

Department of the Army, DoD

§ 536.56

review or evaluation by a source other than claims personnel, are both grounds for denial for failure to document, provided such evaluation is essential to the determination of liability or damages. State a time limit, for example, 30 or 60 days, to furnish the substantiation or expert opinion required in a medical malpractice claim.

(3) If, in exchange for complying with the government's request for the foregoing information, the claimant or the legal representative requests similar information from the file, the claimant may be provided such information and documentation as is releasable under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP). Additionally, work product may be released if such release will help settle the claim. See § 536.18.

(b) An evaluation should be viewed from the claimant's perspective. In other words, before denying a claim, first determine whether there is any reasonable basis for compromise. Certain jurisdictional issues and statutory bases may not be open for compromise. The incident to service and FECA exclusions are rarely subject to compromise, whereas the SOL is more subject to compromise. Factual and legal disputes are compromisable, frequently providing a basis for limiting damages, not necessarily grounds for denial. Where a precise issue of dispute is identified and is otherwise unresolvable, mediation by a disinterested qualified person, such as a federal judge, or foreign equivalent for claims arising under the FCA, should be obtained upon agreement with the claimant or the claimant's legal representative. Contributory negligence has given way to comparative negligence in most United States jurisdictions. In most foreign countries, comparative negligence is the rule of law.

NOTE TO § 536.53: For further discussion see DA Pam 27-162, paragraph 2-59.

§ 536.54 Joint tortfeasors.

When joint tortfeasors are liable, it is DA policy to pay only the fair share of a claim attributable to the fault of the United States rather than pay the claim in full and then bring suit against the joint tortfeasor for contribution. If payment from a joint tortfeasor is not forthcoming after the

CJA's demand, the United States should settle for its fair share, provided the claimant is willing to hold the United States harmless. Where a joint tortfeasor's liability greatly outweighs that of the United States, the claim should be referred to the joint tortfeasor for action.

§ 536.55 Structured settlements.

(a) The use of future periodic payments, including reversionary medical trusts, is encouraged to ensure that the injured party is adequately compensated and able to meet future needs.

(1) It is necessary to ensure adequate care and compensation for a minor or other incompetent claimant or unemployed survivor over a period of years.

(2) A medical trust is necessary to ensure the long-term availability of funds for anticipated future medical care, the cost of which is difficult to predict.

(3) The injured party's life expectancy cannot be reasonably determined or is likely to be shortened.

(b) Under subpart D of this part, structured settlements cannot be required but are encouraged in situations listed above or where state law permits them. In the case of a minor, every effort should be made to insure that the minor, and not the parents, receives the benefit of the settlement. Annuity payments at the age of majority should be considered. If rejected, a blocked bank account may be used.

(c) It is the policy of the Department of Justice never to discuss the tax-free nature of a structured settlement.

NOTE TO § 536.55: For further discussion, see DA Pam 27-162, paragraph 2-63.

§ 536.56 Negotiations—purpose and extent.

It is DA policy to settle meritorious claims promptly and fairly through direct negotiation at the lowest possible level. The Army's negotiator should not admit liability as such is not necessary. However, the settlement should reflect diminished value where contributory negligence or other value-diminishing factors exist. The negotiator should be thoroughly familiar with all aspects of the case, including the claimant's background, the key witnesses, the anticipated testimony and