

**PRESENTED AT**

**The Car Crash Seminar**

August 17-18, 2017

Norris Conference Center – Austin, TX

## **Subrogation and Liens**

**Judy Kostura**

Judy Kostura  
Judge, Kostura & Putman, P.C.  
2901 Bee Cave Road, Suite L  
Austin, Texas 78746

[jkostura@jkplaw.com](mailto:jkostura@jkplaw.com)

512.328.9099

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW OF SUBROGATION, HISTORY, FEDERAL AND STATE BALANCING ACT, AND COMMON LAW EQUITABLE PRINCIPLES	
A. History of state and federal regulation of insurance	1
B. Definitions	2
C. Types of subrogation: contractual, equitable, and effect of pro-rata or other insurance clauses	3
D. Subrogation in the absence of a contract or statute? No and Yes	6
E. Equitable Principles	7
1. Made Whole Doctrine: the plaintiff's right to first recovery.	7
A. Critique of Fortis opinion	11
B. Ch. 140A/HB 1869 Legislative Solutions to Fortis	13
C. Non Legislative Solutions to Fortis	16
1. Read the policy to see if it disclaims Made Whole	16
2. Do not apply Fortis to all contract provisions	18
i. Common fund doctrine	18
ii. PIP and UM/UIM	19
iii. When subrogation has been waived contractually	20
D. When the plan disclaims fairness but the client is not made whole	21
1. Sue the third party tortfeasor	21
2. Limit the damages sought in the third party suit	21
3. Invite the plan to an Allocation Hearing	22
4. Walk away from the case	24
E. Ideas for ERISA Plans	24
1. Get the Summary Plan Description	26
2. Tell the client to spend the Money [may be risky]	26
3. Focus on the Conditions Precedent	30
4. Allocate the Money to family members who don't owe subro	30
5. Focus on whether or not an "identifiable fund" exists	31
6. Determine whether or not a lien is required before an "identifiable fund" exists	34
2. Common Fund Doctrine: the plaintiff's right to reimbursement of a prorata share of the cost of obtaining the recovery	35
a. Passing the benefit of the common fund doctrine to the client	35
b. Passing the benefit of the common fund doctrine to the attorney.	37
3. Laches	38
4. Can the carrier subrogate against itself or its own insured?	39
5. Construe all ambiguities (re: children, spouses, 3rd parties, liable parties) against the plan?	42
6. Subrogation as a sword and shield	45
7. Does bankruptcy by the debtor discharge subro interest or a lien	45
8. Children's recoveries and subrogation interests	46
II. SUBROGATION INTERESTS GRANTED BY FEDERAL LAW (VA, MEDICARE, FEHBA)	47
A. Veterans Administration	47
1. The right of reimbursement	47
2. Made Whole, Pro-Rata Division; Common Fund, Reduction or Waiver	47
3. For cases in litigation	49
B. Medicare	49
1. The right of reimbursement	49

1.1. What is Medicare?	49
1.2. Who receives Medicare benefits?	49
1.3. Other interests arise out of MCRA & Medicaid	50
1.4. Medicare's interest arises out of Medicare Secondary Payer Act.	50
1.5. PIP/Med Pay are Primary and UM/UIM is subject to Medicare.	50
1.6. 2003 Amendment to the MSP	50
1.7. 2007 Amendment to the MSP	51
1.8. One slight exception for uninsured tortfeasors	51
1.9. Medicare's interest is not a Lien	51
2. Finding the intermediaries and opening the file	51
2.1. Open the file with BCRC.	51
2.2. Other contact info for non-tort recoveries	51
2.2.1 BCRC Recovery Portal	52
2.3. BCRC interaction with CMS	52
2.4. FTCA cases	52
2.5 Documents to send to CMS/BCRC	52
3. The amount of reimbursement	53
3.1. Pre-existing and unrelated conditions	53
3.2. Formula for reimbursement	53
3.3. Judgments and their effect	54
3.4 Wrongful death vs. survival damages	54
4. Set-aside provisions: Does Medicare take a holiday?	55
4.1. Definitions and Options offered for Public Comment by CMS	55
4.2. In the Meantime: Medicare Set Aside account	59
4.3 Medicare's position	60
4.4 MSA has its origins in worker's compensation	60
4.5 How to do WCMSAs	60
4.6 Mandatory reporting is required by Defendants and Plaintiffs	60
4.7 Penalties for failing to report.	61
4.8 Reporting effective dates	61
4.9 Content of the new reporting rules	62
4.10 De minimus reporting thresholds apply	62
4.11 The 180 page answer book	63
4.12 The amount to be set aside in trust	63
4.13 Comparative negligence of Plaintiff	63
4.14 Penalty for failing to create MSA	63
4.15 Seeking advance approval of MSA	64
4.16 Who establishes and administers the MSA?	64
4.17 Is an MSA required in all cases?	65
5. The procedure for determining reimbursement	66
5.1. For past medical expenses: start early	66
5.2. For future medical expenses	67
5.3. Confidentiality agreements	68
5.4 Court Allocation of Damages to avoid excessive repayment	68
6. Asking for a waiver	70
7. Penalties for failing to reimburse	71
7.1. Who must reimburse past medical expense subro interest	71
7.2. Medicare's enforcement options	71
7.3. Liability of counsel, tort defendants and liability insurers	72
7.4. Interest on damages	74
7.5 Statute of Limitations	74

