SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

COUNTY OF NEW YORK : CIVIL DIV. : PART 35

In the Matter of,

:

the Liquidation of : Index No.

: 450500/16

HEALTH REPUBLIC INSURANCE OF NEW YORK

CORP. : STATUS

60 Centre Street New York, New York November 29, 2018

BEFORE:

HON. CAROL. R. EDMEAD,

Justice

APPEARANCES:

NEW YORK LIQUIDATION BUREAU 180 Maiden Lane New York, N.Y. 10038

BY: JOHN PEARSON KELLY, ESQ.
Assistant Special Deputy

Superintendent General Counsel

TIBBETS, KEATING & BUTLER, LLC Attorneys for Northwell Health, Inc.

Nine East 45th Street New York, N.Y. 10017

BY: THOMAS NOONAN, ESQ.

ALSO PRESENT:

NEW YORK LIQUIDATION BUREAU

BY: GAIL PIERCE-SIPONEN, Director Creditor & Ancillary Operations

NEW YORK LIQUIDATION BUREAU

BY: RONALD LABENSKI,

Chief Financial Officer

ROBERT PORTAS, R.P.R., C.R.R. SENIOR COURT REPORTER

1	THE COURT: Health Republic at the table.
2	(Brief pause.)
3	THE COURT: On the record.
4	All right, today is a day to get an update, a
5	status on what's going on with respect to the liquidation
6	of Health Republic; yes?
7	MR. KELLY: Yes, Your Honor.
8	MR. LABENSKI: Yes, Your Honor.
9	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Yes.
10	MR. KELLY: Your Honor, before we begin, we have
11	some materials that we've presented both for the Court and
12	for any interested person here in the courtroom that would
13	like to refer to them (handing).
14	THE COURT: Anyone?
15	Anyone else?
16	MR. KELLY: Anyone else here on Health Republic?
17	THE COURT: That would like a package.
18	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.
19	THE COURT: Do you have one more for this
20	gentleman (indicating)?
21	(Mr. Kelly handing to audience member.)
22	THE COURT: Thank you.
23	Okay, let's go.
24	MR. KELLY: Your Honor, I'm John Kelly, I'm the
25	general counsel of Liquidation Bureau. We're here to Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

provide a status report on the progress of the estate which will include a discussion of policy claims, explanations of benefits that have been issued to claimants, the status of appeals, estate expenses this year and projected expenses for 2019.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. KELLY: With the Court's permission, I would like to have Gail Pierce-Siponen, who you have met before, Your Honor, address the claims process. When she is finished I will turn to our chief financial officer, Ron Labenski, he will address the expenses in the estate, and then when he is finished I will return to myself, if I may, and address some legal issues that relate to the estate.

THE COURT: You're up.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: I'm up.

Good morning, Your Honor. Gail Pierce-Siponen,

I'm director of credit and ancillary operations. I

essentially oversee the receiver function relations --

THE COURT: I'm sorry, one second.

In the back row, are you here listening to this or are you here on the hearing? I just want to know if you can hear.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We're here for the hearing.

THE COURT: You're here for...?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: The other case.
Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

1	THE COURT: You?
2	AUDIENCE MEMBER: The other hearing.
3	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hearing.
4	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hearing.
5	THE COURT: The hearing? The other case. Okay.
6	So you can go. I don't need to move my
7	microphones. Go ahead.
8	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: That's good. I can raise my
9	voice a bit.
10	So my job essentially is overseeing the
11	inception of claims, the classification of claims and the
12	resolution of claims. Last time we were here we were
13	still, as you know, in the process of issuing and
14	finalizing the explanation of benefits. And, as I had
15	indicated, it was our projection or goal that we would
16	try our best to resolve those all by the end of the year.
17	And I'm here to tell you that we have done that.
18	THE COURT: When you say "We resolved those
19	claims," what does that mean?
20	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: What it means is that
21	everyone who was issued an EOB
22	THE COURT: EOB.
23	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: EOB is an explanation of
24	benefits.
25	THE COURT: Right.

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: And, just to explain, that is
generally what a doctor submits when he is seeking
reimbursement, and it's the document you get back from the
insurance company telling you what you will pay.

