NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAR 31 2021

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

INTEGRA MED ANALYTICS LLC, Relator,	No. 19-56367
Plaintiff-Appellee,	D.C. No. 2:17-cv-01694-PSG-SS
and	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	MEMORANDUM[*]
Plaintiff,	
v.	
PROVIDENCE HEALTH & SERVICES; et al.,	
Defendants-Appellants.	

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Philip S. Gutierrez, Chief District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted February 12, 2021
Pasadena, California

Before: BOGGS,[**] M. SMITH, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

---

[*]   This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

[**]   The Honorable Danny J. Boggs, United States Circuit Judge for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, sitting by designation.

Relator Integra Med Analytics, LLC, claims that Providence Health & Services, its affiliated hospitals, and J.A. Thomas & Associates, Inc. (JATA), violated the False Claims Act (FCA), 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733. Integra alleges that Providence submitted claims to Medicare that it coded for more lucrative secondary diagnoses that were not supported by patients' conditions. Integra based its complaint primarily on a statistical analysis of Medicare-claims data that demonstrated Providence submitted proportionally more claims with higher-paying diagnosis codes than comparable institutions.

Providence and JATA filed motions to dismiss before the district court. The court granted their motions in part and denied them in part, allowing Integra's primary FCA claim to proceed. At Defendants' request, the district court certified its order for interlocutory appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Its certification was based on two controlling questions of law for which there was substantial ground for difference of opinion: (1) Did Integra adequately plead the falsity of Providence's Medicare claims?; and (2) Is all online information material that is "from the news media" for the purpose of the FCA's public-disclosure bar?

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). We hold that Integra failed to state a plausible claim for relief because its allegations do not eliminate an obvious alternative explanation—that Providence, with JATA's assistance, was more effective at properly coding for better Medicare reimbursement than others in the

2

healthcare industry. Accordingly, we reverse the district court's order denying Defendants' motions to dismiss, and we remand.[1]

I. BACKGROUND

We take the following facts from the complaint as true for the purpose of reviewing a motion to dismiss. *Curtis v. Irwin Indus., Inc*., 913 F.3d 1146, 1151 (9th Cir. 2019).

Providence is "one of the nation's largest health systems, operating 34 hospitals and 600 clinics across five states." A significant portion of Providence's revenue comes from Medicare reimbursements.

Medicare reimburses hospitals on a per-discharge basis, meaning a payment for each time a patient stays at the hospital. The payment amount depends largely on the patient's "diagnosis related group" (DRG). Three types of codes contribute to the DRG: (1) A principal-diagnosis code, (2) surgical-procedure codes, and (3) secondary-diagnosis codes. There can be multiple secondary-diagnosis codes, which together represent "all conditions that coexist at the time of admission, that develop subsequently, or that affect the treatment received [or] the length of stay." Secondary-diagnosis codes can modify the base DRG's severity level to one of three levels: (1) Without complication or major complication, (2) complication or

---

[1] Because Integra did not adequately allege that Providence submitted false claims, we do not address whether the public-disclosure bar applies.

comorbidity (CC), and (3) major complication or comorbidity (MCC). The inclusion of a CC or MCC code can significantly increase the amount of reimbursement that the hospital receives from Medicare.

Providence, like many other hospitals, has a "clinical documentation improvement" (CDI) program that translates clinical language used by medical-treatment providers to Medicare codes. Providence retained JATA to assist its CDI program. JATA offers consulting services to healthcare providers through products and services intended to improve how they document patients' treatments.

JATA worked with Providence to train doctors to describe medical conditions that would support coding for higher-paying diagnoses. For example, JATA provided doctors "Documentation Tips" suggesting specific language conducive to coding CCs and MCCs; for example, specifying the type and degree of malnutrition. It also trained Providence CDI specialists to send allegedly "leading queries" to doctors that were designed to change their initial assessments in a way that would justify coding a CC or MCC.[2] Integra alleged that this pressure "would sometimes result in the creation of contradictory medical records," such as an initial documentation of "delirium" with the later addition of "encephalopathy These

---

[2] The complaint does not provide examples of leading queries used at Providence but claims it is "consistent with JATA's practice at other hospital systems."

queries were designed to stop short of telling doctors *exactly* how to document their care because that would constitute a "noncompliant" leading inquiry.

