§ 220.3 Exclusions impermissible.

(a) Statutory requirement. Under 10 U.S.C. 1095(b), no provision of any third party payer’s plan having the effect of excluding from coverage or limiting payment for certain care if that care is provided in a facility of the uniformed services shall operate to prevent collection by the United States.

(b) General rules. Based on the statutory requirement, the following are general rules for the administration of 10 U.S.C. 1095 and this part.

(1) Express exclusions or limitations in third party payer plans that are inconsistent with 10 U.S.C. 1095(b) are inoperative.

(2) No objection, precondition or limitation may be asserted that defeats the statutory purpose of collecting from third party payers.

(3) Third party payers may not treat claims arising from services provided in facilities of the uniformed services less favorably than they treat claims arising from services provided in other hospitals.

(4) No objection, precondition or limitation may be asserted that is contrary to the basic nature of facilities of the uniformed services.

(c) Specific examples of impermissible exclusion. The following are several specific examples of impermissible exclusions, limitations or preconditions. These examples are not all inclusive.

(1) Care provided by a government entity. A provision in a third party payer’s plan that purports to disallow or limit payment for services provided by a government entity or paid for by a government program (or similar exclusion) is not a permissible ground for refusing or reducing third party payment.

(2) No obligation to pay. A provision in a third party payer’s plan that purports to disallow or limit payment for services for which the patient has no obligation to pay (or similar exclusion) is not a permissible ground for refusing or reducing third party payment.

(3) Exclusion of military beneficiaries. No provision of an employer sponsored program or plan that purports to make ineligible for coverage individuals who are uniformed services health care beneficiaries shall be permissible.

(4) No participation agreement. The lack of a participation agreement or the absence of privity of contract between a third party payer and a facility of the uniformed services is not a permissible ground for refusing or reducing third party payment.

(5) Medicare carve-out and Medicare secondary payer provisions. A provision in a third party payer plan, other than a Medicare supplemental plan under § 220.10, that seeks to make Medicare the primary payer and the plan the secondary payer or that would operate to carve out of the plan’s coverage an amount equivalent to the Medicare payment that would be made if the services were provided by a provider to whom payment would be made under Part A or Part B of Medicare is not a permissible ground for refusing or reducing payment as the primary payer to the facility of the Uniformed Services by the third party payer unless the provision:

(i) Expressly disallows payment as the primary payer to all providers to whom payment would not be made under Medicare (including payment under Part A, Part B, a Medicare HMO, or a Medicare+Choice plan); and

(ii) Is otherwise in accordance with applicable law.

§ 220.4 Reasonable terms and conditions of health plan permissible.

(a) Statutory requirement. The statutory obligation of the third party to pay is not unqualified. Under 10 U.S.C. 1095(a)(1) (as noted in § 220.2 of this part), the obligation to pay is to the extent the third party payer would be