

1 Molly C. Brown  
2 Margaret Simonian  
3 DILLON & FINDLEY, P.C.  
4 1049 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 200  
5 Anchorage, Alaska 99501  
6 Phone: 277-5400  
7 Fax: 277-9896  
8 Email: molly@dillonfindley.com  
9 meg@dillonfindley.com  
10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
11

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000  
1001  
1002  
1003  
1004  
1005  
1006  
1007  
1008  
1009  
1010  
1011  
1012  
1013  
1014  
1015  
1016  
1017  
1018  
1019  
1020  
1021  
1022  
1023  
1024  
1025  
1026  
1027  
1028  
1029  
1030  
1031  
1032  
1033  
1034  
1035  
1036  
1037  
1038  
1039  
1040  
1041  
1042  
1043  
1044  
1045  
1046  
1047  
1048  
1049  
1050  
1051  
1052  
1053  
1054  
1055  
1056  
1057  
1058  
1059  
1060  
1061  
1062  
1063  
1064  
1065  
1066  
1067  
1068  
1069  
1070  
1071  
1072  
1073  
1074  
1075  
1076  
1077  
1078  
1079  
1080  
1081  
1082  
1083  
1084  
1085  
1086  
1087  
1088  
1089  
1090  
1091  
1092  
1093  
1094  
1095  
1096  
1097  
1098  
1099  
1100  
1101  
1102  
1103  
1104  
1105  
1106  
1107  
1108  
1109  
1110  
1111  
1112  
1113  
1114  
1115  
1116  
1117  
1118  
1119  
1120  
1121  
1122  
1123  
1124  
1125  
1126  
1127  
1128  
1129  
1130  
1131  
1132  
1133  
1134  
1135  
1136  
1137  
1138  
1139  
1140  
1141  
1142  
1143  
1144  
1145  
1146  
1147  
1148  
1149  
1150  
1151  
1152  
1153  
1154  
1155  
1156  
1157  
1158  
1159  
1160  
1161  
1162  
1163  
1164  
1165  
1166  
1167  
1168  
1169  
1170  
1171  
1172  
1173  
1174  
1175  
1176  
1177  
1178  
1179  
1180  
1181  
1182  
1183  
1184  
1185  
1186  
1187  
1188  
1189  
1190  
1191  
1192  
1193  
1194  
1195  
1196  
1197  
1198  
1199  
1200  
1201  
1202  
1203  
1204  
1205  
1206  
1207  
1208  
1209  
1210  
1211  
1212  
1213  
1214  
1215  
1216  
1217  
1218  
1219  
1220  
1221  
1222  
1223  
1224  
1225  
1226  
1227  
1228  
1229  
1230  
1231  
1232  
1233  
1234  
1235  
1236  
1237  
1238  
1239  
1240  
1241  
1242  
1243  
1244  
1245  
1246  
1247  
1248  
1249  
1250  
1251  
1252  
1253  
1254  
1255  
1256  
1257  
1258  
1259  
1260  
1261  
1262  
1263  
1264  
1265  
1266  
1267  
1268  
1269  
1270  
1271  
1272  
1273  
1274  
1275  
1276  
1277  
1278  
1279  
1280  
1281  
1282  
1283  
1284  
1285  
1286  
1287  
1288  
1289  
1290  
1291  
1292  
1293  
1294  
1295  
1296  
1297  
1298  
1299  
1300  
1301  
1302  
1303  
1304  
1305  
1306  
1307  
1308  
1309  
1310  
1311  
1312  
1313  
1314  
1315  
1316  
1317  
1318  
1319  
1320  
1321  
1322  
1323  
1324  
1325  
1326  
1327  
1328  
1329  
1330  
1331  
1332  
1333  
1334  
1335  
1336  
1337  
1338  
1339  
1340  
1341  
1342  
1343  
1344  
1345  
1346  
1347  
1348  
1349  
1350  
1351  
1352  
1353  
1354  
1355  
1356  
1357  
1358  
1359  
1360  
1361  
1362  
1363  
1364  
1365  
1366  
1367  
1368  
1369  
1370  
1371  
1372  
1373  
1374  
1375  
1376  
1377  
1378  
1379  
1380  
1381  
1382  
1383  
1384  
1385  
1386  
1387  
1388  
1389  
1390  
1391  
1392  
1393  
1394  
1395  
1396  
1397  
1398  
1399  
1400  
1401  
1402  
1403  
1404  
1405  
1406  
1407  
1408  
1409  
1410  
1411  
1412  
1413  
1414  
1415  
1416  
1417  
1418  
1419  
1420  
1421  
1422  
1423  
1424  
1425  
1426  
1427  
1428  
1429  
1430  
1431  
1432  
1433  
1434  
1435  
1436  
1437  
1438  
1439  
1440  
1441  
1442  
1443  
1444  
1445  
1446  
1447  
1448  
1449  
1450  
1451  
1452  
1453  
1454  
1455  
1456  
1457  
1458  
1459  
1460  
1461  
1462  
1463  
1464  
1465  
1466  
1467  
1468  
1469  
1470  
1471  
1472  
1473  
1474  
1475  
1476  
1477  
1478  
1479  
1480  
1481  
1482  
1483  
1484  
1485  
1486  
1487  
1488  
1489  
1490  
1491  
1492  
1493  
1494  
1495  
1496  
1497  
1498  
1499  
1500  
1501  
1502  
1503  
1504  
1505  
1506  
1507  
1508  
1509  
1510  
1511  
1512  
1513  
1514  
1515  
1516  
1517  
1518  
1519  
1520  
1521  
1522  
1523  
1524  
1525  
1526  
1527  
1528  
1529  
1530  
1531  
1532  
1533  
1534  
1535  
1536  
1537  
1538  
1539  
1540  
1541  
1542  
1543  
1544  
1545  
1546  
1547  
1548  
1549  
1550  
1551  
1552  
1553  
1554  
1555  
1556  
1557  
1558  
1559  
1560  
1561  
1562  
1563  
1564  
1565  
1566  
1567  
1568  
1569  
1570  
1571  
1572  
1573  
1574  
1575  
1576  
1577  
1578  
1579  
1580  
1581  
1582  
1583  
1584  
1585  
1586  
1587  
1588  
1589  
1590  
1591  
1592  
1593  
1594  
1595  
1596  
1597  
1598  
1599  
1600  
1601  
1602  
1603  
1604  
1605  
1606  
1607  
1608  
1609  
1610  
1611  
1612  
1613  
1614  
1615  
1616  
1617  
1618  
1619  
1620  
1621  
1622  
1623  
1624  
1625  
1626  
1627  
1628  
1629  
1630  
1631  
1632  
1633  
1634  
1635  
1636  
1637  
1638  
1639  
1640  
1641  
1642  
1643  
1644  
1645  
1646  
1647  
1648  
1649  
1650  
1651  
1652  
1653  
1654  
1655  
1656  
1657  
1658  
1659  
1660  
1661  
1662  
1663  
1664  
1665  
1666  
1667  
1668  
1669  
1670  
1671  
1672  
1673  
1674  
1675  
1676  
1677  
1678  
1679  
1680  
1681  
1682  
1683  
1684  
1685  
1686  
1687  
1688  
1689  
1690  
1691  
1692  
1693  
1694  
1695  
1696  
1697  
1698  
1699  
1700  
1701  
1702  
1703  
1704  
1705  
1706  
1707  
1708  
1709  
1710  
1711  
1712  
1713  
1714  
1715  
1716  
1717  
1718  
1719  
1720  
1721  
1722  
1723  
1724  
1725  
1726  
1727  
1728  
1729  
1730  
1731  
1732  
1733  
1734  
1735  
1736  
1737  
1738  
1739  
1740  
1741  
1742  
1743  
1744  
1745  
1746  
1747  
1748  
1749  
1750  
1751  
1752  
1753  
1754  
1755  
1756  
1757  
1758  
1759  
1760  
1761  
1762  
1763  
1764  
1765  
1766  
1767  
1768  
1769  
1770  
1771  
1772  
1773  
1774  
1775  
1776  
1777  
1778  
1779  
1780  
1781  
1782  
1783  
1784  
1785  
1786  
1787  
1788  
1789  
1790  
1791  
1792  
1793  
1794  
1795  
1796  
1797  
1798  
1799  
1800  
1801  
1802  
1803  
1804  
1805  
1806  
1807  
1808  
1809  
1810  
1811  
1812  
1813  
1814  
1815  
1816  
1817  
1818  
1819  
1820  
1821  
1822  
1823  
1824  
1825  
1826  
1827  
1828  
1829  
1830  
1831  
1832  
1833  
1834  
1835  
1836  
1837  
1838  
1839  
1840  
1841  
1842  
1843  
1844  
1845  
1846  
1847  
1848  
1849  
1850  
1851  
1852  
1853  
1854  
1855  
1856  
1857  
1858  
1859  
1860  
1861  
1862  
1863  
1864  
1865  
1866  
1867  
1868  
1869  
1870  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874  
1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900  
1901  
1902  
1903  
1904  
1905  
1906  
1907  
1908  
1909  
1910  
1911  
1912  
1913  
1914  
1915  
1916  
1917  
1918  
1919  
1920  
1921  
1922  
1923  
1924  
1925  
1926  
1927  
1928  
1929  
1930  
1931  
1932  
1933  
1934  
1935  
1936  
1937  
1938  
1939  
1940  
1941  
1942  
1943  
1944  
1945  
1946  
1947  
1948  
1949  
1950  
1951  
1952  
1953  
1954  
1955  
1956  
1957  
1958  
1959  
1960  
1961  
1962  
1963  
1964  
1965  
1966  
1967  
1968  
1969  
1970  
1971  
1972  
1973  
1974  
1975  
1976  
1977  
1978  
1979  
1980  
1981  
1982  
1983  
1984  
1985  
1986  
1987  
1988  
1989  
1990  
1991  
1992  
1993  
1994  
1995  
1996  
1997  
1998  
1999  
2000  
2001  
2002  
2003  
2004  
2005  
2006  
2007  
2008  
2009  
2010  
2011  
2012  
2013  
2014  
2015  
2016  
2017  
2018  
2019  
2020  
2021  
2022  
2023  
2024  
2025  
2026  
2027  
2028  
2029  
2030  
2031  
2032  
2033  
2034  
2035  
2036  
2037  
2038  
2039  
2040  
2041  
2042  
2043  
2044  
2045  
2046  
2047  
2048  
2049  
2050  
2051  
2052  
2053  
2054  
2055  
2056  
2057  
2058  
2059  
2060  
2061  
2062  
2063  
2064  
2065  
2066  
2067  
2068  
2069  
2070  
2071  
2072  
2073  
2074  
2075  
2076  
2077  
2078  
2079  
2080  
2081  
2082  
2083  
2084  
2085  
2086  
2087  
2088  
2089  
2090  
2091  
2092  
2093  
2094  
2095  
2096  
2097  
2098  
2099  
2100  
2101  
2102  
2103  
2104  
2105  
2106  
2107  
2108  
2109  
2110  
2111  
2112  
2113  
2114  
2115  
2116  
2117  
2118  
2119  
2120  
2121  
2122  
2123  
2124  
2125  
2126  
2127  
2128  
2129  
2130  
2131  
2132  
2133  
2134  
2135  
2136  
2137  
2138  
2139  
2140  
2141  
2142  
2143  
2144  
2145  
2146  
2147  
2148  
2149  
2150  
2151  
2152  
2153  
2154  
2155  
2156  
2157  
2158  
2159  
2160  
2161  
2162  
2163  
2164  
2165  
2166  
2167  
2168  
2169  
2170  
2171  
2172  
2173  
2174  
2175  
2176  
2177  
2178  
2179  
2180  
2181  
2182  
2183  
2184  
2185  
2186  
2187  
2188  
2189  
2190  
2191  
2192  
2193  
2194  
2195  
2196  
2197  
2198  
2199  
2200  
2201  
2202  
22

