 118:5
<b>noted</b> 79:5 89:23	110:17	34:4 38:22	<b>old</b> 15:5 22:25
92:24 93:1	objective 22:1	40:19 43:16	107:25
nothing's 90:24	108:24	47:22 48:1,3,6,8	omaha 19:4
<b>notice</b> 23:1,5	obligation 8:5	48:9,10,11,20,21	<b>once</b> 4:11 30:24
30:16 36:12	14:24 16:22	48:24 49:1,6,7	114:21
42:16 88:10	22:10 25:10,14	49:10,17,18,21	one's 110:7,7
89:3,5 90:5,8	26:2 29:16 34:4	50:7,13 53:17	<b>ones</b> 52:24 59:6
91:3,4,19,25	38:23 40:20	54:9,13,14,17,21	75:4 86:10 98:3
92:13 95:12	43:4,16,17 47:19	55:7,8 56:1,2,4	<b>onsite</b> 72:8 76:12
104:5 106:9	47:25 51:21	63:4 65:9 67:22	<b>open</b> 100:8
107:20	53:8 62:10 70:9	83:15 84:2	opened 53:1
noticed 27:5	75:17 83:16,18	102:20,22 104:3	opening 22:20
68:12 109:20	102:7 111:6	109:3,5,6 111:24	91:17 92:17
<b>novartis</b> 48:16	112:3,12 115:20	111:25 112:2,10	94:25
november 1:5	115:21,22	116:3,3,4,19	operate 72:11
107:19 120:11	obligations	<b>offered</b> 55:14	102:9
<b>novo</b> 1:9,9 2:8,8	46:24 66:4	offering 5:18	operated 7:11
3:6,7 28:8 47:15	71:11 75:1	21:14 45:20	31:11
119:7	79:23,25	63:12	operates 93:12
nuances 79:4	<b>obviously</b> 25:16	offers 5:23 15:17	96:13
<b>number</b> 5:14 7:4	56:3 65:13 79:4	48:14 115:16	operating 51:13
8:11 11:22	102:1	<b>office</b> 58:11	68:25 93:14
13:16 15:25	occurred 83:5	63:24 64:22	98:1,5
20:22 23:21	105:12 107:22	89:21 113:7	operation 5:20
27:10,13 57:13	odd 37:5 43:3	115:8	20:10
60:17 75:18	Guu 5715 T515	<b>official</b> 89:16	<b>opinion</b> 6:6,23
77:4 81:1 88:19			7:10 14:16 15:8

## [opinion - patient's]

25:6 34:22	outside 21:6	<b>parrish</b> 3:6 24:9	99:9
47:18 53:7 78:2	55:1 69:22 70:2	24:10,11,15	parties 25:15
78:22 80:11	72:15,19 84:20	26:23 27:2	26:2 38:24 42:4
110:14 112:17	84:22 85:1,10	28:10,17 29:22	43:17 45:20
116:7	86:4 87:15,21	32:7,16 33:1,6	47:8 50:22
opportunity	92:4 97:11,16	33:22 34:2 35:2	112:3
12:13 107:16	98:3 100:5,20	35:13,24 36:20	<b>parts</b> 50:16
opposed 26:21	114:13	37:4,20 38:12,20	<b>party</b> 25:10
opposing 110:10	outsource 57:15	39:2 40:8,11,14	43:18 44:1,6
<b>option</b> 87:5,5,6,7	overall 22:4	41:3,5 42:15,20	46:17 47:20,25
87:8,10,10	108:18	42:23 43:24	50:24 51:5,15
<b>options</b> 86:23	<b>overlap</b> 46:13	44:9,11,25 45:23	53:10 57:15
oral 4:8,13 60:7	overlay 47:13	109:11,12	58:3 59:10
118:13	overly 79:6	111:14,17,20	61:21 99:20
orbit 63:17	overwhelming	119:7,11	101:3 112:4
<b>order</b> 44:4 76:16	97:3	parse 28:7 31:3	119:5
102:4 104:12	р	<b>part</b> 5:17 7:2	pass 11:18 90:20
105:9 112:18	<b>p</b> 4:1	11:21 13:23	98:11 99:24
ordinary 83:24	pa 2:24	14:24 33:17,18	passage 89:9
original 41:17	pace 112:19	36:18 37:10	91:21 93:2,25
42:13	page 1:22 2:21	49:17 65:23	94:7,8
originally 35:21	62:9 75:12	88:3	passed 8:25
114:1	80:11 97:23	participate 61:9	11:17 58:12
otsuka 63:25	99:6 115:6	particular 4:18	77:22
103:6	119:5	4:23 32:5 33:4	passing 43:9
ought 22:16 78:8	pages 69:9 74:1	40:6 48:11	74:7
95:1 108:14	74:5 83:6	61:21 64:13,14	patient 12:7 35:6
outer 14:7,12	paid 62:18	64:17,20,24,24	35:15,16,18
17:1	panel 2:18	64:25 66:14,18	38:17 39:3
outlines 74:8	<b>panel's</b> 91:15	66:19 67:12,19	41:10 42:12
outpatient 51:4	<b>paper</b> 11:22 12:1	69:21 73:13	43:10 44:21,22
62:18 63:5	paragraphs	81:17 82:18	56:14,18,20 57:7
outset 4:11	70:11	83:6 87:23	57:18,23 58:2,16
21:24 61:13	pardon 50:1	89:21 90:3 92:2	70:1 75:21
63:14 66:3 68:4	55:17	92:4,18 93:1,14	84:20 108:6,8,8
75:1,17 80:21	parent 113:15	99:5 118:1	108:11,15
81:13 82:13		particularly	patient's 35:22
		45:2 78:2 92:25	99:12