7.6. Constructive notice . . . . .	74
8. Naming Medicare, or not, on the settlement checks . . . . .	74
9. Medicare Advantage . . . . .	75
9.1 Authority for alternative plans under Medicare Part C . . . . .	75
9.2 Does the Medicare Part C Plan have a private cause of action? . . . . .	76
9.2.1 No, says the U.S. District Judge in <i>Humana v. Reale</i> . . . . .	76
9.2.2 Yes says the 3 <sup>rd</sup> , 4 <sup>th</sup> 5 <sup>th</sup> 11 <sup>th</sup> Circuits; see in <i>In Re Avandia</i> . . . . .	77
10. May Providers bill the patient instead of submitting to Medicare? . . . . .	79
10.1. Providers who bill for claim related injuries . . . . .	79
10.2. Seeking conditional payment from Medicare . . . . .	79
10.3. Strategy to encourage providers to bill Medicare . . . . .	80
10.4. The amount the provider may bill the patient beneficiary . . . . .	80
11. Admitting evidence of the subro interest into evidence in 3 <sup>rd</sup> party claim . . . . .	82
12. Recommended Reading . . . . .	83
13. Protecting Recoveries in a Special Needs Trust . . . . .	83
C. Medical Care Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C.A. Sec. 2651-53 (2002) . . . . .	83
D. Federal Employees Health Benefits Act . . . . .	84
E. Federal Employees Worker's Compensation Act . . . . .	89
III. TEXAS STATUTORY SUBROGATION INTERESTS (BUT NOT WORKER'S COMPENSATION) . . . . .	90
A. Medicaid . . . . .	90
1. The right of reimbursement . . . . .	91
2. Balance billing strictly regulated . . . . .	92
3. Finding Medicaid to repay subrogation . . . . .	93
4. Preserving Medicaid eligibility . . . . .	94
5. Reduction for client . . . . .	94
a. Because the client needs public assistance . . . . .	94
b. Ahlborn: Federal anti-lien statute prohibits assignment of property . . . . .	95
6. Attorney's fees and expenses . . . . .	98
7. Medicaid cases involving a minor child . . . . .	98
B. Texas Rehabilitation Commission . . . . .	99
C. Indigent Health Care Treatment Act . . . . .	99
D. Health Care to Prisoners . . . . .	99
E. Crime Victims Compensation Fund . . . . .	99
F. Child Health Plan for Certain Low Income Children (CHIPS) . . . . .	100
G. State Employees Health Benefits Act- ERS . . . . .	100
IV. TEXAS STATUTORY SUBROGATION INTEREST: WORKER'S COMPENSATION . . . . .	102
A. The right of reimbursement . . . . .	102
1. The scope of recovery: from the third party claim . . . . .	102
a. Recovery: from the deductible? . . . . .	102
b. Recovery: Third party does not include employer for gross negl. . . . .	102
c. Recovery: Third party is not those who contractually waive . . . . .	102
d. Recovery: when employer is negligent . . . . .	103
e. Recovery: The carrier's recovery is 2/3 of NET of claimant's recovery, not off the gross amount . . . . .	104
f. Future holiday and multiple beneficiaries in wrongful death cases . . . . .	104
g. County Law Enforcement Wage Continuation Benefits . . . . .	105
h. The carrier's rights are derivative but independent . . . . .	105
i. The intervening carrier does not recover interest or attorney's fees from the third party recovery . . . . .	106

