

Insys Therapeutics: Subsys marketing, criminal accountability, and the limits of financial recovery

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

1. Executive assessment: documented misconduct with distinct legal outcomes

Insys Therapeutics is a documented example of pharmaceutical marketing misconduct for which the public record includes corporate admissions, a subsidiary guilty plea, and individual jury convictions. The principal product was Subsys, a fentanyl sublingual spray approved in 2012 for a defined population of opioid-tolerant adult cancer patients with breakthrough pain. FDA required a risk-management program because misuse, addiction, overdose, and medication errors could create serious risks.¹ Approval of a medicine for that purpose did not authorize bribery or false insurance representations.

In June 2019 DOJ announced a \$225 million global criminal and civil resolution. Its components were a \$2 million criminal fine, \$28 million forfeiture, and \$195 million civil settlement. The parent entered a deferred prosecution arrangement, while operating subsidiary Insys Pharma subsequently pleaded guilty to five mail-fraud counts.^{2,6} These distinctions matter: the parent's deferred prosecution agreement and the subsidiary's guilty plea are different legal events, even though both relate to the same enterprise.

Separately, a federal jury convicted founder John Kapoor and four former executives of racketeering conspiracy in May 2019. In 2021 the First Circuit upheld the jury verdicts and criminal sentences, reinstated certain predicate findings, and required recalculation of specified restitution and forfeiture awards.^{3,4} The existence of a monetary remand does not erase the convictions. Equally, the original monetary awards should not be described as final without checking what happened after remand.

The most important public-interest issue is the interaction between clinical risk and commercial incentives. The evidence describes payments intended to induce prescriptions and an insurance-authorization operation that used false or misleading information to obtain coverage. More sales were not necessarily evidence that previously underserved patients were receiving appropriate care. For a powerful, narrowly indicated medicine, the validity of the prescription and supporting information is central to any access assessment.

The company entered a bankruptcy and liquidation process documented in its public filings.^{6,7} Accordingly, the report treats Insys as a historical operating enterprise and distinguishes estate administration from ongoing product manufacture. FDA later reported a manufacturers' decision to discontinue production of all medicines in the relevant TIRF class in September 2024; FDA expressly said it had not requested the discontinuation.⁸ That later market event must not be presented as a direct FDA punishment of Insys. This report provides no treatment substitutions or legal recovery advice.

2. Historical sequence: approval, commercialization, enforcement, and liquidation

FDA’s Subsys approval letter identified both the narrow benefit-risk setting and the need for safeguards. It required a medication guide, elements to assure safe use, implementation arrangements, and assessments under the shared transmucosal immediate-release fentanyl, or TIRF, REMS system.¹ This matters because the regulatory framework existed at the start of commercialization. The later case did not arise in a setting where the product’s risks or intended patient population were wholly unspecified.

The federal trial record describes commercial conduct during the early years of Subsys. DOJ’s conviction announcement identifies the conspiracy period as May 2012 through December 2015. Its corporate resolution describes sham speaker-program conduct from August 2012 through June 2015.^{2,3} These periods overlap, but they are not interchangeable: the releases concern different proceedings and legal descriptions of conduct. Reporting one period as the definitive scope of all wrongdoing would flatten that distinction.

Date	Event	What it establishes
2012	FDA approves Subsys with REMS safeguards	Authorized indication and risk controls
May 2019	Jury convicts Kapoor and four executives	Individual criminal verdicts
June 2019	Global resolution announced	Corporate criminal and civil terms
7 June 2019	Insys Pharma guilty plea	Five admitted mail-fraud counts
2019	Bankruptcy filings describe liquidation and asset sales	Recovery and corporate-continuity issues
January 2020	Kapoor sentenced to 66 months	Sentence imposed at that time
August 2021	First Circuit rules on appeals	Convictions upheld; monetary awards partly remanded
September 2024	FDA describes TIRF production discontinuation	Later class-wide availability development

The chronology draws on the original documents cited throughout this report.^{1,2,3,4,5,6,8}

Kapoor’s 2020 sentencing is a historical disposition, not proof of his current custodial status. DOJ reported a 66-month prison term and three years of supervised release.⁵ This report does not infer that he remains imprisoned in September 2026. Sentence length, actual time served, release conditions, and later administrative decisions require different records.

The bankruptcy documents also complicate the usual announcement-based narrative. A headline settlement can be followed by disputes over allowed claims, payment priority, and limited estate resources. The company’s disclosure statement records unpaid scheduled criminal-resolution amounts and describes how government claims were handled in the Chapter 11 process.⁶ A fair timeline therefore continues beyond the announcement of a penalty to the practical question of whether creditors and affected parties ultimately receive money. This review does not establish final distributions.

