

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN RE:)
CAMP LEJEUNE WATER LITIGATION) Case No: 7:23-cv-897
)
)
This Document Relates To:) UNITED STATES' STATEMENT OF
ALL CASES) INTEREST REGARDING
) ATTORNEYS' FEES

INTRODUCTION

The United States respectfully provides this Statement of Interest in connection with Plaintiffs' Proposed Common Benefit Order, D.E. 31. The United States "has an interest in seeing that funds it owes to litigants are disbursed properly." *Allen v. United States*, 606 F.2d 432, 434 (4th Cir. 1979). This interest includes the proper allocation of a recovery against the United States between a plaintiff and his or her counsel. *Id.* (rejecting argument that "the government has no standing to contest fee awards based on private contracts between litigants and their lawyers"); *see also Wyatt v. United States*, 783 F.2d 45, 46 (6th Cir. 1986) ("The government has standing to challenge the amount of attorneys' fees to be paid to plaintiffs' attorney.") (citing *Allen*, 606 F.2d 432).

Plaintiffs' Leadership proposes a 3% "Holdback," to be "deducted from the amount charged by the individual plaintiff's attorney, *which shall in turn be governed by the retention agreement between each attorney and his or her clients.*" D.E. 31-1 at 25 (emphasis added). Those retention agreements, and thus the Common Benefit Order as a whole, must be consistent with the congressional limit on attorneys' fees in 28 U.S.C. § 2678. Section 2678 limits attorneys' fees in this litigation to 25% of any settlement or judgment. Thus, any Holdback for compensating attorneys that this Court orders in this litigation must be from the 25% of settlements and judgments reserved for attorneys' fees. Because the Holdback is for attorneys' fees, and because attorneys' fees are subject to § 2678, the Court should set a Holdback that balances the interests

of all plaintiffs’ attorneys, along with the United States’ interest in ensuring that aggregate attorneys’ fees do not exceed 25%.

BACKGROUND

“[T]he United States, as sovereign, is immune from suit save as it consents to be sued and the terms of its consent to be sued in any court define that court’s jurisdiction to entertain the suit.” *Lehman v. Nakshian*, 453 U.S. 156, 160 (1981) (internal quotations omitted). Thus, a court must determine both whether Congress has consented to be sued for damages and the scope of that waiver. The scope of the waiver must “be clearly discernable from the statutory text in light of traditional interpretive tools,” including the traditional sovereign immunity canon “constru[ing] any ambiguities in the scope of a waiver in favor of the sovereign.” *F.A.A. v. Cooper*, 566 U.S. 284, 291 (2012).

Congress has long conditioned the scope of the waiver by limiting attorneys’ fees, “in part to protect just claimants from extortion or improvident bargains and in part to protect the treasury from frauds and imposition.” *Calhoun v. Massie*, 253 U.S. 170, 173 (1920) (Brandeis, J.). Notably, since its enactment in 1946, the Federal Tort Claims Act (“FTCA”) has limited attorneys’ fees for tort claims against the United States. *See, e.g., United States v. Cohen*, 389 F.2d 689, 691 (5th Cir. 1967) (describing FTCA’s legislative history and “congressional concern about attorneys’ collecting enormous fees at the expense of their clients”); *Schwartz v. United States*, 381 F.2d 627, 631 (3d Cir. 1967) (describing limitations on attorneys’ fees under FTCA and explaining that “one of the main purposes of the Congress from the earliest legislation with respect to [FTCA] claims has been to properly protect plaintiffs and Government funds from exorbitant lawyers charges”).¹

¹ Limitations on attorneys’ fees are also common features in federal tort compensation programs. For example, the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act (“RECA”) and 9/11 Victim

In its current form, 28 U.S.C. § 2678 limits attorneys’ fees to 25% “of any judgment rendered pursuant to section 1346(b) of this title or any settlement made pursuant to section 2677 of this title” and to 20% “of any award, compromise, or settlement made pursuant to section 2672 of this title.” As with prior limitations on attorneys’ fees, “[t]he purpose [of § 2678] . . . was to meet a congressional concern about enormous fees at the expense of plaintiffs.” *Duncan v. U.S. Dep’t of Army*, 887 F.2d 1078 (4th Cir. 1989) (unpublished); *cf. Joe v. United States*, 772 F.2d 1535, 1536–37 (11th Cir. 1985) (describing 1966 amendment to FTCA to increase maximum attorneys’ fees from 20% to 25% to “assure competent representation and reasonable compensation”).

Despite these longstanding limits on attorneys’ fees, the United States believes that some plaintiffs’ firms are demanding contingent fees “in excess of 40% or 50%” of any recovery—potentially more than double what § 2678 allows. *See, e.g.,* Ex. A, Kaustuv Basu, *Camp Lejeune Legal Fees Under Fire as Veterans’ Claims Spike*, Bloomberg Law (Dec. 29, 2022), available at <https://perma.cc/6PW3-ZQU5>. The Common Benefit Order contemplates reserving 3% of any settlement or judgment—a “Holdback”—to compensate plaintiffs’ attorneys performing common benefit work. D.E. 31-1 at 25. The Common Benefit Order further contemplates the Holdback applying to an amount “governed by the retention agreement between each attorney and his or her clients.” *Id.* The Court should clarify that any Holdback for common benefit fees must be from

Compensation Fund (“9/11 VCF”) both limit attorneys’ fees to no more than 10%. RECA, § 9(b)(2), 42 U.S.C. § 2210 note, Pub. L. No. 101-426 (Oct. 15, 1990); 9/11 VCF, § 406(e), 49 U.S.C. § 40101 note. Certain RECA claims are subject to a lesser 2% cap on attorneys’ fees. RECA, § 9(b)(1). Attorneys’ fees for veterans’ benefits claims are not capped per se, but “[f]ees which do not exceed 20 percent of any past-due benefits awarded . . . shall be presumed to be reasonable,” and “[f]ees which exceed 33 1/3 percent of any past due benefit awarded shall be presumed to be unreasonable.” 38 C.F.R. § 14.636(f).

that percentage that Congress allows to go toward attorneys' fees, irrespective of retention agreements that seek recoveries greater than what § 2678 allows.

Section 2678's application may also affect the appropriateness of the 3% holdback rate. For example, if the Court orders a holdback rate of 3% (as proposed), then no more than 22% of a settlement or judgment in this litigation may be collected by the individual plaintiff's attorney, in addition to what is reimbursed through the common benefit fund. This Holdback affects the fees that individual attorneys may recover under § 2678, creating a three-way balancing act between Plaintiffs, individual attorneys, and common benefit attorneys. A greater holdback rate may further limit recoveries by individual attorneys, whereas a lesser holdback rate may limit recoveries for common benefit work. Thus, the Court should take § 2678 into account in balancing the interests of attorneys performing common benefit work with the interests of an individual plaintiff's retained counsel.