## [patients - pharmacy]

patients 7:8	<b>people</b> 11:22	108:14	106:2 108:2
10:25 11:3 12:6	33:10 64:15,24	pharmaceutical	109:18 110:1,2,4
12:7,14 21:3	65:5 68:18	44:5	112:13 113:4
33:11,14 34:14	72:10 73:10	pharmaceuticals	114:20 115:10
34:15,17,25 35:7	76:1,5 77:9	2:2 3:7,10 9:20	116:24 117:3
35:8 36:2,5,7,11	94:13 98:8	11:7 46:6 72:24	pharmacists
36:16 38:1,3,6,9	100:1,9 106:20	86:4 103:5	103:9
38:15,15,16 39:3	114:10 115:18	pharmacies 5:14	pharmacy 5:12
39:5,12,12,14,25	perceived 33:24	7:4 8:11 9:5,5	5:13 7:3,11,23
41:18,23 42:3	percent 11:18,25	9:15,22 10:7,21	8:9 9:20 10:2
43:6,12 44:2	30:6,7 35:17	11:3,23 12:4,15	12:10 13:14
57:5,13,14 58:12	36:10 58:8	13:16 16:11	17:18,19 18:25
60:20 71:10,18	72:13 74:3 97:5	20:3,7,22 21:23	18:25 19:25
72:6,20 73:10,20	97:8,25 98:1,16	20:3,7,22 21:23	20:11,17 21:5,6
74:8 75:10	104:17 110:3	29:14 33:16	31:9 32:1,12,13
76:10 81:25	113:11 114:9	37:8,9,23 38:10	32:19,23,24
85:22 98:4,10,22	perfect 8:21	38:14 39:15,18	34:17 35:10,19
99:25 101:16	10:15 77:16	39:21 40:4,20,25	37:14,18 38:11
103:10 113:2	perfectly 89:24	41:25 42:8 44:3	38:18 39:9
114:4	<b>period</b> 57:13	44:8 45:12,15	41:14 42:10
pattern 66:19	92:21 93:17	46:17 47:21	44:22 45:3
68:12 92:2 96:5	108:3	52:4 53:10	52:19,21 54:19
pause 88:19,22	permissible 66:2	54:24 58:1,4,17	54:19 55:12,12
96:7	permitted 61:12	58:17 61:2,8	55:13 56:6,6,15
paused 89:3	111:7,16	64:3,8,23 65:19	56:19 57:12
pay 12:9 13:3	permutations	68:17 70:24	58:13 61:14,17
39:8 70:19	18:11	72:9,14,15,19	61:20 63:24
99:19	<b>person</b> 11:24	73:25 74:3 75:3	66:12 68:20
paying 113:3	87:7 90:11,16	75:14 76:13,14	70:2,25 71:5,9
pays 29:17 35:16	personnel 65:11	76:23 77:7,10,15	71:16 72:25
35:18	67:2,24 81:9,17	78:17 79:12,18	75:7,22 76:12,18
<b>pedley</b> 115:7	perspective	81:8 84:11,13,22	78:9 79:8,10
pegged 11:22	29:14 33:19	85:1,11,15,18,18	81:11,17 82:15
peninsula 76:7	persuasive 6:23	86:5 87:14,16,22	83:11 84:14,17
pennsylvania	<b>petition</b> 107:20	87:22 95:2 97:4	84:20 85:21
3:8,17	petitioners 93:18	97:12,17 98:3	100:8,12 103:20
<b>penny</b> 40:16	<b>pharma</b> 1:9 2:9	99:7,20 100:5,20	103:21,23
	83:23 107:18	101:3 103:18,25	113:16,19

## [pharmacy - pretty]

Page 24

114:10 115:8,12	94:10	82:18,18 83:6	practically
phenomenon	pocket 7:8 9:8	98:15 113:12	40:13 81:20
84:15	9:18,24 38:7	117:7	82:22
philadelphia	39:10 114:7	<b>policy</b> 5:17	practice 83:23
2:24	pocketed 37:23	12:25 13:7,9	84:7
<b>phrase</b> 62:15	41:13 98:25	21:8,17,17 32:11	precedent 91:25
102:21	pocketing 35:20	32:17 51:24	94:2,20 95:9,17
<b>pick</b> 30:10 83:19	39:25	59:5,6 81:20	95:21
<b>pill</b> 74:3	pockets 10:20	105:24 113:17	preceding 51:17
<b>pills</b> 71:1 73:6	39:18	113:24 114:1	precipitously
101:25 102:24	point 4:21 9:22	<b>poor</b> 9:8 21:19	98:16
103:1	11:3,15 14:6,22	22:6 74:14	precise 25:4
<b>pilot</b> 77:5	22:24 26:7,25	109:2	precisely 13:5
<b>place</b> 19:24 32:4	27:20 29:5 30:1	populations	23:19
34:10 36:23	30:4 31:5,12	74:13,15 100:6	precludes 15:13
46:9 48:23	35:14 37:7	porter 3:11	precluding 42:3
64:17 65:10	40:15 41:15,16	portion 40:4	preferred 41:22
106:7 115:20	51:11 53:11	position 15:14	prejudice 95:13
placed 44:4	54:1 56:22 57:7	25:25 26:3,6	107:3,3,9 108:16
48:19 57:2	58:7,21 64:11	34:21 49:2	prejudiced
places 19:5	73:22 85:6,11	60:16 64:1,4	92:20 94:24
<b>plain</b> 16:16 17:2	86:3 87:1,14	65:22 78:13	prepared 4:12
17:4 18:12	88:8 95:4 99:22	79:14 82:9	prescription
plainly 5:17 7:18	102:18 103:3,16	83:17 84:3	35:9 44:23
31:15	104:4,7 106:12	96:21 110:23,24	57:21 63:22
plaintiff 95:11	107:17 108:17	116:14 118:3	70:1
95:11	109:15 113:4	positions 7:2	present 58:7
plaintiff's 78:12	116:7 117:5	possible 92:9	presented
plaintiffs 83:14	point.112826	possibly 82:25	117:14,14
89:8 98:17	88:12	post 114:23	preserves 83:25
<b>plan</b> 105:10	<b>pointed</b> 50:18	postdate 86:21	presumably
planet 15:17	114:8 117:2	potential 71:20	15:16 40:8
plausible 94:7	points 102:17	potentially	presume 23:22
play 80:20 82:20	109:13 110:9	61:16 67:10	presumptively
<b>please</b> 5:4 24:11	112:25	99:15 101:9	92:22
41:10 59:19	<b>policies</b> 17:5,22	<b>practical</b> 39:1	<b>pretty</b> 52:14
<b>plus</b> 39:23 50:10	25:23 61:16	61:10 73:15	54:7 56:16
93:5 94:8,8,8,8	78:19,21 82:16		72:11 79:14

