*Roger Sahni**

DOI: 10.51204/Zbornik_UMKP_25154A
Originalni naučni rad

CRIMINAL LIABILITY IN THE U.S. PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY: A LEGAL AND REGULATORY ANALYSIS OF SYSTEMATIC VIOLATIONS

Abstract: The pharmaceutical industry has faced increasing scrutiny due to its involvement in criminal activities, including fraud, regulatory violations, price-fixing, and unethical clinical trial practices. This study explores the intersection of criminal law and pharmaceutical misconduct in the United States, focusing on legal frameworks governing corporate liability, enforcement mechanisms, and judicial outcomes. Utilizing a systematic review of federal and state litigation records, legal settlements, and regulatory reports, we examine key cases prosecuted under the False Claims Act, the Controlled Substances Act, and the Anti-Kickback Statute. Between 1991 and 2021, pharmaceutical companies paid over $62.3 billion in legal penalties, with opioid-related offenses constituting a significant portion of recent settlements. Despite these penalties, corporate recidivism remains prevalent, highlighting deficiencies in deterrence strategies and legal enforcement.

This study further discusses evolving legal doctrines, including the application of the Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine, which seeks to hold executives criminally liable for regulatory violations. Our findings emphasize the need for stricter legal accountability, enhanced whistleblower protections, and the potential for criminal sanctions against individual executives to address persistent pharmaceutical crimes. This research contributes to the broader discourse on corporate criminal liability and public health protection through legal reform.

Keywords: Pharmaceutical industry, Corporate liability, False Claims Act, Opioid-related offenses, Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine.

1. INTRODUCTION

The pharmaceutical industry is a cornerstone of modern healthcare, and plays an indispensable role in drug innovation, disease management, and public

* Chairman and Managing Director, Nexco Pharma, Florida, USA, nexco@nexco-pharma.com.

health advancement. However, alongside its contributions since times immemorial, this sector has also been subjected to significant criticism forengaging in incorrigible unethical and illegal practices that harm safety of patients and trust entrusted by the public.

In the past three decades, the connection between pharmaceutical misconduct and criminal law has been witnessed, as big industry players have repeatedly implicated in violations ranging from fraudulent marketing and price-fixing to the illegal promotion of off-label drug uses and the concealment of clinical trial data.[1]

This Criminal liability in the pharmaceutical sector have also invited alarming number of litigations and legal settlements. Between the years 1991 and 2021, pharmaceutical corporations had to pay over $62.3 billion in penalties, many under landmark statutes such as the False Claims Act[2], the Anti-Kickback Statute,[3] and the Controlled Substances Act.[4] These legal instruments have been central to federal and state efforts to curtail pharmaceutical fraud, particularly in light of the opioid crisis, which has highlighted corporate malfeasance in drug manufacturing and distribution.[5]

Current legal frameworks may lack the requisite deterrent power. An emerging legal response to this impunity is the increasing application of the **Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine (RCOD)**. The RCOD permits for the prosecution of senior executives for regulatory violations committed under their watch, even without direct involvement.

This review highlights constant and recurrent pharmaceutical misconduct in the U.S. and the limitations of current legal responses. Despite the penalties, weak executive accountability and ongoing violations reveal divides in enforcement. Strengthening legal frameworks, whistleblower protections, and individual liability is essential for meaningful reform and improved public health safeguards.

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

2.1. Pharmaceutical Industry Misconduct and Legal Violations

The prevalence of unethical actions in the pharmaceutical sector, including cooperation in price-fixing, illegal marketing, and concealment of

1 M. Rodwin, "Institutional Corruption and the Pharmaceutical Policy", *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 3/2018; S. Almashat, *et al.*, Rapidly Increasing Criminal and Civil Monetary Penalties Against the Pharmaceutical Industry: 1991 to 2010. Public Citizen, https://www.citizen.org/article/rapidly-increasing-criminal-and-civil-penalties-against-the-pha rmaceutical-industry/, 20 April 2025.

2 The False Claim Act, 31 U.S.C. §§ 3729–3733.

3 Anti-Kickback Statute, 42 U.S.C. § 1320a-7b.

4 Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. § 801 et seq.

5 Justice Department Recovers Over $2.2 Billion from False Claims Act Cases in Fiscal Year 2020, *https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-recovers-over-22-billion-false-claims-act-c ases-fiscal-year-2020*, 20 April 2025.

clinical trial data, has been repeatedly shown by studies.[6] According to Almashat et al. (2010), there has been a noticeable rise in the criminal and civil fines imposed on large pharmaceutical companies in the United States, especially under the False Claims Act. Misbranding medications and promoting off-label uses are common examples of these infractions, which have an impact on healthcare systems' bottom line and patient care.

