The Litigation Gravity Well Around th No Surprises Act and Why Angels Should Care More Than They Think

DEC 11, 2025 • PAID

Disclaimer: These views are my own and do not reflect those of my employer.

If you are interested in joining my generalist healthcare angel syndicate, reach o trey@onhealthcare.tech or send me a DM. Accredited investors only.

Table of contents

Abstract

1. Providers have flooded courts in the past few months with petitions aimed at arbitrator eligibility rules, batching mechanics, and administrative fee structure

2. These fights stem from earlier Fifth Circuit rulings that reshaped how QPA ca influence independent dispute resolution outcomes.

3. The newer wave of petitions is reactive to late 2025 IDR denials, which provid argue were inconsistent with prior case law and improperly constrained what co as a similar claim.

4. The litigation pressure is increasing loss ratios for payers in IDR, particularly specialties with asymmetric negotiating leverage like radiology, anesthesia, and neonatology.

5. Provider groups are now using litigation itself as a kind of stress test on the government's QPA framework, creating a feedback loop that affects contracting, pricing, and the economics of health tech companies supporting either side.

How We Got Pulled Into This IDR Realit

If someone had asked ten years ago whether arbitration rules written for emerge and post stabilization care would become one of the most litigated topics in the US healthcare system, most people would have assumed the question was a joke. here we are, in a universe where everyone from massive physician staffing compa to independent anesthesiology groups to small regional radiology practices is fil challenges over the little procedural gears that drive the independent dispute resolution pathway. The past three months alone saw a concentrated burst of pe that read like a tug-of-war between providers and CMS over how the arbitration machinery is supposed to work. The background here is that the No Surprises A supposed to be a neat policy fix that would stop patients from getting slammed v out of network medical bills. The law ended up creating a new battlefield where providers and payers both argue they are the real victims of regulatory improvis Providers point at CMS and say the arbitrators are being told to view the QPA as gravitational center despite court rulings that told the agency it overstepped. Pa

argue that providers are turning IDR into a revenue engine and filing disputes ir the moment contract negotiations stall. Somewhere in the middle are arbitrators were probably expecting a pretty quiet existence and instead found themselves refereeing some of the most adversarial economic fights in healthcare. The fun t that the court system has become a kind of second arbitration venue, one level u where the disputes are no longer over individual payment amounts but over the that govern the entire pathway.

The Arbitrator Eligibility Fights Getting Real

One of the hot litigation topics in the past quarter is arbitrator eligibility. When NSA machinery was first built, everyone assumed arbitrator qualification rules v be so boring that nobody would ever sue over them. That optimism did not survi contact with reality. Providers started filing petitions arguing that CMS effective rigged the arbitrator environment by allowing too many entities with payer-aligı incentives into the pool or by excluding entities that providers felt were neutral sympathetic to their valuation methodologies. The nuances here get technical fa because eligibility standards are defined in detailed guidance that CMS updates periodically. The argument from providers is that the agency has crossed the lin leaning too heavily on entities with backgrounds tied to claims administration, actuarial pricing, or similar domains that they believe predispose arbitrators tow giving more weight to the QPA. Some petitions even challenge specific arbitrato certifications on the grounds that their selection criteria contradict the court ru that previously told CMS not to bias the process toward the QPA. What makes t cases interesting for investors is the way providers are framing them. They are n arguing about who gets to serve as an arbitrator. They are claiming that the entir fairness of the IDR system hangs on eligibility rules. If the arbitrator pool trend payer aligned, the gap between billed charges and QPA gets compressed. If it tre provider friendly, the arbitration outcomes shift upward. In other words, arbitra eligibility is a pricing battle in disguise. The litigation aims to capture that lever tilt the negotiation dynamics for entire specialties. Investors focused on health t companies that participate in revenue cycle management or network analytics ne

understand that these eligibility fights are not academic. They change the math f payment forecasting.

