

Valeant Pharmaceuticals: pricing, Philidor, and the disclosure of growth

Research checked: 9 September 2026. Publication date: 9 September 2026. New research edition.

1. Executive assessment and the continuing company

Valeant Pharmaceuticals International changed its name to Bausch Health Companies on July 13, 2018. This was a change of corporate name, not the disappearance of the legal entity or a sale of every business to an unrelated buyer. Its shares began trading under BHC on July 16.⁶ This report uses “Valeant” for the historical conduct and “Bausch Health” for the subsequent company where appropriate.

Three distinct issues define the historical case. A congressional investigation scrutinized large price increases for acquired medicines and their effects on patients and hospitals. The SEC later made settled findings concerning improper revenue recognition and misleading financial disclosures associated with Philidor and Glumetza. Separately, two individuals were criminally convicted in a scheme that defrauded Valeant itself.^{1,2,4,5} These issues intersect, but collapsing them into one undifferentiated “fraud scandal” would obscure who did what and which findings were actually made.

The company agreed in July 2020 to a \$45 million SEC civil penalty without admitting or denying the administrative findings. The order addressed accounting, reporting, internal controls, and misleading financial measures.¹ It did not constitute a criminal conviction of the entire company, nor did it establish that all medicines in the portfolio lacked clinical value. The congressional report has a different status: it is an investigative assessment informed by documents, interviews, and testimony, not a court judgment.

The strongest common theme is the difference between reported growth and its source. Acquisitions, price increases, inventory-related credits, and a subsidized pharmacy channel can all increase reported revenue without demonstrating the same underlying demand as broad, sustained growth in prescriptions. For investors and policymakers, identifying that source matters. For patients and hospitals, the way growth is achieved may also affect access and resource allocation.

The continuing company remained operational at the research check. Its July 29, 2026 release reported quarterly consolidated revenue of approximately \$2.85 billion and presented results for Salix, International, Solta Medical, Diversified, and Bausch + Lomb segments.⁸ That current disclosure is relevant to identity and scope, not evidence that all historical concerns have been resolved. A fair profile preserves both the established historical record and the fact that management, portfolio composition, financial structure, and reporting have changed over time.

2. Acquisition-led growth and the sequence of scrutiny

Valeant's strategy during the relevant period emphasized acquisitions. The SEC order explains that the company supplemented GAAP results with measures intended to describe growth in businesses owned for at least a year. Such measures were especially important in a business repeatedly adding new products and companies, because investors needed a way to distinguish acquired revenue from performance within the existing portfolio.¹

The Philidor relationship developed within that strategy. The SEC found that Valeant helped establish, finance, and subsidize the pharmacy channel, acquired a purchase option in December 2014, and did not adequately explain its significance and risks. Valeant ended the relationship in October 2015. In April 2016, it restated prior financial results, including a reduction of approximately \$58 million in 2014 revenue that had been recognized prematurely.¹

Pricing attracted parallel scrutiny. The Senate Special Committee on Aging investigated medicines including Nitropress and Isuprel, acquired from Marathon, as well as Cuprimine and Syprine. Its report examined the economics of older medicines with limited competition and the burdens created by sudden price increases.² That context is narrower and more useful than treating every Valeant product as having the same market conditions.

Date	Development	Type of record
December 2014	Philidor purchase option acquired	SEC factual findings
October 2015	Philidor relationship terminated	Corporate event described by SEC
April 2016	Restatement and congressional testimony	Accounting correction and testimony
July 2018	Name changed to Bausch Health	Corporate filing
October 2019	Tanner/Davenport appeal decided	Convictions affirmed; monetary orders partly remanded
July 2020	Company SEC settlement	Civil administrative resolution
July 2026	Current quarterly results released	Continuing-company disclosure

The sequence is supported by the company order, court opinion, name-change filing, and latest results.^{1,5,6,8} It avoids implying that the SEC settlement occurred at the height of the 2015 controversy; the resolution followed years later.

In April 2016 testimony, then-CEO J. Michael Pearson acknowledged that he and the company had pursued some price increases too aggressively and regretted transactions premised on planned increases. He also emphasized the breadth of Valeant's other businesses and described rebate and distribution initiatives.³ This is a meaningful statement of company leadership's position. It should be assessed alongside the Senate's evidence on whether discounts were reaching hospitals, rather than accepted as proof of implementation or dismissed without examination.

3. The SEC findings and the separate Philidor convictions

The SEC identified both recognition and disclosure problems. Sales to Philidor helped Valeant report strong growth, but collectability was not reasonably assured for certain transactions. Credit-limit increases were approved outside the company's procedures. The eventual restatement reduced 2014 revenue by approximately \$58 million and net income attributable to Valeant by approximately \$33 million. A substantial part of the earnings effect reversed in the following quarter.¹ Thus the issue included timing, rather than a finding that every dollar of the affected sales never existed.

