ISSUES IN LITIGATING HOSPITAL MERGERS

Presentation to FTC/DOJ Hearings on Health Care and Competition Law and Policy

> Robert F. Leibenluft Hogan & Hartson L.L.P. March 29, 2003

> > 1



Presentation overview

- Background, biases and caveats
- What explains the government losing streak?
- What should the enforcers do? Some modest suggestions



What explains the government losing streak?

- Cases raise extremely difficult "traditional" antitrust issues
- "Litigation risk" increased by several factors
 - Non-profit status overlay
 - Underlying skepticism about antitrust and health care



– "Home court" disadvantage

Difficult "traditional" antitrust issues



Geographic market

- Catch-22 of "dynamic analysis"
 - "Hard facts," such as patient flow data, reflect only historical evidence
 - Future-oriented look tends to be speculative and anecdotal
- Rigid application of E-H tests
- Critical loss analysis usually suggests
 very broad markets



Product market

- Competition at the "low end" from freestanding centers and doctors' offices
- Competition at the "high end" from regional referral centers
- Single specialty hospitals
- "Anchor" hospitals



Competitive effects

- At issue (subject to price competition) is only a small minority of hospital patients
- Role of health plans, employers and consumers complicates the competitive story
- Analysis tends to ignore much of the focus of hospital competition, which is on doctors, quality, and expanding scope of services and technology
- Hospitals' pledge to limit price increases can dull apparent need for enforcement action



Efficiencies

- Widespread perception that consolidation could address inefficiencies and overbedding
- The "Medical Arms" race



Increased "litigation risk"



Non-profit status

- Perception that nonprofits act differently
- Nonprofit hospitals often are highlyregarded locally
- Some empirical research suggests nonprofits behave differently than for-profits
- Not all nonprofits are alike



Skepticism about antitrust and health care

- Common belief that health care is "different"
- Locally controlled non-profits, in particular, are perceived to be different
- Skepticism that competition in health care will necessarily result in best quality/price for consumers
- "Managed care backlash" against likely complainants (health plans)



Home court disadvantage

• Unlike with most merger challenges

- Typical hospital PI case will be tried in the backyard of the merging parties
- Judge is likely to have first-hand experience with product at issue, and may have high regard for local community hospitals
- Local judges typically have little experience with merger law or sophisticated antitrust/economic analysis



What should the enforcers do?

Eleven modest suggestions.



1. Do not abandon the field

- In the absence of state regulation, competitive markets are essential
- State enforcers and private litigation cannot fill the void
- Vigilant enforcement even with relatively few cases – can provide an important sentinel effect



2. Do not underestimate complexities to be analyzed

- Extremely challenging to
 - Identify potential "problems"
 - Identify cases that the enforcers can win
- Staff and management must keep current on developments in the industry
- Staff and management must push hard on theories and evidence
- Do not try to fight the "last war"



3. Build – and retain – relevant agency expertise

- Among lawyers
- Among economists
- Outside consultants



4. Increase communication with health plans and employers

- Key to identifying problem areas
- Key to developing crucial evidence



5. Increase communications with the hospital community

- Crucial to fully understanding hospital competition
- Important to explain agency mission



6. Increase communications with other government entities

- These include payers
 - Medicare; Medicaid and other government payers
 - They play key roles in hospital behavior
 - Changes in government policy may affect importance of competitive markets
- Agency for Health Research and Quality
- Also important for FTC and DOJ to coordinate with each other



7. Continue research agenda

- Vital to both understanding and explaining competition issues and possible enforcement actions
- Collaborate with health service researchers
- Issues include
 - Market definition
 - Characteristics of nonprofits
 - Nature of hospital competition
 - Ability to achieve efficiencies
 - **FTC/DOJ Hearings are an excellent start**



8. Take into account non-price issues

- Quality competition
- Competition for physicians
- Competition involving new technology and expanded services



9. Work with state enforcers

- Local authorities have "ear to the ground"
- Federal enforcers
 - Will almost certainly lose if opposed by state
 AG
 - Will be substantially strengthened by state AG support



10. Continue hospital merger retrospective

- Could be very informative, if
 - done in a methodologically sound way
 - results are publicly available
- Could lead to more informed government actions
- Could help provide guidance to private industry and practitioners



11. Choose battles very carefully