At this time, the United States' only asserts an interest in applying § 2678 to all CLJA claims and actions. The United States takes no position on whether and to what extent the Holdback should apply to settlement of administrative claims by "Participating Counsel," except that § 2678 limits attorneys' fees in such cases to 20%. The United States takes no position on how best to balance the expected contributions of attorneys performing common benefit work with the efforts of attorneys not in that group, the appropriate withholding rate for the Holdback Fund, the procedures for requesting reimbursement for common benefit time or expenses, or what work may be compensable under the common benefit doctrine. Further, although the Holdback plus any fees paid from *a settlement or judgment* in this litigation cannot exceed 25%, 28 U.S.C. § 2678 does not limit the amount an attorney may recover *from the Holdback Fund* itself. Thus, so long as the relevant fee cap of 20% or 25% is followed with respect to each individual settlement or

judgment, an attorney who performs common benefit work may recover fees under the Common Benefit Order regardless of how those fees relate to the award in any individual case, without running afoul of § 2678. And, the United States agrees that the Holdback should not apply to “offsets,” because such offsets will be applied *before* § 2678’s cap on attorneys’ fees.

DISCUSSION

For almost 80 years, tort claims against the United States have proceeded exclusively under the Federal Tort Claims Act (“FTCA”). FTCA actions have always been subject to a limitation on attorneys’ fees as a percentage of the ultimate recovery. Today, that limitation is codified at 28 U.S.C. § 2678, which provides that attorneys may not charge or receive more than 20% of “any award, compromise, or settlement made” in the administrative process or more than 25% of “any judgment rendered” or “any settlement made” in litigation. Those limits help to ensure that funds disbursed from the public fisc are being used to compensate the affected individuals on whose behalf their attorneys are acting. *See Duncan*, 887 F.2d 1078 (unpublished).

In enacting the Camp Lejeune Justice Act (“CLJA”), Congress did not completely upend this calibrated approach that has governed tort litigation against the United States for decades. Rather, Congress primarily sought to abrogate certain threshold defenses that would otherwise be available under the FTCA and that had previously barred tort claims relating to Camp Lejeune water. Because no provision of the CLJA addresses attorneys’ fees, or otherwise displaces the fee cap provision in the FTCA, the fee limits apply in CLJA actions.

I. The Text, Structure, and Legislative History of the CLJA Demonstrate that CLJA Actions Are Subject to the Fee Limitations in 28 U.S.C. § 2678.

A. Except where it has been specifically displaced by the CLJA, the FTCA applies in CLJA actions.

In 1946, Congress enacted the FTCA, which “waived the sovereign immunity of the United States for certain torts committed by federal employees’ acting within the scope of their

employment.” *Brownback v. King*, 141 S. Ct. 740, 746 (2021) (quoting *F.D.I.C. v. Meyer*, 510 U.S. 471, 475–76 (1994)). Relying on this waiver, Congress enacted the CLJA in 2022 to permit individuals to bring specified tort claims against the United States. In so doing, Congress intended to adopt the conditions of the FTCA’s waiver, including the fee caps provided in § 2678, that were not abrogated by the CLJA. *See Lehman*, 453 U.S. at 161 (“[T]his Court has long decided that limitations and conditions upon which the Government consents to be sued must be strictly observed and exceptions thereto are not to be implied.”) (internal quotations and citations omitted). The adoption of these conditions is apparent from the CLJA’s text, structure, and legislative history.

1. The CLJA’s text looks to the FTCA to fill gaps.

The CLJA specifically references and incorporates the FTCA’s administrative exhaustion requirement, 28 U.S.C. § 2675, as a prerequisite to suit against the United States. *See* CLJA § 804(h). This Court has recognized as much. *See Pugh v. United States*, No. 22-cv-124, 2023 WL 1081262 (E.D.N.C. Jan. 27, 2023) (Boyle, J.); *Girard v. United States*, No. 22-cv-022, 2023 WL 115815 (E.D.N.C. Jan. 5, 2023) (Flanagan, J.); *Wilson v. United States*, No. 22-cv-316 (E.D.N.C. Jan. 3, 2023) (Myers, J.); *Fancher v. United States*, 646 F. Supp. 3d 694 (E.D.N.C. 2022) (Dever, J.). Congress cannot be reasonably understood to have expressly required administrative *disposition* and *exhaustion* under § 2675, without also authorizing administrative *settlement* under § 2672. Otherwise, if § 2672 did not apply, the Department of the Navy would lack any statutory authority to *resolve* claims presented under § 2675 in any manner besides denying them. Thus, administrative claims presented to the agency are settled under § 2672,² and

² Other protections found in § 2672 are not addressed by the CLJA, indicating that Congress intended § 2672 to apply. For example, § 2672 provides for the release of claims against the

are therefore subject to the 20% fee cap under the express terms of § 2678. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2678 (prohibiting fees “in excess of 20 per centum of any award, compromise, or settlement made pursuant to section 2672”).

Litigation settlements and judgments are similarly subject to the fee cap in § 2678. As noted, Congress intended that claimants would submit claims to the Navy for consideration before filing actions under the CLJA in federal court, and settlement of those administrative claims is covered by §§ 2672 and 2678 for the reasons explained above. It would be passing strange to conclude that § 2678’s limitations apply only during the administrative phase but not once the claims reach litigation. That conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the language in § 2675—the administrative exhaustion requirements expressly referenced in the CLJA—closely mirrors the language in § 1346(b)(1)—the waiver of the United States’ immunity to civil actions in federal district court for tort claims. The 25% fee cap in § 2678 applies to cases that are tried to judgment under § 1346(b)(1) or settled under § 2677. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2678 (prohibiting “fees in excess of 25 per centum of any judgment rendered pursuant to section 1346(b) of this title or any settlement made pursuant to section 2677 of this title”).

The targeted nature of the CLJA’s provisions further indicates that Congress intended to override some but not all of the FTCA’s provisions. Notably, the CLJA expressly eliminates legal defenses that prevented Plaintiffs from moving forward in prior FTCA litigation. *First*, the CLJA prohibits the assertion of the North Carolina’s ten-year statute of repose, which bars injury claims more than ten years after the act or omission giving rise to the action and which otherwise would

United States “and against the employee of the government whose act or omission gave rise to the claim,” directs that settlements greater than \$2,500 shall be paid “in a manner similar to judgments and compromises in like causes and appropriations,” and requires “prior written approval of the Attorney General or his designee” before an agency effects settlements greater than \$25,000.

apply under the FTCA. CLJA § 804(j)(3). **Second**, the CLJA specifically prohibits the assertion of the FTCA’s discretionary function exception in 28 U.S.C. § 2680(a), which bars tort claims challenging discretionary, policy-based conduct, CLJA § 804(f). **Third**, the CLJA prohibits the assertion of the *Feres* doctrine, *Feres v. United States*, 340 U.S. 135 (1950), which bars FTCA claims incident to military service, because the CLJA expressly allows “[a] individual, including a veteran” to bring suit. CLJA § 804(b). These three statutory provisions correlate directly to the three threshold grounds on which courts had previously rejected similar FTCA claims. *See, e.g., Clendenning v. United States*, 19 F.4th 421 (4th Cir. 2021) (*Feres* doctrine and discretionary function exception); *In re Camp Lejeune, N.C. Water Contamination Litig.*, 774 F. App’x 564, 566 (11th Cir. 2019) (North Carolina statute of repose).

