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 compromised, 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 ensure 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
the appearance of the scene. There is no substitute for the claims negotiator's personal study of, and participation in, the case before settlement negotiations begin. If settlement is not possible due to the divergence in the offers, refine the issues as much as possible in order to expedite any subsequent suit. Mediation should be used if the divergence is due to an issue of law affecting either liability or damages. For further discussion see DA Pam 27–162, paragraph 2–64.

§ 536.57 Who should negotiate.

An AAO or, when delegated additional authority, an ACO or a CPO, has authority to settle claims in an amount exceeding the monetary authority delegated by regulation. It is DA policy to delegate USARCS authority, on a case-by-case basis, to an ACO or a CPO possessing the appropriate ability and experience. Only an attorney should negotiate with a claimant's attorney. Negotiations with unrepresented claimants may be conducted by a non-attorney, under the supervision of an attorney. For further discussion see DA Pam 27–162, paragraph 2–65.

§ 536.58 Settlement negotiations with unrepresented claimants.

All aspects of the applicable law and procedure, except the amount to be claimed, should be explained to both potential and actual claimants. The negotiator will ensure that the claimant is aware of whether the negotiator is an attorney or a non-attorney, and that the negotiator represents the United States. As to claims within USARCS' monetary authority, the chronology and details of negotiations should be memorialized with a written record furnished to the claimant. The claimant should understand that it is not necessary to hire an attorney, but when an attorney is needed, the negotiator should recommend hiring one. In a claim where liability is not an issue, the claimant should be informed that if an attorney is retained, the claimant should attempt to negotiate an hourly fee for determination of damages only. For further discussion see DA Pam 27–162, paragraph 2–68.

§ 536.59 Settlement or approval authority.

"Settlement authority" is a statutory term (10 U.S.C. 2735) meaning that officer authorized to approve, deny or compromise a claim, or make final action. "Approval authority" means the officer empowered to settle, pay or compromise a claim in full or in part, provided the claimant agrees. "Final action authority" means the officer empowered to deny or make a final offer on a claim. Determining the proper officer empowered to approve or make final action on a claim depends on the claims statute involved and any limitations that apply under that statute. DA Pam 27–162, paragraph 2–69, outlines how various authority is delegated among offices.

§ 536.60 Splitting property damage and personal injury claims.

Normally, a claim will include all damages that accrue by reason of the incident. Where a claimant has a claim for property damage and personal injury arising from the same incident, the property damage claim may be paid, under certain circumstances, prior to the filing of the personal injury claim. The personal injury claim may be filed later provided it is filed within the applicable statute of limitations. When both property damage and personal injury arise from the same incident, the property damage claim may be paid to either the claimant or, under subparts D or H of this part, the insurer and the same claimant may receive a subsequent payment for personal injury. Only under subparts D or H of this part may the insurer receive subsequent payment for subrogated medical bills and lost earnings when the personal injury claim is settled. The primary purpose of settling an injured claimant's property damage claim before settling the personal injury claim is to pay the claimant for vehicle damage expeditiously and avoid costs associated with delay such as loss of use, loss of business, or storage charges. The Commander USARCS' approval must be obtained whenever the estimated value of any one claim exceeds $25,000, or the value of all claims, actual or potential, arising from the incident exceeds $50,000; however, if the