## UNITED STAT ES OF AMERICA BEFORE THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

COMMISSIONERS:	Edith Ramirez, Chairwoman Julie Brill
	Julie Di III
	Maureen K. Ohlhausen
	Joshua D. Wright

In the Matter of	)
<ul> <li>PRÁXEDES E. ALVAREZ SANTIAG O, M.D., an individual;</li> <li>DANIEL P ÉREZ BRISEBOIS, M.D., an individual;</li> <li>JORGE GRILLASCA PA LOU, M.D., an individual;</li> <li>RAFAEL GARC ÍA NIEVES, M.D., an individual;</li> <li>FRANCIS M. VÁZQUEZ ROURA, M.D., an individual;</li> <li>ANGEL B. RIVERA SANTOS, M.D., an individual;</li> <li>COSME D. SANTOSTORRES, M.D., an individual; and</li> <li>JUAN L. VILARÓ CHARD ÓN, M.D., an individual,</li> </ul>	) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) ) )
	)

COMPLAINT

### I. NATURE OF THE CASE

1. This matter concerns an agreement among eight independent nephrologists in southwestern Puerto Rico to fix the prices and conditions under which they would participate in Mi Salud, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico's Mediad program for providing healthcae services to indigent residents. In furtherance of their conspiracy, Respondents collectively terminated the participation in the Mi Salud program in southwester Puerto Rico after program's regional administrator, Humanateath Plans of Pueto Rico, hc. ("Humana") refused to accede to Respondents' demands to restore a cut in reimbursements for certain patients eligble for benefits underboth Medicae and Mi Salud (dual eligbles"). After Respondents terminated ithervice agreements with Humana, therefused to trebanyof Humana's Mi Salud patients. As a result, Respondents barrees onably restrained competition and eragged in unfar methods of comptetion in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

### **II. RESPONDENTS**

2. Respondents airedividuals licensel to practice medicine in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and enarged in the business of opvriding nephrology services to patients for zefe. They represent blof the nephrologists in the southwest geon who participate in the Humana Mi Salud program and amost 90 percent of all nephrologists in the region. Their respective names and business addreses are

- (1) Praxedes E. Avarez Santiago, M.D., 2916 Avenue Emilio Fagot, Suite 1, Ponce, PR 00716-3611.
- (2) Daniel Pérez Bisebois, M.D., 3011 Avenutemilio Fagot, Ponce, PR 00716.
- (3) JorgeGrillascaPalou, M.D., 302 Torrean Cristobal, Cotodure, PR 00780.
- (4) Rafael Garcia Nieves, M.D., 909 Avenue Tito Castro, Torre Medica San Lucas, Suite 723, Ponce, PR 00716.
- (5) Francis M. Vázquez Roura, M.D., 1203 Avenue Muñoz Rivero, Ponce, PR 00717-0634.
- (6) Angel B. Rivera Santos, M.D., Caribbe Medical Centre, Suite 202-2275, Ponce By Pass, Ponce, PR 00731.
- (7) Cosme D. Santos Tess; M.D., 3011 Aveue Emilio Fagt, Ponce, PR 00716.
- (8) Juan L Vilaró Chadón, M.D., Edificio Para, Oficina 302, Ponce, PR 00731.

### **III**. JURISDICTION AND INTERSTATE COMMERCE

3. At all times relevant to this Complaint, Respondents have en egaged in the business of contraing with third parties for the provision of nephotogy services to persons for a fee.

4. The general business pratices of Responders, including the cets and pratices alleged herein, are in or affecting "commerce," as defined in Section 4 of the effecting Trade Commission Act, as anneeled, 15 U.S.C. § 44.

5. Except to the xetent that competition has breeestraned as bleged herein, Respondents havbreen, ad arenow, in competition with each other the provision of nephrology services to persons for free

6. The Federal Trade Commission has jurisdiction over the subject matter of this proceeding and overRespondents, whoe all persons" within the meraing of Section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended, 15 U.S.C.§ 44, and the proceeding is in the public interest.

### IV. BACK GROUND

7. Certain government-sponsored healthcare programs contract with physicians, hospitals, and other provideof healthcare services in a gographicarea to create a network of healthcare providers that havagreed to provide helthcareservices to enrollees covered under these healthcare programs.

8. To be ome member of these porgrams' provider neworks, physicians often reter into contracts with the programs that establish the terms and conditions, includinges ad other competitively significant terms, for providing health care services to enrollees overed by the government-sponsored hat the programs. Physicians enteing into such on tracts often agee to reductions in their usual ompensation in order o obtain access to additional patients made available to them by the programs' coverage of their enrolles. Such reductors in physician fees maypermit government-sponsored hat the programs to reduce their costs and offer broader benefits coverage to their enrolless.

### V. MI SALUD PROGRAM

9. Puerto Rico's Mi Salud progym is administered by dministración de Seugos de Salud ("ASES"), apublic corporation that is charged with ensuringhat the more thra1.5 milli on indigent residents of Puter Rico have access to a full complement of medicservices. ASES determines the benefits Mi Salud members will receive. ASES contracts with two health plans, Humana and TripleS, to facilitate the provision of medicservices to Mi Salud members and payments to participating providers. Administration of the Mi Salud program takes place in eight regions in Ruerto Rico. Humanadministers and insure the program in three regions: the east, the souther and the southwest. TripSeadministers the program in the other five

regions.