At the same time, the CLJA shows that other FTCA provisions will continue to apply. The CLJA states that “[t]he United States may not assert any claim to immunity in an action under this section that *would otherwise be available* under section 2680(a) of title 28, United States Code.” CLJA § 804(f) (emphasis added). It would have been odd for Congress to say that the FTCA’s discretionary function exception “would otherwise be available” in CLJA actions if the CLJA’s provisions were exclusive and the FTCA had no application whatsoever. By using this phrasing, the CLJA acknowledges that FTCA provisions apply to the extent they are not specifically foreclosed. In addition, it would have been unnecessary for the CLJA to override the FTCA’s discretionary function exception if the FTCA’s provisions did not apply to CLJA cases as a general matter.

2. The CLJA is unlike other statutes that operate independently of the FTCA.

If Congress intended CLJA actions to fall outside § 1346(b)(1)’s waiver, “it knew how to say so.” *Rubin v. Islamic Republic of Iran*, 138 S. Ct. 816, 826 (2018). Congress has been explicit that certain categories of tort claims are to be considered separately from the waiver of sovereign

immunity in § 1346(b). For example, in 28 U.S.C. § 2680(d), Congress provided that § 1346(b) “shall not apply” to “any claim for which a remedy is provided by Chapter 309 or 311 of title 46 relating to claims or suits in admiralty against the United States.” And in 28 U.S.C. § 2680(l), Congress provided that § 1346(b) “shall not apply” to claims asserted against the Tennessee Valley Authority, a sue-and-be-sued agency, *see* 16 U.S.C. § 831c(b). Congress did not, however, use similar exclusionary language in the CLJA. Congress’s desire that FTCA provisions generally govern CLJA claims is reinforced by the CLJA’s codification in Chapter 171 of the United States Code—the very Chapter that § 1346(b)(1) specifically references. *See* 28 U.S.C. Chapter 171, Tort Claims Procedure (Statutory Notes).

It is particularly unlikely that Congress intended to divorce the CLJA’s limited provisions from the more comprehensive FTCA regime that Congress has retained since 1946. The CLJA leaves many critical topics unaddressed that the FTCA expounds upon in detail, including adjustment or compromise for administrative claims (§ 2672) or for cases in litigation (§ 2677). And the CLJA lacks specificity when compared to other statutes that clearly provide for monetary damages against the United States. *See, e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. § 1491(a)(1) (allowing recovery of “liquidated or unliquidated damages” in certain cases “against the United States”); *id.* § 1498(a) (allowing recovery of “reasonable and entire compensation” in patent-infringement “action[s] against the United States”); 11 U.S.C. § 106(a)(3) (“The court may issue against a governmental unit . . . an order or judgment awarding a money recovery”); 5 U.S.C. § 552a(g)(4) (providing that “the United States shall be liable” for “actual damages” for certain Privacy Act violations). These contrasts underscore that the CLJA did not need to effect a waiver of sovereign immunity itself, or set out the complete set of restrictions on the cause of action, because the CLJA

incorporates the requisite provisions from the FTCA to the extent that they are not specifically displaced.

3. Congress has described the CLJA as a type of FTCA claim.

Throughout the drafting process, the CLJA was understood as creating a type of FTCA claim. For example, multiple Representatives who helped introduce the CLJA bill in the House expressly described the CLJA as allowing plaintiffs “to file under the Federal Tort Claims Act.”

The Representatives that introduced the CLJA explained that:

The *Camp Lejeune Justice Act* allows a member of the U.S. Armed Forces, and/or their family members, that were injured or died as a result of the contaminated water at Camp Lejeune to file *under the Federal Tort Claims Act* for fair compensation. This type of claim would already be permitted anywhere else in the United States, but because of a unique provision in North Carolina law, this legislation is necessary for those harmed at Camp Lejeune finally to seek justice.

See, e.g., Ex. B, Press Release: Cartwright, Murphy, Price Introduce Camp Lejeune Justice Act (March 26, 2021), *available at* <https://perma.cc/HT68-4VZB>); Ex. C, Press Release: Rep. Cartwright Announces House Passage of Camp Lejeune Justice Act, included in the Honoring Our PACT Act (Mar. 4, 2022), *available at* <https://perma.cc/5YCC-C2U2> (same).³

Likewise, when the CLJA was introduced in the Senate, the Senators who introduced the legislation explained that the bill was only intended to remove certain legal defenses that were available under the FTCA in prior litigation:

The legislation proposes to correct unfair legal barriers unique to Marine families stationed at Camp Lejeune due to an anomaly in the application of North Carolina law in the federal court system by establishing a new federal cause of action for individuals exposed to

³ Representative Cartwright takes credit for writing the legislation. *See* 168 Cong. Rec. H1193 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2022) (statement of Rep. Cartwright) (“I could not be prouder that the Honoring our PACT Act includes my bill, the Camp Lejeune Justice Act, and let me tell you why I wrote this bill.”).

[Camp Lejeune contaminated water]. This enables individuals affected by toxic exposure at Camp Lejeune to bring suit before the district court for the Eastern District of North Carolina to present evidence for injuries caused by exposure to [Camp Lejeune contaminated water].

See Ex. D, Press Release: Tillis, Blumenthal, Burr, and Peters Introduce the Camp Lejeune Justice Act to Ensure Legal Rights for Water Contamination Victims (Nov. 4, 2021), *available at* <https://perma.cc/LHF6-QX8G>. Other public statements from members of Congress are to the same effect.⁴

That several members of Congress have proposed amendments to the CLJA to establish attorney fee caps that differ from § 2678 does not change the analysis. Compare Protect Camp Lejeune Victims Ensnared by Trial-lawyers’ Scams Act, S. 5130, 117th Cong. (2022) (proposing