#### [prevent - purchase]

Page 25

prevent 106:7	probably 10:10	45:17 51:1,11,18	proposition
previous 53:11	54:1 60:2	55:1,2 60:18	28:16 93:3 94:2
<b>price</b> 5:9,11 6:1	100:25	61:7,10,11,23	prospective
7:22 21:15	problem 18:4	66:1 67:7,9,16	89:11
35:18 39:16	22:15 24:1 31:6	68:1,25 69:19	proverbial 7:24
41:3,6,11,12,13	33:13,18,24	72:8 73:22 75:8	provide 5:15
43:16 48:11,24	36:11,13 41:21	77:6 78:8 80:3	8:11,13 16:10
49:19,25 50:3,5	41:24 42:24	81:6 84:8,12,21	20:23 21:19
50:11 52:25	44:12 77:3	84:25 87:16,19	48:3 54:4 55:22
57:9,9 63:1,6,10	78:18 103:20	101:12 104:19	57:25 58:2
69:20 72:6	105:7 106:6	104:20 105:23	85:14 98:22
102:23,24,25	problematic	110:6 112:19	99:25 104:1
109:7 113:3	108:15	118:2,2	105:24 108:20
<b>prices</b> 96:25	problems 73:15	program's 56:3	116:17
primary 6:8	77:5,8 99:15	84:13	provided 34:13
42:1 54:10	110:5 111:1	programs 17:8	36:4 65:9
<b>prime</b> 42:4 51:1	procedure 6:10	77:20 96:25	114:12
51:2,3	95:14	103:19	providers 8:24
principal 6:12	proceedings	prohibit 44:19	9:7 44:24
21:7 23:17	118:12 120:4	prohibited 13:6	provides 21:8
31:19 40:22	<b>process</b> 57:10	41:19 111:7	105:25
principle 47:8	91:4,6,10 105:3	112:1	providing 8:23
55:7	105:6,15,19	prohibition	20:24 45:4
principles 16:19	production 11:6	15:22	56:15 85:10,17
16:19 17:3	products 27:14	prohibits 6:16	97:16 114:2
18:13,20 20:13	<b>profit</b> 9:13,14	7:20 13:9 102:6	provision 47:22
24:21 26:8	42:5 45:3	projected 98:19	48:1 85:8
27:25 34:10	profits 37:11	promulgate 94:4	102:21
<b>prior</b> 8:24 23:22	39:22 113:15	promulgating	provisions 35:4
32:3 57:13,19,20	program 5:20	89:7	50:23
84:20	7:20 8:21,22	property 43:5	<b>public</b> 114:21,22
<b>priority</b> 80:18	9:11,16 10:16,22	111:21 115:11	published 88:25
<b>private</b> 6:2,15	12:17 13:18	proposal 89:18	91:1
27:2,22 28:12	20:9,10,18 21:24	90:14	purchase 5:10
37:8 47:8 80:7,9	33:17 34:12	proposed 88:10	12:8 48:10,11,24
80:22 101:18	36:1,15,18 38:1	91:5 92:13	49:19 50:7,11
110:7 112:5	38:21 41:17,20	106:9 107:25	63:5 75:9 76:17
	42:14 45:6,8,13		102:4 106:1

#### [purchased - regulation]

purchased 51:12	49:9 50:6 56:13	<b>range</b> 107:15	46:7 59:17
62:15,19 71:8	58:22 59:2,7,8	<b>rare</b> 58:3	119:10,11,12
112:11	60:14,18,25	<b>reach</b> 46:11	<b>receive</b> 70:3
purchaser 54:24	61:22 62:4	<b>read</b> 28:3 31:3,7	received 78:22
55:11 102:24	65:20 66:7 67:3	36:21 37:5 40:2	92:12 94:23
purchasing 9:24	67:10,18 79:3	40:18 69:14	97:22 103:11
52:17 62:25	81:2,12 82:17	112:2	receiving 11:1
76:19	83:1 84:5 95:6	reading 45:1	recognize 26:13
purpose 9:11	104:6 109:1,4	62:6 102:2	27:3 45:9
10:17,24 12:17	110:19 114:8	real 36:13 71:25	reconsidered
20:3 21:4 22:4	115:19,19	72:17 81:15	88:23
33:8 42:13 43:2	117:22	97:13 98:12	<b>record</b> 58:15,20
108:18,19,23	questioning	100:5,13	58:25 75:19
purposes 8:14	103:4	<b>realize</b> 42:25	76:3 83:4 98:6
20:25 40:25	questions 4:22	45:14 117:21	98:14 99:23
42:25 105:17	24:16 60:23	really 27:3 29:17	110:11 113:2,6
111:4	81:1,1 96:19	55:25 61:22	114:20 120:4
pursuant 63:22	102:12 108:5	65:18 75:25	<b>refer</b> 115:18
<b>pursue</b> 80:9	109:22 112:8	82:11 87:4	referring 58:19
pursues 22:1	114:18	97:20 101:10	110:11
108:23	<b>quick</b> 102:17	108:12	<b>refers</b> 48:10
<b>put</b> 11:13 15:2	112:25	<b>rear</b> 115:7	refine 91:5
19:3 22:21,25	<b>quite</b> 10:11	reason 6:12	101:12
47:22 51:19	20:13 47:14	36:24 41:16	reflected 25:5
59:5 64:4 68:14	48:8 108:9	44:16 51:16	56:17 64:21
94:17 103:1	<b>quo</b> 85:7,13	55:2 80:1	reflecting 23:21
105:4,5	96:22,24	reasonable 5:23	<b>refused</b> 78:15
q	r	12:24 22:3	regarding 67:11
qua 23:5	<b>r</b> 4:1 119:3 120:1	83:23 101:2	79:17
qualify 84:19	<b>radius</b> 61:17	105:11	register 23:9
<b>quantity</b> 101:24	raised 78:7	reasoning 25:17	88:25 89:6 92:5
102:3	117:22	80:17	93:11 105:8
question 18:10	<b>raises</b> 73:15	reasons 105:1	106:17
21:12 24:17,19	raising 29:21	<b>rebate</b> 9:1 71:3	regular 41:12
25:3,4,12 32:3	raisins 27:12	rebuts 51:20	regulated 100:21
39:1,25 40:18	<b>rampant</b> 106:3,3	rebuttal 5:5	regulation
47:15 48:20	<b>1</b>	19:11 24:7,13	101:11
		42:17,22 45:22	