When Batching Becomes a Litigation Weapon

Batching was supposed to be a clean, simple way to take multiple similar claims resolve them together. Instead, it has become one of the most contested procedu mechanics in the NSA ecosystem. Providers argue that CMS has interpreted the phrase same or similar in an arbitrarily narrow manner, effectively preventing th from pooling claims that clearly share clinical, geographic, and contractual characteristics. The common complaint in the recent petitions is that late 2025 I denials were inconsistent with earlier guidance or were excessively restrictive, m it uneconomical for providers to pursue many smaller-value disputes. On the pr side, batching is not just procedural convenience. It is a volume strategy. If an anesthesiology group can batch two hundred claims with similar CPT codes, pat acuity profiles, and facility types, they get leverage. The arbitrator sees a pattern rather than one-off encounters. If CMS restricts batching, the leverage drops an many claims become financially impractical to arbitrate. Some of the recent litig reveals provider frustration that the agency keeps redefining what is similar witl offering clear boundaries. There are arguments over whether emergency radiolo claims from the same facility but on different dates qualify. There are disputes o whether multiple neonatology encounters with identical workflows count as one batch. There are petitions arguing that payers weaponize batching rules to force providers into single-claim submissions, knowing that arbitrators may view isol disputes as less persuasive. The past three months have included pointed challe to batching denials in which providers are essentially saying that CMS is constra their ability to correct systematic underpayments. Litigation is being used as a t fork to force the agency to clarify or loosen these constraints. The operational k on effects ripple through the companies that build IDR tools, arbitration workfl systems, and analytics platforms that model payment variance. If batching rules change, these businesses have to reshape their risk scoring logic overnight.

The Administrative Fee Problem Nobod Saw Coming

Administrative fees are the most underappreciated part of the NSA ecosystem ar somehow one of the more contentious. When the fee was increased significantly prior rule cycles, both sides grumbled but adapted. What has happened in the re litigation wave is that providers are pushing back on fee structures they say crea asymmetric burdens. They argue that the administrative fee has turned into a ga mechanism that favors payers because many provider claims simply cannot justi cost unless they are batched. When batching gets restricted, and fees stay high, i effectively shuts down access to IDR for large classes of claims. Several petitions in the last quarter argue that CMS is violating statutory intent by making it prohibitively expensive for providers to challenge underpayments. Some filings e contend that the fee dynamics contradict the court opinions that already warned not to tilt the playing field through guidance. From an investor's perspective, administrative fees matter because they influence the volume of disputes that flo into the system. If the fees stay high and batching remains constrained, IDR volu drop. If fees get reduced or batching rules loosen, volumes spike. Health tech sta building automation around IDR submissions, data ingestion pipelines, or finan modeling engines suddenly find their business assumptions shifting with each regulatory twist. The fee issue is a prime example of a small administrative detai turning into a major economic lever for the entire arbitration market.

Why Providers Are Using the Fifth Circu as a Strategic Amplifier

The Fifth Circuit rulings reshaping QPA influence were celebrated by many pro groups. Those decisions reinforced the idea that CMS could not treat the QPA a default anchor in arbitration. But what has become clearer over the past three m is that providers now see the Fifth Circuit as a strategic amplifier for almost eve complaint they have with the arbitration process. The newer petitions lean heavi that precedent, arguing that any rule, guidance, or procedural constraint that ev indirectly resets QPA as the central valuation factor violates the spirit of those

opinions. Providers are effectively saying that if CMS tweaks arbitrator eligibilit they will challenge it. If CMS tightens batching criteria, they will challenge it. If structures administrative fees in a way that discourages volume, they will challe The Fifth Circuit has become a doctrinal anchor point for these arguments. Prov position each procedural issue as part of a larger pattern of agency overreach. Th creates a powerful litigation posture because it allows them to connect narrow operational disputes to broader constitutional and administrative law argument Investors should pay attention to this because legal strategy is now intertwined v reimbursement economics. When provider groups weaponize case law to influen operating rules of arbitration, it affects everything from contracted rates to reve cycle performance to the business models of startups building payer-provider negotiation tools.

