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Good morning Chairman Pitts, Ranking Member Green, and Members of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Health. My name is Linden Barber, Partner in the law firm of Quarles & Brady and the former Associate Chief Counsel for Diversion Litigation at the Drug Enforcement Administration. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before the Subcommittee to discuss the important issue of preventing the diversion of pharmaceutical controlled substances into illicit channels while ensuring access to these helpful medications for patients with legitimate medical needs.

Little of consequence has changed since April of 2014 when this subcommittee considered The Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act of 2014 introduced by Representatives Blackburn and Marino. The unanimous vote by House of Representatives in favor of the bill is an indicator of the common sense approach embodied in this bill. The proposed legislation will protect access of patients who have legitimate medical needs to pharmaceutical controlled substances which help patients who suffer from the pain of cancer, debilitating diseases and traumatic injuries, and those who suffer from a variety of physical and mental health diseases and disorders. But this bill does more than protect access to controlled substances for patients in need. It protects DEA's important
authority to suspend the registration of a DEA registrant whose conduct poses an imminent danger to public health or safety. Pharmaceutical drug abuse remains a serious national problem that must be addressed. Providing clarity on the legal standard for issuing an immediate suspension remains an important step in addressing this national problem. In the absence of legislation, the executive and judicial branches are likely to continue their decades-long, case-by-case determination on whether a suspension of a registration is appropriate. As the cases discussed in my previous testimony before this Committee, the executive and judicial branches do not always agree on this issue.

While little has changed in the last 10 months, we know more today about the unintended consequences of certain enforcement actions than we did then. For example, we know that some patients with legitimate medical needs find it difficult to locate a pharmacy willing to fill their prescriptions. Although anecdotal at this point, the evidence is mounting that fear of enforcement activity is creating a lack of access to controlled substance medications. Dr. Steven Passik recounts the plight of a breast cancer survivor who suffered chronic pain from a problem with her hip and had an anxiety disorder. Although she used low doses of opiates and benzodiazepines responsibly, her physician refused to continue prescribing
these drugs for her out of fear that he would be violating the law. Dr. Passik noted that this patient suffered not only from the pain of her current malady, but from the fear that should her cancer return, she would have difficulty obtaining appropriate drug therapy to control her pain. Meanwhile, nearly three in four community pharmacists report disruption in their supply of controlled substances causing many of them to turn away patients. Some pharmacists suggested that the lack of supply was a result of "stepped-up DEA pressure [on wholesalers], [who] have set monthly limits on their orders and in some cases stopped shipments altogether."2

DEA officials have correctly asserted that the Agency does not set establish limits on the volume of controlled substances a distributor may supply to a pharmacy. However, DEA has required several distributors to establish monthly limits or thresholds on the controlled substances they will distribute. Since DEA does not provide guidance on how to establish those limits, it is reasonable for a distributor to take a conservative approach in establishing these limits since the consequence of distributing what DEA considers too high a volume of controlled substances can be an immediate suspension of the distributor’s registration. Even those distributors who are

---


not required by agreements with DEA to establish limits must do so as a practical matter. DEA's regulation requires distributors to detect and report suspicious orders, which include orders of unusual size. DEA has communicated to distributors in letters and conference presentations that they are prohibited from shipping an order that the distributor deems suspicious. Thus, while DEA correctly asserts that the Agency does not establish limits that distributors must impose on customers, DEA has imposed a *de facto* requirement that distributors establish volume limits. I do not advocate that distributors be relieved of their obligation to monitor the orders of their customers. Indeed, it is clear that a highly-regulated system of distribution is essential in decreasing the diversion and abuse of pharmaceutical controlled substances. However, when members of the supply chain limit supply out of fear of being second guessed by DEA or simply to limit the risk of regulatory action, patients suffer. When pharmacists refuse to fill a prescription for fear of being second-guessed by DEA or because they lack supply, patients suffer. In some cases, the legitimate businesses of pharmacists suffer because of the lack of supply. None of these are the intended consequences of the law or DEA's enforcement actions. However, these are the results of a lack of clarity in the law that informs both registrants and DEA on the standards that the
Agency will use when taking the severe step of issuing an immediate suspension.