Integra, a data-analytics company, commenced this suit after its analysis of data received from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) demonstrated that Providence submitted claims coded with a higher rate of MCCs than other comparable institutions. Integra is not affiliated with Providence or JATA and did not rely on insider information such as confidential patient medical records. Instead, Integra's supported its complaint primarily through a "proprietary statistical analysis" of the CMS data.

Integra's methodology involved comparing the rate at which Providence coded higher-paying secondary diagnoses in connection with particular principal diagnoses with the rates coded by other institutions. It labeled claims as false if they were coded with an MCC at "more than twice the national rate or were used at a rate three percentage points higher than in the other hospitals." Thus if the national rate of an MCC code accompanying a specific principal diagnosis was .1% but Providence coded it .2% of the time, or if the national rate was 55% and Providence's rate was 59%, Integra would label the claims as false.

Integra's second amended complaint focuses on claims submitted between 2011 and 2017 involving three categories of secondary MCC codes: Encephalopathy, respiratory failure, and severe malnutrition. Integra refers to these

three MCCs as "misstated MCCs." Providence used at least one of these three misstated MCCs on approximately 17 percent of its Medicare claims as opposed to a 10 percent usage rate at non-Providence institutions—1.7 times as often. Integra asserts that its analysis controlled for inter-hospital variation caused by different characteristics in patient populations, "such as age, gender, and race, as well as county demographic factors such as the unemployment rate, median income, and urban-rural differences." Its analysis also found that "there was less than a one-thousandth percent chance" that Providence's greater rate of coding of these MCCs was "due to chance."[3] (Second amended complaint, ¶ 51.)

The complaint's supporting graphs also demonstrate that there was a steadily increasing trend in coding rates for the three allegedly misstated MCCs from 2011 to 2017 at comparable healthcare institutions. By 2017, non-Providence entities generally coded claims with encephalopathy, respiratory failure, and severe malnutrition at similar rates to Providence's in 2011 or 2012. Providence also showed a significant increase in coding MCCs after it hired JATA to assist with claim documentation.

---

[3] We note, however, that the complaint states later that Integra "only considered claim groupings where there was less than a one-in-a-thousand chance that the difference in major complication rate at Providence versus other hospitals was due to random causes." (Second amended complaint, ¶ 125.)

6

II. ANALYSIS

We review de novo a motion to dismiss a claim under the FCA. *United States ex rel. Campie v. Gilead Scis., Inc.*, 862 F.3d 890, 898 (9th Cir. 2017). The "essential elements" of an FCA claim are: "(1) [A] false statement or fraudulent course of conduct, (2) made with the scienter, (3) that was material, causing (4) the government to pay out money or forfeit moneys due." *Campie*, 862 F.3d at 899 (quoting *United States ex rel. Hendow v. Univ. of Phx.*, 461 F.3d 1166, 1174 (9th Cir. 2006)). On appeal, Defendants contest only the first element, that Integra has adequately pleaded false or fraudulent conduct.

As with all fraud allegations, FCA claims must comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8(a) and 9(b). *See United States ex rel. Cafasso v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1047, 1055 (9th Cir. 2011). Rule 8(a) requires the pleading contain a plausible claim for relief, and Rule 9(b) imposes a heightened requirement of particularity. *Ibid.* Integra's complaint fails to meet the Rule 8 standard.

Rule 8 requires "a plausible claim for relief" to survive a motion to dismiss. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009). At this stage, we "accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint" but not the truth of "legal conclusions." *Id.* at 678. In evaluating plausibility, "courts must also consider an 'obvious alternative explanation' for defendant's behavior." *Eclectic Props. E., LLC v. Marcus & Millichap Co.*, 751 F.3d 990, 996 (9th Cir. 2014) (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 682).

7

An allegation merely consistent with a defendant's liability gets "the complaint close to stating a claim, but without some further factual enhancement it stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility . . . ." *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 557 (2007).

Integra argues that the existence of an alternative inference does not defeat a plaintiff's claim at the pleading stage. It relies on our statement in *Starr v. Baca*:

> If there are two alternative explanations, one advanced by defendant and the other advanced by plaintiff, both of which are plausible, plaintiff's complaint survives a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6). Plaintiff's complaint may be dismissed only when defendant's plausible alternative explanation is so convincing that plaintiff's explanation is *im* plausible.