## [regulations - retains]

regulations	remedy 88:4	required 5:19	responded 92:11
105:4	remember 8:21	7:5 8:17 20:14	92:16 110:16
regulatory 77:17	110:23	63:16 75:9	responding
88:20 91:16	remembering	requirement	92:10 94:22
96:7 108:7	94:16	13:23 17:22	response 5:21
reinvest 43:10	<b>remind</b> 24:20	28:9,12 46:16	23:13 61:25
reinvesting	removed 89:14	47:1 50:9 52:3,9	105:21
74:11	render 14:4	53:3 54:9,11	responses 11:12
rejected 86:17	rendered 12:20	59:10 64:7 68:3	17:21
rejecting 52:11	<b>repeat</b> 67:17	73:4,12 84:12	responsibility
75:15	repeated 52:1	91:25 102:19	66:5,5
rejection 52:2	repeatedly 23:2	112:11 117:8,9	rest 23:23 43:22
<b>related</b> 109:21	52:1 108:22	117:25	resting 86:18
relates 90:15	repeating 21:12	requirements	restoration 85:6
relationship	<b>replace</b> 28:12	50:21 64:2 66:1	restore 8:22
31:8,17,18,22	replenish 41:10	73:5 89:25	restoring 85:12
84:24 85:20	replenishment	95:12 104:10,23	restrict 46:21
115:2,3	7:9 12:4 45:10	requires 5:8,24	75:1 115:16,16
<b>relative</b> 80:10	55:3 57:1 72:22	10:14 15:13,21	restricted 86:9
relatively 8:6	<b>report</b> 64:22	23:1 109:5	116:16
114:14	71:14 74:1,5	requiring 66:17	restriction 34:25
relevant 22:12	99:4,5,14 110:7	reserve 5:5	69:25 86:24
62:14	110:8 113:6	19:10 46:7	restrictions
reliance 83:15	reporting 2:23	resides 72:4	87:21
<b>relied</b> 87:15	reports 33:15	residual 29:3	rests 89:8
relief 24:19	represent 113:22	resolution 88:1	result 70:17
relinquish 78:21	representation	resolve 16:13	83:17 84:24
rely 22:23 30:16	48:22 113:8,10	18:6 22:17	92:7 94:20
31:2 58:25	representatives	109:4	113:11
86:14 90:13	51:8	resolved 10:12	results 46:12
97:4,25 98:2,3	repromulgated	22:9 29:6,8	95:10
110:12	90:4	resources 73:21	<b>retain</b> 47:8
<b>relying</b> 30:1	request 24:12	respect 22:20	52:23 84:23
89:20	45:12	48:22 50:9	retained 72:23
remainder 72:14	<b>require</b> 11:6	respectfully	<b>retaining</b> 74:10
remains 112:5	13:1 63:4 65:3	21:25 47:3	77:10
remarkable	65:25 75:3	respond 24:24	retains 84:18
115:25		96:6	

