

PRESENTED AT

The Car Crash Seminar

August 9-10, 2018

Norris Conference Center – City Centre, Houston TX

Subrogation and Liens

Judy Kostura

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

jkostura@jkplaw.com

512.328.9099

JUDY KOSTURA

JUDGE, KOSTURA & PUTMAN, P.C.
THE COMMISSIONER'S HOUSE AT HERITAGE SQUARE
2901 Bee Cave Road, Box L, Austin, Texas 78746
Telephone (512) 328-9099
Facsimile (512) 328-4132

jkostura@jkplaw.com

Licenses: Licensed by Texas Supreme Court: 1980; Licensed by Western District, Federal Court: 1988

Legal Practice: Judge, Kostura & Putman, P.C., www.jkplaw.com; 2004 to current
Sole Practitioner, plaintiff's personal injury practice 1990-2003
Binder & Kostura, plaintiff's personal injury practice 1985-1990
Sole practitioner, general civil practice 1980-1985

AV Rating by Martindale-Hubbell (highest ranking for competence and ethics)

Experience: Trucking, Auto, Cycling and Pedestrian Collisions, DWI Injuries, Wrongful Death, Premises Liability, Burn Injuries, Dog Bites, Subrogation and Liens, Insurance Bad Faith

West Publishing Company: Author of Personal Injury Form Book on Disk
Insurance Subrogation texts for American Association of Justice, Texas Trial Lawyers Assn; CLE speaker on Ethics, Client Communications, Insurance Subrogation, for: American Assn of Justice, Texas Trial Lawyers Assn, UT School of Law, State Bar of Texas, University of Houston Law School, South Texas College of Law, Texas Advanced Paralegal Seminar, Capital Area Trial Lawyers Assn, Austin Bar Assn, South Plains Trial Lawyer Assn.

Course Director: State Bar of Texas Advanced Evidence & Discovery, 2016
Course Director: State Bar of Texas Advanced Personal Injury Seminar, 2013
Course Director: State Bar of Texas Damages Seminar, February 2011

Professional Affiliations: Life Fellow, Texas Bar Foundation
Texas Trial Lawyers Assn: Vice President of TTLA for CLE (2018); Executive Committee (2006, 2018); Nominating Committee (2017); Communications Committee; ListServ Committee (multiple years)
Texas Watch Champion of Justice 2005-2017
Capital Area Trial Lawyers Association (President 1999-2000, President Elect 1998-1999, Secretary Treasurer 1997-1998, Executive Committee through 2015)
Travis County Bar Association, Board of Directors (1995-1998)
Lawyer Referral Service Board of Trustees through 2018 (Chair 1995-1998)
Pro Bono College of Law, over 100 hours of Pro Bono Public Service; 1992 and 1993
College of State Bar (various years)

Professional Honors: *Texas Monthly Super Lawyer* 2015 -2018, *Top 50 Texas Women* 2016, *Top 50 Central/West Texas* 2016
National Association of Distinguished Counsel Nation's Top One Percent 2015
Texas Trial Lawyers Assn Resolution of Appreciation for Legislative Contributions 2013
Scott Ozmun Trial Lawyer of the Year Capital Area Trial Lawyers Assn 2011
John Howie Spirit of Mentorship Award Texas Trial Lawyers Association 2006

Education: Doctor of Jurisprudence, University of Texas at Austin : 1980
Bachelor of Arts, With Honors, University of Texas : 1977

Personal: married to Tom Polk, Realtor, since 1982; mother of daughters Rachel and Kisa
Active member, First United Methodist Church, Austin