What we did here is we attempted to aggregate by provider as much as possible, so the EOBs that they got were larger but it was less paper and it was less expensive to do the mailing.

Everyone who's received one of those, whether a provider or a member, has either accepted the initial determination on the explanation of benefits; or, if they filed either a question, we've resolved it with them without filing a formal appeal; or, if they filed a formal appeal they -- we have resolved it and they have accepted the redetermination of the appeal.

THE COURT: That's all?

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: All. We have no open claims for policyholders at this time.

And just to --

THE COURT: For policyholders.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: For policyholder claims. That's all at this point that we have been working on.

THE COURT: Excellent.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Now, just to give you some numbers there, the total number of explanation of benefits Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

that was issued was 190,000, and that's on Chart A, Slide 1.

MR. KELLY: Slide 1.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Slide 1.

There was 190,367 explanation of benefits issued to -- either to members or providers. That encompassed approximately 881,000 claims, meaning individual submissions for services by providers. And that encompassed, going down just a little further, about 2.1 million of individual service codes within that, because a doctor may have done two or three or four different procedures.

We were able to resolve the vast majority on the EOB itself. And principally I would say the main reason is because of the website in the interactive voicemail, we're able to resolve issues if people had questions before they had to go through the formal process. And, also, as you recall, you had approved us conducting the Truven audit before we issued the EOB and that gave, I think, a lot more clarity and confidence in the numbers.

We received a total of 1,401 official appeals.

And we have, as I indicated, resolved all those with the provider or the member, and they have accepted the determination. So, in essence, none have had to go either to the next stage, which is either the referee or Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

	PROCEEDINGS
1	the independent medical
2	THE COURT: Is there something that falls in the
3	category of unofficial appeals? Because you said "Official
4	appeals."
5	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Well, what I meant, Your
6	Honor, is what I said earlier, which is people who
7	indicated they might want to appeal but when we spoke with
8	them we were able to resolve their issue. It might have
9	been that they thought they had to appeal on the copay
10	THE COURT: Okay.
11	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: and we explained to them,
12	"No, that's not for the procedure."
13	THE COURT: So that's what we would consider
14	unofficial that was resolved.
15	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Correct.
16	THE COURT: The official is the actual appeals
17	process.
18	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Actual people who went into
19	the porthole
20	THE COURT: Right.
21	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: and submitted a form that
22	said, "We are appealing."
23	THE COURT: Right. Got it.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: So at the end of the day we

have 190,367 claims that have been resolved and the total

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

1	is \$217,950,702.
2	THE COURT: That is the number that reflects what?
3	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: That reflects the amount of
4	the resolution of the claims with the providers and
5	members.
6	THE COURT: When you say "Resolution of the
7	claims," is this a payout?
.8	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: This is the amount that would
9	be subject to any distribution that was made
10	THE COURT: Got it. Because the distributions
11	can't be made yet
12	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Right.
13	THE COURT: so the 217 plus million is the
14	amount that would be subject to distribution.
15	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Yes.
16	THE COURT: But the distribution is not happening
17	yet.
18	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Right.
19	THE COURT: Got it.
20	MR. KELLY: May I add one slight addition to that,
21	Your Honor? That is the amount that we are going to be
22	recommending to you
23	MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Yes.
24	MR. KELLY: as the amount to be allowed.
25	Because the actual allowance, of course, rests with you.

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Right. And that's why I'm saying we resolved them. But ultimately we will have to give them to you for final approval.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Now -- So that -- that's one part of the functions that we talked about that we do. The other was the handling of complaints or inquiries or issues that the members or providers had in a more general sense. And that, as you know, we had the website where they could submit those, we also had the interactive phone lines and we also had a dedicated phone line at the NYLB.

Since inception to the end of October we received a total of 43,445 calls, all of which we've handled in some capacity. And of that about 4500 came directly to the bureau, the rest to the interactive voice system. We've had 87,617 visitors to the website of which 61,000 --

THE COURT: I think I required multi-language, didn't I?

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: You did. Spanish and English.

THE COURT: The website is in Spanish and English, because many of the policyholders were Spanish speaking.

Got it. Okay.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: And we had -- Of the 87,600 Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

that visited the website, 61,181 were unique visitors.

THE COURT: Which means...?