1 Department of Justice,<sup>1</sup> confirming that Joan Wilson, one of the plaintiffs in this case, did  
2 not represent the United States of America, and did not provide any information protected  
3 by the attorney-client privilege.<sup>2</sup>  
4

5 Even so, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium (“ANTHC”) asserts it is  
6 entitled to an order from this Court dismissing Ms. Wilson’s claims, and disqualifying  
7 Dillon & Findley, her lawyers, and another plaintiff, Dr. Paul Franke. This is an  
8 extraordinary remedy that should be rejected by this Court.  
9

## 10 **II. LEGAL STANDARD.**

11 Alaska Rule of Professional Conduct 1.9 describes the duties an attorney owes its  
12 former client, and precludes an attorney who formerly represented a client in a matter  
13 from representing another person in the same or a substantially related matter in which  
14 that person’s interests are materially adverse to the interests of the former client unless  
15 the former client consents. The rule also precludes an attorney from using “confidences  
16 and secrets to the disadvantage of a former client” except as allowed under the rules, or  
17 “when the information has become generally known.”<sup>3</sup> The rule further prevents an  
18 attorney from revealing a former client’s “confidences and secrets,” except as allowed  
19 under the rules.<sup>4</sup>  
20  
21

---

22 <sup>1</sup> Dkt. 56.

23 <sup>2</sup> *Id.*

24 <sup>3</sup> Alaska R. Prof. Conduct 1.9(c)(1).

25 <sup>4</sup> *Id.* at (c)(2).

1 Motions to disqualify are subject to strict judicial scrutiny because of the potential  
2 for abuse.<sup>5</sup> Disqualification is a drastic measure that is generally disfavored and imposed  
3 only when absolutely necessary.<sup>6</sup> The United States Supreme Court has expressed  
4 concern at the tactical use of disqualification motions to harass opposing counsel.<sup>7</sup> In a  
5 concurring opinion, Justice Brennan described such motions as a “deeply disturbing  
6 phenomenon.”<sup>8</sup>

7  
8 No Alaska cases have applied Rule 1.9(a) in the manner asserted by the Alaska  
9 Native Tribal Health Consortium (“ANTHC”). Moreover, the facts here establish that  
10 while Ms. Wilson worked on a discrete billing issue (one of at least eight issues described  
11 as examples of False Claims Act violations in all versions of the complaints<sup>9</sup>) on behalf  
12 of ANTHC, she has never represented any party in a substantially related manner that  
13 would violate Rule 1.9, and has not disclosed materials that violate the attorney-client  
14 privilege.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 <sup>5</sup> *Schnider v. Providence Health & Servs.*, No. 3:15-CV-00038-SLG, 2016 WL  
21 158494, at \*4 (D. Alaska Jan. 12, 2016); *Optyl Eyewear Fashion Int’l Corp. v. Style  
Companies, Ltd.*, 760 F.2d 1045, 1050 (9th Cir. 1985).

22 <sup>6</sup> *Beltran v. Avon Prod., Inc.*, 867 F. Supp. 2d 1068, 1077 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (citing  
23 *Optyl Eyewear Fashion Int’l Corp.*, 760 F.2d at 1050).

24 <sup>7</sup> *Richardson-Merrell, Inc. v. Koller*, 472 U.S. 424, 436, (1985).

25 <sup>8</sup> *Id.* at 441 (Brennan, J., concurring).

<sup>9</sup> Dkts. 1, 15 & 49.

