



**TESTIMONY OF
THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
TWENTY-SIXTH LEGISLATURE, 2012**

ON THE FOLLOWING MEASURE:

H.B. NO. 2468, RELATING TO FALSE CLAIMS TO THE STATE.

BEFORE THE:

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

DATE: Tuesday, January 31, 2012 **TIME:** 2:00 p.m.

LOCATION: State Capitol, Room 325

TESTIFIER(S): David M. Louie, Attorney General, or
Michael Parrish, Deputy Attorney General

Chair Keith-Agaran and Members of the Committee:

The Department of the Attorney General strongly supports this bill.

The purpose of this bill is to bring Hawaii's false claims law into conformance with the Federal False Claims Act. This will let Hawaii meet the federal requirement that state laws contain provisions that are at least as effective in rewarding and facilitating qui tam actions for false and fraudulent claims as those described in sections 3730 through 3732 of the Federal False Claims Act, and provide to individuals the same or greater protections as those established under federal law since part II of chapter 661, Hawaii Revised Statutes, was enacted in 2000. By updating part II of chapter 661, Hawaii will comply with the federal mandate that State False Claims Acts provide protection equal or greater to those afforded by the Federal False Claims Act, as amended.

Part II of chapter 661, Hawaii Revised Statutes, provides causes of action that result in civil penalties and damages against individuals or entities claiming or collecting money from the State under false pretenses. The State could retain its pro rata share of civil recoveries under the State False Claims Act and an additional ten percent, because the State False Claims Act tracked the Federal False Claims Act. However, since the State False Claims Act took effect in 2000, the Federal Government has amended its False Claims Act to conform to changes in federal law.

This bill will ensure that Hawaii updates its law to comply with section 1909 of the Social Security Act, which was amended by the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act, the Federal False Claims Act, the Affordable Care Act, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. It will enable the

State to continue to retain an additional ten percent of any civil recovery in cases involving federal programs. Hawaii must comply with the federal law changes by March 31, 2013.

The changes, which bring chapter 661, Hawaii Revised Statutes, in compliance with the Federal False Claims Act, are all designed to give greater protection to individuals who allege fraud against the State. Of particular import is the proposed new section being added to part II of chapter 661, which provides special protection and relief to individuals who try to stop others from committing false claims violations against the State by their own conduct or through the conduct of any of their associates. This section provides to these individuals far greater protection against retaliation than the protections afforded by Hawaii's Whistleblowers' Protection Act. The Whistleblowers' Protection Act, part V of chapter 378, Hawaii Revised Statutes, gives rise to causes of action by **employees** who are retaliated against by **employers** for providing information of wrongdoing. The new section in part II of chapter 661 protects a far greater class of individuals, including **employees, contractors, and agents**, from retaliatory actions by **anyone who has the authority to affect the individual's status as an employee, contractor, or agent**. These categories of protected individuals are not defined, and intentionally left for very broad interpretation. While this is an expanded class of individuals who will receive greater protection, it is limited to only those individuals who file actions under chapter 661 to stop false claims against the State.

Attached please find the letter dated March 21, 2001 from the Federal Office of the Inspector General outlining the mandate and the recommended changes.

The Department respectfully requests passage of this bill.

Attachment



DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES

Office of Inspector General

11-07250

MAR 21 2011

Washington, D.C. 20201

RECEIVED
STATE OF HAWAII
ATTORNEY GENERAL-OAG
2011 MAR 24 P 3:48

The Honorable David M. Louie
Department of the Attorney General
State of Hawaii
425 Queen Street
Honolulu, HI 96813

Dear Mr. Attorney General:

The Office of Inspector General (OIG) of the U.S. Department of Health & Human Services (HHS) previously received your office's request to review the Hawaii False Claims Act, Haw. Rev. Stat. §§ 661-21 through 661-29, under the requirements of section 1909 of the Social Security Act (the Act) and determined that the Hawaii False Claims Act met those requirements. Section 1909 of the Act provides a financial incentive for States to enact laws that establish liability to the State for individuals and entities that submit false or fraudulent claims to the State Medicaid program. For a State to qualify for this incentive, the State law must meet certain requirements enumerated under section 1909(b) of the Act, as determined by the Inspector General of HHS in consultation with the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). As explained below, we have determined, after consulting with DOJ, that the Hawaii False Claims Act no longer meets the requirements of section 1909 of the Act.