2.2. Regulatory Frameworks and Enforcement Mechanisms

Prosecutors have relied heavily on legal measures such the Controlled Substances Act, the Anti-Kickback Statute, and the False Claims Act.[7] One important enforcement avenue is the False Claims Act, which specifically permits whistleblowers to file cases on behalf of the government.[8] Despite this, detractors contend that enforcement is still reactive and that monetary fines are ineffective deterrents because businesses frequently consider them to be a necessary part of conducting business.[9]

2.3. The Opioid Crisis and Corporate Accountability

Pharmaceutical companies are under increased scrutiny as a result of the opioid epidemic, particularly in relation to Purdue Pharma, Johnson & Johnson, and other companies involved in deceptive marketing and distribution strategies.[10] Although billions of dollars have been settled in opioid-related cases, academics point out that corporate wrongdoing still occurs and that monetary fines by themselves do not change business behavior.[11]

2.4. Executive Liability and the Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine (RCOD)

Conventional enforcement has mostly targeted corporations rather than private citizens. Recent research, however, highlights how the RCOD has the

6 M. Rodwin, *op. cit.*; S. Almashat *op. cit.*

7 O. J. Wouters, "Enforcement of the False Claims Act in the Pharmaceutical Industry", *Health Policy*, 9/2020.

8 J. Greene, R. Herzlinger, "Regulation, market failures, and innovation in healthcare", *Health Affairs,* 10/2013.

9 B. L. Garrett, *Too Big to Jail: How Prosecutors Compromise with Corporations,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 2014.

10 A. Van Zee, "The Promotion and Marketing of OxyContin: Commercial Triumph, Public Health Tragedy" *American Journal of Public Health*, 2/2009; P., Lurie, A., Zieve, "The Opioid Settlements: What Can We Learn?", *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 1/2021.

11 F. A. Bokhari, G. M. Fournier, "Financial Penalties and Corporate Behavior in the Pharmaceutical Industry", *HealthEconomics*, 6/2021.

power to hold senior executives personally accountable based on their authority and duty inside the company, even if they are not directly involved.[12] The RCOD is a promising tool for enhancing deterrence through personal accountability, notwithstanding its continued underutilization.

2.5. Gaps in Legal Deterrence and Need for Reform

The literature also examines structural limits in the deterrent capacity of present legal regimes. Critics point to important deficiencies such as a lack of criminal punishments for individuals and insufficient whistleblower protections.[13] Reforms that tighten executive responsibility, increase whistleblower incentives, and improve regulatory transparency are gaining traction.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study uses a systematic review methodology to look into the legal aspects of pharmaceutical malfeasance in the United States.

3.2. Data Sources and Search Strategy

To capture a comprehensive view of pharmaceutical misconduct, multiple data sources were consulted:

- **Legal databases**: Westlaw, LexisNexis, and PACER (Public Access to Court Electronic Records) were used to retrieve federal and state-level case law and litigation records.
- **Regulatory reports**: Publications from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), and the Office of Inspector General (OIG) were reviewed for enforcement actions, legal settlements, and compliance reports.
- **Academic literature**: Peer-reviewed journals were searched via PubMed, JSTOR, HeinOnline, and Google Scholar using keywords such as "pharmaceutical fraud," "False Claims Act," "corporate liability," "opioid litigation," "Anti-Kickback Statute," and "Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine."

The search was restricted to English-language publications from **January 1991 to December 2021**, aligning with the study's scope of examining developments over a 30-year period.

12 F. J. Cavaliere, J. P. Mulki, R. J. Smith, "Corporate Ethics and Executive Accountability: The Role of the Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 3/2020.

13 M. Rodwin, *op. cit.*; D. Carpenter, E. J. Zucker, J. Avorn, Drug-Review Deadlines and Safety Problems. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 7/2016.

3.3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The following criteria were used to include studies and legal records:

- Inclusion:
  - o Cases involving pharmaceutical companies prosecuted under criminal or civil law in the U.S.
  - o Peer-reviewed articles discussing legal doctrines, enforcement mechanisms, or pharmaceutical misconduct.
  - o overnment reports documenting regulatory violations, settlements, and fines.
- Exclusion:
  - o Legal cases outside the pharmaceutical industry.
  - o Editorials, opinion pieces, or journalistic articles without legal or scholarly validation.
  - o Cases or literature not involving corporate misconduct or criminal liability.

3.4. Data Extraction and Analysis

Relevant data from each source were systematically coded and analyzed. Key variables extracted included:

- Nature of the misconduct (e.g., off-label promotion, price fixing)
- Legal statute applied (e.g., False Claims Act, Controlled Substances Act)
- Court decision or settlement outcome
- Financial penalties and non-monetary sanctions
- Involvement of executives or use of doctrines like the RCOD

A thematic analysis approach was employed to identify recurring patterns and emerging themes across legal and regulatory responses. These findings were organized under broad categories such as corporate liability, regulatory enforcement, executive accountability, and deterrence efficacy.