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Which means they went only one time.

> THE COURT: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: As opposed to people who went back more than once.

THE COURT: Got it.

So, essentially what I would MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: say at this point is that the adjudication, except for the final stage, which is your approval of what we have resolved with the policyholders, is completed on our end. But we will continue with the website and we will continue with the call center in order to continue to facilitate whatever may be the interest of the public or the interest of creditors.

And the last slide that I have is Slide 3, which just divides what are the types of inquiries we've received. And, as you can notice, probably close to three quarters was -- involved the claims process in some fashion, and the others were more general, it might be an eligibility question, it might be something they needed for their new insurance carrier, it might be the tax forms they needed under the ACA, and it simply might have been us explaining to them what the liquidation procedure

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

is.

So we have met the target of completing our part of it this year, and, with your permission, Mr. Kelly will go a little more into detail as to how we propose or we would like to discuss with you how we would handle the final approval of our recommended allowances for the Class 2.

THE COURT: I thought it was going this way first (indicating).

MR. KELLY: It is, with a slight detour back to me, if I may, just because this is sort of the subject of the moment, Your Honor. We wanted to ask you the form in which you would like to have the request for allowance or final allowance by the Court presented.

THE COURT: You know what I'm going to say. I say this with respect to everything I ask you to do: I want you to submit a proposal, I want it uploaded, unless there's a reason it shouldn't be, and I need to hear that, and then I will bring you in and we will have an open discussion on the record and then I'll make a ruling.

MR. KELLY: Well, certainly there's no reason why certain aspects of it can't be posted. That's --

THE COURT: Anything that you think cannot be posted, as I've done in the past, I will tell you to provide to me in camera, and I will just make a note on Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

what's posted and uploaded that where something is in camera just indicate, "Submitted to the Court in camera," and so the -- so the uploaded proposal is complete with redaction, where it will say, "Submitted to the Court in camera." And if I believe it should not be protected I will let everyone know universally, as I always do. And if I -- whatever the determination is, the determination will be universal, the application for redaction and in camera is granted or denied, area and item. So that's the -- that's how I want it.

MR. KELLY: That's fine, Your Honor.

THE COURT: When will it be posted?

MR. KELLY: Let me ask you this, if I may and then I'll address that: We have an example of information that we think should not be made public should be redacted.

THE COURT: I don't need an example, I want the for real. I want it submitted to me it could be in boxes or --

MR. KELLY: No, I understand that.

THE COURT: -- but I don't need to --

MR. KELLY: The example was just to show you, Your Honor, what it is, and then I was going to ask you in what form you would like to have it. Because we could give it you to as a flash drive, as a CD-ROM or some other media. It's over 4,000, I believe --

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Pages.

THE COURT: Pages?

MR. KELLY: Pages of claimant information showing

Thumb drive, and I'll just upload.

MR. KELLY: Okay.

THE COURT: Thumb drive. I don't need all that --I don't do paper -- I mean, I -- the part is a paperless part to the degree it can be so. So give me a thumb drive and if I need anything beyond the thumb drive I will let you know. But the likelihood is I can go through it on the screens and then if I -- and I could make rulings. But I also need a -- with the thumb drive I need an index of what I'm getting so I can make rulings next to or I can put right next to the page. Don't worry about an index, I can put it right next to the document.

MR. KELLY: I think it consists of each of the claims, the amount, the provider and the name. And obviously that's information we don't want to be made generally public.

If that's what we're talking about THE COURT: that's very easy. Just send me a thumb drive.

MR. KELLY: That's good, Your Honor.

Because we have a lot of information THE COURT: Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

22

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

1.1

that should not be disclosed with the HIPAA violations and things like that. So give it to me as a thumb drive and I'll go through it.

MR. KELLY: We will do it that way, Your Honor.

And I think it will be forthcoming relatively soon.

THE COURT: I'm only here till the 14<sup>th</sup> of

December. So if it's not here before then understand I

don't need to get it until January 2<sup>nd</sup> when the Court

opens up again.

MR. KELLY: Okay. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right? So that's the reality of time.