26 PLS.’ OPP’N TO MOT. TO DISQUALIFY

*Joan Wilson & Paul Franke, M.D. v. Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, et al.*

Case No. 3:16-cv-00195-TMB

Page 3 of 32

1    **III.    RELEVANT FACTS.**

2            **A.      Facts Related to Ms. Wilson’s Work at Sonosky.<sup>10</sup>**

3            It is undisputed that ANTHC itself publicly disclosed the facts related to its  
4            pharmacy billing practice to regulators prior to the filing of Ms. Wilson’s complaints, and  
5            prior to any work Ms. Wilson completed at Sonosky or ANTHC. According to ANTHC,  
6            it “had received conflicting advice from the State of Alaska’s Medicaid program on this  
7            issue.”<sup>11</sup> The firm could only have received advice if it had requested the advice, and had  
8            explained the issues to regulators. In fact, the following sworn testimony establishes this:  
9

- 10
- 11            • Kay E. Maassen Gouwens, a Sonosky partner, avers in her affidavit that  
12            ANTHC received advice from “DHSS, Division of Health Care Services  
13            regarding Medicaid billing for pharmaceuticals that are injected or otherwise  
14            dispensed to patients during their outpatient visits.”<sup>12</sup> According to  
15            Ms. Gouwens, “DHSS advises ANTHC that the drugs should be billed as part  
16            of the medical claim All Inclusive Rate (AIR) and not out of the pharmacy,  
17            even if the drugs are very expensive, that is, in the thousands of dollars  
18            range.”<sup>13</sup>
  - 19            • Nacole Heslep, ANTHC’s general counsel, explained that the pharmacy matter  
20            related to “inconsistent guidance from regulators” ANTHC received, “which  
21            potentially impacted other tribal health providers.”<sup>14</sup>

22            The information in the complaint reveals exactly what DHSS already knew  
23            through ANTHC – that ANTHC billed for drugs “through its Pharmacy Medicaid  
24

25            <sup>10</sup>        “Sonosky” is Sonosky, Chambers and Sachse.

26            <sup>11</sup>        Dkt. 33 at 13.

<sup>12</sup>        Dkt. 35 at 3-4, ¶ 7.

<sup>13</sup>        *Id.*

Enrollment Number for infusion drugs dispensed during an outpatient visit,” and that it included the “expense of these drugs in the cost reports used to calculate the Indian Health Services encounter rate for outpatient visits.”<sup>15</sup> None of the complaints or the documents disclosed to the Department of Justice reveal the advice Ms. Wilson provided to ANTHC, her legal conclusions, or any internal attorney-client or work product protected information.<sup>16</sup>

**B. Facts Related to Ms. Wilson’s Work at ANTHC.**

**September 2014 – April 2016.** ANTHC hired Ms. Wilson as its Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer (“Ethics Officer”) on September 8, 2014.<sup>17</sup> Ms. Wilson worked as an “at will” employee,<sup>18</sup> governed by various ANTHC policies and state and federal statutes and regulations. As the Ethics Officer, Ms. Wilson worked at the direction of the CEO to establish and maintain “an effective ethics and compliance program to promote awareness of, and compliance with, ANTHC’s values, applicable laws, regulations, policies, procedures and standards.”<sup>19</sup> Ms. Wilson did not represent ANTHC as an attorney at any time during her tenure as ANTHC’s Ethics Officer.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Dkt. 37 at 3, ¶ 6.

<sup>15</sup> Dkt. 49 at 7, ¶ 22.

<sup>16</sup> Wilson Decl., Dec. 13, 2018 at 5-6, ¶ 7.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.* at 2, ¶ 2.

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> Exhibit A, Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer Job Description, Dec. 10, 2013.

<sup>20</sup> Wilson Decl. at 2, ¶ 3.

1 The ANTHC values Ms. Wilson worked to uphold included those articulated in  
2 the ANTHC Code of Conduct, which states, in part, that ANTHC will comply with  
3 “state, federal and local laws,”<sup>21</sup> and that ANTHC “will never engage in any business  
4 activity that we believe is unethical and illegal.”<sup>22</sup> In fact, several policies, including one  
5 signed in 2014 by ANTHC Board of Directors (“Board”) Chairman Andy Teuber, state  
6 that ANTHC employees are “expected to exercise due diligence in the prevention,  
7 detection, and correction of potential compliance issues,” including by “promptly” and  
8 “candidly” reporting concerns to ANTHC through “appropriate channels.”<sup>23</sup> Employees  
9 who make such concerns are protected from retaliation, according to several ANTHC  
10 policies.<sup>24</sup>

11 Ms. Wilson believed her job as the Ethics Officer was separate and apart from the  
12 ANTHC’s legal department, and conducted herself accordingly.<sup>25</sup> During her tenure as  
13 the Ethics Officer, Ms. Wilson worked under the Code of Ethics for Health Care  
14 Compliance Professionals (“HCCP Rules”), widely considered the gold standard for  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

---

21 <sup>21</sup> Exhibit B, ANTHC Code of Conduct, Feb. 2009 at 4.

22 <sup>22</sup> *Id.*

23 <sup>23</sup> Exhibit C, Compliance Awareness and Reporting, Board Policy No. 01-3007,  
24 Oct. 7, 2014 at 2.

25 <sup>24</sup> *Id.*; Exhibit B; Exhibit D, Board of Directors Good Faith Reporting and Chain of  
26 Command Policy No. 1200, Sept. 1, 2015 at 1.

<sup>25</sup> Wilson Decl. at 2, ¶ 3.

1 Ethics Officers.<sup>26</sup> In fact, ANTHC, like most major health care providers, followed the  
2 Office of Inspector General (“OIG”) compliance program guidelines, making  
3 Ms. Wilson, as the Ethics Officer, separate, independent and not subordinate to  
4 ANTHC’s general counsel, or most other executives.<sup>27</sup> This is because of the OIG’s  
5 directive that  
6

7 [f]ree standing compliance functions help to ensure independent and  
8 objective legal reviews and financial analyses of the institute’s compliance  
9 efforts and activities. By separating the compliance function from the key  
10 management positions of general counsel or chief financial officer (where  
11 the size and structure of the hospital make this a feasible option), a system  
12 of checks and balances is established to more effectively achieve the goals  
13 of the compliance program.<sup>28</sup>

14 During Ms. Wilson’s tenure, the billing issues outlined in all of the complaints,  
15 including the most recently amended complaint, were addressed in open compliance  
16 files.<sup>29</sup> With respect to the pharmacy billing issue, Gwen Obermiller contacted  
17 Ms. Wilson during Ms. Wilson’s tenure as the Ethics Officer and requested assistance  
18 regarding the billing issues.<sup>30</sup> Ms. Wilson worked to resolve this issue as the Ethics  
19

---

20 <sup>26</sup> *Id.* at 2-3, ¶ 4.

21 <sup>27</sup> *Id.*

22 <sup>28</sup> Department of Health and Human Services, OIG Compliance Program Guidance  
23 for Hospitals, *Federal Register*, Vol. 63, No. 35, Feb. 23, 1998, 8987, at 8993, n.35; *see*  
24 *also* OIG Supplemental Compliance Program Guidance for Hospitals, *Federal Register*,  
25 Vol. 70, No. 19, Jan. 31, 2005, 4858, at 4874.

26 <sup>29</sup> Wilson Decl. at 4-5, ¶ 6.

27 <sup>30</sup> *Id.* at 5-6, ¶ 7.

1 Officer.<sup>31</sup> In fact, Ms. Obermiller's concerns were part of an ongoing compliance matter,  
2 opened by another Ethics Officer in the ANTHC system called Mediregs.<sup>32</sup> The  
3 Mediregs system is a filing system separate and apart from the legal department.<sup>33</sup>  
4 Ms. Wilson, without receiving any material advice from the legal department or  
5 ANTHC's outside counsel, worked on the matter.<sup>34</sup> As with other compliance issues,  
6 Ms. Wilson worked independently with employees who raised concerns, and reported  
7 those concerns to executives within ANTHC.  
8

9  
10 Besides the pharmacy billing issue, which is the only issue addressed in ANTHC's  
11 motion, Ms. Wilson worked on the following issues, all of which are included in the  
12 complaints: (1) billing for oncology services provided by nurses;<sup>35</sup> (2) billing for  
13 unauthenticated orders;<sup>36</sup> (3) billing for unauthenticated orders related to the admission of  
14 newborn babies;<sup>37</sup> (4) billing for improper reference lab orders;<sup>38</sup> (5) billing related to  
15 known electronic health record system errors;<sup>39</sup> (6) improper retention of meaningful use  
16  
17

18  
19 <sup>31</sup> *Id.*

20 <sup>32</sup> *Id.*

21 <sup>33</sup> *Id.*

22 <sup>34</sup> *Id.*

23 <sup>35</sup> Dkt. 49 at 7, ¶ 23.

24 <sup>36</sup> *Id.* at 8-9, ¶ 26.

25 <sup>37</sup> *Id.* at 9, ¶ 27.

<sup>38</sup> *Id.* at 10, ¶ 30.