## [reticulated - second]

	42 20 44 10		20 14 20 2 45 5
reticulated	43:20 44:18	<b>run</b> 76:6	38:14 39:2 45:5
68:25 69:4 70:6	111:21	running 37:16	51:25 52:8
70:10 87:24	rin 89:18 94:18	<b>runs</b> 84:10	64:13 65:7
102:8 115:14	94:21	<b>rural</b> 19:2 21:20	66:25 67:21
reticulation 70:6	<b>rins</b> 94:20	22:6 74:12 76:9	68:15,20,22
retrospective	<b>ripe</b> 93:23	100:7 109:2	69:22 70:9
57:10	<b>rise</b> 84:14	S	73:12,24 78:8,24
revenue 21:22	<b>risk</b> 47:23	<b>s</b> 4:1	80:6,25 91:13
97:25 98:5	<b>rite</b> 98:25	<b>safe</b> 18:2,3	92:16 93:19
revenues 37:25	robust 10:4	safety 8:23 9:7	94:20 96:1,2
39:23	<b>rodeo</b> 59:22	103:8	97:23 100:25
<b>reverse</b> 12:11	<b>room</b> 3:16 74:25	sale 37:11 56:22	111:5,18,20
reversible 95:19	80:9 102:9	57:7 58:7 63:12	says 10:22 14:17
<b>review</b> 93:18,23	115:15	sales 98:15	15:15 17:2
<b>rid</b> 30:24	<b>rough</b> 60:7	113:11,16,21,22	26:18 29:10
<b>right</b> 7:22 8:8	roughly 58:8	115:16 116:16	31:14 35:5,5
13:11 15:25	<b>rule</b> 16:12 22:25	sanofi 1:3,15 3:3	43:21 47:10
16:16 17:18,20	22:25 23:1,1,9	4:4 5:4,8 6:3	64:1 70:11
18:1 26:5,23	23:18,18,21,21	14:11 20:20,20	82:22 87:2,24
27:2,13,14 28:4	23:22 88:24	47:15 91:18	90:11 91:18
28:14 31:12	89:7,17 90:3,6	97:23 103:24	92:15 93:9
33:13 35:8,13	90:25 91:7,9,23	104:11 115:5	95:14 102:21
37:2 38:19	92:4,10,11,20	119:6	105:8,13 106:16
39:12 42:6	93:21 94:4	sanofi's 7:20	115:9
44:10,24 46:25	95:10 96:8,9,15	13:9 92:17	scarce 73:21
47:8 49:12,15,25	101:14 106:16	105:17,23	scattered 116:25
50:3 52:6,14	106:19 107:4,7,8	santa 80:3	scenario 72:17
61:3 68:19	107:19,20 108:1	satisfy 54:23	72:22
76:20 81:15,21	rulemaking	55:9,10	scheme 20:4
85:18 87:19	26:16,19,22 28:7	save 42:17	69:1,4 70:6,10
89:4,7,11 91:4	29:7 69:5 88:10	savings 74:7,10	87:24 88:7
96:18 106:24	90:20 91:5	86:10 97:25	102:8 115:14
109:15,16,22	92:13 106:9	98:17.21	schemes 71:2
110:25 111:7,8	111:2	saw 37:20	80:10
112:5 114:8	<b>rules</b> 80:21 93:1	saying 14:2 19:5	scholer 3:11
115:24	94:21	21:5 23:18	seasonal 113:21
<b>rights</b> 27:18,23	ruling 23:6	25:24 32:3,8,24	second 14:6
28:13 29:9 34:5			24:20 26:19

Page: 149

## [second - sort]

29:25 34:4	sending 38:5	seven 8:12 20:23	similarly 70:3
59:24 96:21	sense 8:21 10:15	seventh 33:20	<b>simple</b> 22:23
104:6 107:17	25:24 28:11	59:25	25:12
116:6	42:24 45:1	<b>shared</b> 12:14	simplistically
secondly 18:5	77:17 109:19	33:9 41:13	79:6,14
19:19 108:4	sentence 62:14	42:10	<b>simply</b> 7:19 8:16
secretary 2:5 4:5	62:14 118:12	shedding 86:25	9:15 13:8 22:8
62:16 70:15	separate 8:7	<b>shelf</b> 72:25	48:23 106:5
80:6 94:4	19:18 73:4,12,14	shelves 57:3	109:5
section 5:7 46:15	seriously 73:19	<b>ship</b> 18:23 45:11	<b>sine</b> 23:4
50:24 51:11,17	serve 42:13	72:3	<b>single</b> 22:1 23:16
51:17 69:12,16	served 108:13	shipped 57:2	108:23 109:7
69:17,17 102:7	server 61:21	shipping 18:22	singular 62:21
<b>see</b> 2:21 27:10	serves 103:21	<b>shove</b> 73:13	<b>sir</b> 5:6 46:4
27:18 39:12	service 45:4	<b>show</b> 57:25 78:6	site 35:1 71:16
47:9 49:13	<b>services</b> 1:6,13	<b>showed</b> 11:22	86:11 100:8
52:15 58:19	1:19 2:6,12 4:6	12:1	situation 72:2
70:6 92:14	21:19 58:1	showing 30:3	six 99:8
94:23 97:21	74:11,14 98:9,22	<b>shown</b> 113:13	slash 18:22
100:21 113:2,8	100:1,2,3	<b>shows</b> 9:10	<b>small</b> 110:1
114:24 115:6	serving 9:9	106:3	114:2,14 116:24
seeing 77:5,8	33:10 57:5 76:1	sick 59:25	social 8:23 9:7
seek 93:18	100:9	sickness 60:6	109:1,4
seen 7:1 37:25	set 4:9 7:1,25	<b>side</b> 4:13,14	<b>sold</b> 40:16 97:1
<b>sees</b> 57:24	8:22 18:12	11:13 15:2	<b>solely</b> 56:11
selecting 86:23	19:22 44:13	54:13 85:5	84:17
<b>self</b> 115:22	52:25 59:12	98:24 103:2	<b>solves</b> 103:19
<b>sell</b> 34:9 38:6	61:12 63:22	116:15,22	somebody 41:8
44:15 63:17	85:8 91:24	sides 54:2	43:5 81:16 87:6
65:24 75:13	103:22 112:18	116:11	90:11 102:25
78:16 101:19,22	117:10	significant 4:7	108:11
102:24,25	sets 7:14 44:1	52:14	sorry 16:5 35:25
<b>selling</b> 63:9,11	68:23 70:8	significantly	42:16 75:12
66:13	89:24 105:10	82:9	79:2 97:7
semantic 48:13	setting 37:16	silence 111:15	110:11 111:17
<b>semi</b> 34:1	69:23 91:10	similar 69:24	117:19,20 118:7
send 29:19 54:2	95:9	83:17 88:22	<b>sort</b> 26:24 42:24
106:2			49:7,8 51:5,21