⁴ See, e.g., 168 Cong. Rec. H1192 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2022) (statement of Rep. Price) (stating that “[t]he Camp Lejeune Justice Act will correct an anomaly in North Carolina law by providing a legal pathway for affected veterans and their families to pursue fair compensation”); 168 Cong. Rec. H1190 (daily ed. Mar. 1, 2022) (statement of Rep. Ross) (“For years, North Carolina law prevented these individuals from seeking relief in court. The Camp Lejeune Justice Act rights this wrong, bringing long overdue justice to affected veterans.”); 168 Cong. Rec. E215 (daily ed. Mar. 3, 2022) (statement of Rep. Eshoo) (“[T]hey’ve been denied compensation because of an anomaly in North Carolina state law. I’ve consistently advocated for remedying this injustice, and I’m pleased that the Honoring Our PACT Act does so by establishing a federal cause of action related to contaminated water at Camp Lejeune.”); Ex. E, Press Release: Senate Passes Bipartisan Bill to Help Veterans Exposed to Toxic Substances, Including Ross-Supported Camp Lejeune Justice Act (Jun. 16, 2022), *available at* <https://perma.cc/L768-SPVG> (press release from Rep. Deborah Ross) (“The legislation includes the *Camp Lejeune Justice Act*, bipartisan legislation supported by Congresswoman Deborah Ross (NC-02) that gives affected veterans the opportunity to seek compensation for exposure to contaminated water at Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base in North Carolina...North Carolina law has prevented them from seeking relief in court. The *Honoring Our PACT Act* corrects this injustice.”); Ex. F, Press Release: Camp Lejeune Justice Act Headed to President’s Desk (Aug. 3, 2022), *available at* <https://perma.cc/QDZ9-Z6DV> (press release from Rep. Murphy) (“Our bipartisan bill, the *Camp Lejeune Justice Act* eliminates burdensome red tape to ensure that those exposed to toxic chemicals, including servicemembers, Marine dependents, civil servants, and contractors, can receive their day in court.”).

2% and 10% fee caps), *with* Protect Access to Justice for Veterans Act, H.R. 1204, 117th Cong. (2022) (proposing 20% and 33.3% fee caps). The question before the Court is whether § 2678’s fee caps apply in the absence of a contrary indication in the CLJA as enacted.⁵ Congress is of course free to modify the caps if it determines that different caps are appropriate for this particular litigation. But the relevant point here is that, although Congress abrogated other features of the FTCA for CLJA actions, Congress *has not* abrogated § 2678’s fee caps.

B. No other provision of the CLJA renders the fee caps in § 2678 inapplicable.

That the CLJA describes an “action . . . to obtain appropriate relief for harm that was caused by exposure to the water at Camp Lejeune,” CLJA § 804(b), and specifies burden of proof and standards for causation, CLJA § 804(c), does not affect the CLJA’s adoption of the FTCA’s waiver of sovereign immunity in § 1346(b)(1). *See Meyer*, 510 U.S. at 484 (characterizing a waiver of sovereign immunity as “analytically distinct” from the existence of a cause of action); *Fancher*, 646 F. Supp. 3d at 703 (“The FTCA does not itself provide for a substantive cause of action.”) (quoting *Unus v. Kane*, 565 F.3d 103, 107 (4th Cir. 1992)). Rather than create a remedy entirely separate from the FTCA, Congress identified a certain subset of tort claims—namely, those involving “harm that was caused by exposure to the water at Camp Lejeune”—that should be adjudicated differently than other FTCA claims in certain ways. As described above, the CLJA

⁵ An early version of the CLJA stated that attorneys’ fees be “in accordance with section 2678 of title 28, United States Code.” Camp Lejeune Justice Act of 2021, H.R. 2192, 117th Cong. § 2(h) (2021). It is unclear whether Congress chose to omit this provision from future bills because it was surplusage or for some other reason, such as ongoing debate about setting a different fee cap. In any event, Congress chose *not* to expressly abrogate § 2675 in the same way that it abrogated § 2680(a) or statutes of repose applicable under state law.

was enacted as a direct response to the litigation of these claims under the FTCA, and the CLJA expressly depends on the FTCA.⁶ *See* CLJA § 804(f).

The CLJA’s venue and remedial provisions similarly do not undermine the relevance of the FTCA or otherwise displace its fee cap provision. Congress’s decision to have all CLJA actions litigated in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, CLJA § 804(d), does not change the nature of the underlying action. *Cf. Blatchford v. Native Village of Noatak and Circle Village*, 501 U.S. 775, 787 n.4 (1991) (explaining that a given court’s jurisdiction to hear a claim and the waiver of sovereign immunity for that claim “are wholly distinct”). Nor does the bar on bringing future “tort action[s] against the United States for such harm pursuant to any other law,” CLJA § 804(e)(1), speak to the attorneys’ fees issue or affect the interaction of the CLJA and the FTCA. Although a CLJA action precludes *future* tort actions for the same harm, the initial CLJA action is not excepted from the FTCA. *See* Part I.A.2., *supra* (describing other causes of action expressly excepted from the FTCA); 28 U.S.C. § 2680 (describing “exceptions” to the FTCA). The CLJA, as a whole, operates in conjunction with the FTCA, including provisions like the fee caps in § 2678 that have not been overridden.

Although the CLJA replicates the FTCA’s bar on punitive damages, that provision is not mere surplusage. *See* CLJA, § 804(g); 28 U.S.C. § 2674. The CLJA permits claims for “appropriate relief for harm,” but does not clearly define that term. CLJA, § 804(b). Thus, the

⁶ The CLJA also indicates that it “shall apply only to a claim accruing before the date of enactment of this Act.” CLJA § 804(j)(1). As Plaintiffs’ Lead Counsel acknowledged in litigating the administrative exhaustion issue, this subsection supports that the CLJA did not create a new freestanding claim but rather a new way to vindicate preexisting claims. *See, e.g., Benson v. United States*, No. 7:22-cv-00140-BO-KS, Dkt. 19 at p. 3 (“[T]he CLJA applies ‘only to a claim accruing before the date of the enactment of the [Honoring our PACT] Act,’ and thus does not create any new claims—only a new statutory cause of action to vindicate preexisting claims. CLJA § 804(j)(1).”).

CLJA's bar on punitive damages forecloses any argument that "appropriate relief" abrogated § 2674 or that punitive damages might be "appropriate."

In short, the CLJA provides a cause of action that is asserted against the United States under § 1346(b)'s waiver. Congress "legislate[s] with knowledge of former related statutes and will expressly designate the provisions whose application it wishes to suspend, rather than leave that consequence to the uncertainties of implication compounded by the vagaries of judicial construction." *United States v. Mitchell*, 39 F.3d 465, 472 (4th Cir. 1994) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Here, the CLJA was enacted against the backdrop of the FTCA. Congress "expressly designate[d] the provisions whose application it wishe[d] to suspend," *Mitchell*, 39 F.3d at 472, such as the FTCA's discretionary function exception. *See* CLJA § 804(f) (abrogating 28 U.S.C. § 2680(a)). But Congress did not suspend § 2678. Except where abrogated, the FTCA's carefully formulated substance and procedures, including its caps on attorneys' fees, are applicable.

