Legal uncertainty clouds direct-to-consumer drug program after OIG advisory and Senate scrutiny

By Diana Shaw, Esq., Wiley Rein LLP

FEBRUARY 26, 2026

A newly released advisory (https://bit.ly/3ZF5moN) by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Office of Inspector General (HHS OIG) on how direct-to-consumer (DTC) prescription drug programs intersect with the federal Anti-Kickback Statute (AKS) has thrown pharmaceutical manufacturers and market participants into an uncertain legal environment — and prompted scrutiny from U.S. senators over how aggressively oversight should proceed.

The advisory addresses TrumpRX, a DTC prescription drug platform designed to facilitate patient access to certain medications outside of the traditional pharmacy benefit and reimbursement framework. Under the program, patients — often including individuals enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid — can be connected with telehealth prescribers and dispensing channels that enable cash-pay transactions at lower advertised prices than may be available elsewhere.

The structure relies heavily on third-party prescribers and affiliated vendors, and its AKS compliance posture depends in part on whether those relationships can be characterized as sufficiently independent from manufacturer influence. The AKS bars the knowing and willful offering or paying of remuneration to induce the referral of items or services reimbursable by federal programs such as Medicare and Medicaid. If financial incentives embedded in the TrumpRX ecosystem were viewed as steering prescriptions or otherwise influencing clinical decision-making, regulators could conclude that the arrangement implicates the statute.

A finding of non-compliance would carry significant implications not only for the platform itself, but for participating pharmaceutical manufacturers, who could face criminal liability, civil monetary penalties, False Claims Act (FCA) exposure, and exclusion from participation in Medicare and Medicaid. An adverse determination could also chill broader DTC initiatives, trigger reputational harm, and prompt heightened scrutiny of telehealth-enabled distribution models across the industry.

Given the concerns and potential stakes, HHS OIG issued its January 27 Special Advisory Bulletin (SAB) to describe the circumstances in which the OIG views manufacturer DTC sales of prescription drugs to federal health care program enrollees as low-risk under the AKS.

However, just days after HHS OIG issued the guidance, Senators Richard Durbin (D-Ill.), Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.), and Peter Welch (D-Vt.) sent a letter to the OIG expressing concern that the advisory "fails to adequately address whether TrumpRx and affiliated platforms will be compliant with federal law, including the Anti-Kickback Statute" and urging more rigorous review ahead of the TrumpRx launch. The letter parallels broader congressional skepticism about rapid regulatory changes in the healthcare sector.

A central theme in the Senate letter is skepticism about whether prescriptions generated for DTC programs — particularly those mediated through telehealth vendors — meet the "independent" prescriber standard outlined in the guidance.

The interplay between HHS OIG's guidance and the Senate inquiry highlights an emerging tension in U.S. health care regulation: how to encourage innovation and patient access to lower drug prices while preventing conduct that might undermine program integrity.

What the OIG guidance says

HHS OIG's SAB focuses narrowly on DTC prescription drug sales offered by manufacturers directly to patients enrolled in federal health care programs, outside the usual insurance or claims process. The guidance identifies several characteristics that, in the OIG's view, mitigate AKS risk.

Among these are:

- The patient has a valid prescription from an independent, third-party prescriber.

Thomson Reuters is a commercial publisher of content that is general and educational in nature, may not reflect all recent legal developments and may not apply to the specific facts and circumstances of individual transactions and cases. Users should consult with qualified legal counsel before acting on any information published by Thomson Reuters online or in print. Thomson Reuters, its affiliates and their editorial staff are not a law firm, do not represent or advise clients in any matter and are not bound by the professional responsibilities and duties of a legal practitioner. Nothing in this publication should be construed as legal advice or creating an attorney-client relationship. The views expressed in this publication by any contributor are not necessarily those of the publisher.

Thomson Reuters™

- No claims for DTC products are submitted to any federal health care program.
- The manufacturer does not use the DTC program as a vehicle to market other drugs that may be reimbursed by federal programs.
- The program's pricing is not conditioned on any future purchase or participation.
- The manufacturer makes the drugs available through the DTC program for at least one full plan year.
- No controlled substances are offered through the DTC program.

The advisory also recommends that manufacturers establish communication mechanisms with federal health plans to support appropriate drug utilization reviews and medication therapy management. This communication is intended to reduce risks of contraindicated or duplicative prescriptions, and support patient safety.

In this evolving regulatory landscape, companies planning or operating DTC drug programs should take a cautious and structured approach to compliance.

HHS OIG also issued a Request for Information (RFI) inviting public comment on whether existing AKS safe harbors or civil monetary penalty provisions should be modified or expanded to better account for DTC programs and other emerging models of drug distribution.

Senate concerns: legal and ethical ambiguity

In their January 29 letter to the HHS OIG, the senators raised a series of substantive questions about the SAB and its implications for enforcement and oversight.

A central theme in the Senate letter is skepticism about whether prescriptions generated for DTC programs — particularly those mediated through telehealth vendors — meet the "independent" prescriber standard outlined in the guidance. Manufacturers and platforms often rely on third-party telehealth companies to evaluate patients and issue prescriptions, but the senators questioned whether these prescribers are sufficiently detached from manufacturer influence to avoid AKS pitfalls. They cited concern about incentives that may favor prescription steering or limit the depth of clinical encounters.