652 F.3d 1202, 1216 (9th Cir. 2011) (emphasis and word break in original). But the *Starr* court expressly relied on factual allegations that did not support an "'obvious alternative explanation,' within the meaning of *Iqbal*." *Ibid.* (quoting *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 682); *see also Eclectic Props. E.*, 751 F.3d at 996–97 (discussing the above quote from *Starr* and requiring "[s]omething more . . . , such as facts tending to exclude the possibility that the alternative explanation is true, in order to render plaintiffs' allegations plausible" (quoting *In re Century Aluminum Co. Sec. Litig.*, 729 F.3d 1104, 1108 (9th Cir. 2013)).

Here, we accept the following factual allegations: Providence submitted Medicare claims with secondary MCCs—such as encephalopathy, respiratory failure, and severe malnutrition—at a higher rate than most other comparable

institutions; this increased rate was not the result of chance or variations in patient populations; and Providence's CDI specialists and JATA staff incentivized doctors to use language conducive to coding higher-paying secondary diagnoses through their documentation tips and queries. But we need not—and cannot—accept the conclusion that these allegations resulted from fraud or that doctors recorded unsupported medical conditions.

Integra does not rule out an obvious alternative explanation, that Providence, with JATA's assistance, was simply ahead of others in its industry. This situation is unlike the competing inferences in *Starr*, "both of which [were] plausible." 652 F.3d at 1216. Integra offers only a *possible* explanation—that doctors lied about underlying medical conditions—to explain a statistical trend that is consistent with a plausible alternative (and legal) explanation.[4] It is reasonable that Providence, one of the largest healthcare systems in the country, which specifically hired consultants to improve its Medicare billing, would be at the forefront of a national trend toward coding these relevant MCCs at a higher rate. We need not accept the conclusion that the defendant engaged in unlawful conduct when its actions are in line with lawful "rational and competitive business strategy." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 554. Therefore,

---

[4] CMS has acknowledged that there is nothing "inappropriate, unethical or otherwise wrong with hospitals taking full advantage of coding opportunities to maximize Medicare payment that is supported by documentation in the medical record." Medicare Program; Changes to the Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems and Fiscal Year 2008 Rates, 72 Fed. Reg. 47,130, 47,180 (Aug. 22, 2007).

Integra does not state a plausible claim for relief, and its complaint must be dismissed.[5]

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, we REVERSE the district court's denial of the motion to dismiss and REMAND with instructions to DISMISS the complaint.

---

[5] We note that this conclusion does not categorically preclude statistical data from being used to meet Rule 8(a)'s pleading requirement and, when paired with particular details of a false claim, Rule 9(b).

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Office of the Clerk
95 Seventh Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Information Regarding Judgment and Post-Judgment Proceedings

Judgment
- This Court has filed and entered the attached judgment in your case. Fed. R. App. P. 36. Please note the filed date on the attached decision because all of the dates described below run from that date, not from the date you receive this notice.

Mandate (Fed. R. App. P. 41; 9th Cir. R. 41-1 & -2)
- The mandate will issue 7 days after the expiration of the time for filing a petition for rehearing or 7 days from the denial of a petition for rehearing, unless the Court directs otherwise. To file a motion to stay the mandate, file it electronically via the appellate ECF system or, if you are a pro se litigant or an attorney with an exemption from using appellate ECF, file one original motion on paper.

Petition for Panel Rehearing (Fed. R. App. P. 40; 9th Cir. R. 40-1)
Petition for Rehearing En Banc (Fed. R. App. P. 35; 9th Cir. R. 35-1 to -3)

(1)   A.   Purpose (Panel Rehearing):
- A party should seek panel rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:
  - ► A material point of fact or law was overlooked in the decision;
  - ► A change in the law occurred after the case was submitted which appears to have been overlooked by the panel; or
  - ► An apparent conflict with another decision of the Court was not addressed in the opinion.
- Do not file a petition for panel rehearing merely to reargue the case.