Applied here, § 2678's protections for *Plaintiffs* also potentially affects the allocation of fees between common benefit and individual *attorneys*. If, for example, the Court approves the requested Holdback of 3%, then an individual plaintiff's retained counsel may be limited to recovering 22% of a settlement or judgment as a contingent fee—rather than the greater contingent fees the individual attorney might otherwise seek through a retention agreement if § 2678's protections did not apply. If the Court approves a greater Holdback, then the individual attorney's recovery may be further limited. If the Court approves a lesser Holdback, then there may be fewer incentives for common benefit work. Again, the United States takes no position on what an appropriate Holdback would be. The United States seeks only to advise the Court of § 2678's potential effect on the proposed Common Benefit Order, including the Holdback.

CONCLUSION

The Department of Justice estimates that the total amount demanded for the approximately 117,000 administrative claims currently filed with the Department of Navy is nearly **\$3.3 trillion**. Settlements and judgments for CLJA claims and actions will be paid through the Judgment Fund. Even if the Judgment Fund pays only 1% of that amount—\$33 billion—a 40% recovery for plaintiffs’ attorneys would total \$13.2 billion (and a 3% Holdback would total nearly \$1 billion). Section 2678 ensures that a greater portion of that money makes its way to the individual plaintiffs, in the same manner that Congress has directed for other tort claims against the United States. The Court’s Common Benefit Order should balance the contributions of both common benefit work and non-common benefit work in light of the ultimate 25% fee cap on recoveries.

Respectfully submitted on October 27, 2023.

BRIAN BOYNTON
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Civil Division

J. PATRICK GLYNN
Director, Torts Branch
Environmental Torts Litigation Section

BRIDGET BAILEY LIPSCOMB
Assistant Director, Torts Branch
Environmental Torts Litigation Section

ADAM BAIN
Senior Trial Counsel, Torts Branch
Environmental Torts Litigation Section

HAROON ANWAR
Trial Attorney
Environmental Torts Litigation Section

/s/ Nathan Bu

NATHAN BU

Trial Attorney, Torts Branch
Environmental Torts Litigation Section
U.S. Department of Justice
P. O. Box 340, Ben Franklin Station
Washington, D.C. 20044
E-mail: nathan.j.bu@usdoj.gov
Telephone: (202) 705-5938
Fax: (202) 616-4989

Attorney inquiries to DOJ regarding the
Camp Lejeune Justice Act:
(202) 353-4426

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on October 27, 2023, a copy of the foregoing document was filed via the Court's ECF system and served on counsel of record through the ECF system.

/s/ Nathan Bu
NATHAN BU

Exhibit A

Kaustuv Basu, *Camp Lejeune Legal Fees Under Fire as Veterans' Claims Spike*,
Bloomberg Law (Dec. 29, 2022)

Camp Lejeune Legal Fees Under Fire as Veterans' Claims Spike

By Kaustuv Basu

- CBO projects \$6.1 billion payout
- Sen. Sullivan seeks caps of 2-10%

Republican lawmakers in the next Congress plan to ramp up efforts to cap the attorney fees for claims filed over toxic water exposure at Camp Lejeune, which are likely to involve hundreds of thousands of veterans and their families.

Sen. Dan Sullivan (R-Alaska) tried unsuccessfully this month to add to the year-end omnibus package the measure (S.5130) he introduced in November that would limit attorney fees in such claims to 10% or less of the payout. He and other supporters are expected to push the proposal again when the new Congress takes office in January, an aide said.

"US Marines and their families are being preyed upon by unscrupulous trial lawyers," Sullivan said during a Senate floor debate last month.

The move to limit fees stems from what could be an unprecedented tide of claims from veterans and their relatives who served or lived on the North Carolina base and training ground for Marines. Under the Promise to Address Comprehensive Toxics Act signed by President Joe Biden in August, veterans can seek damages if they were exposed for at least 30 days to contaminated water at the camp between August 1953 and December 1987.

The Department of Veterans Affairs estimated in 2017 that about 1 million veterans were potentially affected by the tainted water. The Congressional Budget Office, an economic scorekeeper for Congress, estimates the claims will cost the government about \$6.1 billion over 10 years.

About 15,000 Camp Lejeune disability claims have been filed with the Department of the Navy since the law was enacted, a Navy spokesperson said this week. The government has six months from the date of filing to adjudicate each claim. After that, veterans unsatisfied with the outcome have the option to file a lawsuit in the Eastern District of North Carolina. All lawsuits must be filed by Aug. 10, 2024.

The law has unleashed a barrage of advertising as lawyers jockey for clients.

Firms spent more than \$100 million on local and national television advertising in search of Camp Lejeune clients from Jan. 1 through Dec. 15, said Matt Webb, senior vice president of legal reform policy at the US Chamber of Commerce.

"The law was changed to make it much easier for these cases to go forward," Webb said. "There's very little risk for the attorneys involved."

'In Excess of 40%'

Sullivan and others assert some attorneys are demanding excessively high percentages of any payouts they help obtain, even though the cases are easier than most to litigate because the law restricts the government from mounting a traditional defense in court.

"We've certainly heard reports of firms charging in excess of 40% or 50%," Lawrence Montreuil, the legislative director for the American Legion, told Bloomberg Law. Some plaintiffs' lawyers have also failed to tell veterans that their settlements could be smaller if they had already received benefits related to their health problems from the VA, or through Medicare and Medicaid, he said.

A Camp Lejeune veteran told Bloomberg Law that one Baltimore law firm said its fees would be 40% of his settlement or award. Lawyers would also charge him for paperwork, filing fees and travel expenses, said the veteran, who lived at the base for about seven years between 1978 and 1987 and spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was still hoping to find an attorney to represent him.

Sullivan's proposal calls for capping attorney fees at 10% in cases that had been filed before Congress passed the measure in August, and at 2% for claims filed since then.

Sen. Dick Durbin (D-Ill.), a former trial lawyer who heads the Senate Judiciary Committee, wants a higher limit. He noted that no competent attorney would take a case with a 2% cap on fees, as lawyers typically collect a third of any settlement amount.

Durbin said he will work with Sullivan on a compromise.

Protecting Veterans

The Marine Corps found in 1982 that drinking water from two of the eight water treatment plants at the base contained certain volatile organic compounds, meaning that exposure could potentially cause various kinds of cancer and cardiac defects. But the fight to get the government to acknowledge and address the impact on veterans took decades.

Advocacy groups are now trying to help claimants navigate the potentially murky legal waters.

Patrick Murray, the legislative director for the VFW, said some firms see the veterans as "cash cows" so the VFW has teamed with Bergmann & Moore LLC, a law firm in Rockville, Md. that specializes in veteran disability benefits, to help those filing Camp Lejeune claims. The VFW also recommends another Maryland firm, Baird Mandalas Brockstedt Federico & Cardea.

In a news release announcing the partnerships, the VFW urged its members “to avoid predatory law firms advertising endlessly on television and other media.”

The leader of the American Association for Justice, the primary lobby for trial lawyers, said his group had long supported veterans in their bid to get Congress to recognize and act on the tainted base water, and that Sullivan’s proposal to cap fees would undermine the intent of the law.

