

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
ROANOKE DIVISION

ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF VIRGINIA,  
INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND  
BLUE SHIELD and HEALTHKEEPERS, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AGS HEALTH, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

7:25-cv-00804-RSB-JCH

District Judge: Robert S. Ballou  
Magistrate Judge: Joel C. Hoppe

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO  
DEFENDANTS' THIRD NOTICE OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITY<sup>1</sup>**

*Blue Cross Blue Shield of Tex. v. HaloMD, LLC*, No. 5:25-cv-00132-RWS (E.D. Tex. May 22, 2026) (“*HaloMD TX*”) follows two erroneous district court opinions (*see* ECF No. 61-1,) to opine that “inherent in the NSA’s bar of judicial review of payment determinations is a limitation on the review of eligibility decisions.” *Id.* at 7. This is wrong for at least two reasons.

First, the NSA only limits judicial review of “[a] determination of a certified IDR entity under subparagraph (A)[.]” 42 U.S.C. § 300gg-111(c)(5)(E)(i)(II). In subparagraph (A), the NSA states that an IDRE will be selected to make a payment determination. *Id.* § 300gg-111(c)(5)(A). And per the NSA, IDREs are only compensated for making a payment determination. *Id.* § 300gg-111(c)(5)(F). Nothing in the NSA suggests that Congress intended for eligibility decisions to be “inherent” in “[a] determination of a certified IDR entity under subparagraph (A).” *Opp.* at 15-18.

The Departments’ regulations prove this point. Per the regulations, IDREs are supposed to confirm eligibility. 45 C.F.R. § 149.510(c)(1)(v). But the Departments could have decided to

---

<sup>1</sup> Capitalized terms have the same meaning provided in Anthem’s Memorandum of Law in Opposition to Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss (“*Opp.*” at ECF No. 51).

confirm eligibility themselves. If they had, eligibility decisions obviously would not be “[a] determination of a certified IDR entity under subparagraph (A).” The Departments’ regulations cannot alter Congress’s intentions with the Judicial Review Provision. And the regulations only limit judicial review of payment determinations, not eligibility decisions. Opp. at 15-18.

Second, *HaloMD TX* compounds its error by failing to apply the standard of review dictated by the Supreme Court. Courts must presume Congress intended to preserve judicial review absent clear and convincing statutory text to the contrary. Opp. at 15-18. The inquiry is not whether Congress “intend[ed] to *impliedly provide* an avenue for challenging eligibility decisions while expressly foreclosing judicial review of . . . payment determinations.” *HaloMD TX* at 7-8 (emphasis added). The inquiry is whether Congress clearly and convincingly intended to *bar* any judicial review of a racketeering scheme involving thousands of fraudulent eligibility attestations in violation of RICO and other laws. It did not. Opp. at 15-17; *see* ECF No. 61-1.

Finally, *HaloMD TX*’s conclusion “Plaintiff’s claims are an impermissible collateral attack on the IDR awards” (*HaloMD TX* at 8-9) is wrong for at least three reasons. First, the collateral attack doctrine prevents parties from circumventing the exclusive remedy for challenging a dispute resolution determination, such as an award subject to the FAA’s procedures. Opp. at 18-23. The NSA contains no exclusive remedies regarding IDR payment determinations or otherwise, so the doctrine does not apply. Opp. at 18-19. Second, the IDR payment determinations in this case are not “binding” because they involve “a fraudulent claim or evidence of misrepresentation of facts presented to the IDR entity involved regarding such claim.” 42 U.S.C. § 300gg-111(c)(5)(E)(i). There is no “binding” decision subject to collateral attack. Third, per *HaloMD TX* at 13, requests for prospective injunctive relief do not implicate the collateral attack doctrine. Unlike the plaintiff in *HaloMD TX*, Anthem may seek that here via ERISA. *See* Complaint at ¶¶ 378-385.

Dated: May 27, 2026

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/ Jason T. Mayer  
Jason T. Mayer (*pro hac vice*)  
Illinois Bar No. 6309633  
Martin J. Bishop (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)  
Illinois Bar No. 6269425  
Alexandra M. Lucas (*pro hac vice*  
forthcoming)  
Illinois Bar No. 6313385  
**Crowell & Moring LLP**  
300 N. LaSalle Drive, Suite 2500  
Chicago, IL 60654  
Tel: (312) 321-4200  
[jmayer@crowell.com](mailto:jmayer@crowell.com)  
[mbishop@crowell.com](mailto:mbishop@crowell.com)  
[alucas@crowell.com](mailto:alucas@crowell.com)  
Jed Wulfekotte  
VA Bar No. 73538  
**Crowell & Moring LLP**  
1001 Pennsylvania Ave. NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel: (202) 624-2693  
Fax: (202) 628-5116  
[jwulfekotte@crowell.com](mailto:jwulfekotte@crowell.com)

Jhneal Moore White  
**Glen Robinson Cathey Memmer & Skaff, PLC**  
400 Salem Ave., S.W., Suite 100  
Roanoke, VA, 24016  
Tel: (540) 767-2206  
[jwhite@glenrobb.com](mailto:jwhite@glenrobb.com)

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Anthem Health Plans  
of Virginia, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue  
Shield and Healthkeepers, Inc.*