MR. KELLY: And, if I may clarify one other point on this point: We generally when we ask for allowances submit them by ex parte application. And by that I mean not on notice. We would upload it to the docket and it would include a -- an affirmation discussing the fact that this was the result of the process that had been previously ordered, and it would recite what the process was and the fact that we are asking the Court to review and allow the recommendations that we have made. It would not, however, be on notice, other than to be uploaded onto the Court's E-File docket. Is that sufficient for the Court here?

THE COURT: Well, the concern I would have, of course, is this would then require that everyone who might Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

be disallowed be viewing the the web, be viewing the
site. Do you see what I mean? And I don't assume even in
2018 that everybody is upload online looking at
everything, especially in this kind this case, which is
massive. It's massive.

So a disallowance where you're asking the Court to disallow would be the only notice that a person or a provider or a client would get that it was disallowed?

MR. KELLY: No, Your Honor. This is the end of a process where everyone has already had an opportunity to review their --

THE COURT: On notice.

MR. KELLY: -- their results.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: They received the EOB --

THE COURT: Then it's okay.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: -- and on the appeals they accepted our information.

THE COURT: As long as this isn't the first notice. This is the notice to the Court saying, "This is what we'd like you to do," but they've already received notice of the determination.

MR. KELLY: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. KELLY: This is the end of the process, the last step.

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

THE COURT: Got it. Good. That's all right. 1 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Your Honor. 2 THE COURT: Next. 3 MR. KELLY: And now we will turn to Mr. Labenski, 4 if we may. 5 Good morning, Your Honor. MR. LABENSKI: 6 THE COURT: Good morning again. 7 MR. LABENSKI: My name is Ron Labenski --8 THE COURT: We know your name. 9 MR. LABENSKI: -- and I am the CFO of the New York 10 Liquidation Bureau. 11 THE COURT: We know what you do. 12 MR. LABENSKI: I'm here to report on the 2018 13 actual expenses and the 2019 projected expenses. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. MR. LABENSKI: On Slide 4 I have the total 16 incurred expenses from 2016 to 2018 and the projected 17 expenses for 2019. In 2016 total incurred expenses 18 amounted to \$7.5 million and were reduced to \$2.8 million 19 in 2017 with a further decline in expenses in 2018 to 2.0 \$1.7 million. For this period of time expenses have been 21 reduced by \$6.2 million. This reduction is due to the 22 23 internalization by the NYLB of the claims, legal and

financial functions with the complete elimination of

outside consultants and a reduction in audit fees.

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

24

We expect this trend to continue in 2019 and we project total incurred expenses to amount to \$1.2 million in 2019, a 30 percent reduction from the 2018 incurred expenses.

I will discuss the 2019 projected expenses in more detail when we get to Slide Number 7.

On Slide Number 5 you will find the New York
Liquidation Bureau's average expenses per quarter. This
slide represents the NYLB's average monthly charges for
each quarter from May 2016 to September 2018. This
includes NYLB salaries allocated to the HRI, along with
the allocation of the NYLB's overhead, such as rent,
benefits and administrative expenses.

The slide demonstrates a downward trend from 130,000 in the second quarter of 2016 to 51,000 in the third quarter of 2018. This decrease is due to accounting issues being resolved and a reduction in the claims handling process.

THE COURT: What was the big spike in July/September of 2017.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: The EOBs.

MR. LABENSKI: That was the processing of the EOBs and the appeals.

THE COURT: Got it. Okay.

MR. LABENSKI: If you look at Slide 6, you will Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

see the actual 2018 incurred expenses versus the 2018 projected expenses. The green line is the projected expenses and the blue line is the actual expenses.

THE COURT: Tell me about February, March, April, the spike.

MR. LABENSKI: The spike is due to a settlement with an outside vendor.

THE COURT: Which vendor?

MR. KELLY: That was Magna Carry, Your Honor.

That was the repricing services that were performed for the liquidator post liquidation where the liquidator had a disagreement about the cost and we resolved it, and we submitted it to Your Honor for your review and approval.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. LABENSKI: So for the year 2018 we projected expenses of \$2.7 million. Our actual will be 1.8 million, which is \$900,000 under our projected expenses. The savings is primarily due to the NYLB's efficient manner in the processing of EOBs and appeals that resulted in a \$310,000 savings.

