IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

TEXAS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION,	
DR. ADAM CORLEY, TYLER REGIONAL)
HOSPITAL, LLC, TEXAS RADIOLOGICAL)
SOCIETY, and HOUSTON RADIOLOGY)
ASSOCIATED,)
)
Plaintiffs,	
V.)
INITED OT A TEC DED A DEMENT OF)
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF	
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, OF-	
FICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT,	
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, DEPART-	Ó
MENT OF THE TREASURY, CENTER FOR	Civil Action No. 6:23-cv-00059-JCB
MEDICARE & MEDICAID SERVICES, XA-)
VIER BECERRA in his official capacity as)
the Secretary of Health and Human Services;)
KIRAN AHUJA in her official capacity as the)
Director of the Office of Personnel Manage-)
ment, JANET YELLEN in her official capac-)
ity as the Secretary of the Treasury, MARTIN)
J. WALSH in his official capacity as the Sec-)
retary of Labor, and CHIQUITA BROOKS-)
LASURE in her official capacity as Adminis-)
trator of the Center for Medicare & Medicaid)
Services,)
)
Defendants.	J

JOINT MOTION TO SET AN EXPEDITED SUMMARY JUDGMENT BRIEFING SCHEDULE

The parties in the above-captioned case respectfully submit this joint motion to set an expedited summary judgment briefing schedule for this case.

This case concerns agency actions implementing the independent dispute resolution ("IDR") process established by the No Surprises Act ("NSA") to resolve disputes between

healthcare providers and insurers over reimbursement for out-of-network medical services. Specifically, the complaint challenges (1) defendants' December 23, 2022 action increasing the non-refundable administrative fee parties must pay to access the IDR process from \$50 to \$350; and (2) a provision of an interim final rule issued by defendants in September 2021 that specifies that parties may "batch" claims together in a single IDR proceeding only if the underlying items or services are billed under the same service code.

Plaintiffs respectfully submit that expedited summary judgment proceedings are warranted because plaintiffs believe that the challenged actions make it cost-prohibitive for providers that have large numbers of small-value claims to access the IDR process for the vast majority of their claims. The administrative fee increase took effect on January 1, 2023.

Defendants disagree that expedited briefing is warranted but have agreed to the proposed schedule in an effort to compromise with plaintiffs.

Accordingly, the parties have met and conferred and agreed on the following schedule for expedited summary judgment briefing:

- Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment Feb. 13, 2023
- Defendants' opposition/cross-motion for summary judgment Mar. 15, 2023
- Plaintiffs' opposition/reply in support of summary judgment Mar. 27, 2023
- Defendants' reply in support of summary judgment Apr. 7, 2023

Given the anticipated interest from *amici curiae* on both sides, the Court may also wish to consider setting a deadline by which *amicus* briefs may be filed, such as seven days after the summary judgment motion of the party supported.

For the briefing format, the parties propose that plaintiffs be permitted to file a summary judgment motion of up to 30 pages and an opposition/reply brief of up to 20 pages. The parties

propose that defendants be permitted to file a single consolidated opposition/cross-motion for summary judgment of up to 30 pages and a reply brief of up to 20 pages. All parties reserve the right to request additional pages for their briefs, after reviewing the other parties' submissions.

Plaintiffs note that they are available for a hearing April 19–20 or 24–25. Defendants defer to the Court's preferences on whether to hold a hearing but note they are available on those dates.

Finally, plaintiffs agree to waive defendants' response to the complaint and defendants reserve the right to raise threshold objections to the complaint in their dispositive briefing.

CONCLUSION

For these reasons, the parties respectfully request that the Court enter the proposed schedule and format for expedited summary judgment briefing. A proposed order is attached.

February 10, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Eric D. McArthur

Eric D. McArthur (pro hac vice) (Lead Attorney) emcarthur@sidley.com
Brenna E. Jenny (pro hac vice)
bjenny@sidley.com
J. Manuel Valle (pro hac vice)
manuel.valle@sidley.com
Madeleine Joseph† (pro hac vice)
mjoseph@sidley.com
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street, N.W.

Tel: (202) 736-8018 Fax: (202) 736-8711

Washington, D.C. 20005

Jaime L.M. Jones (pro hac vice) jaime.jones@sidley.com Matthew Guillod (pro hac vice) mguillod@sidley.com SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP One South Dearborn Chicago, Illinois 60603 Tel: (312) 853-7000 Fax: (312) 853-7036

Penny P. Reid
Texas Bar No. 15402570
preid@sidley.com
Kelsey M. Taylor
Texas Bar No. 24098507
ktaylor@sidley.com
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
2021 McKinney Ave., Suite 2000
Dallas, Texas 75201
Tel: (214) 981-3413
Fax: (214) 981-3400

Counsel for Plaintiffs

[†]Admitted only in Massachusetts; pending approval of application for admission to the D.C. Bar, practicing law in the District of Columbia under the supervision of principals of the firm who are members in good standing of the D.C. Bar.

/s/ Anna Deffebach

Anna Deffebach
Trial Attorney
D.C. Bar No. 241346
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
1100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: (202) 305-8356

Phone: (202) 305-835 Fax: (202) 616-8470

E-mail: anna.l.deffebach@usdoj.gov

Counsel for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF CONFERENCE

Undersigned counsel certifies that counsel for all parties have agreed upon this motion.

/s/ Eric D. McArthur Eric D. McArthur

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing document was filed electronically in compliance with Local Rule CV-5(a). This document was also served on all counsel via email service, on February 10, 2023.

/s/ Eric D. McArthur Eric D. McArthur

EXHIBIT 1

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS TYLER DIVISION

TEXAS MEDICAL ASSOCIATION, et al.)
Plaintiffs,)
v.)
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, et al.,) Case No.: 6:23-cv-00059-JCB)
Defendants.)
)
	ý

[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING THE PARTIES' JOINT MOTION TO SET AN EXPEDITED SUMMARY JUDGMENT BRIEFING SCHEDULE

Before the Court is the parties' joint motion to set an expedited summary judgment briefing schedule for this case. Having fully considered the motion, the Court is of the opinion that the motion should be **GRANTED**. It is therefore

ORDERED that the briefing schedule for summary judgment in this matter is as follows:

- Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment Feb. 13, 2023
- Defendants' opposition/cross-motion for summary judgment Mar. 15, 2023
- Plaintiffs' opposition/reply in support of summary judgment Mar. 27, 2023
- Defendants' reply in support of summary judgment Apr. 7, 2023

Plaintiffs may file a summary judgment motion of up to 30 pages and an opposition/reply brief of up to 20 pages. Defendants may file a single consolidated opposition/cross-motion for summary judgment of up to 30 pages and a reply brief of up to 20 pages.

Defendants' obligation to answer the complaint is waived, and defendants may raise threshold objections to the complaint in their dispositive briefing.