<sup>39</sup> *Id.* at 11, ¶ 31.



1 funds;<sup>40</sup> (7) billing for charges related to Pyxis;<sup>41</sup> and (8) billing practices related to off  
2 campus care.<sup>42</sup> Ms. Wilson's office had open files for each of these issues, and she  
3 discussed the same with ANTHC executives.<sup>43</sup>  
4

5 **April & May 2016.** ANTHC, through its CEO Roald Helgesen, commended  
6 Ms. Wilson in an April 1, 2016 letter and awarded Ms. Wilson a salary increase.<sup>44</sup> Under  
7 ANTHC employment standards, salary increases are only awarded when an employee  
8 meets all job expectations. Mr. Helgesen's letter stated that ANTHC appreciated  
9 Ms. Wilson's "dedication to our vision that Alaska Native people are the healthiest  
10 people in the world," and commended Ms. Wilson for her "efforts each day" that moved  
11 ANTHC "toward that goal."<sup>45</sup> ANTHC increased Ms. Wilson's salary, effective March  
12 20, 2016.<sup>46</sup>  
13  
14

15 Days after Mr. Helgesen's letter, Mr. Helgesen confirmed his personal  
16 commitment to Ms. Wilson's service to ANTHC.<sup>47</sup> This personal conversation took  
17 place on April 22, 2016 regarding Ms. Wilson's concerns about ANTHC's compliance  
18

---

19 <sup>40</sup> *Id.* at 11-13.

20 <sup>41</sup> *Id.* at 14, ¶ 37.

21 <sup>42</sup> *Id.* at 14-15, ¶ 38.

22 <sup>43</sup> Wilson Decl. at 4-5, ¶ 6.

23 <sup>44</sup> *Id.* at 6, ¶ 8.

24 <sup>45</sup> *Id.*; Exhibit E, Letter from Roald Helgesen to Joan Wilson, April 13, 2016.

25 <sup>46</sup> Exhibit E.

26 <sup>47</sup> Wilson Decl. at 6-7, ¶ 9.

1 with privacy laws.<sup>48</sup> On May 1, 2016, Mr. Helgesen texted Ms. Wilson that he agreed  
2 with her request to obtain out-of-state training for one of Ms. Wilson's employees, with  
3 the hope that the increased knowledge could protect patient safety.<sup>49</sup> This request was  
4 just one of Ms. Wilson's concerns.  
5

6 During this same time period, Ms. Wilson voiced concerns about all of the issues  
7 outlined above, and had a very tense disagreement with ANTHC's legal department  
8 regarding an external security risk assessment completed by an outside auditor.<sup>50</sup> That  
9 auditor completed the assessment at the request of the Chief Information Office and the  
10 Compliance Department, not at the request or commission of the legal department.<sup>51</sup> In  
11 fact, the legal department declined the opportunity to participate in the audit, including  
12 interviews with auditors.<sup>52</sup>  
13  
14

15 The auditor determined ANTHC to be at risk of an intrusion to its information  
16 network (including protected health information), concluded ANTHC was unprepared to  
17 deal with any similar issue, and found that ANTHC was at risk for violating patient  
18 privacy laws.<sup>53</sup> Only after ANTHC received the audit did its legal department attempt to  
19  
20

---

21 <sup>48</sup> *Id.*

22 <sup>49</sup> *Id.*

23 <sup>50</sup> *Id.* at 7, ¶ 10.

24 <sup>51</sup> *Id.*

25 <sup>52</sup> *Id.*

<sup>53</sup> *Id.* at 7-8, ¶ 11.

1 assert the attorney-client privilege over the document.<sup>54</sup> Ms. Wilson objected to the legal  
2 department's attempt to assert an after-the-fact privilege claim, designed to hide the  
3 document from outside officials, including the Office of Civil Rights.<sup>55</sup>  
4

5 ANTHC fired Ms. Wilson on May 6, 2016.<sup>56</sup> The termination occurred days after  
6 Ms. Wilson voiced her objection to the ANTHC CEO regarding his decision to exclude  
7 her from a Medicaid reform and expansion meeting to discuss billing plans for a third  
8 payer.<sup>57</sup> Ms. Wilson needed to be at the meeting as the Ethics Officer, responsible for  
9 assuring ANTHC's compliance with state and federal laws and ANTHC policies  
10 regarding billing practices.<sup>58</sup> Prior to her termination, Ms. Wilson had also informed  
11 Mr. Helgesen about the legal department's attempt to assert a privilege over the audit.<sup>59</sup>  
12

13 **C. Facts Related to Ms. Wilson's Post-Termination Conduct.**  
14

15 ANTHC's suggestion that Ms. Wilson misappropriated ANTHC's computers is  
16 wrong. Ms. Wilson took both of her computers home on May 5, 2016 because she had a  
17 pre-arranged vacation day on May 6, 2016.<sup>60</sup> Because of her job, Ms. Wilson often  
18 worked from home on her days off, and routinely took her computers home during  
19

---

20 <sup>54</sup> *Id.*

21 <sup>55</sup> *Id.*

22 <sup>56</sup> *Id.* at 9-10, ¶ 14.

23 <sup>57</sup> *Id.* at 8-9; Exhibit F, Appeal letter to ANTHC Board of Directors from Joan  
Wilson, May 20, 2016.

24 <sup>58</sup> Wilson Decl. at 8-9, ¶ 13; Exhibit F.

25 <sup>59</sup> Exhibit F.

1 planned time off and on the weekends.<sup>61</sup> ANTHC called Ms. Wilson into work on May  
2 6, 2016 for a meeting.<sup>62</sup> Ms. Wilson had no idea ANTHC intended to terminate her at the  
3 meeting, and did not bring the computers back to work on that day.<sup>63</sup> Ms. Wilson  
4 informed Mr. Helgesen that she would make the computers available to a courier, if and  
5 when ANTHC made such arrangements to pick the computers up from her home.<sup>64</sup>  
6

7 After being terminated, Ms. Wilson sought reinstatement, and followed the  
8 internal ANTHC procedures related to employment grievances.<sup>65</sup> Ms. Wilson also  
9 contacted individuals affiliated with the HCCP Rules and inquired with them regarding  
10 her obligations and duties. She also discussed her termination with individuals at  
11 Southcentral Foundation, ANTHC's partner in the Alaska Native Medical Center.<sup>66</sup>  
12 Ms. Wilson believed that the ANTHC Board would reinstate her, based on the  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

---

18 <sup>60</sup> Wilson Decl. at 9-10, ¶ 14.

19 <sup>61</sup> *Id.*

20 <sup>62</sup> *Id.*

21 <sup>63</sup> *Id.*

22 <sup>64</sup> Exhibit G, Emails to and from Danielle Ryman and Joan Wilson, May 25 & 26,  
23 2016.

24 <sup>65</sup> Wilson Decl. at 10, ¶ 15. For example, ANTHC Board of Directors Dispute  
25 Resolution Policy, ANTHC Policy No. 01-2059, entitled Ms. Wilson to certain  
26 procedures, including a formal dispute resolution. Exhibit H, ANTHC Board of  
Directors Dispute Resolution Policy No. 01-2059, Dec. 30, 2016.

<sup>66</sup> Wilson Decl. at 10-11, ¶ 16.

1 importance of her job, her performance, and the wrongful nature of her termination.<sup>67</sup>  
2 Pursuant to ANTHC's formal resolution process, Ms. Wilson submitted an appeal to the  
3 ANTHC Board on May 20, 2016.<sup>68</sup> The ANTHC Board did not immediately respond to  
4 Ms. Wilson's appeal, or acknowledge that it received the document.  
5

6 Ms. Wilson's appeal explained the special requirements of her job, citing to  
7 ANTHC policies and the HCCP Rules, and detailed Ms. Wilson's right and obligation to  
8 disagree with unprofessional and unethical conduct (including fraud) and to report the  
9 conduct when required by law.<sup>69</sup> Ms. Wilson explained that she believed ANTHC  
10 terminated her in part for her reports related to improper billing and the failure to return  
11 overpayments, in violation of state and federal law and OIG precedent.<sup>70</sup> Ms. Wilson  
12 also cited to several statutes that protected her conduct, and stated that ANTHC had  
13 subjected itself to various state and federal claims, including False Claims Act liability "if  
14 not immediately rectified."<sup>71</sup> In fact, Ms. Wilson explicitly told the ANTHC Board that  
15 if it did not reinstate her, Ms. Wilson intended to "pursue all remedies under the law and  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

---

21 <sup>67</sup> <https://www.southcentralfoundation.com/about-us/history/> (explaining that  
22 Southcentral Foundation and ANTHC operate the Alaska Native Medical Center under a  
Joint Operating Board).