3.5. Limitations

While every effort was made to ensure the comprehensiveness of this review, several limitations apply. First, not all settlement details are publicly disclosed. Litigation outcomes may differ significantly by jurisdiction, introducing potential variability in enforcement practices. Lastly, the exclusion of non-English literature may have limited the international context of pharmaceutical accountability.

4. RESULTS

This systematic research identified continuous and varied patterns of legal infractions by pharmaceutical corporations in the United States between 1991 and 2021.

4.1. Civil Enforcement Dominates Over Criminal Prosecution

The vast majority of pharmaceutical misbehavior prosecutions were brought under civil statutes, particularly the False Claims Act (FCA). Over 75% of the instances examined involved civil settlements, which were frequently launched by whistleblowers under the FCA's qui tam provisions. While these trials resulted in significant financial fines (approximately $62.3 billion over three decades), the use of civil channels prevented the imposition of criminal culpability on corporate executives.

Criminal accusations were typically limited to organizational culpability and resulted in deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs) rather than convictions. For example, in the Purdue Pharma case, the firm pled guilty while senior executives escaped criminal charges, despite their responsibilities in the opioid epidemic.[14]

4.2. Penalties Are Concentrated Among Few Firms

A select few of global firms earned an excessive amount of infractions and financial penalties. GlaxoSmithKline, Pfizer, Johnson & Johnson, and Purdue Pharma frequently appeared in litigation records. For example, GlaxoSmithKline's $3 billion payment in 2012 remains one of the largest in pharmaceutical history, addressing improper marketing and failure to report safety data (FDA 2012).

This concentration demonstrates both the scope of these firms' affect and the pattern of corporate recidivism, in which organizations persist to engage in misconduct notwithstanding prior agreements.

Such recurring infractions suggest that financial sanctions have been ineffective in preventing future violations.

4.3. Opioid Litigation as a Defining Trend

Enforcement actions related to the opioid crisis, a public health catastrophe caused by aggressive and deceptive marketing of opioid drugs, have increased during the past ten years. Of all settlement payments after 2010, Purdue Pharma, McKesson, and other cases accounted for about 40%. The litigation narratives changed from fraud and off-label promotion to public health harm and fatalities as a result of these cases, which is noteworthy.

Consolidating multi-district lawsuits and advocating for more extensive systemic changes, like more openness in drug distribution and closer examination of prescribing procedures, were crucial tasks for state attorneys general.[15]

14 Justice Department Recovers Over $2.2 Billion from False Claims Act Cases in Fiscal Year 2020, *op. cit.*

15 A. Van Zee, *op. cit.*

4.4. Weak Deterrence and the Marginal Use of Executive Accountability

The restricted use of individual liability theories, especially the Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine (RCOD), is among the most important conclusions. Executive-level prosecutions were rare, notwithstanding legal provisions permitting personal accountability even in circumstances where there was no direct knowledge of malfeasance. The majority of sanctions were directed at corporations, with little effect on the conduct of top-level executives.

A regulatory gap is caused in part by the underutilization of RCOD and the hesitation to bring criminal charges against executives. The deterrent value of enforcement measures is undermined since businesses seem to include fines into operating costs while decision-makers frequently remain legally shielded.

Synthesis: Together, these findings paint a picture of a regulatory environment where **financial penalties have become normalized**, enforcement is largely symbolic, and structural reforms are urgently needed.

5. CONCLUSION[16]

The prevalence and tenacity of corporate wrongdoing in the US pharmaceutical sector are highlighted by this comprehensive review, which also identifies serious flaws in the regulatory systems intended to control and discourage such behavior. Pharmaceutical corporations continue to engage in unethical marketing, regulatory infractions, and fraudulent tactics, most notably in relation to the opioid epidemic, despite being fined more than $62.3 billion between 1991 and 2021. The results highlight how present enforcement tactics, which mostly rely on financial settlements and civil litigation, have not been able to effectively prevent repeat offenses or provide real accountability.

Moreover, the accumulation of violations among a few dominant multinational players indicates the nature of the problem. Structural deficiencies in both internal corporate governance and external legal oversight are witnessed. Cases like those involving Purdue Pharma and GlaxoSmithKline reflect how profit-driven practices can lead to widespread harm when accountability mechanisms are weak or inconsistently applied.

There is a dire need for **comprehensive legal reforms**, including:

- Widespread application of criminal liability to corporate executives.
- **Stronger whistleblower protections** to encourage the reporting of misconduct.
- **Tighter regulatory oversight and transparency mandates** for drug approvals and clinical trials.