Perhaps the most significant of the unintended consequences related to the manner in which controlled substances laws are enforced is the rise in the use of and overdose deaths attributable to heroin. The National Institutes of Health reported that some individuals who previously used prescription opiates have turned to heroin because it is cheaper and easier to obtain. I do not advocate that prescribers and pharmacists knowingly permit the misuse of prescription opiates in order to reduce the likelihood that individuals addicted to these medications will turn to heroin. However, it is essential that legislators, policy makers, and the executive branch make informed decisions about how to best address the link between opiate use and heroin use. The lack of availability of prescription opiates causes a certain segment of the population that uses opiates to turn to heroin, which comes from drug dealers, not physicians and pharmacists who are well-positioned to intervene and assist a patient with issues of addiction to or the misuse of prescription opiates. This issue is not directly addressed by the bill. However, it is likely that among the millions of individuals who use opiates for legitimate medical purposes that

---

some of them are left without access to medication because prescribers, pharmacists, wholesalers and manufacturers have made decisions to limit supply based on the very real risk that DEA will take the severe step of suspending their registrations. It is also a likely but unintended consequence that some individuals who cannot obtain controlled substances for legitimate medical needs will turn to non-pharmaceutical controlled substances like heroin.  

The Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act provides a important clarity that will encourage meaningful efforts by members of industry and DEA to take actions that will actually reduce prescription drug abuse and ensure an adequate and uninterrupted supply of medication for those patients with legitimate medical needs. For the convenience of the Committee, I include below portions of my testimony from the hearing on this bill held on April 7, 2014, with updated information where appropriate.

* * * * *

It is vitally important that steps taken to ensure patient access to controlled medications do not undermine the ability of the DEA to protect the public health from the devastating ills caused by the abuse and misuse

---

4 It is well-documented that some individuals who use pharmaceutical opiates for non-medical purposes turn to heroin when price or supply issues make pharmaceutical opiates less accessible.
of controlled substances. The Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act is an Act that addresses both issues by providing clarity in the law and by encouraging collaboration between regulators, law enforcement, health care providers, and the pharmaceutical supply chain.

By providing definitions for two key terms in the Controlled Substances Act, Congress will bring clarity to the regulatory environment. I will focus my comments on defining the term "imminent danger." By defining "imminent danger," Congress can provide clarity that is beneficial to DEA and to the registrants the Agency regulates. How does defining "imminent danger" benefit DEA? The Controlled Substances Act permits DEA to immediately suspend the registration of a registrant whose conduct poses an imminent danger to public health or safety. Unlike other federal statutes, such as the Mine Safety Act, the Controlled Substances Act does not define imminent danger. In the absence of clarity from Congress, the Agency will determine what constitutes an imminent danger on a case-by-case basis. And when a registrant challenges DEA's use of its immediate suspension power, it is ultimately courts that will determine what constitutes an imminent danger. History is instructive, and there is a long history of judicial challenges to the Agency's use of immediate suspensions. Forty years ago, a registrant successfully challenged an immediate suspension
because the conduct that DEA alleged created the danger was not imminent, but was more than seven months old.

More recently, a legal challenge to the Agency's immediate suspension power thwarted the Agency's ability to address illicit Internet pharmacy schemes. In 2005, three pharmacies in Colorado successfully challenged the immediate suspension orders issued by DEA. In early 2006, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled that the manner in which DEA processed immediate suspensions deprived the registrants of Due Process. Although the ruling in that case was based on the extraordinary length of time that the registrants had to wait for a hearing, the pharmacy registrants also claimed that the conduct that DEA alleged created a danger had ceased more than a month before DEA issued the suspensions. Having dissolved the suspensions on Due Process grounds, the court did not need to address the troubling allegation that the conduct at issue ceased well before issuance of the immediate suspension orders.