On May 20, 2009, the Fraud Enforcement and Recovery Act of 2009 (FERA) made numerous amendments to the Federal False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729-33. On March 23, 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) amended the Federal False Claims Act. Also, on July 21, 2010, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (the Dodd-Frank Act) further amended the Federal False Claims Act. These three acts, among other things, amended bases for liability in the Federal False Claims Act and expanded certain rights of *qui tam* relators. As a result of the FERA, the ACA, and the Dodd-Frank Act, the Hawaii False Claims Act is no longer in compliance with section 1909 of the Act. OIG also identified additional provisions in the Hawaii False Claims Act that do not satisfy the requirements of section 1909 of the Act.

Section 1909(b)(1) of the Act requires the State law to establish liability for false or fraudulent claims described in the Federal False Claims Act with respect to any expenditure described in section 1903(a) of the Act. The Federal False Claims Act, as amended by the FERA, establishes liability for, among other things:

- knowingly presenting, or causing to be presented, a false or fraudulent claim for payment or approval (removing the requirement that the claim be presented to an officer or employee of the Government);

- knowingly making, using, or causing to be made or used, a false record or statement material to a false or fraudulent claim;
- conspiring to commit a violation of the Federal False Claims Act; and
- knowingly making, using, or causing to be made or used, a false record or statement material to an obligation to pay or transmit money or property to the Government, or knowingly concealing or knowingly and improperly avoiding or decreasing an obligation to pay or transmit money or property to the Government.

See 31 U.S.C. § 3729(a). Relevant to the above-described bases for liability, the Federal False Claims Act, as amended by the FERA, includes an expanded definition of the term “claim” and defines the terms “obligation” and “material.” See 31 U.S.C. § 3729(b). In contrast, the Hawaii False Claims Act does not establish liability for the same breadth of conduct as the Federal False Claims Act, as amended.

Section 1909(b)(2) of the Act requires the State law to contain provisions that are at least as effective in rewarding and facilitating *qui tam* actions for false and fraudulent claims as those described in sections 3730 through 3732 of the Federal False Claims Act. The Federal False Claims Act, as amended by the FERA and the Dodd-Frank Act, provides certain relief to any employee, contractor, or agent who is retaliated against because of lawful acts done in furtherance of a Federal False Claims Act action or efforts to stop violations of the Federal False Claims Act. See 31 U.S.C. § 3730(h). The Hawaii False Claims Act does not expressly provide retaliation protection for employees, but such protections are in Hawaii’s Whistleblowers’ Protection Act, Haw. Rev. Stat. §§ 378-61 through 378-69. Hawaii’s Whistleblowers’ Protection Act, however, does not provide employees, contractors, or agents with as much protection from retaliatory action as the Federal False Claims Act. In addition, Hawaii’s Whistleblowers’ Protection Act provides for a shorter statute of limitations for retaliation actions than the Federal False Claims Act, which provides for a 3-year statute of limitations. Therefore, the Hawaii False Claims Act is not at least as effective in rewarding and facilitating *qui tam* actions as the Federal False Claims Act.

In addition, the Federal False Claims Act, as amended by the FERA, provides that for statute of limitations purposes, any Government complaint in intervention, whether filed separately or as an amendment to the relator’s complaint, shall relate back to the filing date of the relator’s complaint, to the extent that the claim of the Government arises out of the conduct, transactions, or occurrences set forth, or attempted to be set forth, in the relator’s complaint. See 31 U.S.C. § 3731(c). In contrast, the Hawaii False Claims Act does not contain a similar provision. Therefore, the Hawaii False Claims Act is not at least as effective in rewarding and facilitating *qui tam* actions as the Federal False Claims Act.

In addition, the Federal False Claims Act, as amended by the ACA, provides that the court shall dismiss an action or claim under the Federal False Claims Act, unless opposed by the Government, if substantially the same allegations or transactions as alleged in the action or claim were publicly disclosed: (1) in a Federal criminal, civil, or administrative hearing in which the Government or its agent is a party; (2) in a congressional, Government Accountability Office, or other Federal report, hearing, audit, or investigation; or (3) by the news media, unless the action is brought by the Attorney General or a person who is an original source of the information. See 31 U.S.C. § 3730(e)(4)(A). In contrast, the Hawaii False Claims Act requires a court to dismiss a broader category of cases based on a public disclosure and does not give Hawaii the opportunity to oppose the dismissal. Therefore, the Hawaii False Claims Act is not at least as effective in rewarding and facilitating *qui tam* actions as the Federal False Claims Act.

