PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

VOLUME 8	NUMBER 12	December 2022
Editor's Note: Developments Victoria Prussen Spears		393
DOJ Aggressively Pursues Co Callan G. Stein, Michael S. Lo Frederick J. King		396
OFCCP Clarifies Position in I in Revised Pay Equity Direct Leann M. Walsh, Craig E. Lee		402
Can the Government Assert Contracts Awarded Based on Amanda J. Sherwood and Soni		Audit Delay and 406
U.S. Government Issues Software Security Procurement Guidance Steven G. Stransky, Francis E. Purcell, Jr., and Mona Adabi		410
	Heat Nor Gloom of Night Will S Its Contractor's Trade Secrets?	Stop the U.S.
False Claims Act Damages: I Back to the Well Megan Mocho	O.C. Circuit Says Government Canno	t Keep Going
In the Courts Steven A Meyerowitz		419



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call: Email: heidi.a.litman@lexisnexis.com Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000 For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call: (800) 833-9844 Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385 Customer Service Website http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/ For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call (800) 223-1940 Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

ISSN: 2688-7290

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt).

Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. Originally published in: 2015

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office 230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW & BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

MARY BETH BOSCO
Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

PABLO J. DAVIS

Of Counsel, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

MERLE M. DELANCEY JR.

Partner, Blank Rome LLP

J. ANDREW HOWARD

Partner, Alston & Bird LLP

KYLE R. JEFCOAT

Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP

JOHN E. JENSEN

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

DISMAS LOCARIA

Partner, Venable LLP

MARCIA G. MADSEN

Partner, Mayer Brown LLP

KEVIN P. MULLEN

Partner, Morrison & Foerster LLP

VINCENT J. NAPOLEON

Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP

STUART W. TURNER

Counsel, Arnold & Porter

ERIC WHYTSELL

Partner, Stinson Leonard Street LLP

WALTER A.I. WILSON

Partner Of Counsel, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report is published 12 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

False Claims Act Damages: D.C. Circuit Says Government Cannot Keep Going Back to the Well

By Megan Mocho*

The author of this article discusses the U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit's recent ruling in United States v. Honeywell International Inc., which holds that a defendant may offset its False Claims Act damages, dollar for dollar, against the settlement amounts paid by other defendants.

False Claims Act ("FCA") cases, particularly in the government contracts space, often have several defendants; prime contractors, subcontractors, vendors and individuals are all common targets. In healthcare FCA cases, with increasing regularity, multiple parties (hospitals, providers, investors, etc.) appear in the defendant bracket. According to the U.S. Supreme Court, these defendants face joint and several liability for the treble damages permitted under the statute.

But what if one or more defendants settles first?

D.C. CIRCUIT RULING

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit's recent ruling in *United States v. Honeywell International Inc.* holds that a defendant may offset its damages, dollar for dollar, against the settlement amounts paid by other defendants.

This *pro tanto* approach is markedly different from the "proportionate share" approach, advanced by the government and followed by the district court, under which a defendant is responsible for its proportionate share of the damages, regardless of any amounts paid in prior settlements. According to the government, this approach allows a court to "calibrate a party's punishment to its relative culpability, furthering, at least to some extent, the punitive effect of the [FCA]."

In rejecting the proportionate share approach, the court noted that "the FCA says nothing at all about how to address indivisible harms or whether joint and several liability is appropriate. And a literal reading could suggest that because

^{*} Megan Mocho is a partner at Holland & Knight LLP where she focuses on government and internal investigations for corporate and individual clients in the healthcare, government contracts, aerospace, intelligence, banking/financial services, education, pharmaceutical and medical device industries. Ms. Mocho, who may be contacted at megan.mocho@hklaw.com, also co-chairs the firm's White Collar Defense and Investigations Team.

a person is 'liable' for the damages sustained by the government based on that person's actions, no offset for settling parties is allowed." Such a reading, however, goes against the common law principle "that settlement with, or successful litigation against, one party reduces the damages owed by other parties who are jointly liable."

The position also goes against equitable principles because although the government cannot successively litigate against each defendant and recover the full damages, joint and several liability under the FCA has been interpreted to exclude a right to contribution. The court aptly noted that "[t]ogether these two rules mean that a person who violates the FCA in a joint scheme may have to pay for all the government's trebled damages, and, even if that defendant is the least responsible party, it cannot force the other violators to pay their fair share." In this posture, the government is poised to recover more than its total damages merely because one party settled early.

But the truth is most FCA cases settle when the government intervenes (whether that is a function of the case's merits, negotiating position imbalance, cost avoidance, etc.). By fashioning a *pro tanto* federal common law rule, the *Honeywell* decision addresses this reality and leaves it to the government to "pursue settlement and/or seek damages against each violator in line with its assessment of relative fault."

CONCLUSION

From a practical perspective, how this rule will be moderated in simultaneous settlement negotiations remains to be seen. Companies often do not know if they are but one of several defendants. FCA cases are filed under seal, blocking access to the named parties and allegations.

Even if a defendant receives a copy of the complaint via partial lift of the seal, the names of other defendants are typically redacted. Parties only become aware of FCA cases upon receipt of a FCA civil investigative demand or subpoena, but may not connect with other potential defendants in those instances.

Even if it is known that multiple parties are named, many investigations led by the U.S. Department of Justice ("DOJ") involve only the primary defendant, with secondary defendants never notified of the case or pursued. By the time DOJ issues a press release announcing a settlement, the ink has dried on the settlement agreement.

Only common interest communications or DOJ-provided insight into settlement negotiations will ensure the *Honeywell* damages rule is utilized during simultaneous settlement negotiations.