“The draconian caps he has proposed will eliminate the ability of lawyers to take on these cases, leaving veterans with no good options for legal help,” AAJ President Tad Thomas said in a statement.

To contact the reporter on this story: Kaustuv Basu in Washington at kbasu@bloombergtax.com

To contact the editors responsible for this story: Bernie Kohn at bkohn@bloomberglaw.com; John P. Martin at jmartin@bloombergindustry.com; Brian Flood at bflood@bloomberglaw.com

Related Stories	U.S. Marine's Widow Loses Appeal Of Camp Lejeune Death Suit	Veterans Affairs To Pay \$2.2B For Camp Lejeune Illnesses	Some Camp Lejeune Communities Exposed To Contaminants Longer Than Thought	Federal Court Denies Government Motion To Dismiss Camp Lejeune Exposure Lawsuit	Navy To Fund Study Of People Exposed To Toxic Chemicals At Camp Lejeune
	December 1, 2021, 3:36 PM UTC	Jan. 13, 2017, 5:31 PM UTC	Oct. 26, 2010, 4:00 AM UTC	Feb. 26, 2010, 5:00 AM UTC	Feb. 23, 2010, 5:00 AM UTC

© 2023 Bloomberg Industry Group, Inc. All Rights Reserved

Exhibit B

Press Release: Cartwright, Murphy, Price Introduce Camp Lejeune Justice Act
(March 26, 2021)

[Home](#) / [Media](#) / [Press Releases](#)

Cartwright, Murphy, Price Introduce Camp Lejeune Justice Act

MEDIA

[Media Contacts](#)

[Press Releases](#)

[Photos](#)

March 26, 2021 [Press Release](#)

Washington, D.C. – Today, U.S. Representatives Matt Cartwright (D-PA-08), Greg Murphy, M.D. (R-NC-03) and David Price (D-NC-04) introduced legislation to ensure servicemembers and their families can receive justice for their exposure to toxic chemicals in drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

Over a 30-year period spanning the 1950s through the 1980s, thousands of Marines, their families, civilian workers and personnel used government provided tap water that was contaminated with harmful chemicals, found at levels ranging from 240 to 3400 times the levels permitted by safety standards. These exposures likely increased the risk of cancers, such as renal cancer, multiple myeloma, leukemia and more. It also likely raised their risk of adverse birth outcomes, along with other negative health effects.

The *Camp Lejeune Justice Act* allows a member of the U.S. Armed Forces, and/or their family members, that were injured or died as a result of the contaminated water at Camp Lejeune to file under the *Federal Tort Claims Act* for fair compensation. This type of claim would already be permitted anywhere else in the United States, but because of a unique provision in North Carolina law, this legislation is necessary for those harmed at Camp Lejeune finally to seek justice.

"The servicemembers who signed up to defend their country and the people who supported them at Camp Lejeune were let down in a big way by their government," **said Rep. Cartwright.** "This tragedy was a major failure on the part of the Department of Defense, and all those who suffered for it deserve justice."

"Military service comes with incredible sacrifice and immense struggle. If government failure makes those struggles even worse, we owe it to our veterans to make sure they are taken care of," **said Rep. Murphy.** "When it comes to getting care to those affected by water contamination at Camp Lejeune, we have failed. That's why I'm joining Representatives Cartwright and Price to remove the legal hurdles currently preventing veterans from getting their day in court."

"The federal government has a responsibility to care for our veterans, servicemembers, and their families – but that's not what happened at Camp Lejeune when thousands were exposed to contaminated tap water for decades. They deserve justice – and their day in court," **said Rep. Price.** "That's why, I'm proud to join Congressman Cartwright and Murphy in this bipartisan effort to introduce the Camp Lejeune Justice Act which will offer opportunities for long overdue judicial relief for many who have been suffering."

Additional co-sponsors in the U.S. House are Reps. Alma Adams (D-NC-12), Ted Budd (R-NC-13), G.K. Butterfield (D-NC-01), Alcee Hastings (D-FL-20), Richard Hudson (R-NC-08), Ted Lieu (D-CA-33), Kathy Manning (D-NC-06), Patrick McHenry (R-NC-10), Del Eleanor Holmes Norton (D-DC), Jamie Raskin (D-MD-08), Deborah Ross (D-NC-02), and David Rouzer (R-NC-07).

Full text of the bill can be found [here](#).



407 Cannon House
Office Building
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-3415

Greenville, NC 27858
Phone: (252) 931-1003

Jacksonville, NC 28540
Phone: (910) 937-6929

Room 194
Manteo, NC 27954
Phone: (252) 230-3549

Phone: (252) 636-6612

Mailing address:
Congressman Greg
Murphy, MD
PO Box 1000
Manteo, NC 27954

Exhibit C

Press Release: Rep. Cartwright Announces House Passage of Camp Lejeune Justice Act, included in the Honoring Our PACT Act (Mar. 4, 2022)



REP. CARTWRIGHT ANNOUNCES HOUSE PASSAGE OF CAMP LEJEUNE JUSTICE ACT, INCLUDED IN THE HONORING OUR PACT ACT

Washington, D.C. , March 4, 2022

Tags: [Veterans Issues](#)

Today, U.S. Representatives Matt Cartwright (D-PA-08), Gregory Murphy, M.D. (R-NC-03) and David Price (D-NC-04) announced the House passage of legislation to ensure servicemembers and their families can receive justice for their exposure to toxic chemicals in drinking water at Camp Lejeune.

Over a 30-year period spanning the 1950s through the 1980s, thousands of Marines, their families, civilian workers and personnel used government provided tap water that was contaminated with harmful chemicals, found at levels ranging from 240 to 3400 times the levels permitted by safety standards. These exposures likely increased the risk of cancers, such as renal cancer, multiple myeloma, leukemia and more. It also likely raised their risk of adverse birth outcomes, along with other negative health effects.

The *Camp Lejeune Justice Act* provisions included in the *Honoring Our PACT Act* allow a member of the U.S. Armed Forces, and/or their family members, that were injured or died as a result of the contaminated water at Camp Lejeune to file under the *Federal Tort Claims Act* for fair compensation. This type of claim would already be permitted anywhere else in the United States, but because of a unique provision in North Carolina law, this legislation is necessary for those harmed at Camp Lejeune finally to seek justice.

“The servicemembers who signed up to defend their country and the people who supported them at Camp Lejeune were let down in a big way by their government. This tragedy was a major failure on the part of the Department of Defense, and all those who suffered for it deserve justice,” said **Rep. Cartwright**. “The *Camp Lejeune Justice Act*, included in the *Honoring Our PACT Act*, is an important step forward in achieving that goal.”