23 <sup>68</sup> Wilson Decl. at 10, ¶ 15; Exhibit F.

24 <sup>69</sup> Exhibit F at 1-2.

25 <sup>70</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>71</sup> *Id.* at 5.

1 through all means possible to reclaim my position and prevent further wrongdoing.”<sup>72</sup>

2 The ANTHC Board did not immediately respond to the appeal.<sup>73</sup>

3 Instead, ANTHC retained an attorney to obtain the two computers in Ms. Wilson’s  
4 possession.<sup>74</sup> On May 25, 2016, that lawyer contacted Ms. Wilson in writing.<sup>75</sup>  
5 Ms. Wilson told that lawyer that she did believe one of the computers could not be  
6 returned, as it constituted evidence of crime.<sup>76</sup> Following that conversation, Ms. Wilson  
7 contacted the State of Alaska Medicaid Fraud Control Unit and reported her concerns  
8 regarding ANTHC.<sup>77</sup> Ms. Wilson reasonably believed that she needed to report her  
9 disclosure to the entities was necessary to prevent, mitigate, or rectify the past and  
10 ongoing substantial financial injury resulting from ANTHC’s violations of state and  
11 federal law. The computer became subject to a court-issued warrant, and was eventually  
12 returned to ANTHC, pursuant to ANTHC’s own admissions.<sup>78</sup>  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

---

20 <sup>72</sup> *Id.*

21 <sup>73</sup> Wilson Decl. at 11, ¶ 17.

22 <sup>74</sup> Dkt. 37 at 6, ¶ 16.

23 <sup>75</sup> *Id.*; Exhibit G.

24 <sup>76</sup> Wilson Decl. at 11, ¶ 17.

25 <sup>77</sup> *Id.*; *see also* Exhibit I, Email from Joan Wilson to Andrew Peterson, June 6, 2016,  
26 enclosing copy of the Board appeal.

<sup>78</sup> Dkt. 37 at 7, ¶ 19.

At about that same time, Richard Monkman, an attorney representing ANTHC in this case, contacted Ms. Wilson regarding her Board appeal.<sup>79</sup> According to Mr. Monkman, the ANTHC Board did not want to meet with Ms. Wilson “yet,” and sent Mr. Monkman to meet with Ms. Wilson instead.<sup>80</sup> Following that meeting, Ms. Wilson provided additional information to Mr. Monkman, and asked him to provide it to the Board.<sup>81</sup> Ms. Wilson’s May 31, 2016 letter detailed additional and unlawful behavior by ANTHC executives in violation of federal and state law, and internal ANTHC policies.<sup>82</sup> Ms. Wilson also detailed serious allegations regarding the biased and conflicted nature of Mr. Helgesen, Nacole Heslep, and others.<sup>83</sup> According to Ms. Wilson, those individuals and others have serious conflicts of interest based on their role in some of the alleged unlawful conduct.<sup>84</sup> Ms. Heslep filed an affidavit in support of ANTHC’s motion.<sup>85</sup>

Ms. Wilson and Dr. Paul Franke filed a Complaint, alleging violations of the False Claims Act and state employment claims in August 2016. Pursuant to applicable rules,

---

<sup>79</sup> Wilson Decl. at 11-12, ¶¶ 18-19; Exhibit J, Emails to and from Richard Monkman and Joan Wilson, May 27 & 31, 2016.

<sup>80</sup> *Id.*

<sup>81</sup> Exhibit J.

<sup>82</sup> Exhibit K, Supplemental Appeal (redacted), May 31, 2016.

<sup>83</sup> *Id.*

<sup>84</sup> *Id.*

<sup>85</sup> Dkt. 37.

1 the Complaint remained under seal. The Department of Justice provided notice to the  
2 Court that it declined to intervene in December 2017.<sup>86</sup>

3  
4 **IV. ARGUMENT.**

5 **A. The Information Provided to the Department of Justice and Described**  
6 **in Pleadings is not Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege.**

7 ANTHC makes general claims that Ms. Wilson violated her ethical obligations to  
8 ANTHC by disclosing documents protected by the attorney-client privilege, and other  
9 confidentiality restrictions. ANTHC is wrong.

10 First, Ms. Wilson's description of the pharmacy billing issue is not protected by  
11 the attorney-client privilege. The purpose of the attorney-client privilege is to  
12 "[e]ncourage full and frank communication between attorneys and their clients and  
13 thereby promote broader public interests in the observance of law and administration of  
14 justice."<sup>87</sup> For the attorney-client privilege to apply, eight elements must be satisfied:

16 (1) legal advice must be sought, (2) from a professional legal advisor in his  
17 or her legal capacity, (3) the communications must relate to that legal  
18 advice, (4) they must be made in confidence, (5) by the client or the  
19 attorney, (6) the privilege is asserted by the client, (7) from disclosure by  
20 the client or the attorney, and (8) the protection must not be waived.<sup>88</sup>

21  
22 <sup>86</sup> Dkt. 12.

23 <sup>87</sup> *Upjohn Co. v. U.S.*, 449 U.S. 383, 389 (1981).

24 <sup>88</sup> *U.S. v. Graf*, 610 F.3d 1148, 1156 (9th Cir. 2010); *see also Upjohn Co.*, 449 U.S.  
25 at 384 ("Confidential communications from the attorney back to the client, in the form of  
advice, are also protected.").



1 ANTHC argues that the description of the pharmacy billing matter in the  
2 Complaint violates the privilege, but fails to explain how. As explained above, ANTHC  
3 admits that it received contrary and confusing advice from regulators, making clear that  
4 the facts articulated in the Complaints do not satisfy the elements above. Moreover,  
5 Ms. Wilson did not provide any document that described ANTHC's legal opinion  
6 regarding the issue. She revealed only the facts, well-known to ANTHC employees and  
7 outside regulators.  
8

9  
10 In an attempt to bolster its misplaced privilege claim, ANTHC argues that the  
11 pharmacy billing matter is the "centerpiece" of the Second Amended Complaint.<sup>89</sup> That  
12 too is incorrect. The pharmacy billing matter is one of eight issues outlined in the  
13 Complaint. The centerpiece for Ms. Wilson is not the few paragraphs that describe the  
14 facts (but not legal advice or representation) related to the pharmacy billing issue, but  
15 instead the retaliation she suffered as a result of fulfilling her obligations as the Ethics  
16 Officer.  
17

18  
19 Second, in attachments to the ANTHC motion, ANTHC's attorneys and a  
20 paralegal allege additional violations of the attorney-client privilege. Through an  
21 affidavit by Martina Ruhle, an ANTHC legal specialist, ANTHC alleges additional  
22 confidentiality and privilege violations by Ms. Wilson. None of Ms. Ruhle's statements  
23

24  
25 <sup>89</sup> Dkt. 33 at 11.

1 describe the elements necessary to establish that the documents are protected by the  
2 attorney-client privilege.

3 For example, Ms. Ruhle states that 435 unidentified documents “could be  
4 characterized as having attorney-client privileged information or falling within the  
5 attorney work product rule.”<sup>90</sup> But it is well-established that a notation that a document  
6 is privileged, made at the direction of ANTHC’s legal department or even containing the  
7 phrase “legal opinion requested” is not the determining factor. “It is the content of the  
8 communication that determines whether the privilege applies. What would otherwise be  
9 routine, non-privileged communications between corporate officers or employees  
10 transacting the general business of the company do not attain privileged status solely  
11 because in-house or outside counsel is ‘copied in’ on correspondence or memoranda.”<sup>91</sup>  
12 “The mere fact that a communication is made directly to an attorney, or an attorney is  
13 copied on a memorandum, does not mean that the communication is necessarily  
14 privileged.”<sup>92</sup> A party cannot insert the legal department into a business activity in order  
15 to conceal the activity.<sup>93</sup>  
16  
17  
18  
19

20 <sup>90</sup> Dkt. 36 at 3.