## [sort - structuring]

53:16 54:25	spelled 69:15	statements 92:4	statute's 44:19
55:6 57:16 59:1	<b>split</b> 4:13,14	94:13 106:20	statutes 42:25
65:3 77:11	12:11	110:13	84:25
116:13	<b>spoken</b> 40:23	states 1:1,6,12	statutory 5:24
sorts 52:22 78:7	<b>spread</b> 35:20	1:18 2:5,12,16	21:4 25:12
114:24	37:25 41:11	3:15 4:5 28:18	28:22,24 30:17
<b>sought</b> 100:16	43:9 78:18	statistics 56:17	53:3,8,23 58:22
<b>sound</b> 21:12	square 23:3,4,5	57:24	59:2 60:14 62:4
<b>sounds</b> 70:5 82:7	76:7	status 85:7,13	62:5 66:1,4 70:4
82:8	squarely 13:5	96:22,24	71:10 78:16
sources 113:5	<b>staff</b> 87:7	<b>statute</b> 6:4,14,16	79:1,24 91:8
<b>space</b> 73:16	stakeholders	7:20 8:18 9:1	102:4 110:19,22
spalding 3:7	22:12,13	10:13 11:6 13:6	stay 34:10 88:7
<b>spawn</b> 80:15,25	stand 103:21,23	15:13 22:1,3,9	stem 110:20
speak 23:23,24	standard 16:24	25:9,13,14 26:1	<b>step</b> 21:16 96:15
speaking 81:20	17:6 21:8	26:4,11,15,21	stephanos 2:20
82:22 114:15	standards 12:21	27:17,18 28:1,3	steps 17:12
speaks 49:23	standing 94:2	28:8,25 31:1,8	<b>stock</b> 115:10
50:6	standpoint 61:11	31:11,14 33:8	<b>stop</b> 41:19
specialization	stands 93:3 94:1	34:3,7 35:2	storage 73:16
65:3	<b>stark</b> 7:14 46:14	36:21,23,24 37:2	<b>store</b> 57:3
specialized	46:22 50:17	37:3,6,10 40:2	straightforward
64:12,15,21,23	51:22 59:5	40:21,23 46:18	8:6 80:20
65:10 66:14	116:5	47:1,19,21 48:10	strands 60:12
67:1,2,24 72:10	stark's 6:23 47:4	49:4,7,23 50:6,8	street 2:23 56:24
81:8,16	78:2	59:9 60:15 62:2	strengthen 87:23
specialty 65:1	<b>start</b> 32:18 46:10	68:23 69:9 73:4	stretching 73:21
103:4,9	54:3 77:5 90:7	74:24 77:21	<b>strike</b> 112:15
specific 25:25	started 78:18	78:11,25 80:8	strikeout 82:11
70:22	state 32:5 63:23	82:6,19,21 83:13	strikes 25:20
specifically	66:17,23 67:15	85:3,12 86:6,8	string 17:11
50:24	67:20	86:22 87:1,20	stronger 48:8
specificity 50:15	state's 74:8 99:4	90:19 100:15,21	strongly 17:23
50:20 52:9	stated 4:25	101:1,23 102:2,5	structure 47:9
<b>spectrum</b> 82:10	65:21	102:9,19 104:3	60:15 62:5
speculation	statement 28:9	106:5 108:20,23	structuring
99:18	28:11	110:21 112:12	115:23
		117:9	

[study - text]

<b>study</b> 58:9,15,19	suggest 31:18	67:18 71:23	talk 37:6 78:12
77:2	47:3 75:23	73:8 77:12	101:23 115:13
submission	111:25	81:24 88:18	talked 36:10
40:21 54:10	suggested 107:2	96:21 99:3	48:2 58:5
<b>submit</b> 20:19	suggesting 50:11	104:17 106:12	talking 27:6
21:25 105:10,14	suggestion 31:20	107:13 114:6	37:21 39:23
107:20	105:21	117:18,18	48:24 50:7 54:5
submitted	suggests 64:4	<b>surface</b> 16:3,6	55:4 60:10
107:12 115:5	<b>suit</b> 80:7	surprise 95:6	71:13 72:24
submitting	<b>suite</b> 2:24 3:8,12	suss 116:13	99:14 110:4
48:23	suits 80:12,22	<b>system</b> 68:23	talks 27:12 51:7
subsection 51:1	82:25	69:21,22,24	51:8,11
51:6 62:5,9	summary 116:6	82:25 88:1	teasing 16:5
subsections	<b>summer</b> 78:15	89:22 99:21	technically
69:10,11 70:10	supermarket	t	53:25 81:15
<b>subset</b> 11:20	30:6,9	<b>t</b> 119:3 120:1,1	<b>tedious</b> 47:23
subsidization	supervise 64:2	table 22:13	<b>tell</b> 48:5 62:1,1
22:5	supervising	47:23 106:18	116:2
subsidize 10:5	77:12	take 21:16 27:25	telling 65:8
subsidy 9:13	support 62:6	36:17,18 41:21	tells 107:1 116:8
10:19,23 21:18	supporting	44:15 46:13	tenth 88:21 89:1
108:20	105:14	55:15,18 58:18	96:8,11
substance 92:18	supports 30:18	71:7 75:9 85:13	term 8:2 50:14
92:19	62:12 110:23	92:25 93:12	terms 21:4,16
substantially	supposed 33:12	95:15 96:13	25:17,22 26:10
13:15 14:12	33:17 44:19	99:17 104:20	27:6 28:4 29:24
substantive	80:18,19 90:11	110:6 113:20	34:20 64:6
94:21 106:12	90:16 99:2	117:15 118:11	71:12 74:20
107:5,6	106:19	<b>taken</b> 10:1 15:14	81:3 85:7 112:7
<b>sue</b> 80:4	supreme 12:18	25:25 34:21	texas 28:18
sued 68:17 78:11	13:4 23:2 27:7	37:18 96:15	text 5:24 11:12
suffice 54:1	27:11,21 80:2,8	107:23 112:6	17:2,4 18:12
sufficient 19:21	86:18 108:22	115:9,11	20:1 24:23
53:12 59:11	111:9	takes 5:15 26:24	30:18 54:4
101:25 105:12	sure 4:8,22 10:3	111:22,22	60:15 62:4
sufficiently	11:8 16:15	takings 36:13	92:14 108:19
108:1	17:14 22:17	41:16	111:4
	27:5 49:3 61:1		