“I am so glad to see the *Camp Lejeune Justice Act* pass the House as part of the *PACT Act* today,” said **Rep. Murphy**. “This much-needed legislation eliminates red tape and gives our veterans, their dependents, contractors, and civil servants who were exposed to toxic chemicals in drinking water at Camp Lejeune their day in court. Over a million people who served at Camp Lejeune during that period drank contaminated water, and tragically, many have died or been seriously injured as a result. We owe it to these Marine families, civil servants, and contractors to seek justice and ensure they receive the benefits and health care they deserve. I am so grateful to my colleague Rep. Cartwright for his work on this essential bill, and look forward to bringing the *Camp Lejeune Justice Act* across the finish line.”

“For over three decades, thousands of service members and their families were exposed to contaminated tap water at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina, likely increasing their risk of developing cancers and adverse birth outcomes,” said **Rep. Price**. “The bipartisan *Camp Lejeune Justice Act*, included as part of today’s *Honoring Our PACT Act*, closes a legal loophole to give those impacted their day in court. I’m grateful for the tireless advocacy of affected Marines and their families, supportive allies, and congressional colleagues that

allowed for this culmination of long-deferred justice.”

H.R. 3967, *The Honoring Our PACT Act*, passed the House by a vote of 256-174 on Thursday, March 3, 2022.

Full text of the bill can be found [HERE](#).

Washington, DC Office

2102 Rayburn HOB
Washington, DC 20515
Phone: (202) 225-5546
Fax: (202) 226-0996
Hours: 9:00am - 5:00pm, M-F

Scranton District Office

226 Wyoming Ave
Scranton, PA 18503
Phone: (570) 341-1050
Fax: (570) 341-1055
Hours: 9:00am - 5:00pm, M-F

Wilkes-Barre Office

20 N. Pennsylvania Ave., Suite 213
Wilkes-Barre, PA 18711
Phone: (570) 371-0317
Fax: (570) 341-1055
Hours: 8:30am - 4:30pm, M-F

Hazleton Office

1 South Church Street, Suite 100
Hazleton, PA 18201
Phone: (570) 751-0050
Fax: (570) 341-1055
Hours: 9:00am - 5:00pm, M-F

Tannersville Office

2959 Route 611, Suite 105
Tannersville, PA 18372
Phone: (570) 355-1818
Fax: (570) 341-1055
Hours: 9:00am - 5:00pm, M-F

Hawley Office

8 Silk Mill Drive, Suite 213
Hawley, PA 18428
Phone: (570) 576-8005
Fax: (570) 341-1055
Appointments only.
Please contact the Tannersville office for
information, (570) 355-1818



[PRIVACY](#) [Accessibility](#) [Contact](#) [house.gov](#)



Exhibit D

Press Release: Tillis, Blumenthal, Burr, and Peters Introduce the Camp Lejeune Justice Act to Ensure Legal Rights for Water Contamination Victims (Nov. 4, 2021)



PRESS RELEASES

Home (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/home>) / News (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/news>)
/ Press Releases (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/press-releases>)

Nov 4 2021



Tillis, Blumenthal, Burr, and Peters Introduce the Camp Lejeune Justice Act to Ensure Legal Rights for Water Contamination Victims (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/2021/11/tillis-blumenthal-burr-and-peters-introduce-the-camp-lejeune-justice-act-to-ensure-legal-rights-for-water-contamination-victims>)

WASHINGTON, D.C. – Today, U.S Senators Thom Tillis (R-NC), Richard Blumenthal (D-CT), Richard Burr (R-NC), and Gary Peters (D-MI) introduced the Camp Lejeune Justice Act, bipartisan legislation that will provide veterans and their families who are suffering due to water contamination at Camp Lejeune, NC long-overdue judicial relief.

The legislation proposes to correct unfair legal barriers unique to Marine families stationed at Camp Lejeune due to an anomaly in the application of North Carolina law in the federal court system by establishing a new federal cause of action for individuals exposed to CLCW. This enables individuals affected by toxic exposure at Camp Lejeune to bring suit before the district court for the Eastern District of North Carolina to present evidence for injuries caused by exposure to CLCW.

Senator Tillis has been a leading advocate for servicemembers and veterans exposed to toxicants at Camp Lejeune since being sworn-in in 2015. In 2019, he co-introduced (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/2019/5/senators-continue-bipartisan-fight-for-victims-of-camp-lejeune-toxic-exposure>) The Janey Ensminger Act to ensure individuals with diseases scientifically linked to toxic chemical exposure at Camp Lejeune, North Carolina receive proper medical care from the VA.

“Currently, veterans and their families affected by water contamination issues at Camp Lejeune are running into roadblocks with the application of North Carolina law, keeping them from getting their day in court for often-crippling and deadly medical conditions they have suffered,” **said Senator Tillis, member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs and Judiciary Committees.** “Since coming to office, I have worked alongside veterans stationed at Camp Lejeune and exposed to toxicants for years to finally give them the health care and benefits they deserve. I am proud to introduce this legislation with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to bring justice for our veterans and their families and provide a fix so these victims have access to courts and the judicial system like they would in other states and territories.”

“This bill vindicates victims of Camp Lejeune’s contaminated water,” **said Senator Blumenthal, member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs and Judiciary Committees.** “Far too many veterans, their family members, and others have suffered from debilitating, deadly diseases resulting from their exposure on base. Granting victims their overdue day in court is a step toward justice and accountability.”

“For too long, veterans and their families have lived with devastating illnesses caused by exposure to toxic chemicals at Camp Lejeune,” **said Senator Burr, Ranking Member of the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee.** “Many of these illnesses take years to develop and current law prevents these veterans from taking legal action in North Carolina. This legislation does right by those who served by removing current legal barriers. I’m proud to work with my colleagues on this bipartisan, commonsense legislation and I urge the Senate’s swift passage.”

“It’s unacceptable that veterans and their families suffering from the harmful effects of water contamination and exposure to toxic substances are unable to receive due process,” **said Senator Peters, Chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.** “I’m proud to join this bipartisan bill that would eliminate legal barriers currently blocking these families at Camp Lejeune from accessing the justice system.”

Background:

Between 1953 and 1987, thousands of Marines, their families, civilian workers and personnel living or working at U.S. Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, North Carolina, were exposed to drinking water contaminated with industrial solvents, benzene, and other harmful chemicals. These chemicals were identified in water throughout the military installation at levels ranging from 240 to 3,400 times the levels permitted by safety standards. In 1997, the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) concluded that the water had been contaminated for nearly three decades. Tragically, Camp Lejeune Contaminated Water (CLCW) significantly increased the risk of cancers, adverse birth outcomes, and other negative health conditions among the individuals exposed to it.

Under federal court procedures, federal courts are guided, in many instances, by state laws. When there is confusion as to controlling law or a need for clarification of state law, federal procedure allows for a certification process between the federal system and the highest court within a state’s system to determine the controlling state law. In water contamination cases from Camp Lejeune, the state of North Carolina did not have this procedure. Therefore, federal courts have been required to apply the North Carolina legal anomaly and to accept a position asserted by federal lawyers -- even though under Senator Tillis’ leadership as Speaker of the House, North Carolina has since taken necessary corrective action to show that North Carolina law is contrary to what the federal attorneys asserted.