Other savings were realized through the internalization by the NYLB of the legal and financial functions and a reduction in the annual audit fees.

We talked about the spike, and, as John alluded, it was due to a one-time settlement.

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

	PROCEEDINGS
1	THE COURT: Got it.
2	MR. LABENSKI: On Slide 7 we have the 2019
3	projected incurred expenses. Our projected expenses for
4	2019 is \$1.2 million, a reduction of \$509,000 of 30 percen
5	from the 2018 actual expenses of \$1.7 million.
6	In 2019 I'm going to have three major categories
7	of expenses: Administration expenses, legal expenses and
8	the annual audit.
9	THE COURT: The legal expenses, does that pick up
10	the claim the cases that may be brought or are brought
11	in pending federal cases?
12	MR. KELLY: It does, Your Honor. And that's
13	something that I'll address
14	THE COURT: Okay.
15	MR. KELLY: more fully.
16	THE COURT: But that's being handled in-house or
17	outside counsel?
18	MR. KELLY: No, that is being handled by outside
19	counsel, Your Honor.
20	THE COURT: What's the firm?
21	MR. KELLY: Garren
22	THE COURT: I remember. Yes.
23	AUDIENCE MEMBER: It's Clarick.

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

THE COURT: What is it?

24

	PROCEEDINGS
1	MR. KELLY: Clarick.
2	THE COURT: C-L Just spell it.
3	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Clarick & Gueron.
4	C-L-A-R-I-C-K.
5	THE COURT: Is the firm handling the federal
6	litigation.
7	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Correct.
8	MR. KELLY: Federal litigation.
9	THE COURT: I remember that came before the Court.
10	I just wanted the record to pick it up. Got it. All
11	right.
12	MR. LABENSKI: The claims handling expenses will
13	be less of a driving factor in 2019 as the claim processing
14	function, as Gail has alluded to, as mentioned earlier, the
15	2018 incurred expenses will be \$1.7 million. Claims
16	pros I'm talking on Slide 8 now.
17	THE COURT: Yes. I'm on 8.
18	MR. LABENSKI: You're on eight?
19	Claims processing has been our largest function
20	at 49 percent of total expenses. This entailed a
21	processing of EOBs and addressing and resolving appeals.
22	Finance is 23 percent of the total expenses and
23	includes the audit fee and continued administration of
24	HRI's books and records; IT, which provides support

services to claims and finances, 14 percent of the

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

expenses; creditor communications is performed by an outside vendor who maintains the website and porthole and incurred 3 percent of the total expenses; legal constitutes 11 percent of total incurred expenses.

THE COURT: Okay. Off the record.

(Discussion off the record.)

THE COURT: Back on. Am I -- I'm on Page 9.

MR. LABENSKI: Turning to Slide 9, the last slide. We have assets, liabilities and the deficit.

As of October 31, 2018 cash and invested assets totaled \$36.3 million, assets were \$37 million. Cash and invested assets is basically the only asset that HRI has at the moment. Liabilities total 705.8 million, which includes Class 2 claims of \$217.9 million. From 2016 to 2018, October of 2018 the deficit reported to the Court has remained fairly consistent going from the negative 659.7 million to 2016 to a negative 668.7 million in October 2018. The decrease in equity is basically due to the increase in the Class 2 expenses claims.

The HRI audited finance financial statements with footnotes for the years 2016 and 2017 can be found in the HRI website. The 2018 annual audit is scheduled to commence in January of 2019.

THE COURT: Say that again. The 2000...

MR. LABENSKI: 19.

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

1 | THE COURT: Yes. Audit?

MR. LABENSKI: Is scheduled to start in January of 2019.

THE COURT: Excellent. Okay. Excellent. We're moving well.

Now, back to Individual Number 1, and then I want to know if you have any issues I need to address.

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KELLY: I wanted to discuss some matters that bear on the estate, one of which has been discussed really from the beginning, and that is the estate's potential claims against some former directors and officers of Health Republic. We've been investigating this, really, from the beginning of the liquidation, it's been averted to a number of times before Your Honor. I wanted to let he know, without going into too much detail about it, that we have entered into a toeing agreement with the potential targets of those claims and are in discussions with them. We are doing what we can to seek a resolution of these claims without the necessity of having to commence what could be a lengthy and expensive litigation. So it would be --

THE COURT: You understand that's going to be subject to scrutiny.