21 <sup>91</sup> *F.C. Cycles Intern., Inc. v. Fila Sport, S.p.A.*, 184 F.R.D. 64, 71 (D. Maryland  
22 1998) (citing *United States Postal Service v. Phelps Dodge Refining Corp.*, 852 F. Supp.  
156, 163-64 (E.D.N.Y. 1994)).

23 <sup>92</sup> *Simon v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 816 F.2d 397, 403-04 (8th Cir. 1987).

24 <sup>93</sup> *SCM Corp. v. Xerox Corp.*, 70 F.R.D. 508, 515 (D. Conn. 1976) “[l]egal  
25 departments are not citadels in which public, business or technical information may be  
placed to defeat discovery and thereby ensure confidentiality.” *Rhoads Indus., Inc. v.*

Ms. Ruhle also states that a confidential joint defense agreement between ANTHC and a third party (Southcentral Foundation) is privileged.<sup>94</sup> But Ms. Heslep describes the joint defense agreement at length in *Southcentral Foundation v. ANTHC*, case number 3:17-cv-00018-TMB.<sup>95</sup>

Ms. Ruhle also identifies the existence of “[s]tatutes, regulations, laws, cases, research” in documents provided to the Department of Justice, which only establish that Ms. Wilson took her Ethics Officer job seriously, and gathered relevant information.<sup>96</sup> As evidenced by Ms. Wilson’s submissions to the ANTHC Board, various statutes provided Ms. Wilson direction and guidance.

ANTHC has failed to establish that any information disclosed by Ms. Wilson violated the attorney-client privilege or the work product rule. This Court should disregard arguments that suggest otherwise.

---

*Bldg. Materials Corp. of Am.*, 254 F.R.D. 238, 240-41 (E.D. Pa. 2008) (finding that each individual email within a string is a separate document that, if withheld, should be separately logged); *In re Universal Serv. Fund Tel. Billing Practices Litig.*, 232 F.R.D. 669, 671 (D. Kan. 2005) (same); *Baxter Healthcare Corp. v. Fresenius Med. Care Holding, Inc.*, No. C 07-1359 PJH (JL), 2008 WL 4547190, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2008) (“Each e-mail is a separate communication, for which a privilege may or may not be applicable. Defendants cannot justify aggregating authors and recipients for all e-mails in a string and then claiming privilege for the aggregated e-mails”).

<sup>94</sup> Dkt. 36 at 3.

<sup>95</sup> See *Southcentral Foundation v. ANTHC*, 3:17-cv-00018-TMB at Dkt. 106, ¶ 6. The joint defense agreement is also discussed at Dkt. 21 in that same case, and presumably other pleadings.

<sup>96</sup> Dkt. 36 at 3.

PLS.’ OPP’N TO MOT. TO DISQUALIFY

*Joan Wilson & Paul Franke, M.D. v. Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, et al.*

Case No. 3:16-cv-00195-TMB

Page 19 of 32

1           **B.       Ms. Wilson Did Not Violate Rule 1.9.**

2                   **1.       Ms. Wilson did not violate Rule 1.9(a).**

3           ANTHC argues that filing a False Claims Act complaint against a former client  
4           automatically implicates Rule 1.9(a). However, “to the extent that state law permits a  
5           disclosure of client confidences, such as to prevent a future or ongoing crime or fraud,  
6           then the attorney’s use of the *qui tam* mechanism to expose that fraud should be  
7           encouraged, not deterred.”<sup>97</sup> None of the cases cited by ANTHC in support of its  
8           argument match the facts presented in this case -- where an attorney relator / plaintiff  
9           based her claims on non-privileged information in a non-representative capacity.  
10           

11           ANTHC’s analysis glosses over the crucial fact that Ms. Wilson does not represent  
12           any party in this case (not to mention any party adverse to ANTHC) and instead is an  
13           individual plaintiff asserting claims. There is no violation of Alaska Rule of Professional  
14           Conduct 1.9(a) unless a lawyer “represent[s] another person[.]”<sup>98</sup> The cases cited by  
15           ANTHC make this clear.  
16           

17           For example, ANTHC cites to *Trone v. Smith*, a 1980 Ninth Circuit case, in  
18           support of its argument that a matter is “substantially related” for the purpose of  
19           

20  
21  
22           <sup>97</sup>       *U.S. ex rel. Doe v. X Corp.*, 862 F. Supp. 1502, 1507-08 (E.D. Va. 1994).

23           <sup>98</sup>       Alaska R. Prof. Conduct 1.9(a). ANTHC grounds its attempt to disqualify  
24           Ms. Wilson and dismiss the complaint by arguing that Ms. Wilson represents (or  
25           represented while the False Claims Act fraud claims existed) the United States in the *qui*  
26           *tam* complaint. But the *qui tam* complaint is no longer the operative complaint in this  
          PLS.’ OPP’N TO MOT. TO DISQUALIFY  
          *Joan Wilson & Paul Franke, M.D. v. Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, et al.*  
          Case No. 3:16-cv-00195-TMB  
          Page 20 of 32

1 determining whether the duty of loyalty applies when the facts of the two matters are  
2 similar or related.<sup>99</sup> But the *Trone* case makes clear that the “substantially related”  
3 analysis applies when an attorney accepts “representation adverse to a former client.”<sup>100</sup>  
4 Similarly, in *U.S. for Use and Benefit of Lord Elec. Co. v. Titan Pac. Const. Corp.*, the  
5 court disqualified an attorney because the attorney represented a party adverse to a  
6 former client.<sup>101</sup> Ms. Wilson does not represent any party in the instant case.

7  
8 The same is true for the Alaska cases. ANTHC cites extensively to state cases  
9 addressing the application of Rule 1.9(a). Those cases apply the analysis under Rule  
10 1.9(a) to an attorney who represents a party that is adverse to its former client.<sup>102</sup> While  
11 it is true that the Alaska Supreme Court endorses a broader test regarding the  
12 interpretation and application of a “substantially related” case under Rule 1.9(a), that  
13  
14

15  
16 proceeding, supplanted by the Second Amended Complaint, filed with the permission and  
at the direction of this Court. Dkt. 48. *See also* Dkt. 56.

17 <sup>99</sup> 621 F.2d 994, 998 (9th Cir. 1980).

18 <sup>100</sup> *Id.* The same analysis applies in *Achter v. Weyerhaeuser Co.*, 1995 WL 302406  
19 (N.D. Cal. May 15, 1996), a case addressing a factual scenario that relates more to Rule  
20 1.9(b). Those facts are not present here. By ANTHC’s own admission, Ms. Wilson  
works for the State of Alaska, as an assistant attorney general. Dkt. 33 at 4; Wilson Decl.  
at 1-2, ¶ 1.

21 <sup>101</sup> 637 F. Supp. 1556, 1560-62 (W.D. Wash. 1986) (explaining that the attorney  
22 disqualified represented the plaintiff in the case).

23 <sup>102</sup> *Richard B. v. State, Dep’t of Health & Soc. Servs., Div. of Family & Youth Servs.*,  
71 P.3d 811, 818 (Alaska 2003) (involving an attorney in connection with his  
24 representation of a client); *Moore v. Olson*, 351 P.3d 1066, 1072 (Alaska 2015) (same);  
25 *Griffith v. Taylor*, 937 P.2d 297, 301 (Alaska 1997) (same); *Burrell v. Disciplinary Bd. of*  
*Alaska Bar Ass’n*, 702 P.2d 240 242 (Alaska 1985) (same).