Table of Contents

I. OVERVIEW OF SUBROGATION, HISTORY, FEDERAL AND STATE BALANCING ACT, AND COMMON LAW EQUITABLE PRINCIPLES.....	1
A. History of state and federal regulation of insurance.....	1
B. Definitions.....	2
C. Types of subrogation interests: conventional, legal, equitable, and “other insurance” or “pro-rata” clauses: 4	
D. Is there subrogation in the absence of a contract or statute? No, unless yes ...	6
E. Equitable Principles.	7
1. Made Whole Doctrine: the plaintiff's right to first recovery.	8
A. <i>The critique of the Fortis opinion:</i>	11
B. <i>HB 1869 Legislative Solution to Fortis:</i>	13
C. <i>Non-Legislative Solutions to Fortis:</i>	16
1. Read the written policy to see if it provides for subrogation without any additional reference to claims priority.	16
2. Do not apply Fortis to subrogation principles that were not at issue in Fortis.	18
i. The common fund doctrine:.....	18
ii. No subrogation against PIP and UM/UIM:	20
iii. ..If the subrogation interest has been waived by the plan, then <i>Fortis</i> does not reinstate that subrogation interest.....	21
D. <i>Options when the injured claimant is not being made whole by the third party recovery and the contract disclaims the made whole doctrine:</i>	22
1. Sue the third party tortfeasor.	22
2. Limit the damages sought in the third party suit.	22
3. Invite the plan to a contested hearing on the allocation of the damages obtained in the Recovery.	23
4. Walk away from the case.	25
E. Ideas for ERISA plans:	25
1. Get the Summary Plan Description:	27
2. Tell the client to spend the money? [JK: this is not without risk!]	27
3. Focus on conditions precedent:	31
4. Allocate the money to injured family members or claimants who do not owe a subrogation interest:	31
5. Focus on whether or not an “identifiable fund” exists out of which to repay the plan. ...32	
6. Determine whether or not a lien is required before an “identifiable fund” exists out of which to repay the plan.	35
2. Common Fund Doctrine: the plaintiff's right to reimbursement of a pro-rata share of the cost of obtaining the recovery.	36
a. Passing the benefit of the common fund doctrine to the client.....	36
b. Passing the benefit of the common fund doctrine to the attorney.	39
3. Laches.	40
4. Can the carrier subrogate against itself or its own insured?	40
5. Construe all ambiguities against the plan.	44
6. Subrogation as a sword and shield.	46
7. Does bankruptcy by the debtor discharge a subrogation interest or lien?	47
8. Subrogation in cases involving a minor child.	47
II. SUBROGATION INTERESTS GRANTED BY FEDERAL LAW (VA, MEDICARE, FEHBA).....	48
A. Veterans Administration.	48
1. The right of reimbursement.	48
2. Cases evaluating Made Whole and Pro-Rata division; also Common Fund and reduction or waiver...	50
3. For cases in litigation.	51
B. Medicare.....	51
1. The right of reimbursement.	52
1.1 <i>What is Medicare?</i>	52
1.2 <i>Who receives Medicare benefits?</i>	52
1.3 <i>Other Subrogation interests arise out of Medicaid and Medical Care Recovery Act:</i>	52
1.4 <i>Medicare's subrogation interest arises out of the Secondary Payor Act:</i>	52

1.5 PIP and Medical Payments Coverages are Primary and UM is subject to Medicare’s interest: 53

1.6 2003 Amendment to the MSP:53

1.7 2007 Amendment to the MSP:53

1.8 One slight exception:53

1.9 Medicare’s interest is not a “lien”:53

2. **Finding the intermediaries and opening the file.**54

2.1 Open the file:54

2.2 Other contact information for non-tort recoveries54

2.3 BCRC interaction with CMS:55

2.4 FTCA cases:55

2.5 Documents to send to CMS/BCRC:56

3. **The amount of reimbursement for past medical bills.**56

3.1 Pre-existing and unrelated conditions:56

3.2 Formula for Reimbursement:57

3.3. Judgments and their effect:57

3.4 Wrongful death vs survival damages:57

4. **For Future Medical Bills: Does Medicare get a holiday and is a set-aside required?**58

