

HB 468 (see companion bill SB 188)

Provides relative to utilization review standards and approval procedures for healthcare service claims submitted by healthcare providers

FTC Merger Oversight Dealt Blow in Hospital Disclosure Loss

Elevance Health, BCBSLA press pause on \$2.5B merger as regulators turn up the heat

Average annual healthcare

cost in all 50 states

SB 171

Creates the pharmacy benefit managers quality incentive program

HB 427

Provides relative to disclosure by healthcare facilities to patients of prices for certain items and services

FTC Urges Court Not To End La. Hospital Merger Notice Case

FTC Says Hospital Deal's Evasion Of Scrutiny Hurts Antitrust

Louisiana system can integrate 3 hospitals while FTC case plays out

In re Matter of LCMC Health & HCA Healthcare

This action arises out of the FTC's objection to LCMC's acquisition of three hospitals owned by HCA Healthcare in Louisiana. LCMC, a nonprofit hospital that operates six hospitals in the New Orleans area, had obtained a certificate of public advantage (COPA) from the Louisiana attorney general for the acquisitions, which were completed in early 2023.

The FTC alleges that even though LCMC obtained a COPA from the state, the parties are still required to comply with the FTC's Hart-Scott-Rodino (HSR) Act and report the transaction to the FTC. The hospitals and Louisiana AG (Plaintiff-Intervenor in the case) claim that the transactions are not subject to federal antitrust enforcement due to the state action immunity

doctrine.

In response to the FTC's objection, LCMC and HCA Healthcare filed separate complaints in the District Court for the Eastern District of Louisiana. FTC then countersued with an action of their own in the District of Columbia District Court. However, the FTC's action was transferred from DC to the Eastern District of Louisiana.

On September 27, 2023, a federal judge ruled in favor of Louisiana Children's Medical Center's purchase of the three HCA hospitals, dismissing the FTC's claims with prejudice. The judge concluded that the transaction was exempt from the federal antitrust laws and was not required to comply with Section 7A of the Clayton Antitrust Act's requirements.

Follow the latest developments of the case on the [Source Blog](#).