Further, the Federal False Claims Act, as amended by the ACA, defines “original source” as an individual who either: (1) prior to a public disclosure, voluntarily disclosed to the Government the information on which the allegations or transactions in a claim are based or (2) has knowledge that is independent of and materially adds to the publicly disclosed allegations or transactions, and who has voluntarily provided the information to the Government before filing an action. See 31 U.S.C. § 3730(e)(4)(B). In contrast, the Hawaii False Claims Act has a more restrictive definition of “original source.” Therefore, the Hawaii False Claims Act is not at least as effective in rewarding and facilitating *qui tam* actions as the Federal False Claims Act.

In addition, the Federal False Claims Act bars *qui tam* actions that are based upon allegations or transactions that are the subject of a civil suit or an administrative civil money penalty proceeding in which the Government is already a party. See 31 U.S.C. § 3730(e)(3). In contrast, the Hawaii False Claims Act more broadly bars *qui tam* actions that are “based upon allegations or transactions that are the subject of a civil or criminal investigation by the State, civil suit, or an administrative civil money penalty proceeding in which the State is already a party.” See Haw. Rev. Stat. § 661-27(e)(3). Therefore, the Hawaii False Claims Act is not at least as effective in rewarding and facilitating *qui tam* actions as the Federal False Claims Act.

In addition, the Hawaii False Claims Act provides that no *qui tam* may be brought by a present or former employee of the State that is based upon information discovered by the employee during the course of the employee’s employment unless the employee first exhausted internal procedures for reporting and seeking recovery of the falsely claimed sums and the State failed to act within a reasonable period of time. See Haw. Rev. Stat. § 661-27(e)(2). The Federal False Claims Act contains no such limitation. Therefore, the Hawaii False Claims Act is not at least as effective in rewarding and facilitating *qui tam* actions as the Federal False Claims Act.

Section 1909(b)(4) of the Act requires the State law to contain a civil penalty that is not less than the amount of the civil penalty authorized under section 3729 of the Federal False Claims Act. As amended by the FERA, the Federal False Claims Act now expressly provides that its civil penalty shall be adjusted by the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act of 1990. See 31 U.S.C. § 3729(a). Pursuant to the Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act, a civil

penalty under the Federal False Claims Act is not less than \$5,500 and not more than \$11,000. In contrast, the Hawaii False Claims Act provides for a penalty of not less than \$5,000 and not more than \$10,000. See Haw. Rev. Stat. § 661-21(a).

Hawaii will be granted a grace period, ending March 31, 2013, to amend the Hawaii False Claims Act and resubmit it to OIG for approval. Until March 31, 2013, Hawaii will continue to qualify for the incentive under section 1909 of the Act. Resubmission to OIG of an amended act will toll the expiration of the grace period until OIG issues a letter deeming the act either compliant or not compliant with section 1909 of the Act. To continue to qualify for the incentive after March 31, 2013, or after the expiration of any tolling period, if applicable, Hawaii must amend the Hawaii False Claims Act to meet the requirements of section 1909 of the Act with reference to the Federal False Claims Act in effect on the date of this letter, submit it for review, and receive approval by OIG. If any provision of the Federal False Claims Act that is relevant to section 1909 of the Act is amended further, Hawaii will again be granted a 2-year grace period from the date of enactment of any such amendments in which to amend its act to conform with the amended Federal False Claims Act and resubmit it to OIG for approval.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me or have your staff contact Katie Arnholt, Senior Counsel, at (202) 205-3203 or Tony Maida, Deputy Chief, Administrative and Civil Remedies Branch, at (202) 205-9323.