4.1 Definitions and Options offered for Public Comment by CMS:58

4.2 In the meantime...62

4.3 Medicare’s position:63

4.4 MSA has its origins in worker’s compensation cases:63

4.5 How to do WCMSAs:63

4.6 Mandatory reporting is required of Defendants and Plaintiffs:64

4.7 Penalties for failing to report:64

4.8 Reporting effective dates:64

4.9 Content of the new reporting rules:65

4.10 De minimus reporting thresholds:65

4.11 The 180 page answer book:66

4.12 The amount to be set aside in trust:66

4.13 Comparative negligence of Plaintiff:66

4.14 Penalty for failing to create MSA:67

4.15 Seeking advance approval of MSA:67

4.16 Who establishes and administers the MSA?68

4.17 Is An MSA required in all cases?:68

5. **The procedure for determining reimbursement.**69

5.1 For past medical expenses: Start early:69

5.2 For future medical expenses:71

5.3 Confidentiality Agreements:71

5.4 Court Allocation of Damages to avoid excessive repayment:71

6. **Asking for a waiver.**74

7. **Penalties for failing to reimburse.**74

7.1 Who must reimburse the past medical expense subrogation interest:74

7.2 Medicare’s enforcement options:74

7.3 Liability of Plaintiff’s counsel, tort defendants and liability insurers:75

7.4 Interest on damages by Medicare and Defendants:77

7.5 Statute of Limitations:77

7.6 Constructive notice:78

8. **Naming Medicare, or not, on the settlement check:**78

9. **Medicare Choice HMO's and Medicare Advantage HMO's.**79

9.1 Authority for alternative plans under Medicare Part C:79

9.2 Does the Medicare Part C Plan have a private cause of action to enforce its subrogation interest?80

9.2.1: No says the U.S. District Judge in Humana v. Reale80

9.2.2: Yes says the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 11th Circuits; see in In Re Avandia81

10. **May providers bill the patient instead of submitting the bills to Medicare? Maybe. For a up to a year.**82

10.1 Providers who bill for claim related injuries:82

10.2 Seeking conditional payment from Medicare:83

10.3	Strategy to encourage providers to bill Medicare:	84
10.4	The amount the provider may bill the beneficiary:	84
11.	Admitting evidence of the subrogation interest into evidence in the third party claim:	87
12.	Recommended Reading:	88
13.	Protecting Recoveries in a Special Needs Trust	88
C.	Medical Care Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C.A. § 2651-53 (2002)	88
D.	Federal Employees Health Benefits Act	89
E.	Federal Employees Workers Compensation Act	94
III.	TEXAS STATUTORY SUBROGATION INTERESTS (NOT INCLUDING WORKER’S COMPENSATION)	95
A.	Medicaid	95
1.	Medicaid’s assignment/right of reimbursement.	95
2.	Balance billing strictly regulated.	97
3.	Finding Medicaid to repay subrogation.	98
4.	Preserving Medicaid eligibility.	99
5.	Reduction for client.	100
a.	Because the client needs public assistance.	100
b.	Ahlborn: Because federal anti-lien statute prohibits assignment of property	100
6.	Attorney’s fees and expenses.	103
7.	Medicaid cases involving a minor child.	104
B.	Texas Rehabilitation Commission	104
C.	Indigent Health Care Treatment Act	104
D.	Health Care to Prisoners	105
E.	Crime Victim’s Compensation Fund	105
F.	Child Health Plan For Certain Low-Income Children (CHIPS)	105
G.	State Employees Health Benefits Act and ERS and exhaustion of remedies	106
IV.	TEXAS STATUTORY SUBROGATION INTEREST: WORKER’S COMPENSATION	108
A.	The right of reimbursement	108
1.	The scope of recovery: from the third party claim.	108
a.	Recovery: from the deductible	108
b.	Recovery: Third party does not include the employer for gross negligence	108
c.	Recovery: Third party is not those who contractually waive subrogation against the employer IF waiver is in the policy and contract	108
d.	Recovery: not from the share attributable to the employer’s negligence	109
e.	Recovery: The carrier’s recovery is 2/3 of the NET of the injured claimants’ recovery, not off the gross amount	110
f.	Future holiday and multiple beneficiaries in wrongful death cases	111
g.	County Law Enforcement Wage Continuation Benefits	111
h.	The carrier’s rights are derivative but independent	111
i.	The intervening carrier does not recover interest or attorney’s fees from the third party recovery	113
2.	Attorney fees for collecting the subrogation interest.	113
3.	Attorney fee for collecting the attorney fee.	116
4.	Attorney liability for failing to pay the w/c subrogation interest.	117
5.	There is no made whole doctrine in worker’s compensation: Allocating the third party recovery and the subrogation interest.	117
6.	Three practice tips.	118
a.	Contested hearing on damages	118
b.	Segregate each client’s damages	118
c.	Drafting settlement documents	119
7.	Statute of limitations.	120
a.	Against the third party	120
b.	Against the injured worker by the comp carrier	120
8.	Disclosure and consent.	121
9.	Ethical Considerations.	121
10.	Uninsured/Underinsured Motorist Coverage.	122
11.	Substitute policies.	125
a.	Apply Statutory Rules found in HB 1869/Ch. 140	125
b.	Waivers are barred	126
c.	Retaliation is barred under ERISA	126