3. Principal evidence: speaker payments and insurance authorization

The corporate resolution describes speaker programs that functioned as a channel for inducing prescriptions rather than genuine independent education. DOJ said targeted practitioners were paid in exchange for increased Subsys prescribing and higher dosages. The civil allegations also included jobs for relatives and friends, expensive meals, and entertainment.² The report distinguishes those civil allegations from the admitted criminal conduct and individual verdicts; not every allegation in a broad settlement automatically became a separately adjudicated finding.

Payments for legitimate educational work are not inherently equivalent to bribery. The relevant question is what the arrangement purchased. A useful evidence test considers selection of speakers, actual attendance and educational content, repeated payments, prescribing expectations, and internal instructions. In this case the government did not rely solely on a coincidental association between payment and prescribing. The company accepted a statement of facts concerning illegal marketing, and a jury heard evidence about a coordinated scheme.^{2,3}

The First Circuit's opinion supplies a more detailed judicial account of the reimbursement operation. Insys initially used a third party for prior authorizations, then brought the process in-house through its reimbursement center. The court describes collecting insurer-specific information, pressure to raise approval rates, and communications about diagnoses used to secure coverage.⁴ Such an operation could legitimately help a physician navigate administration. The misconduct issue is whether the information transmitted was truthful and clinically grounded, not whether paperwork assistance existed.

This distinction is especially important in access advocacy. An insurer's refusal may be inappropriate or burdensome in some circumstances, but that possibility does not make falsification an acceptable response. A process that represents a patient as meeting criteria when they do not may defeat a safeguard while shifting cost to a payer. It also makes later claims data unreliable for researchers trying to understand actual medical use.

The appellate decision is not a summary judgment that every Subsys prescription was unnecessary. It reviews evidence supporting the charged conspiracy and resolves defendants' legal challenges. Its conclusions should not be stretched into a claim about every prescriber, pharmacist, patient, or employee associated with the product. Nor should aggregate opioid deaths be assigned to this company without a defensible attribution method.

The strongest supported finding is organizational: the misconduct linked sales incentives, practitioner payments, and reimbursement support. Assessing any one of those functions in isolation could miss the way they reinforced one another. That analytical conclusion follows from the documented structure of the scheme, while responsibility for particular acts remains tied to the named defendants and established proceedings.

4. Pricing and access: interpreting dollars without inventing patient harm

The publicly announced \$225 million resolution is often an effective shorthand, but it combines three categories with different functions. The \$2 million criminal fine was a penalty, the \$28 million forfeiture concerned proceeds, and the \$195 million civil component resolved False Claims Act allegations.² The report does not treat the total as a direct measurement of deaths, pain, addiction, or all insurer losses. Financial dispositions are legal outcomes shaped by statutes, negotiations, proof, and ability to pay.

Announced component	U.S. dollars	Category
Criminal fine	2,000,000	Penalty
Forfeiture	28,000,000	Criminal financial remedy
Civil resolution	195,000,000	False Claims Act settlement
Announced combined amount	225,000,000	Sum of the three components

The arithmetic is simply \$2 million plus \$28 million plus \$195 million. It is not an additional recovery or a new damages estimate. All values describe the announced 2019 U.S. resolution, not a verified amount ultimately collected.²

The company's bankruptcy disclosure shows why that qualification matters. It describes a government allowed unsecured claim and a recovery cap, as well as an arrangement under which specified other unsecured creditors would recover a percentage before further government distributions. It also reports that an initial scheduled criminal payment was not made in the circumstances described.⁶ These are concrete reasons to separate liability from payment. This review did not reconstruct the estate's final cash-distribution ledger.

No continuous, comparable dataset of historical Subsys list prices, net prices, rebates, or patient copayments was assembled for this report. It therefore does not calculate a percentage price increase or declare a specific per-prescription price excessive. A branded delivery system for an existing active ingredient can raise economic questions, but the mere presence of fentanyl in both branded and generic products does not establish identical dosing, delivery, substitution, or net acquisition costs.

The better-supported access concern here is distorted utilization. A payment system can be harmed when reimbursement is obtained through false representations even if the nominal price of the drug is unchanged. Patients can also face risk when commercial influence displaces appropriate clinical judgment. Quantifying those effects would require prescription-level information, validated indications, doses, treatment histories, coverage decisions, and outcomes. This report identifies that evidentiary requirement rather than substituting settlement dollars for an epidemiological study. Accurate cost analysis must preserve both the unit being measured and the people whose circumstances it is supposed to describe.