A second mechanism involved Glumetza, acquired through Salix. The company received price-appreciation credits from wholesalers after a large price increase. According to the SEC, the \$110.4 million second-quarter credit was allocated as revenue to 106 other products rather than to Glumetza. This affected reported business-unit performance and measures of existing-business growth. The order says reported second-quarter 2015 same-store organic growth was 19%, versus 14% without the relevant allocation.¹

These details explain why an apparently technical accounting issue mattered. Moving revenue among products can change the story told about which businesses are growing. A reader might infer a broad improvement across existing franchises when a material portion instead arises from a pricing event involving a recent acquisition. Reconciliation to total revenue does not necessarily correct a misleading explanation of its source.

The company settled the SEC matter without admitting or denying the findings. The order also records cooperation, replacement of executive management, accounting-policy revisions, strengthened controls, and training.¹ Those are documented responses. They do not establish an independent conclusion about the effectiveness of every current control.

The Tanner/Davenport criminal case had different victims and elements. DOJ reported that former Valeant executive Gary Tanner and former Philidor CEO Andrew Davenport were convicted by a jury and sentenced in October 2018 to one year and one day each. The scheme involved Tanner serving Philidor and Davenport's interests while purporting to represent Valeant, with secret payments to Tanner.⁴ Valeant was the defrauded employer in that case. This does not cancel its own disclosure failures; it demonstrates why a company can occupy different legal roles in related events.

The October 2019 appellate opinion affirmed both convictions but vacated parts of the restitution and forfeiture orders. It required a sound method for determining actual loss and a combined forfeiture no greater than \$9,703,995.33.⁵ Repeating the original order as \$9.7 million from each defendant would miss the appeal. The report does not establish final post-remand restitution or present custody, and neither is inferred from the original sentencing announcement.

4. Pricing and access beyond a headline percentage

The Senate report offers evidence about the institutional consequences of price increases, not just their size. Hospitals described spending increases for Nitropress and Isuprel, changes to inventories and treatment protocols, and staff time spent finding alternatives. The report records Johns Hopkins' description of an approximately \$1 million 2015 impact from price increases for the two products. It also reports Cleveland Clinic spending of more than \$5 million for them in 2015, compared with less than \$2 million the previous year.²

These observations are attributed hospital experiences collected by a congressional investigation. They are not a randomized study or a nationwide estimate. The hospitals differed in volume, case mix, purchasing arrangements, and use of substitutes. It would therefore be inappropriate to multiply one system's spending increase by the number of hospitals to invent national harm.

The access mechanism is nevertheless concrete. Inpatient drug costs may be absorbed within a broader payment for care, so a sudden acquisition-cost increase can place pressure on an institution even when the patient does not receive a separate retail bill for the drug. The Senate report discusses these budget pressures and the resources required to revise protocols.² The effects can extend to staff time and other services, not only the immediate medicine purchase.

Pearson's testimony described volume-based rebates, while the committee reported that many hospitals and purchasing organizations had not received the discounts represented as available. It later described expanded contracts and the limited discounts for which many users would qualify.^{2,3} The difference between a program announcement and a verified discount received is an important evidentiary lesson. A claimed maximum rebate should not be applied to every purchase in an affordability analysis.

The following financial measures illustrate separate dimensions of the case:

Figure	What it measures	What it does not measure
Approximately \$58 million	Restated 2014 revenue	Total patient loss
\$110.4 million	Q2 2015 Glumetza credit allocation	A patient's prescription price
\$45 million	Company SEC civil penalty	All related settlements combined
19% versus 14%	SEC comparison of a growth measure	A current company growth rate

The table reports figures from the SEC order without creating a common denominator.¹ No aggregate “cost of misconduct” is calculated because these amounts overlap in purpose or represent fundamentally different concepts.

For current price comparisons, this report lacks a consistent product-level series distinguishing list, net, hospital acquisition, and patient out-of-pocket prices. Its conclusions therefore concern the documented historical increases and institutional burdens. It does not present the 2015-2016 experience as a September 2026 price quotation or advise substitution of a medicine in a particular clinical situation.

5. Resolutions and the current Bausch Health context

The 2020 company penalty was \$45 million. The SEC's related proceedings against the company and three individuals together imposed \$45.425 million in civil penalties. The SEC later consolidated the corresponding Fair Funds, appointed administrators, and approved a distribution plan in August 2024.⁷ A company-only number and a group total should not be added together; the company amount is part of the latter.

The Fair Fund is designed for investors harmed by the specified revenue-recognition and disclosure conduct. It is not a fund compensating every patient who bought a Valeant product. The reviewed SEC page establishes approval of the distribution plan, but this report has not independently checked a final payment ledger or determined whether a particular claimant received money.⁷ Distinguishing a remedy's intended recipients helps avoid overstating its reach.

The name-change filing provides unusually clear continuity evidence. It states that the corporate name changed and shareholders' rights were not affected by that change.⁶ “Bausch Health” is therefore the correct current corporate reference, while “Valeant” remains appropriate for the historical period. This report retains the historical title while explaining the continuing company’s current name.