MR. KELLY: Of course it would come before the Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

1 Court if we do reach a potential resolution.

THE COURT: Because the Court -- I would want to know what was the outside possibility of liability and what the resolution number is and that it's in the best interest of the -- of the overall interest of resolving it in the best interest of the claims holders.

MR. KELLY: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: To make sure the money goes -- as much as possible stays in the pot to be divided up by those whose claims have been approved. So, believe me, that will have strict scrutiny.

MR. KELLY: We understand that, Your Honor. And, of course, we would bring it before you as soon as possible if such a proposal is reached.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KELLY: But I think it would be premature and unwise for me to discuss any details of it right now.

THE COURT: Yes. I don't need to know any more now --

MR. KELLY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: -- because the point is, until it's ready to be reviewed you can negotiate as much as you want.

MR. KELLY: I just wanted to let you know that it's underway, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.
Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

1

What about the other suits?

2 3

is still stayed as of today.

MR. KELLY:

4

THE COURT: Stayed by...? At whose request?

The other suit, the federal litigation

5

6

7 8

9

and Moda Health.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. KELLY: It's pending in the Court of Claims, federal Court of Claims, it is stayed by agreement of the parties and the Judge who's presiding. Pending the outcome of the related -- legally related cases, Land of Lincoln

Now, as I think the Court is aware, those two cases were heard in the federal claims, they reached opposite results in terms of the federal government's obligations to pay, they were both appealed to the Federal Circuit and the Federal Circuit reached a decision in June. The Federal Circuit decision was somewhat odd, it basically said, "Yes, the government has an obligation to pay the money that it agreed to pay, but, no, there's no obligation to pay now because congress has withheld any appropriations and has withheld funding for the risk --"

THE COURT: I don't find that complex. It's very clear. It's very clear. Okay.

MR. KELLY: So at the time that I wrote Your Honor a letter in June, I think it was in June or July, last summer, we were expecting that there would be a petition Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

for an En Banc rehearing of the Federal Circuit decision.

That petition was made and was recently denied.

We are now expecting in the aftermath of that denial that there will be a petition for cert to the Supreme Court. A writ of certiorari.

THE COURT: Certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States. Okay.

MR. KELLY: Now, the timing of that, Your Honor, is that the petition would need to be made by February 4, 2019. That's 90 days from --

THE COURT: And...? You all should be getting on it.

MR. KELLY: It hasn't been -- well, actually, we're -- we're bystanders to this one, Your Honor, in that it's the Moda and the Land of Lincoln attorneys that will be bringing it on, I believe. But we're watching closely because it involves the same risk corridor issues that are the subject of -- partially the subject of our lawsuit against the federal government.

THE COURT: We will see.

MR. KELLY: So what we expect will happen is that by the end of the current Supreme Court term in June we should know whether the Supreme Court is going to grant cert or not.

(To the reporter) Certiorari, that's lawyer Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

∥ talk.

1.2

...grant certiorari or not. And I think at that point we will have a much better idea of where the risk corridor question is going to go. Because if the Supreme Court grants certiorari, then it's going to be briefed and there will ultimately be a decision by the Supreme Court. If they do not, then the Federal Circuit decision is going to stand, and all the parties are going to have to work by interpreting that decision and reaching a resolution of the matter.

Meanwhile, our case is stayed, it is subject to review by the Court in January 2019, and my expectation is that it will continue to be stayed until the resolution in the Supreme Court one way or another.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. KELLY: So I think that we and the other coops around the country and other participants in the ACA are all waiting for a resolution of the risk corridors issue before there really can be a global resolution of -- of the --

THE COURT: ACA, for the record --

MR. KELLY: The Affordable Care Act.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MR. KELLY: ...a global resolution of claims against the federal government, and also a resolution of Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

claims that the federal government has against the -- the coops, because the federal government has claims for payment in our estate, we also have payments -- we also have claims against the federal government that they owe us money.

THE COURT: I've got to wrap this up, folks.

MR. KELLY: If I may speak to one other quick point, Your Honor?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. KELLY: I just want you to know, too, that because we don't think the risk corridor issue is going to be resolved immediately --

THE COURT: Any time soon.