2. Attorney fees for collecting the subrogation interest . . . . .	106
3. Attorney fees for collecting the attorney fee . . . . .	109
4. Attorney liability for failing to pay the w/c subrogation interest . . . . .	109
5. There is no made whole doctrine in worker's compensation: Allocating the third party recovery and the subrogation interest . . . . .	110
6. Three practice tips . . . . .	111
a. Contested hearing on damages . . . . .	111
b. Segregate each client's damages . . . . .	111
c. Drafting settlement documents . . . . .	111
7. Statute of limitations . . . . .	113
a. Against third party . . . . .	113
b. Against injured worker . . . . .	113
8. Disclosure and consent . . . . .	113
9. Ethical considerations . . . . .	114
10. Uninsured/Underinsured motorist coverage . . . . .	114
11. Substitute Policies . . . . .	117
a. Apply Statutory Rules Found in HB1869 . . . . .	117
b. Waivers are barred . . . . .	119
c. Retaliation is barred under ERISA . . . . .	119
12. When the third party settles the lien cheap. . . . .	119
13. Waiver of the worker's comp lien in contracts . . . . .	120
14. State of Texas self-funded worker's compensation plans . . . . .	121
15. Worker's Comp cannot subrogate to the Guaranty Assn but Assn can subrogate to Ptf recovery . . . . .	122
16. Admitting evidence of the worker's comp lien in the third party case . . . . .	122
17. Jurisdiction over the dispute: court or commission? . . . . .	123
 V. TEXAS STATUTORY LIENS (HOSPITAL LIENS AND CHILD SUPPORT LIENS) . . . . .	124
A. The hospital lien statute: lien content; UM/UIM; wrongful death; SOL . . . . .	124
1. Regular and Reasonable Rate & Patient Protection/Afford Care Act . . . . .	125
2. Emergency hospital care and Emergency medical care . . . . .	128
3. Admission within 72 hours . . . . .	129
4. Constructive notice and the timing of notice . . . . .	129
5. The lien applies to a child's recovery . . . . .	130
6. Subrogation principles do not apply . . . . .	130
7. Unanswered question if recovery inadequate . . . . .	131
8. Unanswered question if hospital named on check but not paid . . . . .	131
9. Lienholders don't get interest or attorneys' fees plus lien (unless) . . . . .	131
10. Balance Billing: Hospitals and emergency care physicians are prohibited by Chapter 146 of Civil Practice and Remedies Code from asserting a lien when health insurance should pay; Chapter 55 of the Property Code reiterates that prohibition to physicians . . . . .	132
a. Out of network providers and Ins. Code 1467F.8. . . . .	133
b. Balance billing allowed or not allowed: Examples. . . . .	133
c. Chapter 146 and Medicaid and Medicare . . . . .	133
d. Seeking conditional payment from Medicare . . . . .	134
e. Strategy to encourage providers to bill Medicare . . . . .	135
f. The amount the provider may bill the Medicare beneficiary . . . . .	135
11. Crime Victims Compensation Fund . . . . .	136
12. Remedies for improperly filed lien . . . . .	137
13. Does bankruptcy by the debtor discharge the lien? . . . . .	138