Payers Start Feeling the Shift in IDR Lo Ratios

The cumulative effect of these litigation dynamics has started to show up in paye ratios within the arbitration channel. While each specialty behaves differently, r reports suggest specialty-specific increases in unfavorable IDR outcomes for pay radiology, anesthesia, and neonatology. These are specialties where the gap betw billed charges and the QPA has historically been wide, and where provider consolidation or staffing company involvement can influence negotiation dynam When arbitrators lean away from QPA as a dominant signal, providers in these fi tend to win larger awards. The litigation pressure is reinforcing this shift. Provi point to legal precedent when arguing that arbitrators should give greater weigh factors like complexity, acuity, and market dynamics. Payers counter with argum that QPA reflects fair market rates. Arbitration outcomes become more variable the weighting of these factors is unsettled. For investors, this shift matters becau health plans compensate by tightening contracting strategies, deploying more analytics, and sometimes creating friction in service authorizations as indirect counterbalances. Startups selling to payers need to recognize that arbitrations ar a side channel anymore. They meaningfully affect actuarial forecasts and networ strategy. Companies selling to providers need to understand that favorable IDR

outcomes can mask deeper instability in commercial contracting. The litigation
is not just noise. It is reshaping the economics of out of network care.

The Bigger Picture for Investors Who Want to Play the Edges

If you zoom out far enough, most of the dysfunction in the current IDR environ
comes down to volume. The system was never designed to manage hundreds of thousands of disputes a year, yet that is exactly what happened once providers re arbitration was their only reliable tool to counteract what they view as artificiall suppressed payment benchmarks. The statutory language never anticipated that would become a kind of clearinghouse for entire specialties. It was supposed to emergency valve. Instead, because the QPA structure presented a valuation gap t providers refused to accept, IDR became the default negotiation forum. That vol is what broke everything. Arbitrators started seeing dispute stacks that looked l mass tort dockets. Payers built intake screens just to sort through disputes they they would inevitably lose or occasionally win. Providers hired staff whose full t job was assembling arbitration packets. The backlog grew. The timelines slippe CMS repeatedly intervened with guidance updates that often made the situation worse. Each procedural change triggered new litigation. The whole thing becam physics problem. Volume rises, pressure builds, regulators clamp down, provide payers counter adapt, arbitrators get whiplash, and the cycle restarts.

Investors sometimes misunderstand this because they assume arbitration is a technical subcategory of revenue cycle operations. The truth is more complicate IDR has become a macroeconomic phenomenon in the middle of the commercial insurance market. It affects network participation rates. It influences payer risk It shapes how hospital-based specialties behave in negotiations. It even trickles i how certain private equity backed groups evaluate the resale value of their provi assets. When IDR outcomes drift in favor of providers, payers tighten contractin shift volumes toward employed models or lower cost settings. When IDR outcon toward payers, providers ramp up litigation and arbitration volume to restore leverage. The loop never stops. Every part of the loop has implications for health

Companies building claims automation tools see more demand. Companies offer contract modeling analytics get pulled into payer negotiations. Companies build billing systems or physician workflow platforms suddenly become part of an IDR analytics pipeline whether they like it or not.

The Late Twenty Twenty Five Denials That Tipped the Dominoes

One of the real accelerants behind the most recent litigation wave was a pattern denials in late twenty twenty five that blindsided a lot of provider groups. These denials generally claimed issues with batching compliance, arbitrator selection inconsistencies, or administrative deficiencies that providers argue were not def all but rather symptoms of shifting internal agency rules that were never clearly communicated. Several emergency medicine groups found entire batches rejecte even though they mirrored prior accepted batches. Neonatology practices were t that certain encounters were not similar enough despite identical CPT distribut and facility characteristics. Radiology groups saw denials that hinged on technic involving notification windows that had never been interpreted that strictly befc Providers read these denials as a direct signal that CMS was tightening the screv reduce volume. Whether that was the intent or not, it created immediate backlas

Providers view these denials as procedural overreach that undercuts the statutor promise of a fair arbitration pathway. They argue that CMS has been using infor guidance adjustments and opaque internal decision logic to quietly limit access IDR in order to manage the crushing administrative volume. They also argue tha these denials show CMS drifting back toward treating the QPA as an anchor, bec narrower batching definitions inevitably pull arbitrators back to QPA centric comparisons. This is where the Fifth Circuit precedent becomes the rhetorical crowbar. Providers cite it constantly to insist that CMS is forbidden from makin QPA the gravitational center of arbitration. Any procedural constraint that indi moves the system in that direction, they argue, is unlawful. Those late twenty tw five denials gave them the perfect evidentiary foothold to escalate the fight.