26 PLS.’ OPP’N TO MOT. TO DISQUALIFY

*Joan Wilson & Paul Franke, M.D. v. Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, et al.*

Case No. 3:16-cv-00195-TMB

Page 21 of 32

1 analysis still only applies in the context of an attorney's representation of a party adverse  
2 to a former client. Those facts are not present here.<sup>103</sup>

3 ANTHC also cites to several cases for the general argument that the duty of  
4 loyalty precludes attorney relators from making claims under the False Claims Act. But  
5 the cases cited by ANTHC do not support this general application and are all factually  
6 distinct from Ms. Wilson's situation.  
7

8 In *United States v. Quest Diagnostics, Inc.*, a New York federal case, the trial  
9 court disqualified an attorney relator (and others) primarily because the claims stemmed  
10 from an over disclosure of confidential information an attorney obtained as general  
11 counsel of a company.<sup>104</sup> The lawyer relator in the *Quest* case reached a conclusion in  
12 his position as general counsel that the company had violated federal law related to health  
13 care services.<sup>105</sup> The trial court determined that the attorney relator's disclosures in  
14 connection with the complaint "went beyond what was reasonably necessary" to prevent  
15 the fraud.<sup>106</sup> That finding stemmed from the relator's inclusion of documents and other  
16 evidence that dated back to 1996, nine years before the relator filed a complaint in  
17 2005.<sup>107</sup>  
18  
19  
20  
21

---

22 <sup>103</sup> *Moore*, 351 P.3d at 1072-73.

23 <sup>104</sup> 734 F.3d 154, 157-58 (2d. Cir. 2013).

24 <sup>105</sup> *Id.* at 160.

25 <sup>106</sup> *Id.* at 165.

<sup>107</sup> *Id.*

1 Although the trial court determined that the attorney relator violated a duty of  
2 loyalty owed under a New York ethics rule that is nearly identical to Rule 1.9(a) in  
3 Alaska, the *Quest* court on appeal only addressed the issue of whether the attorney relator  
4 could be disqualified for using confidential information under Rule 1.9(c).<sup>108</sup> The *Quest*  
5 court did not find that an attorney relator is automatically disqualified. Instead, it held  
6 that ethics rules like Rule 1.9 and others must be interpreted and applied to “balance the  
7 federal interests at stake,” which includes the desire to end fraud perpetrated against the  
8 government.<sup>109</sup> As such, an attorney relator should only disclose the confidential  
9 information necessary to prevent the company from committing a crime.<sup>110</sup> Citing to the  
10 other relators’ admissions that the information from the attorney was not necessary to  
11 establish the fraud (or that it could have been limited substantially), the *Quest* court  
12 determined the attorney relator violated the ethics rules, and upheld the trial court’s  
13 decision to disqualify the relator.<sup>111</sup>

14  
15  
16  
17 The same is not true here. First, as established above, the information Ms. Wilson  
18 provided to the Department of Justice is not confidential information. Second,  
19 Ms. Wilson provided the information in the context of her job as the Ethics Officer.  
20 Unlike the attorney relator in *Quest*, Ms. Wilson did not serve as general counsel of  
21

22  
23 <sup>108</sup> *Id.*

24 <sup>109</sup> *Id.* at 163.

25 <sup>110</sup> *Id.* at 164.

<sup>111</sup> *Id.* at 165.

1 ANTHC, or provide information obtained during her work as a Sonosky attorney.  
2 Instead, Ms. Wilson provided basic and general facts known to state and federal  
3 regulators regarding ANTHC's pharmacy billing, all of which were contained in the files  
4 of ANTHC's own compliance department.  
5

6 ANTHC's reliance on other False Claims Act cases is similarly misplaced. In *U.S.*  
7 *ex rel. Doe v. X Corp.*, a Virginia federal court determined that a former in-house  
8 attorney could serve as a relator, but could not use documents or information in those  
9 documents in connection with his *qui tam* complaint.<sup>112</sup> The facts in the *X Corp* case are  
10 complicated and convoluted, making the case inapplicable to the straightforward issue  
11 here. In *X Corp*, the attorney relator's employer obtained an injunction that precluded the  
12 attorney from using information (confidences and secrets), and required the Department  
13 of Justice to return the relator's complaint and written disclosure statement.<sup>113</sup> Because  
14 the attorney relator relied on information subject to an injunction, the *X Corp* court found  
15 that he could not serve as a relator.<sup>114</sup> Importantly, however, the *X Corp* court found that  
16 neither the relator's "status as an attorney" nor his "use of a letter referencing the material  
17 in the complaint as his 'written disclosure'" barred him from serving as a relator.<sup>115</sup>  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

23 <sup>112</sup> 862 F. Supp. 1502, 1508-10 (E.D. Va. 1994).

24 <sup>113</sup> *Id.*

25 <sup>114</sup> *Id.* at 1509-10.

<sup>115</sup> *Id.* at 1510.



1 None of the facts in *X Corp* are present here. The same is true of *U.S. ex rel.*  
2 *Holmes v. Northrup Grumman Corp.*, another case cited by ANTHC, in which a court  
3 disqualified an attorney relator because the court addressed the disqualification of an  
4 attorney as a relator based on the attorney's violation of a protective order in a separate  
5 arbitration, a violation of a conflict of interest (based on concurrent representation) and  
6 the attorney's lack of candor to the court.<sup>116</sup> None of these facts are present here.

8 Contrary to ANTHC's arguments, lawyers, including Ms. Wilson, are permitted to  
9 assert personal rights in lawsuits where they might be forbidden to represent other parties.  
10 *Doe v. A Corp.*, a Fifth Circuit case, the court explained, citing to an American Bar  
11 Association opinion, that it would be a "manifest injustice to allow the client to take  
12 advantage of the rule of exclusion as to professional confidence to the prejudice of his  
13 attorney, or that should it be carried to the extent of depriving the attorney of the means  
14 of obtaining or defending his own rights."<sup>117</sup> The *Doe* court provided several examples  
15 of instances when an attorney could advance his or her own interests without violating  
16 ethical rules.<sup>118</sup> This includes allowing a lawyer to sue a former client (a corporation) as  
17 a party because the lawyer held stock in the corporation.<sup>119</sup> The *Doe* court explained that  
18  
19  
20  
21

---

22 <sup>116</sup> *U.S. ex rel. Holmes v. Northrup Grumman Corp.*, 642 F. App'x 373, 377 (5th Cir.  
23 2016).

24 <sup>117</sup> *Doe v. A Corp.*, 709 F.2d 1043, 1049 (5th Cir. 1983) (internal citations omitted).

25 <sup>118</sup> *Id.*

<sup>119</sup> *Id.* at 1049.

1 the lawyer was “disqualified” from “appearing as a lawyer in the action,” but could  
2 maintain the action in his personal capacity.<sup>120</sup>

3 Similarly, in *Wadler v. Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.*, Northern District of California  
4 held that claims that stem from (potentially) confidential or privileged relationships are  
5 not automatically barred.<sup>121</sup> Citing to the *Doe* case, the court agreed that a lawyer does  
6 not forfeit his rights just because he must utilize confidential information.<sup>122</sup> In *Wadler*, a  
7 discrimination case, the court allowed the plaintiff attorney latitude to establish  
8 retaliation.<sup>123</sup>

9  
10  
11 Finally, ANTHC argues that Ms. Wilson violated Rule 1.9(a) because she actively  
12 represented ANTHC during her tenure as the Ethics Officer. At Docket 56, the  
13 Department of Justice confirmed that Ms. Wilson did not represent the United States. In  
14 fact, Ms. Wilson did not represent ANTHC at any time during her tenure as the Ethics  
15 Officer, as explained at length in her declaration.<sup>124</sup>

16  
17 **2. Ms. Wilson did not violate Rule 1.9(c).**

18 ANTHC argues that Ms. Wilson violated Rule 1.9(c) because she purportedly  
19 revealed ANTHC’s confidences and secrets. But, as established above, Ms. Wilson did  
20

21  
22 <sup>120</sup> *Id.* (internal citations omitted).

23 <sup>121</sup> 212 F. Supp. 3d 829, 847 (N.D. Cal. 2016).

24 <sup>122</sup> *Id.* (internal citation omitted).

25 <sup>123</sup> *Id.*

26 <sup>124</sup> Wilson Decl. at 13-15, ¶¶ 22-23.