- 12. *When the third party settles the comp lien cheap.*.....127
- 13. *Waiver of the worker’s comp lien in contracts.*.....127
- 14. *State of Texas and local gov’t self-funded worker’s compensation plans.*.....129
- 15. *Worker’s comp plans cannot subrogate to the Guaranty Association but Association can subrogate to Plaintiff recovery.*130
- 16. *Admitting evidence of the worker’s compensation lien into evidence in the third party claim:*130
- 17. *Jurisdiction over the dispute: court or commission?*131
- V. TEXAS STATUTORY LIENS (HOSPITAL LIENS AND CHILD SUPPORT LIENS)132
 - A. The Hospital Lien Statute; lien content, UM/UIM, wrongful death, SOL.132
 - 1. *Reasonable and Regular Rate:*133
 - 2. *Emergency hospital care and emergency medical care:*136
 - 3. *Admission within 72 hours:*137
 - 4. *Constructive notice and the timing of notice.*138
 - 5. *The lien applies to a child’s recovery*139
 - 6. *Subrogation principles do not apply.*139
 - 7. *Unanswered question if recovery inadequate.*140
 - 8. *Unanswered question if the settlement check is made payable to a hospital but not paid over to the hospital.*140
 - 9. *Lienholders do not get interest or attorneys’ fees on top of the lien amount (unless via dec action).* 141
 - 10. *Balance Billing: Hospitals and emergency care physicians are prohibited by Chapter 146 of Civ. Prac. and Rem. Code from asserting a lien when health insurance should pay; Chapter 55 of the Property Code reiterates that prohibition to physicians.*141
 - a. *Out of network providers and Ch. 1467.F.8. Ins. Code*142
 - b. *Balance billing allowed or not allowed: Examples*.....142
 - c. *Chapter 146 and Medicaid and Medicare:*143
 - d. *Seeking conditional payment from Medicare:*144
 - e. *Strategy to encourage providers to bill Medicare:*145
 - f. *The amount the provider may bill the beneficiary:*145
 - 11. *Crime Victims Compensation Fund:*147
 - 12. *Remedies for improperly filed lien:*147
 - 13. *Does bankruptcy by the debtor discharge the lien?*.....148
 - 14. *Turning a lien into lemonade: The Stowers Doctrine.*.....148
 - 15. *Hospital liens in other states.*149
 - B. The Child Support Lien Statute.....150
 - 1. *Notice of the child support lien: actual or constructive?*151
 - 2. *The property of the current spouse is not subject to the child support lien.*152
 - 3. *Medical liens and attorneys’ fees and expenses take priority over the child support lien.*152
 - 4. *Letters of protection do not take priority over the child support lien.*152
 - 5. *The child support lien takes priority over an ERISA interest.*153
 - 6. *Lottery Winnings may be subject to child support liens.*.....153
- VI: MUNICIPAL OR COUNTY EMPLOYEE SUBROGATION INTERESTS GRANTED BY TEXAS LAW.....153
 - A. Employees of Local Political Subdivisions.....153
 - B. Municipal Officers & Employees.....154
- VII: ERISA EMPLOYEE WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS.....155
 - A. The effect of ERISA (overview of subrogation cases).....156
 - B. Establishing the plan’s status as an ‘employee welfare benefit plan’.....162
 - 1. *There must be a plan.*162
 - 2. *There must be proper intent and handling.*162
 - 3. *The employer must be engaged in an industry or activity affecting interstate commerce.*163
 - C. Plans that are not ERISA plans:163
 - D. Laws that are/are not preempted by ERISA:164
 - E. The child support lien takes priority over an ERISA interest.....166
 - F. Retaliation is barred under ERISA.166
 - G. The beneficiaries’ remedy for an ERISA plan’s misrepresentation of its subrogation rights.166
- VIII. ERISA AND TEXAS COMMON LAW EQUITABLE CONCEPTS, INCLUDING MADE WHOLE AND COMMON FUND, IN AN INSURANCE FUNDED PLAN.167
 - A. ERISA does not (automatically) kill off Texas’ made whole doctrine or common fund doctrine because ERISA’s savings clause preserves state regulation.....167