In addition, the senators highlighted issues around transparency and conflicts of interest linked to TrumpRx itself, including reported connections between the platform and outside vendors with political ties. While the letter does not allege criminal wrongdoing, it underscores the perception that insufficient oversight could open the door to improper practices.

Legal risks for companies navigating DTC programs

The uncertainty left by HHS OIG's guidance and the issues raised by the Senate letter converge on a central point: companies that engage in or support DTC prescription drug programs face a range of legal and compliance risks if they misinterpret or stretch the boundaries of what the OIG deems low-risk.

1. AKS enforcement and criminal liability

At its core, the Anti-Kickback Statute is a criminal statute. Knowing and willful violations can result in fines up to $100,000 per offense and imprisonment for up to 10 years. While HHS OIG's guidance suggests certain program features may reduce risk, it neither immunizes programs from enforcement nor creates a safe harbor with the force of regulation.

Given the breadth of federal enforcement tools, companies risk significant financial and reputational harm if regulators later determine their arrangements crossed the statute's line.

2. Civil and administrative sanctions

Even absent criminal prosecution, companies can face civil and administrative actions. HHS OIG may impose civil monetary penalties for providing remuneration that induces the purchase of items reimbursable by federal programs.

Federal health care programs, like Medicare and Medicaid, may also exclude entities or individuals from participation — an administrative sanction that can devastate commercial prospects for health care firms.

3. Telehealth and prescriber independence

Telehealth intermediaries and clinically detached prescribers are a common feature of emerging DTC models. If regulators decide, for example, that physicians or nurse practitioners associated with these platforms lack sufficient "independence," manufacturers and platform operators could face heightened enforcement scrutiny. The Senate letter specifically underscores this ambiguity.

Identifying which telehealth practices trigger AKS risk — and which do not — remains an open question with serious compliance implications.

4. Misalignment with existing fraud alerts

HHS OIG has historically flagged suspect telemedicine arrangements in special fraud alerts, noting arrangements that could corrupt clinical decision-making or increase unnecessary federal spending. If elements of a DTC program resemble previously targeted conduct, companies could find themselves subject to multiple overlapping legal theories.

©2026 Thomson Reuters

What companies can do to mitigate risk

In this evolving regulatory landscape, companies planning or operating DTC drug programs should take a cautious and structured approach to compliance. Several concrete steps can help mitigate legal and oversight risks:

1. Conduct comprehensive risk assessments

Organizations should perform detailed analyses of their DTC models against the criteria laid out in the SAB, identifying areas where practices may diverge from OIG's low-risk features. Risk assessments should evaluate the entire value chain — including prescriber relationships, telemedicine partners, pharmacies, and promotional activities.

2. Seek advisory opinions and early engagement

Where ambiguity persists, companies can pursue formal advisory opinions (https://bit.ly/3OAYAxT) from HHS OIG. Although advisory opinions do not definitively shield conduct from enforcement, they provide documented regulatory views on specific arrangements that are binding on the requesting party and can be persuasive in future legal contexts.

3. Document independence and clinical integrity

Companies should be prepared to demonstrate through documentation and policies that prescribers in their DTC programs operate independently of manufacturer influence. Clinical governance structures, clinician contracting practices, and quality assurance protocols can support this narrative.

4. Monitor congressional and regulatory developments

Given the Senate's active engagement, companies must stay abreast of congressional oversight hearings, potential legislation, and further OIG activity. The RFI itself suggests HHS OIG is considering additional guidance or safe harbor modifications.

5. Build robust compliance programs

Formal compliance programs with dedicated training on federal fraud and abuse laws can help prevent violations. Internal auditing, real-time monitoring, and routine policy updates are essential pillars of effective compliance.

Conclusion

Together, HHS OIG's guidance and the Senate inquiry signal a transitional moment in federal health law enforcement. While HHS OIG seeks to provide clarity on DTC prescription drug programs, its narrow focus and open questions leave significant uncertainty about how anti-kickback protections will apply in practice.

For companies navigating this landscape, the stakes are high: Missteps in structuring DTC programs could trigger criminal, civil, and administrative penalties, while inadequate oversight invites both regulatory and legislative scrutiny.

In this unsettled environment, firms that invest in rigorous legal analysis, thoughtful program design, and proactive engagement with regulators and policymakers will be best positioned to manage risk and sustain innovation in patient-centric drug distribution.

Diana Shaw is a regular contributing columnist on federal oversight and enforcement issues for Reuters Legal News and Westlaw Today.

About the author



Diana Shaw is a partner at **Wiley Rein LLP** and is based in Washington, D.C. She previously served as the acting inspector general for the U.S. Department of State, and as an assistant inspector general for special reviews and evaluations at the U.S. Department of Homeland Security. She can be reached at dshaw@wiley.law. The opinions expressed are those of the author. This article is for general information purposes only and should not be taken as legal advice.

This article was first published on Reuters Legal News and Westlaw Today on February 26, 2026.

© 2025 Thomson Reuters. This publication was created to provide you with accurate and authoritative information concerning the subject matter covered, however it may not necessarily have been prepared by persons licensed to practice law in a particular jurisdiction. The publisher is not engaged in rendering legal or other professional advice, and this publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. If you require legal or other expert advice, you should seek the services of a competent attorney or other professional. For subscription information, please visit legalsolutions.thomsonreuters.com.