14. Turning a lien into lemonade: The <i>Stowers</i> Doctrine . . . . .	138
15. Hospital liens in other states . . . . .	138
B. The Child Support Lien . . . . .	139
1. Notice of the child support lien: actual or constructive? . . . . .	140
2. The property of the current spouse is not subject to the child support lien . . . . .	141
3. Medical liens and attorneys' fees take priority over child support lien . . . . .	141
4. Letters of protection do not take priority of the child support lien . . . . .	141
5. Child support liens takes priority over an ERISA interest . . . . .	142
6. Lottery winnings may be subject to child support liens . . . . .	142
VI. MUNICIPAL OR COUNTY EMPLOYEE STATUTORY SUBROGATION INTERESTS GRANTED BY TEXAS LAW . . . . .	142
A. Employees of local political subdivisions . . . . .	142
B. Municipal officers and employees . . . . .	144
VII. ERISA EMPLOYEE WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS . . . . .	144
A. The effect of ERISA (overview of subrogation decisions) . . . . .	145
B. Establishing a plan's status as an 'employee welfare benefit plan' . . . . .	151
1. There must be a plan . . . . .	151
2. There must be proper intent and handling . . . . .	151
3. The employer must be engaged in an industry or activity affecting interstate commerce . . . . .	152
C. Plans that are not ERISA plans . . . . .	152
D. Laws that are not preempted by ERISA . . . . .	153
E. Child support liens and domestic relations orders trump ERISA interests. . . . .	155
F. Retaliation is barred under ERISA . . . . .	155
G. The beneficiaries' remedy for ERISA plan's misrep of its subro rights . . . . .	156
VIII. ERISA AND TEXAS COMMON LAW EQUITABLE CONCEPTS, INCLUDING MADE WHOLE AND COMMON FUND, IN AN INSURANCE FUNDED PLAN . . . . .	156
A. ERISA does not automatically kill off Texas' made whole doctrine or common fund doctrine because ERISA's savings clause preserves state regulation . . . . .	156
1. Made whole doctrine and ERISA . . . . .	157
A. Do not waive your common law made whole doctrine . . . . .	159
2. Common fund doctrine and ERISA . . . . .	161
IX. THE DOCUMENTS MATTER; GET THE SUMMARY PLAN DESCRIPTION AND THE EMPLOYEE WELFARE BENEFIT PLAN . . . . .	162
A. ERISA and the Summary Plan Description . . . . .	162
1. Statutory requirement . . . . .	162
2. The Summary Plan Description requirements; a) compare the SPD to the Plan; b.) What if there is just one document? . . . . .	164
3. What constitutes a Summary Plan Description . . . . .	168
4. Read the Employee Welfare Benefit Plan's subrogation provision . . . . .	168
X. ERISA AND SELF-FUNDED EMPLOYEE WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS . . . . .	169
A. The statutory authority . . . . .	169
B. Stop Loss coverage . . . . .	170
1. And the issue of state regulation . . . . .	170
2. And the issue of appropriate equitable relief . . . . .	172
C. The first seminal self-funded case: FMC v. Holliday . . . . .	172



D. The 5 <sup>th</sup> Circuit and Supreme Court: what's equity got to do with it? . . . . .	173
E. Bad news from the 4 <sup>th</sup> Circuit: Failing to sign subrogation reimbursement forms terminates coverage . . . . .	177
F. The Effect of Knudson and Sereboff: The Plan may seek equitable relief, including imposing a constructive trust on identifiable funds . . . . .	178
G. Making the Self-Funded ERISA Plan Secondary. . . . .	179
H. Overview of Cases on Appropriate Equitable Relief and the Plan's Remedies . . . . .	181
1. Liability of the plan member . . . . .	181
2. Liability of the plan member's attorney . . . . .	190
3. Liability (or not) of third parties including other insurance companies. . . . .	193
I. The plan must plead and prove its ERISA status . . . . .	195
J. Four practice tips . . . . .	195
a. The subrogation questionnaires . . . . .	195
b. Close out the subrogation interest at settlement . . . . .	196
c. Know your risks and benefits . . . . .	196
d. Ethics: Avoid dual representation of the client and plan . . . . .	196
XI. ERISA'S PREEMPTION (OR NOT) OF FEDERAL OR STATE LAW CAUSES OF ACTION . . . . .	196
A. State law causes of action and ERISA preemption . . . . .	197
B. Federal law causes of action and preemption . . . . .	198
C. The Common Fund doctrine and ERISA preemption . . . . .	199
D. Preemption of state court jurisdiction, or not . . . . .	200
E. Long Term Disability Policies . . . . .	202
F. Additional research sources . . . . .	203
XII. USING THE DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ACT TO CONSTRUE AN AMBIGUOUS OR SILENT PLAN DOCUMENT OR TO DETERMINE ENTITLEMENT TO RECOVERY . . . . .	203
A. Federal actions authorized by ERISA . . . . .	203
B. Action in state court. . . . .	205
XIII. NON-ERISA PLANS SUCH AS HMO'S, CHURCH-SPONSORED OR GOVERNMENT PLANS, AND INDIVIDUALLY PURCHASED HEALTH INSURANCE CONTRACTS . . . . .	206
A. Non-ERISA plans . . . . .	206
B. HMO's . . . . .	206
C. Private health insurance . . . . .	207
D. Government or church employer sponsored plans . . . . .	207
XIV. AUTOMOBILE POLICIES, INCLUDING PIP, MEDICAL PAYMENTS, UM/UIM, AND PROPERTY DAMAGE . . . . .	208
A. Preserving the plaintiff's PIP . . . . .	208
B. Medical Payments Coverage on auto policies . . . . .	209
1. The Common Fund Doctrine . . . . .	209
2. The Made Whole Doctrine . . . . .	210
C. Uninsured/Underinsured Motorist Coverage . . . . .	210
1. The Statutory Authority . . . . .	210
a. Preserving the UM/UIM carrier's subrogation rights . . . . .	211
b. <i>Stowers</i> and the UIM carrier . . . . .	211
c. Preserving the client's UM/UIM coverage free of subrogation . . . . .	212
i. When the subrogation interest is ambiguous about its right to subrogate to first party uninsured motorist coverage . . . . .	212

