



State of Minnesota v. United States, 102 F.Supp.2d 1115 (D. Minn. 2000)

Topics Covered: Medicare

Outcome: Very Unfavorable

Issue

The issue in this case was whether the Medicare+Choice program was constitutional, insofar as it provided capitation payments for physicians that varied from state to state.

AMA Interest

The AMA supports fair payments to physicians for their services.

Case Summary

The Minnesota Attorney General challenged the constitutionality of the Medicare+Choice program, enacted under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. The complaint charged, inter alia, that the statutory payment formula violated the Fifth Amendment's equal protection requirement because it provided different capitation payments for similar HMO participants in different states and was not rationally related to the purpose of expanding health care delivery options to beneficiaries nationwide. The Justice Department moved to dismiss the complaint.

The court granted the motion and dismissed this case.

Litigation Center Involvement

The Minnesota Medical Association filed an amicus brief, which the Litigation Center joined. The brief argued that the motion to dismiss should be denied.