MR. KELLY: -- although we expect that it will be resolved once we get a decision from the Supreme Court, in the meantime we have taken another avenue and we've asked the federal government to grant a partial waiver of federal claims against the Health Republic estate. A partial waiver would permit an initial partial distribution of assets of the estate to allowed claimants. It would be a distribution as to which the government had waived any claim that it had against the estate or against the receiver of the estate.

So we have requested that. We requested that in June -- I'm sorry, in April of 2018, we have followed up Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

1.6

with the government, but we have not as of yet received a	
response to our request. The silence of the government	
might be a matter that they've just not finished	
reviewing it, it might be that they don't think it	
advisable for them to do this until the risk corridor	
issue is	

THE COURT: Is resolved.

MR. KELLY: -- is resolved.

So -- but I wanted you to know that we had also made an application for a partial waiver in connection with an initial partial distribution of assets.

THE COURT: The proposed -- When would I be looking at getting that? I don't remember, the proposal that you're going to send me with the thumb drive.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: We can try before the 14<sup>th</sup>.

MR. KELLY: We will try to do it before the

14<sup>th</sup>, Your Honor.

THE COURT: If it's -- there's no -- I mean, believe me, between now and the 14<sup>th</sup> I won't be able to see it, so don't try to get it to me before the 14<sup>th</sup>.

MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: All right.

THE COURT: You notice, I have another case that's Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

	29
	PROCEEDINGS
1	chomping at the bit for you to get up and get out of here.
2	So what do you do you have anything I need to
3	consider?
4	MR. NOONAN: No, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: You're good.
6	From the public, did you have anything you
7	wanted to add?
8	AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could we have that waiver
9	request posted on the website?
10	THE COURT: The waiver request to?
11	AUDIENCE MEMBER: To the government.
12	THE COURT: To the government?
13	MR. KELLY: I would prefer not to.
14	THE COURT: Well
15	MR. KELLY: Well, the reason for that is, Your
16	Honor, that be the waiver request contains information that
17	we're requesting the government understand which would
18	include the fact that we intend to make a distribution of
19	the waived claim.
20	THE COURT: Right. But that can't so far that
21	language is not in any way confidential yet, what you just
22	said.
23	MR. KELLY: Well, well, I would suggest to Your

MR. KELLY: Well, well, I would suggest to Your

Honor that it's not advisable to make that public for the

following reason: It is not of assistance to creditors and

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

it may very well be of assistance to speculators, factors and others who seek to purchase claims.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. KELLY: It is --

THE COURT: Actually, the point is --

MR. KELLY: We have a general --

THE COURT: The point is there is no need for anyone to know, other than the fact that they have requested a waiver. The details of what that would entail doesn't affect the decision, it's between the government and -- and Health Republic. So the details of why the waiver would be a good idea is not of moment to interested parties who have claims. What would be the interest?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: To have policyholders, including service providers, have a rough idea how much their claims are worth and when they will be paid.

THE COURT: First let me start out by saying:
That doesn't include you. And, second, I don't think
that's a sufficient reason for me to modify my decision
that it does not have to be posted.

Anything else?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: May we have a copy of the minutes, Your Honor, posted?

THE COURT: Do I always -- don't I always have the minutes posted?

Robert Portas, RPR, CRR

1 MR. KELLY: Yes, Your Honor. THE COURT: They will be. 2 Folks, when am I bringing you back in? First of 3 all, I'm going to get the proposal, and in the proposal, the cover letter, give me a recommended date you'd like 5 me to have reviewed it and bring you back in for 6 consideration. Okay? 7 MR. KELLY: Thank you, Your Honor. 8 MS. PIERCE-SIPONEN: Good. 9 THE COURT: Okay, thanks. Have a good holiday. 10 This record is so ordered. I'll see you all next year. 11 I'm back to my hearing. 12 (Whereupon, the above-captioned proceedings 13 were concluded.) 14 15 (It is hereby certified that the (foregoing is a true and accurate 16 (transcript of the proceedings. 17 ROBERT PORTAS, RPR, CRR 18 Senior Court Reporter 19 000 20 21 22

23

24