ii. Because underinsured motorist coverage is first party coverage, not third	213
D. Vehicle Property Damage	214
XV. COORDINATION OF BENEFITS AS A MEANS OF AVOIDING PAYMENT BY INSURERS	215
XVI. ASSIGNMENTS TO CREDITORS, LOPs, AND AGREEMENTS TO REPAY SUBROGATION	217
A. Assignments to creditors	217
B. Letters of Protection	220
C. Agreements to Repay the Subrogation Interest	222
1. Ethical Issues if the client reneges or the recovery is inadequate	224
2. Ethical Issues when the Plan is self-funded	224
3. Does a Reimbursement agreement confer more benefits to the Plan than a Subrogation Agreement	226
4. Do not sign a Reimbursement Agreement which is broader than the Plan or the Summary Plan Description provisions	226
XVII. STATUTORY VIOLATIONS BY HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS AND STATUTORY VIOLATIONS BY SUBROGATION COLLECTION AGENCIES	226
A. Chapter 146, Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code and when Balance Billing is ok or not ok	226
B. Violations of Insurer Federal Fair Debt Collections Practices Act	228
C. Violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices-Consumer Protection Act	229
1. State law damages available to injured consumers	229
2. Extra-contractual damages may not be allowed in ERISA Plans	230
D. Violations by Hospitals of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act	230
XVIII. ADVICE TO ATTORNEYS	230
A. Communicating with the client	231
1. At the first interview	231
2. At the time of settlement	231
3. If a lawsuit against the subrogee is necessary	231
B. Communicating with the third party liability carrier	232
1. At the time the file is opened	232
2. At the time of settlement	232
C. Communicating with the subrogated insurer or Self-Funded Health Plan	234
1. At the time the file is opened	234
2. During the course of the claim	234
3. At the time of settlement	235
D. Converting the money ... bad idea?	236
1. Penalties for conversion	236
2. Protect yourself if the client does not want to repay	237
3. Statute of limitations	238
E. Health insurers who refuse to pay bills rather than pay and subrogate	239
XIX. INDEMNIFICATION AND RELEASE DOCUMENTS	240
XX. APPENDIX	
HB 1869, as Ch. 140A Civ. Prac. and Rem. Code, Legislative Solution to Fortis v. Cantu	
Medicare Overview of the Beneficiary NGHP Recovery Process flowchart	
Medicare Recovery Process step by step	
Cover Sheet to CMS re Non-Group Health Plan subrogation correspondence	



Medicare Consent to Release (HIPAA authorization) discussion and form  
Medicare Proof of Representation discussion and form  
Medicare Recovery Worksheet  
Medicare Final Settlement Detail Document  
Medicare MMSEA Claimant Refusal to Release SSN  
Medicare Memo 09/30/11 Doctor Certification of no future medical care  
Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act Notice 2010-39 re: limit on hospital bill amounts  
Medicare Websites