Because of the court's ruling, the DEA and the Department of Justice imposed a hiatus on issuing immediate suspension orders until the immediate suspension process could be restructured to address the Due Process issue that led to the adverse decision from the court. Several months after that decision, I became the Associate Chief Counsel for
Diversion Litigation at DEA and was charged with revamping the immediate suspension process. For more than six months, in the height of the illegal Internet pharmacy schemes that fueled prescription drug abuse, the Agency was effectively stripped of its power to issue immediate suspension orders. Although we fixed the immediate suspension process and, I am proud to say, issued a record number of immediate suspensions in 2007 and 2008, the Agency did not issue immediate suspension orders for more than six months in 2006, during which time millions of dosage units of controlled substances were distributed through illicit Internet pharmacy schemes that could have been dismantled by immediate suspension orders. As a practitioner in this area of the law and an observer of the courts, I am very concerned that in the absence of legislative clarity about the meaning of "imminent danger," courts will intervene and curtail the Agency's powers in a way that will prevent the Agency from being able to effectively address true imminent dangers. Based on more recent challenges to DEA's suspension authority and some troubling and pointed questions about the imminent danger standard raised by the DC Circuit Court of Appeals in 2012, it is, in my opinion, likely that courts will step in to ensure the fair application of the imminent danger requirement in the absence of a clear legal standard that is consistently applied by DEA. Indeed, many of my
colleagues believe that the 2012 case would have resulted in a narrowing of DEA's authority if the Agency had not settled its dispute with the registrant. As a supporter of DEA's mission, I urge this Committee to take legislative action that clarifies the meaning of imminent danger.

The definition of imminent danger in the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act is a common sense standard and is similar to the standard that that Agency used for issuing immediate suspensions employed in the immediate aftermath of the adverse court decision in 2006 previously discussed. Using such a standard the DEA issued a record number of immediate suspensions in 2007 and 2008. Based on that history, I am confident that the definition of imminent danger in the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act will not inhibit DEA's ability to take swift action to address conduct that poses an imminent danger to the public.

However, the Agency appears to have moved away from using a consistent standard when making a finding that a registrant's conduct poses an imminent danger. In doing so, the Agency invites judicial intervention which could severely limit its powers. The definition of imminent danger in the bill is consistent the plain and ordinary meaning of the term, the definition of that term in other federal statutes, and the case
law that has developed around that term. The clarity of this bill, and the Agency's consistent application of the standard articulated in this bill, will substantially strengthen the Agency's position in the face of legal challenges to its suspension powers.

It is worth noting that in fiscal year 2014 DEA initiated few, if any, immediate suspensions. In the past, DEA has publicized many of its suspensions actions, but a search of public records reveals no indication that DEA has issued immediate suspensions in the last 15 months. The cause of this is unclear. One cause may be the lack of a clear legal standard for the issuance of a suspension. Thus, clarifying the definition of "imminent danger" could serve to empower DEA to issue suspensions that meet a clear legislative standard.

Clarity in the law also benefits DEA registrants. Clarity fosters compliance and collaboration with DEA. Conversely, the current lack of clarity fosters confusion and fear. A pharmacist that decides he or she will no longer fill prescriptions issued by a physician because of concerns about their legitimacy is unlikely to communicate that decision to DEA if the pharmacist is concerned that the Agency will use that information to immediately suspend the pharmacy's DEA registration because the pharmacy previously filled prescriptions issued by the physician. The DEA
has issued immediate suspensions in such contexts. While the Agency surely has a right to address past conduct through normal administrative channels, issuing an immediate suspension for conduct that has stopped is not only contrary to the plain meaning of imminent, it is counter-productive and discourages communication with the Agency.

Many times I have heard my former colleagues at DEA say that enforcement alone will not solve the problem of prescription drug abuse. That is why it so important to provide clarity about the meaning of "imminent danger." The definition found in the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act is precisely the clarity that will encourage registrants to communicate with DEA, turning registrants into a force multiplier that will help DEA identify those registrants who truly require the swift response of an immediate suspension.