Sincerely,



Daniel R. Levinson
Inspector General

GRANDE LAW OFFICES

1164 BISHOP STREET
SUITE 124-24
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

THOMAS R. GRANDE
tgrande@GrandeLawOffices.com

TELEPHONE: (808) 521-7500
FAX: (888) 722-5575

Rep. Gilbert S.C. Keith-Agaran, Chair
Rep. Karl Rhoads, Vice Chair
House Committee on Judiciary
Hawai'i State Legislature
Honolulu, Hawai'i 96813

Re: HB 2468
Relating to False Claims to the State

Hearing Date & Time: January 31, 2012
2:00 p.m.

Place: Conference Room 325
State Capitol
415 South Beretania Street

Mr. Chair and Members of the Committee:

I am Tom Grande, an attorney in private practice, testifying in favor of this measure.

Over the past thirteen years, I have litigated false claims act cases in Hawai'i and on the mainland, in both state and federal courts. In 2000, I worked closely with then Senator Coleen Hanabusa to draft the first Hawai'i False Claims Act.

As the Committee is aware, this statute brings Hawai'i into conformance with the federal false claims act. This is beneficial not only to ensure the continued flow of monies into the state for work on federal cases, but also ensures that federal and other state case law may be followed by our courts in interpreting our statute.

As the Committee is also aware, under the federal requirements, the state must enact the same minimum protections afforded by the federal statute, but may also impose greater protections.

I have several suggested revisions:

1) H.R.S. § 46-171 *et seq.*, the County False Claims Act, was passed in 2001 and tracts the language of the state False Claims Act. It allows counties to sue in state court for false claims submitted to the counties. The County False Claims Act should also be amended to track the changes made by HB 2468.

GRANDE LAW OFFICES

Rep. Gilbert S.C. Keith-Agaran, Chair
Rep. Karl Rhoads, Vice Chair
House Committee on Judiciary
January 30, 2012
Page 2

2) Since the passage of the Hawai'i False Claims Act in 2000, the federal government has amended Section 7623 of the Internal Revenue Code to allow for false claims actions to be pursued for tax fraud. At least one state, New York, has amended its state false claims act to specifically allow for tax fraud actions to be pursued. (New York State False Claims Act, N.Y. State Fin. Law § 188).

I strongly recommend that the Committee follow the New York statute by amending the bill to delete section 661-21(f)¹, which precludes actions brought for tax fraud. This limitation does not make any sense in light of the current federal statutes and it affords a further opportunity for the state to recover monies for tax fraud.

3) I suggest that current section 661-21(a) be amended to clarify that the statute allows for the recovery of consequential damages. Consequential damages are those that flow indirectly from an injury and have been held by some courts not to be recoverable under the federal false claims act.

For example, if a contractor knowingly delivers substandard automobile parts to the State, which causes engine failure, the contractor would be liable for the cost of parts, but not for the engine replacement.

As amended that section would read:

“shall be liable to the State for a civil penalty of not less than ~~[\$5,000]~~ \$5,500 and not more than ~~[\$10,000;]~~ \$11,000, plus three times the amount of all damages, including consequential damages, that the State sustains due to the act of that person.”

This amendment also tracks an amendment passed by the New York legislature.

4) As currently drafted, Section 5 of the bill states

SECTION 5. This Act does not affect rights and duties that matured, penalties that were incurred, and proceedings that were begun, before the effective date of this Act.

I suggest that section 5 be deleted in its entirety. As drafted it could be misinterpreted to apply to contracts that were negotiated before its effective date, but for which false claims were

¹ “HRS § 661-21(f) This section shall not apply to claims, records, or statements for which procedures and remedies are otherwise specifically provided for under chapter 231 [Administration of Taxes].”

GRANDE LAW OFFICES

Rep. Gilbert S.C. Keith-Agaran, Chair
Rep. Karl Rhoads, Vice Chair
House Committee on Judiciary
January 30, 2012
Page 3

submitted after its effective date. This provision was not contained in Act 126 (2000), which was the original False Claims Act statute.

5) I would suggest that the liberal construction provision contained in Act 126 (2000) be put in place of current Section 5 as follows:

SECTION 5. The provisions of this Act are not exclusive and are in addition to any other applicable law or remedy. This Act shall be liberally construed and applied to promote the public interest.

Omission of this liberal construction provision may lead courts to conclude that the legislature did not intend to apply the same interpretative standards to the False Claims Act amendments as those that are applied to the original statute.

Thank you very much. I would be happy to make myself available to the Committee to provide any further information that may help the Committee in its consideration of this very important measure.