## [textual - trade]

Page 32

		1	1
<b>textual</b> 11:14	14:13,16 15:1,9	96:12 97:2,19,23	threshold 48:19
30:19 47:24	15:12 16:12,18	99:3 101:2,9	<b>tied</b> 41:23
49:4 53:15 54:7	16:20,23,25 17:1	103:7,12 104:2	<b>time</b> 4:8 9:4,6
54:10	17:5,11,12,24,25	104:12,14,24	12:23,24 13:2,4
textually 54:14	18:5,9,12 19:16	106:23 107:21	19:11,12 26:1
thank 19:14 24:6	19:17,18,19,20	107:25 108:16	31:10 35:18
24:8,10 42:20	19:25 20:13	112:16	41:9 42:17,21
45:21,23 46:3,5	21:10 22:2	thinking 26:10	53:7 57:23 58:9
59:14,15 102:13	23:12,15 24:4,18	29:25	72:7,12 77:21
102:14,16 109:9	26:9 28:22,25	thinks 10:18	78:3,25 79:21
109:10,12	29:24 30:10,11	48:6 104:21	84:7 86:7 89:9
112:21,22,24	33:8 36:21 41:8	116:3	91:21 92:22,25
117:11,12,13	43:10 44:25	third 1:1 24:24	93:2,17,22 94:1
118:5,8,10	45:1 46:12	25:10,15 26:2	94:7,8 97:17
<b>theory</b> 9:19 31:7	47:13 48:19	27:20 38:23	98:6 112:21
89:8 91:20	49:3,5,7,18	42:4 43:17,17	113:18
<b>thin</b> 72:11	50:18 51:19,20	44:1,6 45:20	<b>time's</b> 42:16
thing 5:8,25	52:13 53:4,15,25	46:17 47:20,25	<b>times</b> 9:21 97:2
10:11 22:17	54:3,5,7,14,21	50:21,23,24 51:5	99:11 100:6
23:7,25 25:7	55:5,21 56:4,9	51:15 53:10	104:15 114:17
26:13 34:3,4	58:21 59:4,21	57:15 58:3	<b>title</b> 7:7 31:23
54:12 65:4	60:12 62:4 64:6	59:10,22 61:21	52:24 71:1,8
85:21 105:20	65:12,18 66:16	99:20 101:3	72:2,4,23 75:9
107:5,6,14 109:5	67:8,9 70:9	104:4 110:2,3	77:11 84:18,23
115:25 117:5	71:12,13 72:12	112:3,3	115:1,11
things 6:5 14:18	73:1,18 74:22	thomas 2:19	today 4:12 10:18
14:19 20:21	76:2,9,21 77:9	thoroughly	60:13 82:5
24:16 26:15	77:24 78:10,25	51:20	83:14 109:24
29:23 31:17	80:1,6,16 81:10	thought 24:15	118:11
34:19 45:9 47:4	82:12,14 83:3,12	40:24 54:15	told 34:8
53:1 77:23	83:13,16 84:4,5	60:21 86:16	tolerate 21:21
91:18 106:20	85:16 86:5,20,25	thousand 61:6,7	tools 28:24 29:5
114:24	87:2,10 88:19	<b>three</b> 16:9 24:16	<b>top</b> 31:16
think 4:20,23	89:8,19 90:1,17	24:21 26:8	tort 68:17 82:25
6:12,23 7:16,18	91:18,19 92:2,13	27:25 34:19	tough 17:18
8:7,20 9:10 10:6	92:17 93:2,10,22	39:23 48:15	track 41:24
10:21 11:13	93:25 94:9,11	63:8 83:14	<b>trade</b> 107:18
12:16,18 13:25	95:1,8,24 96:4,9	109:13	

[tradeoff - use]

[	1	1	
tradeoff 43:2	111:24	underscores	99:12 109:2
traditional	<b>turn</b> 45:15 65:19	12:16	114:3
28:24 29:4	<b>two</b> 17:20 20:21	underserved	unintended 9:2
<b>trained</b> 67:2,24	29:22 32:19	74:15	<b>unique</b> 89:21
training 64:12	33:1 34:10	understand	118:1
64:16,24	46:10 58:8	11:14 16:1	<b>unison</b> 62:1
transactions	59:21 60:12	21:11 59:4 65:1	<b>united</b> 1:1,6,12
42:6	65:13 77:23	69:19 85:24	1:18 2:5,12,16
transcript 4:12	110:9	88:9 96:21,23	3:15 4:5 28:18
120:3	<b>type</b> 22:10 26:10	103:17 117:22	unknown 55:1
transfer 37:7	44:18 54:13,17	understanding	unlawful 25:21
43:4 45:7	54:21 55:7 56:1	11:17 23:8	74:20
transferring	84:22 90:14	67:18 71:24	unlawfully
20:5 36:14	104:13	86:2	93:19
translation	<b>types</b> 45:10	understood	unlimited 5:14
100:3	49:14	20:17 32:14	7:4 8:10 13:16
<b>travel</b> 117:3	<b>typical</b> 54:22	34:12 72:18	14:9,10 15:25
<b>treated</b> 36:5,8	u	102:6 117:23	20:22 47:19
39:16 115:10	<b>u</b> 119:3	undertaking	49:20 75:4
treatment 50:17	<b>u.s.</b> 3:3	22:11	101:22 103:25
55:6	<b>u.s.</b> 90:8	unenacted 86:15	106:1,2 109:18
tried 15:10	ucc 14:17 16:19	86:18 116:4,8	unnamed 50:21
82:13	ultimately 78:23	unexplained	unqualified
<b>tries</b> 70:1	87:6	110:16	62:10 70:9
<b>trigger</b> 105:3,6	<b>unable</b> 110:22	unfortunately	102:7 111:5
105:15,18	unambiguously	59:25	unreasoned
<b>true</b> 16:8 30:2	110:24	<b>unified</b> 89:10,15	110:15
57:22 76:16	uncoordinated	90:12 91:20	unused 13:3
78:14 86:20	80:16	92:5 93:15 94:3	<b>unusual</b> 68:13
112:2 120:4	<b>underlies</b> 36:13	94:10	<b>update</b> 61:20
<b>truly</b> 99:16	underlying 8:20	uniform 34:1	<b>upper</b> 76:6
<b>truth</b> 30:24	undermine	80:14,18	upwards 75:22
<b>try</b> 18:6 76:17	80:13	unilateral 68:3	<b>urge</b> 18:6 110:18
80:9	undermines	79:1,23 102:10	urging 54:3
trying 25:22	91:25	uninsured 9:9	<b>usa</b> 80:2
33:25 41:21	underscore	21:20 22:6	<b>use</b> 9:8,21 11:5
		I share the second s	
68:7 71:23 74:13 80:4	109:14	33:11 35:23 36:2,8 38:1 74:4	12:22,24 13:1,15 20:11 30:5