Read the bill **here** (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/services/files/2B672EE4-7CA6-477C-BDF5-DDA2E796F843>).

###

<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/2021/11/tillis-blumenthal-burr-and-peters-introduce-the-camp-lejeune-justice-act-to-ensure-legal-rights-for-water-contamination-victims> (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/2021/11/tillis-blumenthal-burr-and-peters-introduce-the-camp-lejeune-justice-act-to-ensure-legal-rights-for-water-contamination-victims>)

Home (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov>) | Contact (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/email-me>) | Privacy (<https://www.tillis.senate.gov/privacy-policy>)
f (<https://www.facebook.com/SenatorThomTillis>) **t** (<https://twitter.com/senthomtillis>) **@** (<https://instagram.com/senthomtillis/>)
▶ (<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCUD9VGV4SSGWjGdbn37Ea2w>)

PRESS RELEASES (/PRESS-RELEASES)

Senate Passes Bipartisan Bill to Help Veterans Exposed to Toxic Substances, Including Ross-Supported Camp Lejeune Justice Act (/press-releases?ID=0AA28EB5-A35D-4EDC-B275-95FB16A6E818)

June 16, 2022

Washington D.C.—Today, the U.S. Senate passed the bipartisan *Sergeant First Class Heath Robinson Honoring Our PACT Act* (<https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/3967>), which will enable veterans exposed to toxic substances to receive proper benefits and care. The legislation includes the *Camp Lejeune Justice Act*, bipartisan legislation supported by Congresswoman Deborah Ross (NC-02) that gives affected veterans the opportunity to seek compensation for exposure to contaminated water at Camp Lejeune Marine Corps Base in North Carolina. For decades, Marines and their families stationed at this base unknowingly consumed, bathed in, and used water containing harmful chemicals and industrial solvents. However, North Carolina law has

prevented them from seeking relief in court. The *Honoring Our PACT Act* corrects this injustice.

“North Carolina veterans put themselves in harm’s way to defend our nation, and we have a profound obligation to provide them with the resources they need to live healthy, fulfilling lives,” **said Congresswoman Ross**. “Too many servicemembers have been exposed to toxic substances while serving our country, only to return home without access to the care and benefits they deserve. I am especially grateful that this legislation will enable servicemembers from Camp Lejeune who were exposed to toxic chemicals at the base to finally pursue long-overdue justice in court. Our veterans and their families should not pay the price for congressional inaction. I’m glad we are setting our partisan differences aside to pass this urgently needed legislation, and I look forward to voting for it when comes back to the House.”

The *Honoring Our PACT Act*:

- provides access to VA health care to millions of veterans exposed to toxic substances;
- requires the VA to presume vets exposed rather than forcing vets to prove their exposure; and
- makes key improvements to streamline the VA's review processes for veterans to receive care for toxic exposure-related illnesses.

In March, a version of this bill passed the House, which included Congresswoman Ross’ amendment to support veterans exposed to PFAS. Now that the Senate-version of the legislation has passed, it is expected to come back to the House. Congresswoman Ross spoke in support of the legislation on the **House floor** (<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6YOAeBNtGT4>).

###

Permalink: <https://ross.house.gov/2022/6/senate-passes-bipartisan-bill-help-veterans-exposed-toxic-substances-including>

(<https://ross.house.gov/2022/6/senate-passes-bipartisan-bill-help-veterans->

[Case 7:23-cv-00897-RJ Document 34-5 Filed 10/27/23 Page 2 of 3](#)

exposed-toxic-substances-including)

Exhibit F

Press Release: Camp Lejeune Justice Act Headed to President's Desk (Aug. 3, 2022)

[Home](#) / [Media](#) / [Press Releases](#)

Camp Lejeune Justice Act Headed to President's Desk

MEDIA

[Media Contacts](#)[Press Releases](#)[Photos](#)August 3, 2022 [Press Release](#)

Washington, D.C. – Today, Reps. Greg Murphy (NC-03), Matt Cartwright (PA-08), and David Price (NC-04) applauded the Senate passage of their bipartisan legislation, the Camp Lejeune Justice Act which will now head to the president's desk as part of the Honoring our PACT Act. The [Camp Lejeune Justice Act](#), which will soon become law, will provide long-overdue judicial relief to victims of water contamination at Camp Lejeune.

"When we send our men and women overseas, we make a promise to care for them when they come home" **said Rep. Greg Murphy** (NC-03). "We failed our veterans when they were exposed to toxic drinking water at Camp Lejeune, and it is up to us to make it right. Our bipartisan bill, the *Camp Lejeune Justice Act* eliminates burdensome red tape to ensure that those exposed to toxic chemicals, including servicemembers, Marine dependents, civil servants, and contractors, can receive their day in court. As the proud representative of more than 89,000 veterans, I am honored to lead the effort to make sure our Camp Lejeune community gets the long-overdue care and benefits they've earned. I am relieved to see so much bipartisan support for the Camp Lejeune Justice Act today, and I look forward to having our bill finally become law for families in Eastern North Carolina."

"After years of commitment to this issue, I am grateful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle agreed to pass this crucial legislation so that poisoned Camp Lejeune veterans can finally seek justice," **said Rep. Matt Cartwright** (PA-08). "The servicemembers who signed up to defend their country and the people who supported them at Camp Lejeune were let down by their government. Having H.R. 6482, the *Camp Lejeune Justice Act*, included in the *Honoring Our PACT Act*, is an important step forward to ensure military families, civil servants and contractors can receive the benefits and health care they deserve. As the author of *The Camp Lejeune Justice Act*, I will continue to advocate on behalf of all military members and their families."

"The federal government has a responsibility to care for our veterans, service members, and their families – but that's not what happened at Camp Lejeune when thousands were exposed to contaminated tap water for decades. Those affected have suffered for far too long, and they deserve justice--including their day in court," **said Rep. David Price** (NC-04). "I am grateful for the tireless advocacy of Marines and their families, supportive allies, and congressional colleagues that has encouraged us to persevere in getting this deferral of justice corrected. I am proud to see our bill head to the President's desk as a prominent part of Honoring our PACT, a historic package which honors our commitment to those who have served our country."

###

Issues: [Veterans](#)

Washington, D.C. Office

407 Cannon House
Office Building

Greenville Office

1105 Corporate Drive
Suite C

Greenville, NC 27858

Jacksonville Office

815 New Bridge Street
PO Box 1487

Jacksonville, NC 28540

Manteo Office

954 Marshall C. Collins
Dr

Room 194

New Bern Office

2402 Dr. M.L.K. Jr. Blvd.
New Bern, NC 28562

Phone: (252) 636-6612



Murphy, MD
PO Box 1000
Manteo, NC 27954