

The Health Care Reform Battle Heats Up in the Courts

Countering decisions of two other district courts, on Monday, December 13, Judge Henry E. Hudson of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia ruled that the provision requiring citizens to maintain a minimum level of health insurance coverage is unconstitutional. Judge Hudson held that Section 1501 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act ("PPACA"), more popularly known as the "Minimum Essential Coverage Provision," exceeds Congressional power under the Commerce Clause, and is therefore unconstitutional. A link to the ruling can be found here.

The challenge to PPACA, brought by Ken Cuccinelli, the Attorney General of Virginia, argued that the Minimum Essential Coverage Provision was unconstitutional under the Commerce Clause, the Necessary and Proper Clause, and the taxing power of the General Welfare Clause. The Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services countered with an "aggregation theory" that the collective effect of individual decisions on buying health care coverage has a significant impact on interstate commerce and therefore provides a basis for authority under the Commerce Clause. Hudson ultimately agreed that the Provision exceeds the historical boundaries of Commerce Clause power because it forces individuals to purchase a product from a private vendor. Hudson also held that, because the Provision exceeds the limits of the Commerce Clause, the Necessary and Proper Clause provides no "safe sanctuary" as the legislation was not enacted in furtherance of Congress's constitutional powers. Finally, Hudson also held that the Provision did not qualify as a tax under the General Welfare Clause despite the Provision's codification in the Internal Revenue Code. Judge Hudson agreed with Cuccinelli that the penalty for an individual who does not retain coverage lacked a revenue raising purpose and is merely a penalty, and therefore not a "tax."

The ruling is limited—only the Minimum Essential Coverage Provision was declared unconstitutional, and not the entirety of PPACA. Although this decision supports the idea that the provisions of PPACA are severable, meaning that some PPACA provisions are enforceable even if other provisions are unconstitutional, a decision eliminating the Minimum Essential Coverage Provision alone could unbalance the entirety of PPACA. Other provisions, such as the requirement that insurance companies cover pre-existing conditions and charge similar prices, are tethered to the minimum coverage requirement. As a result, while Judge Hudson's ruling was limited to the minimum coverage requirement, it could upset the mechanics of the entire PPACA.

One must also note that Judge Hudson issued only a declaratory judgment and declined to issue an injunction against the implementation of the Provision. The Provision is set to go into effect in 2014, leaving the true effects of the decision up to the appeals process. Judge Hudson's opinion marked a departure from two previous decisions, one coming out of another <u>Virginia district court</u> and the other out of <u>Michigan</u>, each declaring the Minimum Essential Coverage Provision to be constitutional. The Michigan and Virginia cases have been appealed, and yet another case will be heard later this week by a federal judge in Florida. Judge Hudson's ruling intensifies the battle over constitutionality of the minimum coverage requirement provision, and greatly increases the likelihood that the Supreme Court will eventually hear these cases and determine PPACA's ultimate constitutionality.

For additional information or if you have any questions pertaining to Health Care Reform, please contact <u>Todd Presnell</u>, <u>Sara Anne Thomas</u> or any member of our Health

Care Reform Task Force.

Health Care Reform Task Force:

Lance Bridgesmith	Ipbridgesmith@millermartin.com	615-744-8492
Christie Burbank	cburbank@millermartin.com	423-785-8307
Chris Crevasse	ccrevasse@millermartin.com	423-785-8420
Teresa Culver	tculver@millermartin.com	615-744-8406
Dan Elrod	delrod@millermartin.com	615-744-8526
Sepideh Khansari	skhansari@millermartin.com	615-744-8575
<u>Ian Leavy</u>	ileavy@millermartin.com	423-785-8493
<u>Howard Levine</u>	hlevine@millermartin.com	423-785-8233
Sarah Maxwell	smaxwell@millermartin.com	615-744-8453
Stephanie Pierce	spierce@millermartin.com	615-744-8522
Eric Stevens	estevens@millermartin.com	615-744-8423
Rebecca Rojas	rrojas@millermartin.com	423-785-8264
Jim Tramonte	jtramonte@millermartin.com	404-962-6415
Clay Walts	cwalts@millermartin.com	404-962-6409
Bryant Witt	bwitt@millermartin.com	615-744-8431
Jeff Zager	jzager@millermartin.com	615-744-8419

The opinions expressed in this bulletin are intended for general guidance only. They are not intended as recommendations for specific situations. As always, readers should consult a qualified attorney for specific legal guidance. Should you need assistance from a Miller & Martin attorney, please call 1-800-275-7303.

FOLLOW US ON twitter

Atlanta | Chattanooga | Nashville www.millermartin.com

ATLANTA

1170 Peachtree Street, N.E., Suite 800 Atlanta, GA 30309-7706

CHATTANOOGA

832 Georgia Avenue, Suite 1000, Volunteer Building Chattanooga, TN 37402-2289

NASHVILLE

150 Fourth Avenue North, Suite 1200, One Nashville Place Nashville, TN 37219

Subscribe to our email list