Fostering communication and collaboration between registrants and DEA would be further enhanced by the corrective action plan section of the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act. A registrant who knows that the Agency will consider corrective action before deciding to revoke or suspend the registrant’s registration is more likely to communicate with DEA. Addressing the problem of prescription drug abuse requires registrants throughout the supply chain to bring concerns
about other registrants to DEA's attention. A distributor who grows concerned about a pharmacy's dispensing practices after several months of supplying the pharmacy needs the assurance that DEA will consider any corrective action taken by that distributor in order to encourage the distributor to communicate its concerns to DEA.

As a supporter of DEA's power to issue immediate suspensions, it is important to note the interplay, or lack thereof, between the corrective action plan provision in the bill and the Agency's power to issue immediate suspensions. Foundational to this discussion is the identification of the two types of suspensions in Controlled Substances Act. There is a post-adjudication sanction that includes suspension or revocation, and there is the pre-adjudication suspension (i.e., an immediate suspension) based on a finding of imminent danger. The corrective action plan section of the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act is placed within a subsection of the statute that indicates its application is limited to the context of post-adjudication revocations or suspensions. In other words, DEA would not have to provide a registrant whose conduct poses an imminent danger to the public health an opportunity to submit a corrective plan prior to issuing an immediate suspension order. This is clear not only from the subsection in which the corrective action plan language is located,
but also from standard statutory interpretation. Requiring DEA to give a registrant who poses an imminent danger to public health an opportunity to submit a corrective action plan would eviscerate the clear intent of the statute that empowers DEA to issue immediate suspensions to abate an imminent danger.

Finally, legislative clarity will foster a regulatory environment that will promote access to controlled medications for patients in need. When registrants are uncertain about the regulatory environment, many will take actions to reduce the perceived risk of regulatory action. A pharmacist may refuse to fill prescriptions for narcotics intended to treat chronic pain, not because the pharmacist believes the prescriptions are illegitimate, but simply because dispensing a high volume of narcotics brings scrutiny from suppliers and from the DEA. Similarly, members of the supply chain may refuse to service a pharmacy that dispenses a large volume of narcotics. No one intends for cancer patients, wounded veterans, and those suffering with intractable pain from chronic conditions to have difficulty obtaining pain medication. But this has been an unintended consequence brought about by a chain of actions and reactions that are produced by a lack of clarity in the law. While some of accounts of the lack of access to drugs may be overstated, the mounting anecdotal evidence that individuals with legitimate
medical needs are being refused controlled medications is disturbing. In
the absence of clarity in the law, this trend is likely to continue because
registrants will continue to take action to limit supply to avoid the perceived
threat of administrative action.

It has been nearly a decade since the team of dedicated investigators
and lawyers I worked with at DEA used the Agency's administrative power
to cripple dozens of illicit Internet pharmacy schemes. Convinced that we
would be more effective by expanding our actions to pursue the supply
chain, I developed the legal framework to pursue actions against
distributors that supplied those Internet pharmacies. We initiated a record
number of administrative actions; the Government collected record-setting
civil penalties in conjunction with those actions. But prescription drug
abuse continued to rise. Action by DEA alone was not and is not enough to
address the problem. Now, as then, DEA's actions are fueled by a desire
to protect the public. Now, as then, the overwhelming majority of
registrants are working diligently to prevent the diversion of controlled
substances while ensuring that legitimate patients have access to needed
medications. But how can we channel these efforts to achieve maximum
effectiveness?
Prescription drug abuse is a complex problem that no single legislative or regulatory action will fix. Likewise, access to medications for legitimate patients will not be guaranteed by any single piece of legislation. But the clarity provided by the Ensuring Patient Access and Effective Drug Enforcement Act is consistent with the findings Congress made when it enacted the Controlled Substances Act -- controlled substance are beneficial in meeting the medical needs of many Americans, but the abuse and misuse of those substances are detrimental to the public health. The clarity in this bill will create a regulatory environment in which DEA and those registrants who are committed to compliance can make meaningful strides to reduce prescription drug abuse while improving access to medication for patients in need. Clarity will foster compliance. Clarity will enhance communication. Clarity will create collaboration and collaboration will address root problems, not just symptoms.

Thank you for inviting me to appear before you. I trust that these insights gleaned from more than a decade of zealously representing DEA and more than three years of assisting registrants with DEA compliance will be of help to you.