1.	Made whole doctrine and ERISA.	168
	<i>A. Do not waive any common law made whole doctrine:</i>	170
2.	Common fund doctrine and ERISA.	172
IX.	THE DOCUMENTS BEGIN THE DISCUSSION; GET THE SUMMARY PLAN DESCRIPTION AND THE EMPLOYEE WELFARE BENEFIT PLAN.	174
A.	ERISA and the Summary Plan Description.	174
1.	Statutory Requirement for the plan and providing copies on request.	174
2.	The Summary Plan Description requirements;	176
3.	What constitutes a Summary Plan Description.	179
4.	Read the Employee Welfare Benefit Plan’s subrogation provisions.	180
X.	ERISA AND SELF-FUNDED EMPLOYEE WELFARE BENEFIT PLANS.	181
A.	The statutory authority.	181
B.	Stop Loss Coverage:	182
1.	Stop loss coverage and the issue of state regulation:	182
2.	Stop loss coverage and the issue of appropriate equitable relief:	183
C.	The first [of several] seminal self-funded cases: FMC v. Holliday.	184
D.	The 5 th Circuit and Supreme Court: what part of "all" do you not understand? Allowing the plan to sue its own insured for reimbursement.	185
E.	Bad news from the 4 th Circuit: Failing to sign subrogation reimbursement forms terminates coverage.	189
F.	The Effect of Knudson and Sereboff: The Plan may seek equitable relief, including imposing a constructive trust on identifiable funds.	190
G.	Making the Self-Funded ERISA Plan Secondary.	191
H.	Overview of Cases Determining Appropriate Equitable Relief and the Plan’s Remedies:	193
1.	Liability of the plan member:	193
2.	Liability of the plan member’s attorney:	201
3.	Liability (or not) of third parties including other insurance companies:	204
I.	The plan must plead and prove its ERISA status.	207
J.	Four practice tips.	207
a.	<i>Clients should send the attorney the subrogation questionnaires and counsel should modify them or refuse to return them but not become a party to them:</i>	207
b.	<i>Close out the subrogation interest at the end of the case:</i>	208
c.	<i>know your risks and benefits:</i>	208
d.	<i>Ethics Pointer: avoid dual representation.</i>	208
XI.	ERISA’S PREEMPTION (OR NOT) OF FEDERAL OR STATE LAW CAUSES OF ACTION.	208
A.	State law causes of action and ERISA preemption:	209
B.	Federal law causes of action and preemption:	210
C.	The Common Fund doctrine and ERISA preemption.	211
D.	Preemption of state court jurisdiction, or not:	212
E.	Long Term Disability Policies	214
F.	Additional research sources.	215
XII.	USING THE DECLARATORY JUDGMENT ACT TO CONSTRUE AN AMBIGUOUS OR SILENT PLAN DOCUMENT OR TO DETERMINE ENTITLEMENT TO RECOVERY.	215
A.	Federal Actions Authorized by ERISA:	216
B.	Action in State Court.	217
XIII.	NON-ERISA PLANS SUCH AS HMO’S, CHURCH-SPONSORED OR GOVERNMENT PLANS, AND INDIVIDUALLY PURCHASED HEALTH INSURANCE CONTRACTS.	218
A.	Non-ERISA Plans	218
B.	HMO’s.	219
C.	Private Health Insurance.	219
D.	Government or Church Employer Sponsored Plans.	219
XIV.	AUTOMOBILE POLICIES, INCLUDING PIP, MEDICAL PAYMENTS, UM/UIM, AND PROPERTY DAMAGE.	220
A.	Preserving the plaintiff’s PIP.	220
B.	Medical Payments Coverage on Auto Insurance.	221
1.	The Common Fund Doctrine:	221
2.	Made Whole Doctrine.	223
C.	Uninsured/Underinsured Motorist Coverage.	223
1.	Statutory Authority.	223
a.	Preserving the UM/UIM carrier’s subrogation rights.	223