## SUBROGATION AND LIENS

### I. OVERVIEW OF SUBROGATION, HISTORY, FEDERAL AND STATE BALANCING ACT, AND COMMON LAW EQUITABLE PRINCIPLES.

#### A. *History of state and federal regulation of insurance.*

Subrogation is an element of insurance law. In 1944, the United States Supreme Court determined that “insurance” is a form of interstate commerce subject to federal regulation; see *United States v. South-Eastern Underwriters Assoc.*, 322 U.S. 533 (1944). Shortly thereafter, Congress passed the McCarran-Ferguson Act, 15 U.S.C.S. § 1011 and following. The McCarran-Ferguson Act granted authority to the states to regulate the “business of insurance.” Various federal laws continued to govern the “peripherals of the industry (labor, tax, securities).” State laws which regulated the core nature of the insurance business therefore overrode most federal laws to the contrary. This paper is designed to analyze the myriad of state and federal statutes and cases on the topic of subrogation, from the standpoint of the plaintiff’s personal injury practitioner.

In an attempt to harmonize the proliferation of insurance policies and laws and to protect workers, Congress passed the Employee Retirement and Income Security Act, commonly known as ERISA, in 1974. ERISA did not vitiate the McCarran-Ferguson’s grant of state regulation; it did spawn a spate of lawsuits trying to determine which state laws qualify as state regulation (not-preempted by ERISA) and which laws deal with peripheral issues (pre-empted by ERISA). ERISA also recognized that some health plans are self-funded, not funded by insurance premiums, and those plans are exempt from state regulation.

The shifting of risk through the payment of premiums is the most fundamental principle of insurance. Subrogation is a bastardization of that risk-shifting principle. Therefore, subrogation should come within the “core business” of insurance and be subject to state regulation for all premium funded insurance policies. A Florida court traced the history and analysis:

[T]he court in *Pilot* looked to case law interpreting the phrase “business of insurance” under the McCarran-

UT CLE The Car Crash Seminar 2017 Subrogation and Liens

Ferguson Act. *Id.* This law, taken as a whole, provided three criteria for determining whether a practice would fall under the “business of insurance.” *Id.* Namely:

“[F]irst, whether the practice has the effect of transferring or spreading a policyholder’s risk; second, whether the practice is an integral part of the policy relationship between the insurer and the insured; and third, whether the practice is limited to entities within the insurance industry.” *Union Labor Life Ins. Co. v. Pireno*, 458 U.S. 119, 129, 102 S.Ct. 3002, 3009, 73 L.Ed.2d 647 (1982) (emphasis in original). *Id.* at 48-49.

However, more recently, in *Kentucky Ass’n of Health Plans, Inc. v. Miller*, 538 U.S. 329, 341-42 (2003), the Supreme Court receded from the McCarran-Ferguson factors, stating:

Today we make a clean break from the McCarran-Ferguson factors and hold that for a state law to be deemed a “law ... which regulates insurance” under § 1144(b)(2)(A), it must satisfy two requirements. First, the state law must be specifically directed toward entities engaged in insurance. See *Pilot Life, supra*, at 50, 107 S.Ct. 1549; *UNUM, supra*, at 368, 119 S.Ct. 1380; *Rush Prudential, supra*, at 366, 122 S.Ct. 2151. Second ... the state law must substantially affect the risk pooling arrangement between the insurer and the insured. Kentucky’s law satisfies each of these requirements.

The majority of cases addressing state subrogation and collateral source statutes have determined that they are laws regulating insurance. In *FMC Corp. v. Holliday*, 498 U.S. 52, 60-61 (1990), the Supreme Court considered whether a Pennsylvania anti-subrogation statute was a law “regulating insurance” and held:

There is no dispute that the Pennsylvania law falls within ERISA’s insurance saving clause.... Section 1720 directly controls the terms of insurance contracts by invalidating any subrogation provisions that they contain. See *Metropolitan Life Ins. Co. v. Massachusetts*, 471 U.S., at 740-741,

105 S.Ct., at 2389-2390. It does not merely have an impact on the insurance industry; it is aimed at it. See Pilot Life Ins. Co. v. Dedeaux, 481 U.S. 41, 50, 107 S.Ct. 1549, 1554, 95 L.Ed.2d 39 (1987). This returns the matter of subrogation to state law.