B.   Purpose (Rehearing En Banc)
- A party should seek en banc rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:

► Consideration by the full Court is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions; or

► The proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance; or

► The opinion directly conflicts with an existing opinion by another court of appeals or the Supreme Court and substantially affects a rule of national application in which there is an overriding need for national uniformity.

(2)   Deadlines for Filing:
- A petition for rehearing may be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party in a civil case, the time for filing a petition for rehearing is 45 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the mandate has issued, the petition for rehearing should be accompanied by a motion to recall the mandate.
- *See* Advisory Note to 9th Cir. R. 40-1 (petitions must be received on the due date).
- An order to publish a previously unpublished memorandum disposition extends the time to file a petition for rehearing to 14 days after the date of the order of publication or, in all civil cases in which the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party, 45 days after the date of the order of publication. 9th Cir. R. 40-2.

(3)   Statement of Counsel
- A petition should contain an introduction stating that, in counsel's judgment, one or more of the situations described in the "purpose" section above exist. The points to be raised must be stated clearly.

(4)   Form & Number of Copies (9th Cir. R. 40-1; Fed. R. App. P. 32(c)(2))
- The petition shall not exceed 15 pages unless it complies with the alternative length limitations of 4,200 words or 390 lines of text.
- The petition must be accompanied by a copy of the panel's decision being challenged.
- An answer, when ordered by the Court, shall comply with the same length limitations as the petition.
- If a pro se litigant elects to file a form brief pursuant to Circuit Rule 28-1, a petition for panel rehearing or for rehearing en banc need not comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32.

- The petition or answer must be accompanied by a Certificate of Compliance found at Form 11, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms.*
- You may file a petition electronically via the appellate ECF system. No paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise. If you are a pro se litigant or an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, file one original petition on paper. No additional paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise.

Bill of Costs (Fed. R. App. P. 39, 9th Cir. R. 39-1)
- The Bill of Costs must be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment.
- See Form 10 for additional information, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms.*

Attorneys Fees
- Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1 describes the content and due dates for attorneys fees applications.
- All relevant forms are available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms* or by telephoning (415) 355-7806.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari
- Please refer to the Rules of the United States Supreme Court at www.supremecourt.gov

Counsel Listing in Published Opinions
- Please check counsel listing on the attached decision.
- If there are any errors in a published <u>opinion</u>, please send a letter **in writing within 10 days** to:
  ► Thomson Reuters; 610 Opperman Drive; PO Box 64526; Eagan, MN 55123 (Attn: Jean Green, Senior Publications Coordinator);
  ► and electronically file a copy of the letter via the appellate ECF system by using "File Correspondence to Court," or if you are an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, mail the Court one copy of the letter.

Post Judgment Form - Rev. 12/2018

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT
Form 10. Bill of Costs

Instructions for this form: http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/form10instructions.pdf

9th Cir. Case Number(s)

Case Name

The Clerk is requested to award costs to (*party name(s)*):

I swear under penalty of perjury that the copies for which costs are requested were actually and necessarily produced, and that the requested costs were actually expended.

Signature   **Date**

(use "s/[typed name]" to sign electronically-filed documents)

COST TAXABLE	REQUESTED *(each column must be completed)*			
DOCUMENTS / FEE PAID	No. of Copies	Pages per Copy	Cost per Page	TOTAL COST
Excerpts of Record*			$	$
Principal Brief(s) *(Opening Brief; Answering Brief; 1st, 2nd , and/or 3rd Brief on Cross-Appeal; Intervenor Brief)*			$	$
Reply Brief / Cross-Appeal Reply Brief			$	$
Supplemental Brief(s)			$	$
Petition for Review Docket Fee / Petition for Writ of Mandamus Docket Fee				$
			TOTAL:	$

***Example:** Calculate 4 copies of 3 volumes of excerpts of record that total 500 pages [Vol. 1 (10 pgs.) + Vol. 2 (250 pgs.) + Vol. 3 (240 pgs.)] as:*
No. of Copies: 4; Pages per Copy: 500; Cost per Page: $.10 (or actual cost IF less than $.10);
TOTAL: 4 x 500 x $.10 = $200.

Feedback or questions about this form? Email us at forms@ca9.uscourts.gov

Form 10   *Rev. 12/01/2018*