10. h October2010, the Mi Salud reimbursementogram was modified for pesons eligible for both Mediareand Mediaid ("dual eligibles"). Under the previous program, called La Reforma, provides received 100 pecent of the Medicate established rate for dual eligibles. As the primary payer, Medicate paid 80 pecent, and payers administering the Mi Salud program paid the renaining 20 pecent coordination of breefits amount (20 percent COB"). Under the Mi Salud program, provides no longe received a coordination of benfets amount for dual eligibles, except in rareircumstances. Thus, Responted reimbursenents werelower under Mi Salud than the shad previously been under La Reforma.

1100 0.0000 TD (ma.) Tj ET 1.06ni3y2 (nt coordination of be) Tj 100.2000 0.0000 Tj 58.20j

GrillascaPalou, MD, wrote:

Under the present conditions, can anticipate that will not continue offering services to Humana ptaents if these [policies for payent for sevices to dual eligibles] are not modified. Pleasemembethat the real population requise our services to stay alive and in good health. I am legitimately concerned that servicemaybe affected for patients that canonly [emphasis in original] be attended by a nephologist. Loosing [sic] nephrolog services for your population may create acomplicated and dangerous situation, espiradly for critical care patients in a hospital.

He requested that Humanahold an urgent meetingwith me and othercolleagues that sharthe same concern." Dr. Grillasca copied the other Respondents on the email.

15. On Deember8, 2011, Humana ntowith two of the Respondents, Drngel Rivera Santos and Dr. Draiel Perez Bisebois, to discuss the reimbursement poliDyuring the meeting they pressel Humana to pathe 20 percent COB and Dr Perez handle to Humana peroposed schedule of codes for which Respondents wanted rate increases.

16. On December 9, 2011, the day after the meeting, Respondent Dr. Rivera sent to Humana an email stating,

I understand sawell that have the right to receive the 20 percent that has been denied. If will depend on these issues idlecided to continue myprofessional relationship with Humana Mi Salud. Also meember that am waitingfor your response related to the newlyproposed artes that we handed to you yesterd are by my colleague Dr. Daniel Peez. I will expect your answe concerning these issues on or before December 16, 2011.

Dr. Rivera copied all of the other Respondents on the email.

17. In aseparate email sent to Humana on December 9, 2011, Dr. Grillasca expressed his support for Dr Rivera's demand fothe reinstatement of the 20 poent COB and implementation of Respondents' proposed fee schedule. "I am echoing the expressions of my colleague Dr. Angel Rivera Santos. Hope we communicate aerly next week to solve the pendingissues." Dr. Grillasca copied all of the other Respondents on the email.

18. Hoping to avoid the possible loss of nephrology services for Mi Salud patients, ASES called a meeting of Respondents, Humana do there on February 16, 2012. ASES explained at that meeting that the new reimbursement formula was agovernment rule and would not be chaged because the povernment had a vey limited budget. Despite the ASES explanation, Respondents continued to joinstlek arate increase. At the end of the neeting Respondents prested Humana revised schedule fees and odes for which they wanted increased payments. 19. Two weeks laterRespondents aign sent Humana schelule of proposel fee increases and threatened to terminate their contracts with D (c)T8200 0.0000 TD (c)Tj 8.2800 0.0000 TD

miles away but the familyobjected beauseof the distance

24. Respondents envice ally began treating patients again only after being ordered to do so by the Office of the Health Advocate, who determined that Respondents' immediate terminations violated the notice opvision in their contracts and the continuation of reviews requirement in the Puerto Rico Patient's Bill of Rights and Responsibilities.

## C. Resulting Increase in Reinbursement

25. Respondents' refusal to treat Humana's Mi Salud patients forced ASES to ultimately accede to Respondes' demands foreinstatement of the policyrequiringpayment of the 20 percent COB. On June 13, 2012, ASES issued Circulaettler No. 12-0613, statinghat retroactive to March 16, 2012, it would require insurers to pay the 20 percent COB to all healthcare providers, essretially abandoninghe new eimbursement formula and dopting the reimbursement policyunder la Reforma. ASES reinstated the 20 rcent COB because it was concerned about lack of access to nephrolog services for its Mi Salud members, and libered that it had no otherhoice but to accede to adopting the 20 percent COB eimbursement policy ASES believes that inestating this reimbursement will increase the anual costs of the Mi Salud program bybetween \$4 and \$6 million.

# VII. NO LEGITIMATE JUSTI FICATION F OR THE CONDUCT

26. Respondents' conduct is not reasonably related to achieving any efficiencyenhaning integration. Respondents have dertaten no ativities to integrate their delivery of nephrology services and thus cannot justify conducted scribel in the foregoing paragraphs. They neither shared financial risk in providing nephrology services for clinically integrated their delivery of care to patients

# VIII. ANTIC OMPETIT IV E EFFECTS

27. Respondents' actions have the purpose and had the effect of unreasonably restraining trade and hindling competition in the provision of nephrologervices in the southwest region of Puerto Rico by:

- (a) depriving third-paty payers and consumers of benfets of such completion;
- (b) increasingprices of nephology services to Mi Salud; and
- (c) collectively withholding treatment from Mi Salud patients, sudting in significant and real consequences to patients.

# IX. VIOLATION OF THE FTC AC T

28. The acts and practices described above constitute unfair methods of competition in or affecting commercein violation of Section 5 of the Beral TradeCommission Act, as

amended, 15U.S.C.§ 45. Such acts and practices, or the effects thereof, are continuing and will continue or ecurin the absence of therelief herein requested.

WHE REFORE, THE PREMISES CONSIDERED, the Feleral Trade Commission has caudethis Complaint to be signed by its Secretary and its official seal to be hereto affixed, at Washington, D.C., this first datyMay, 2013.

By the Commission.

Donald S. Clark Secreary

SEAL