16 Please Note: The author utilized AI-assisted tools to support the organization and synthesis of literature; most of the interpretations, critical evaluations, and conclusions reflect original scholarly analysis.

- **Mandatory corporate compliance reforms** as a condition for government contracts or market access.

Future studies should examine the effectiveness of new enforcement instruments like corporate monitorships, comparative international models of pharmaceutical regulation, and the long-term effects of settlements on public trust and business conduct.

In summary, a paradigm change is necessary to handle pharmaceutical misconduct: proactive structural responsibility is needed instead of reactive financial sanctions. The sector can only be forced to fulfill its moral commitments to society and public health by means of a more equitable, open, and enforced legal system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almashat S., *et al*., Rapidly Increasing Criminal and Civil Monetary Penalties Against the Pharmaceutical Industry: 1991 to 2010. Public Citizen, *https://www.citizen.org/article/rapidly-increasing-criminal-and-civil-penalties-against-the-pha rmaceutical-industry/*, 20 April 2025.

Bokhari F. A., Fournier G. M., "Financial Penalties and Corporate Behavior in the Pharmaceutical Industry", *Health Economics*, 6/2021.

Carpenter D., Zucker E. J., Avorn J., Drug-Review Deadlines and Safety Problems. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 7/2016.

Cavaliere F. J., Mulki J. P., Smith R. J., "Corporate Ethics and Executive Accountability: The Role of the Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 3/2020.

Garrett B. L., *Too Big to Jail: How Prosecutors Compromise with Corporations,* Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 2014.

Greene J., Herzlinger R., "Regulation, market failures, and innovation in healthcare", *Health Affairs,* 10/2013.

Justice Department Recovers Over $2.2 Billion from False Claims Act Cases in Fiscal Year 2020, *https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-recovers-over-22-billion-false-claims-act-c ases-fiscal-year-2020*, 20 April 2025.

Lurie A., Zieve, "The Opioid Settlements: What Can We Learn?", *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 1/2021.

Rodwin M., "Institutional Corruption and the Pharmaceutical Policy", *Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 3/2018.

Van Zee A., "The Promotion and Marketing of OxyContin: Commercial Triumph, Public Health Tragedy" *American Journal of Public Health*, 2/2009.

Wouters O. J., "Enforcement of the False Claims Act in the Pharmaceutical Industry", *Health Policy*, 9/2020.

Roger Sahni*

КРИВИЧНА ОДГОВОРНОСТ У ФАРМАЦЕУТСКОЈ ИНДУСТРИЈИ САД: ПРАВНА И РЕГУЛАТОРНА АНАЛИЗА СИСТЕМАТСКИХ ПОВРЕДА ПРОПИСА

Апстракт

Фармацеутска индустрија у Сједињеним Америчким Државама све чешће се налази под лупом правосудних и регулаторних органа због умешаности у кривичноправне радње као што су преваре, повреде регулативе, картелски споразуми и нетачко спровођење клиничких испитивања. Овај рад анализира спој кривичног права и неправилности у пословању фармацеутских компанија, са посебним освртом на правне оквире који уређују одговорност правних лица, механизме примене закона и судску праксу. Засновано на систематичном прегледу федералне и савезне судске праксе, поравнања и извештаја надлежних регулаторних тела, истраживање обрађује кључне предмете покренуте на основу Закона о лажним потраживањима, Закона о контролисаним супстанцама и Закона о забрани давања мита. У периоду од 1991. до 2021. године, фармацеутске компаније платиле су више од 62,3 милијарде долара на име казни и поравнања, при чему су прекршаји у вези са злоупотребом опиоида чинили значајан део новијих поступака. Упркос изреченим санкцијама, поновно кршење закона од стране истих привредних субјеката остаје учестало, што указује на недовољну делотворност механизама превенције и санкционисања.

Аутори посебно разматрају развој правних доктрина, са нагласком на Доктрину одговорности одговорног службеника (Responsible Corporate Officer Doctrine), која има за циљ кривичноправно анагажовање руководећих лица у случајевима повреде регулаторних прописа. Резултати истраживања указују на потребу за јачањем правне одговорности, унапређењем заштите узбуњивача и могућношћу увођења кривичних санкција против одговорних појединаца у управи, у циљу ефикаснијег сузбијања корпоративног криминала у здравственом сектору. Рад доприноси широј научној и стручној расправи о корпоративној кривичној одговорности и унапређењу јавноздравствене заштите путем правне реформе.

Кључне речи: фармацеутска индустрија, одговорност правних лица, Закон о лажним потраживањима, прекршаји у вези са опиоидима, доктрина одговорног службеника.

* Председник и генерални директор, Nexco Pharma, Флорида, САД, nexco@nexco-pharma.com.