Page: 154

[use - wholesalers]

52:17,20,21	<b>verbal</b> 115:17	W	45:16 47:4,12
68:13 73:11	veritext 2:23	wages 13:3	55:25 81:4
76:13,14,25 77:6	<b>version</b> 99:10	walgreens 19:1,1	82:24 84:11
77:9 78:17 79:8	<b>versus</b> 56:16	31:21 32:1,2,4	85:22 95:23,24
79:9,19 87:21	58:17	32:20,23 33:2,3	99:2 100:16
88:1 103:15,20	veterans 51:10	35:11 39:21	101:12 104:20
108:2,2 109:25	69:12	75:24 98:25	106:24,25
113:3 116:24	<b>view</b> 21:17 67:6	walk 33:10	108:12,24 109:3
useful 59:3	67:25 78:24	walking 56:23	116:13,17
85:21	83:12	walks 12:7 57:6	ways 6:24 33:24
<b>uses</b> 54:24 57:16	<b>views</b> 77:25 78:3	walmart 99:1	53:18 54:8 56:9
<b>usual</b> 96:12	violate 53:9	want 5:11 6:3,16	85:25 100:10
usually 23:7	violated 46:24	7:21 13:10	wayside 7:9
40:15 57:14	92:15	14:23 20:12	<b>we've</b> 7:1 9:10
63:23 93:12,21	violating 63:8	21:18 22:5	12:16 15:3,18
93:22 96:5,5,16	74:20	24:24 29:10	23:3 27:11
114:22	violation 6:7,25	34:9 36:22	37:25 48:2 54:6
V	7:13 15:14	45:24 53:17	55:3 60:22
<b>v</b> 1:5,11,17 2:4	26:21 46:23	55:15,18 56:11	76:25 78:24
2:11 4:5 12:20	47:2,16 53:13,20	62:8 65:23 73:7	79:17 85:4
28:18 80:2	53:22 58:23	82:11 87:9 88:7	91:21 92:22
vacate 26:5	67:7,9,11,14,16	88:8 93:19,20	103:13
112:15	67:25 68:5	96:13 100:25	<b>web</b> 61:15
<b>vacated</b> 90:3,6	70:18 71:4,4	101:11,13 106:8	<b>website</b> 106:21
vacates 25:20	78:24 79:1,13	109:14 112:14	week 5:16
vaccine 74:13	81:5 88:3	wanted 12:23	weeks 57:11
100:2	105:12 117:6,8	22:20 41:23	weigh 101:14
validate 113:8	118:3	112:19 114:5	weird 33:7
validated 115:4	violations 80:7	wants 27:22	went 46:19
<b>value</b> 93:13	82:19	110:14	113:17 114:11
various 6:24	<b>virtue</b> 13:13	warehouse	wheelhouse
18:11 74:2	<b>visit</b> 34:14	69:21	101:10
vast 12:13 35:17	vizient 113:15	washington 3:5	white 11:21 12:1
72:14 85:13	voluntary 8:22	3:9,12,17	wholesale 44:17
<b>vendor</b> 42:4 51:1	9:2,3	way 4:10 23:8,16	wholesaler
<b>vendors</b> 51:2,3		23:17,23 30:18	44:14
		31:11,14 36:6,21	wholesalers
		38:5 40:3 45:15	75:14

[wholly - zero]

	1 25 10	12.10
wholly 6:25 7:16	work 37:19	years 13:18
108:18	40:12 61:8 76:5	20:10,18 31:11
willing 15:24	100:7 105:10	31:13 43:11
21:21	working 44:2	60:17 77:4
win 28:3 29:1,5	69:22 100:17	79:15 92:23
windfall 37:10	works 60:18,19	109:19
winding 71:2	71:13 99:21	<b>york</b> 30:13
<b>wish</b> 13:22	<b>world</b> 31:21	Z
104:20	71:25 72:17	<b>zero</b> 99:10
withdraw 23:18	77:17 81:16	
96:8,14	97:13 98:12	
withdrawal 88:9	100:5,13 104:2	
89:1 95:10	109:23	
106:17	worry 92:3 96:2	
withdrawing	write 14:16 15:9	
23:9	16:12	
withdrawn	writing 15:8	
23:19,20,22,24	<b>written</b> 44:23	
89:15 90:12	wrong 31:15	
92:22 93:6	37:2 43:21	
94:14 96:10	44:21 64:19	
106:21,22,25	65:11 112:14	
107:1,25	wrongdoing	
withdrew 22:25	105:16	
88:24	X	
withheld 93:19	<b>x</b> 49:1 119:1	
<b>wolfson</b> 46:15,19		
word 10:13 15:4	<b>y</b>	
15:5 16:18 18:8	yeah 13:24 14:22	
21:13 22:18	23:15 24:3 33:7	
31:2 48:2,6,7	33:22 41:3	
53:16 55:7	43:24 44:9 52:7	
83:15 84:2	64:11 68:2	
103:15 108:8,15	81:23 88:13	
109:3 116:4	89:13	
<b>words</b> 63:8	<b>year</b> 37:22 39:24	
104:18	57:11 71:22	
	98:20 108:3	