*Coleman v. BCBS of Alabama, Inc.*, No. 1D10-1366, (D. Ct of Appeal Florida, 1<sup>st</sup> Dist. - Dec. 8, 2010)

This paper reviews U.S. and Texas subrogation interests and liens in favor of Veterans Administration, Medicare, Medicaid, workers' compensation, Hospital Liens, or child support liens. It covers conventional/contractual subrogation interests, including ERISA Employee Welfare Benefit Plans and Non-ERISA Plans, Self-funded Pools, Private Health Insurance, Government Employer or Church Sponsored Plans, Medical Payments Coverage, Uninsured/Underinsured Motorist Coverage, Vehicle Property Damage, and HMO's. It also covers equitable subrogation imposed by law. It analyzes the effect of the Texas Supreme Court's decision in *Fortis Benefits v. Cantu*, 234 S.W.3d 642, 649 (Tex. 2007), No. 05-0791, on the made whole doctrine, and the legislative reform of *Fortis* by the passage of Ch. 140A Civ. Prac. and Rem. Code, effective on 01/01/2014. See Section I.E.1.B, Ch. 140A of this paper for a discussion of the *Liberty Mutual Ins. Co. v. Transit Mix Concrete & Materials Co.*, No. 06-12-00117-CV, (\_\_\_ S.W.3d \_\_\_ June 28, 2013, pet. den.) case and the statute's effective date for 3<sup>rd</sup> party and 1<sup>st</sup> party claims.

## **B. Definitions.**

"Subrogation" has been defined as the "substitution of one person in the place of another with reference to a lawful claim, demand or right." Black's Law Dictionary. "Subrogation is the substitution of one person in the place of another, whether as creditor or as the possessor of some lawful claim, so that he who is substituted succeeds to the rights of the other in relation to the debt or claim. . . . By subrogation, a court of equity, for the purpose of doing exact justice between parties in a given transaction, places one of them, to whom a legal right does not belong, in the position of a party to whom the right does belong." 53 Tex.Jur.2d Subrogation § 1, at 429 (1964).

Although some courts use "subrogation" and "reimbursement" interchangeably, they are distinct concepts. The "subrogee" is the entity – usually an insurer -- which paid benefits to the subrogor (injured plaintiff) and has a right to stand in the shoes of the plaintiff, with respect to the plaintiff's liability claims, and sue the tortfeasor. The "subrogor" is the one who contracted away his or her rights of recovery to the subrogee. A right of reimbursement requires the person with the original claim (injured plaintiff) to turn over collected claim proceeds to the insurer claiming the right of reimbursement from its own insured. See *Charla Aldous v. Darwin National Assurance Company*, No. 16-10537-CV0 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 03/16/17) which denied an insurer the right to collect from its own insured because it failed to exercise its contractual subrogation interest against the third party and had no right of reimbursement against its insured. A subrogation interest is not the same as a lien and a subrogee is not automatically a secured lienholder. Subrogation and assignments were equated by the 5<sup>th</sup> Circuit in *Associated International Ins. Co. v. Scottsdale Ins. Co.*, 16-20465 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 07/07/17): "[S]ubrogation works much like an assignment: both transfer rights from the assignor to the assignee. See *Hamilton v. United Healthcare of La., Inc.*, 310 F.3d 385, 397 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir.) (Garza, J., concurring) ("[I]n essence, subrogation is an assignment."): COUCH ON INSURANCE § 222:54 (noting that the distinction between assignment and subrogation may be "academic and not a substantive matter"). Although subrogees stand in the shoes of the subrogors, they cannot seek the same statutory or punitive damages as the subrogors; *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa. v. Ins. Co. of N. Am.*, 955 S.W.2d 120, 133 (Tex. App. – Houston [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1997), *aff'd sub nom. Keck, Mahin & Cate v. Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa.*, 20 S.W.3d 692 (Tex. 2000).

Subrogation has been characterized by Texas courts as a 'pure equity,' as a 'wholesome rule of equity,' and as 'a doctrine belonging to an age of enlightened policy and refined, although natural justice.' *Chambers & Co. v. Little*, 21 S.W.2d 17, 22 (Tex. App.--Eastland 1929, writ ref'd); *O'Brien v. Perkins*, 276 S.W. 308, 315 (Tex. App.--Amarillo 1925), *aff'd sub nom., Shelton v. O'Brien*, 285 S.W. 260 (Tex.1926).

Also available as part of the eCourse

[Answer Bar: Taking on the Car Crash Client](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the  
2017 The Car Crash Seminar session

"Subrogation and Liens"