1 not disclose confidential information. The information in the complaints, including the  
2 Second Amended Complaint, reveal information that is publicly known by state and  
3 federal regulators, per ANTHC's own actions. Rule 1.9(c)(1) makes clear that a lawyer  
4 can use information that is "generally known."  
5

6 Additionally, Rule 1.9(c) allows an attorney to disclose information as permitted  
7 by ethics rules. Accordingly, a lawyer may reveal confidences and secrets to the extent  
8 that the lawyer reasonably believes it is necessary "to prevent, mitigate, or rectify  
9 substantial injury to the financial interests or property of another that is reasonably  
10 certain to result or has resulted from the client's commission of a crime or fraud in  
11 furtherance of which the client has used the lawyer's services."<sup>125</sup>  
12

13 Regardless of the confidential nature of the information, Ms. Wilson was entitled  
14 to reveal ANTHC's improper billing practices and improper use of federal funds under  
15 Alaska Rule of Professional Conduct 1.6(b)(3), as she intended to prevent, mitigate, or  
16 rectify the injury from ANTHC's fraudulent actions.  
17

18 Ms. Wilson's decision to report ANTHC's conduct is not a violation of the rules  
19 of professional conduct.<sup>126</sup> The allegations in the complaints clearly demonstrate a  
20 substantial injury and conduct precluded by federal and state statutes. Ms. Wilson  
21 detailed those statutes in her letters to the ANTHC Board to include violations of:  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>125</sup> Alaska R. Prof. Conduct 1.6(b)(3).

25 <sup>126</sup> *Pederson v. Barnes*, 139 P.3d 552, 557 (Alaska 2006).

- the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act of 2010, § 1558;<sup>127</sup>
- 45 C.F.R. § 160.316;<sup>128</sup>
- OIG guidance regarding fraud, waste, abuse and mismanagement reporting to Indian Health Services;<sup>129</sup>
- the False Claims Act;<sup>130</sup> and
- crimes that subject ANTHC to United States Sentencing Commission, Federal Sentencing Guidelines § 8B2.1(a)(1) and (a)(2).<sup>131</sup>

The lengthy complaints in this case detail additional laws that Ms. Wilson believes ANTHC violated.<sup>132</sup> Ms. Wilson reasonably believed that disclosure of the information related to ANTHC's violation of federal law to the appropriate state and federal authorities, and ultimately the filing of the *qui tam* complaint as explicitly authorized by federal statute, were reasonably necessary to prevent, mitigate, or rectify the past and ongoing substantial financial injury resulting from ANTHC's violations. Importantly, Ms. Wilson's disclosure of information on the ANTHC computer is not a violation of any ethics rules, as a disclosure "to comply with . . . a court order" is explicitly allowed under 1.6(b)(6).

---

<sup>127</sup> Exhibit F at 4, n.4.

<sup>128</sup> *Id.*

<sup>129</sup> *Id.*

<sup>130</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>131</sup> Exhibit K at 4.

<sup>132</sup> Dockets 1, 15, 22-1, 28-2, & 49.

1 ANTHC summarily states that Ms. Wilson disclosed more documents than  
2 necessary to reveal ANTHC's fraud, and complains that Ms. Wilson sought to profit from  
3 filing her complaint as a relator. First, ANTHC has no idea what Ms. Wilson said or did  
4 not say to investigators during interviews. Moreover, ANTHC has identified over 800  
5 documents that Ms. Wilson and Dr. Franke did **not** provide to the Department of  
6 Justice.<sup>133</sup> Second, ANTHC's arguments ignore several important undisputed facts:  
7 (1) Ms. Wilson repeatedly attempted to get ANTHC to change its billing practices to  
8 comply with the law;<sup>134</sup> (2) after being wrongfully terminated, Ms. Wilson sought  
9 reinstatement before making any reports to federal and state agencies, repeatedly stating  
10 her intent to "return to work immediately and resolve the many compliance concerns I  
11 have attempted to bring forward;"<sup>135</sup> and (3) after the federal government declined to  
12 intervene, Ms. Wilson and Dr. Franke dismissed the fraud claims and are only pursuing  
13 employment claims. ANTHC's arguments are simply unsupported.  
14  
15  
16

17 **C. Ms. Wilson Did Not Abuse the Judicial Process.**

18 There is no evidence that Ms. Wilson violated professional conduct, acted in bad  
19 faith or misappropriated ANTHC documents and secrets. ANTHC's arguments are  
20 unsupported as explained in Ms. Wilson's declaration, and the repeated appeals she  
21 made to the ANTHC Board for reinstatement.  
22  
23

---

24 <sup>133</sup> Dkt. 36 at ¶ 4.

25 <sup>134</sup> Wilson Decl. at 3-4.

1 In support of its argument for sanctions, ANTHC cites extensively to *Xyngular*  
2 *Corp. v. Schenkel*, a 2018 case decided by the Tenth Circuit.<sup>136</sup> The *Xyngular* case is not  
3 factually similar to this case, and establishes why sanctions are **not** available here. The  
4 *Xyngular* plaintiff, unlike Ms. Wilson, did not file a False Claims Act claim, or report  
5 fraud to federal and state agencies. The *Xyngular* plaintiff, an employee, stole documents  
6 from the company by convincing another employee and IT consultant to “gather  
7 documentation” that the plaintiff needed for a future lawsuit.<sup>137</sup> None of those facts are  
8 present here. Ms. Wilson discovered the fraud identified in the complaints through her  
9 work at ANTHC as the Ethics Officer. She did not turn over the computer to the state  
10 until she received a warrant for it.

11 The *Xyngular* court, like most other courts that apply sanctions, looked to several  
12 factors to determine sanctions, including those in Federal Civil Rule 37. But prelitigation  
13 sanctions, including the dismissal of a case for allegations of bad faith, are rare. Here,  
14 there is no conduct justifying any sanction. ANTHC’s arguments are without merit.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

23 <sup>135</sup> Exhibit F at 5.

24 <sup>136</sup> 890 F.3d 868 (10th Cir. 2018).

25 <sup>137</sup> *Id.* at 871.

1           **D.     There is no Basis to Disqualify Ms. Wilson, Dr. Paul Franke or Dillon**  
2           **& Findley.**

3           This Court should reject ANTHC's arguments that Ms. Wilson and Dillon &  
4 Findley should be disqualified because ANTHC is wrong that there were violations of the  
5 ethics rules.

6           ANTHC first argues that Dillon & Findley should be disqualified in a footnote in  
7 its conclusion under Alaska Rule of Professional Conduct 8.4, which states, in part, that it  
8 is "unprofessional misconduct for a lawyer to (a) violate or attempt to violate the Rules of  
9 Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the  
10 acts of another." As outlined at length above, Ms. Wilson did not violate the rules. As  
11 such, Dillon & Findley did not violate any rules.

12           ANTHC also argues that Dillon & Findley should be disqualified under Rule  
13 1.16(a), which states, in part, that a "lawyer shall not represent a client or, where the  
14 representation has commenced, shall withdraw from the representation of a client if: (1)  
15 the representation will result in violation of the rules of professional conduct or other  
16 law." No such violations have occurred.

17           Finally, and without any support, ANTHC seeks disqualification of Dr. Paul  
18 Franke, the other plaintiff in this. There is no basis for this request.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 PLS.' OPP'N TO MOT. TO DISQUALIFY

*Joan Wilson & Paul Franke, M.D. v. Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, et al.*

Case No. 3:16-cv-00195-TMB

Page 31 of 32

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  
26

**CONCLUSION**

For the reasons explained here, and in the attached declaration, this Court should deny ANTHC's motion.

DATED this 13th day of December 2018, at Anchorage, Alaska.

DILLON & FINDLEY, P.C.  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

By: s/Molly C. Brown  
Molly C. Brown, ABA No. 0506057  
1049 W. 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 200  
Anchorage, Alaska 99501  
Phone: 277-5400  
Fax: 277-9896  
Email: molly@dillonfindley.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on December 13, 2018 a copy of the foregoing Plaintiffs' Opposition to Motion to Disqualify served electronically through the CM/ECF system on Nicholas C. Perros, Richard L. Pomeroy, and Richard D. Monkman.

s/Molly C. Brown

PLS.' OPP'N TO MOT. TO DISQUALIFY

*Joan Wilson & Paul Franke, M.D. v. Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, et al.*

Case No. 3:16-cv-00195-TMB

Page 32 of 32