The Hidden Impact on Health Tech Startups

Startups rarely think they are in the arbitration business, yet more and more of t are being dragged into it indirectly. A company building a financial analytics toc practices may suddenly hear from customers who want arbitration packet genera QPA deviation analysis, or simulation models that predict arbitrator behavior ac facilities. A company building workflow tech for outpatient specialty groups ma requests to integrate arbitration triggers into their claims lifecycle logic. Meanw startups selling to payers discover that their clients want predictive scoring mod that identify which disputes to fight, which to settle early, and which to preempt renegotiate. It is not glamorous work, but it is commercially real. And the compa that can make sense of messy IDR data, consolidating patterns across specialties geography, will find themselves surprisingly valuable.

This hidden impact also shows up in compliance and legal tech. Providers are m cautious now because the procedural rules change so quickly and the risk of adv determination is higher. They need tools that surface eligibility issues before submission, detect arbitrator conflicts, or map claim similarity clusters algorithmically. Payers similarly want tech that helps them track arbitrator tendencies, detect abnormal filing patterns, or predict the financial impact of procedural rule changes. Angels investing in health tech underestimate how larg market can become. There is a vacuum for infrastructure companies that treat arbitration as a first class workflow category rather than a regulatory nuisance. T vacuum exists because everyone assumed IDR would shrink over time. The oppo happened.

The Bigger Picture for Investors Who Want to Play the Edges

For an angel investor, the interesting part of this whole mess is that it is not goir away. The incentives that created the arbitration surge are structural. You have a statutory mechanism with enough ambiguity to invite interpretation fights. You

agencies trying to manage unmanageable volume. You have providers who feel financially cornered and are not shy about using the court system to push back. have payers who build models that assume predictable arbitration outcomes, onl have those predictions destabilized by litigation. And you have a cottage industr law firms, consultants, and arbitrators who now understand these rules better th anyone and are helping shape strategy on both sides. This is not a temporary imbalance. It is a living system with its own gravitational pull.

For investors with an appetite for complexity, there are sideways opportunities h Tools that diagnose the fairness of arbitrator pools. Tools that evaluate whether claim is similar enough to batch. Tools that quantify deviation from QPA in a wa meets the rhetorical needs of both sides. Tools that track litigation and map how correlates to arbitration outcomes. Tools that help providers or payers simulate behavior across future contract cycles. These are niche seeming markets that act sit on top of billions of dollars in disputed payments. And as long as the system remains strained, those markets will not shrink.

A Closing Note on How Weirdly Fast Th Space Is Evolving

If you had told anyone twenty years ago that one of the most technically gnarly p of the commercial insurance ecosystem in the United States would be a federal arbitration process governing out of network payments, they would have assume were confused or joking. But here we are, and the pace of evolution is insane. Guidance shifts. Court rulings land. Arbitrators recalibrate. Providers react. Pay adapt. Startups pivot. The ground never settles. For angels, the trick is not to pr the future with precision. It is to understand the forces at work. The arbitration universe is shaped by incentives, not ideology. Providers are fighting for survival specialties squeezed by payer consolidation. Payers are fighting to maintain rate integrity in a chaotic environment. Regulators are fighting to keep the process fr collapsing under its own weight. Courts are fighting to keep agencies within the Every part of this tension creates opportunity for people who understand the mechanics deeply enough to build or back the right tooling.

This essay is one long way of saying something simple. The No Surprises Act wa never just a policy. It was the start of a new economic system layered onto an alr stressed market. And now that system is being shaped as much by litigation as b regulation. For investors who like frontier spaces where rules are still being writ and data still has to be tamed, it is one of the stranger but richer corners of the l care landscape.

Write a comment...