The July 2026 earnings release shows the continuing scope of the enterprise and reports Bausch + Lomb within consolidated segment results, while also providing measures that exclude it. It discusses financial flexibility, refinancing, and evaluation of options for the value of the businesses.⁸ This supports a current operating-company profile. It does not establish that a proposed separation or sale has been completed, and the report does not assume such a transaction from discussion of strategic options.

Current financial results should also be read with definitions intact. The release distinguishes reported revenue growth, organic growth, GAAP income, and adjusted measures. Their presence is not itself evidence of the earlier misconduct recurring. Non-GAAP measures can offer useful context when transparently defined and reconciled. The historical lesson is to inspect their composition and presentation, not to regard every adjusted metric as inherently deceptive.

The record contains credible acknowledgment and remediation, but it is not an all-purpose compliance certificate. The report has not audited present pricing decisions, reconciled every outstanding lawsuit, or assessed the safety and efficacy of each current product. The defensible current statement is that a continuing company with a changed name and operating context carries an established historical record of disclosure findings and pricing scrutiny. Those facts can be presented together without treating either the rebranding or the past conduct as a complete account of the present enterprise.

6. Implications, method, and unresolved evidence

The central governance lesson is that the source of growth needs to remain visible. Acquisitions, sales through a closely supported intermediary, price increases, and credits on existing wholesaler inventory can have very different implications for sustainability and demand. When a company emphasizes growth in established businesses, allocations that move benefits from an acquired product into those businesses need careful scrutiny. That inference follows directly from the SEC's Glumetza findings.

The Philidor record also highlights the importance of economic relationships beyond formal ownership. A pharmacy can be significant because of financing, subsidies, purchase rights, concentration, and operational dependence even before a company legally acquires it. Disclosure analysis should therefore ask how the relationship works and what risks it creates, rather than relying on whether an entity is labeled independent.

For access policy, the Senate evidence demonstrates that abrupt price changes can burden institutions as well as retail consumers. A hospital may preserve treatment for a patient while absorbing a cost increase, revising protocols, or reallocating resources. Measuring access only by whether a prescription was dispensed would miss those effects. At the same time, evidence of pressure should not be converted into an unsupported count of injuries or hospital closures caused by one company.

The research used eight primary sources. The company SEC order supplied findings and settlement terms. The Senate's report and Pearson's testimony supplied investigative evidence and the company's contemporaneous position. DOJ and the appellate opinion established the separate individual case and its amended monetary posture. The name-change filing, SEC Fair Fund page, and July 2026 earnings release supplied identity and subsequent developments. For the appellate source, the court's opinion text hosted by Justia was read; the site's editorial summary was not treated as the primary evidence.

The review did not recreate the SEC's accounting analysis from transaction-level records, test clinical outcomes, or survey current prices. It also did not inspect every post-remand filing in the Tanner/Davenport case or every current Bausch Health legal proceeding. No claim of exhaustive legal clearance follows from those limits. Material changes in corporate structure, actual distribution status, and product-specific evidence about current affordability remain important subjects for further research.

The supported conclusion is precise: Valeant's record contains substantial pricing concerns documented by Congress, settled SEC findings that financial reporting obscured important sources of revenue, and separate convictions of individuals who defrauded the company. Explaining each on its own terms gives readers a stronger account than a single slogan. It connects the evidence to the practical issues - trustworthy reporting, accountable intermediaries, and medicine access - while preserving the distinctions needed for a fair current profile.

References

1. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. *In the Matter of Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc., n/k/a Bausch Health Companies Inc., Release No. 10809: Order Instituting Cease-and-Desist Proceedings, Making Findings, and Imposing a Cease-and-Desist Order*. 31 July 2020. [Open source](#)
2. U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging. *Sudden Price Spikes in Off-Patent Prescription Drugs: The Monopoly Business Model that Harms Patients, Taxpayers, and the U.S. Health Care System*. December 2016. [Open source](#)
3. J. Michael Pearson, testimony to the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging. *Statement of J. Michael Pearson, Chief Executive Officer, Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc.* 27 April 2016. [Open source](#)
4. U.S. Attorney's Office, Southern District of New York. *Former Valeant Executive And Former Philidor CEO Sentenced For Illegal Kickback Scheme*. 30 October 2018. [Open source](#)
5. U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. *United States v. Tanner, Nos. 18-3598, 18-3601, 19-294, opinion*. 31 October 2019. [Open source](#)
6. Bausch Health Companies Inc. *Form 8-K: change of corporate name effective July 13, 2018*. 16 July 2018. [Open source](#)
7. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. *In the Matters of Valeant Pharmaceuticals International, Inc. n/k/a Bausch Health Companies Inc., J. Michael Pearson, Howard B. Schiller, and Tanya R. Carro, CPA*. Checked 9 September 2026. [Open source](#)
8. Bausch Health Companies Inc. *Bausch Health Announces Second Quarter 2026 Results, Raises Guidance*. 29 July 2026. [Open source](#)