b.	<i>Stowers</i> and the UIM carrier.	224
c.	Preserving the client’s full use of his or her UM/UIM coverage free of subrogation claims.	224
i.	<i>When the subrogation interest is ambiguous about its right to subrogate to first party uninsured motorist coverage.</i>	225
ii.	<i>Because underinsured motorist coverage is first party coverage, not third.</i>	225
D.	Vehicle Property Damage.	226
XV.	COORDINATION OF BENEFITS AS A MEANS OF AVOIDING PAYMENT BY HEALTH INSURERS.	227
XVI.	ASSIGNMENTS TO CREDITORS, LETTERS OF PROTECTION AND AGREEMENTS TO REPAY SUBROGATION INTERESTS.	230
A.	Assignments to Creditors.	230
B.	Letters of Protection.	233
C.	Agreements to Repay Subrogation Interests.	235
1.	<i>Ethical Issues When the Client Reneges or the Recovery is Inadequate.</i>	236
2.	<i>Ethical Issues When the Plan is Self-Funded.</i>	237
3.	<i>Does a Reimbursement Agreement confer more benefits to the Plan than a Subrogation Agreement?</i>	238
4.	<i>Do Not Sign a Reimbursement Agreement which is broader than the Plan or Summary Plan Description provisions.</i>	239
XVII.	STATUTORY VIOLATIONS BY HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS AND STATUTORY VIOLATIONS BY SUBROGATION COLLECTION AGENCIES.	239
A.	Chapter 146, Civil Practice & Remedies Code and Balance Billing.	239
B.	Violations by Insurer of Federal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act.	241
C.	Violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices-Consumer Protection Act.	242
1.	<i>State Law Damages Available to Injured Consumers.</i>	242
2.	<i>Extra-Contractual Damages May Not be Allowed in Plans Subject to ERISA.</i>	243
D.	Violations by Hospitals of the Federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.	243
XVIII.	ADVICE TO ATTORNEYS.	244
A.	Communicating with Client.	244
1.	<i>At the first interview.</i>	244
2.	<i>At the time of settlement.</i>	244
3.	<i>If a lawsuit against the subrogee is necessary.</i>	245
B.	Communicating with Third Party Liability Carrier.	245
1.	<i>At the time the file is opened.</i>	245
2.	<i>At the time of settlement.</i>	246
C.	Communicating with Subrogated Insurer or Self-Funded Health Plan.	247
1.	<i>At the time the file is opened.</i>	247
2.	<i>During the course of the claim.</i>	247
3.	<i>At the time of settlement.</i>	248
D.	Converting the Money ... bad idea? Or naughty but immune?	249
1.	<i>Penalties for conversion.</i>	249
2.	<i>Protect yourself if the client does not want to repay.</i>	251
3.	<i>Statute of limitations.</i>	251
E.	Health insurers (or plans) which refuse to pay bills rather than pay and subrogate.	252
XIX.	INDEMNIFICATION AND RELEASE DOCUMENTS.	253
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-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, 1st 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 3rd party and 1st 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 (5th 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 5th Circuit in *Associated International Ins. Co. v. Scottsdale Ins. Co.*, 16-20465 (5th 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 (5th 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 [14th 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).

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/eLibrary\)](https://utcle.org/eLibrary)

Title search: Subrogation and Liens

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
2018 The Car Crash Seminar session

"Subrogation and Liens"