5. Outcomes, defense context, and the present product landscape

The individual cases passed through trial and appellate review. The First Circuit affirmed the jury's findings and verdicts, rejected challenges seeking acquittals or new trials, and upheld the sentences. It also vacated specified restitution and forfeiture orders for recalculation, except the identified Kapoor forfeiture order.⁴ The correct description is therefore a substantive affirmance of criminal responsibility with a separate monetary-remedy correction. "The case was overturned" would be misleading, and "every original monetary award was affirmed" would also be wrong.

The appeal is valuable evidence of the defense context because it records the issues defendants raised and the court's reasons for rejecting or accepting them. A public-interest report should not imply that conviction eliminated the right to contest legal error. Here those challenges produced a meaningful remand concerning calculations even though the convictions remained. This illustrates why dispositions should be read in full rather than inferred from a press-release headline.

Corporate responsibility was structured differently. Insys Pharma pleaded guilty, while the parent's prosecution was deferred subject to an agreement. The bankruptcy disclosure also describes a corporate integrity agreement requiring marketing cessation or divestiture and an exit from opioid business activities within specified periods.⁶ Those requirements are evidence of the intended compliance response. Without inspecting every subsequent compliance determination, this report does not certify that each obligation was completed or that all potential future liability ended.

The liquidation plan contemplated trusts, asset realization, creditor claims, and wind-down activities.⁷ Product assets and their acquirers must be distinguished from the historical misconduct of Insys. A transaction can transfer intellectual property or a drug application without proving that a purchaser participated in the seller's earlier acts. The cited disclosure discusses asset-sale and successor-liability conditions, but this report does not offer a legal opinion about any purchaser's liabilities.⁶

Finally, FDA's September 2024 notice reports that manufacturers planned to discontinue all TIRF production and that the program would cease accepting new enrollments. It explicitly states that FDA did not request the discontinuation. The REMS would continue while the relevant applications remained approved, regardless of marketing status.⁸ Production, available inventory, application approval, and risk-program operation are four different facts. This report makes no assertion about a particular pharmacy's September 2026 stock. For historical reporting, the notice prevents the obsolete assumption that Insys remains an ordinary active supplier and prevents a commercial discontinuation from being mislabeled an FDA safety withdrawal.

6. Implications, method, and unresolved questions

This new research edition was prepared for the Pharma Foundation library in September 2026. The previously linked report was unavailable. The present account is not a recovered version of that document and does not assert earlier authorship or establish past publication. Its conclusions are based on the references below rather than on an assumed continuity with the missing report.

The source hierarchy placed the appellate opinion first for the legal disposition of contested trial issues, agency records first for approvals and announced enforcement actions, and company bankruptcy filings first for the debtor's description of corporate structure and payment arrangements. These sources answer different questions. A filing by a debtor is not an independent audit of its ultimate distributions; a prosecutor's release is not a replacement for an appellate mandate; an FDA product notice is not a verdict on corporate criminal conduct.

The September 2026 status search located the FDA discontinuation notice and the publicly available court and bankruptcy records used here. It did not establish a complete current inventory of open trust litigation, all final recoveries, or each defendant's custody history. Those matters remain explicit limits. The report also did not conduct new patient interviews or obtain insurer claim files. Statements about causation and population harm are therefore intentionally narrower than statements about the proven conspiracy.

The organizational lesson is specific. Controls around educational payments and reimbursement services must be able to identify a commercial relationship that undermines the stated purpose of those services. A speaker program should be assessable by the education actually delivered, while an authorization operation should preserve the source and accuracy of medical facts. Merely having a compliance policy is weaker evidence than records showing that a questionable payment or inaccurate submission was detected and corrected. These observations are analytical conclusions from the case, not a claim that the same misconduct exists at every pharmaceutical company.

This account distinguishes the parent from its subsidiary, criminal from civil amounts, the appellate monetary remand from the underlying convictions, and agreed obligations from collected funds. Current availability is described through the dated FDA notice; the report provides no individualized treatment advice. Final distributions and later court orders could change the recovery picture without altering the historical record. The documented marketing scheme shows why accountability includes both a legal judgment and the practical limits of recovery.

References

1. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *Subsys (fentanyl sublingual spray): NDA 202788 approval letter*. 2012. [Open source](#)
2. U.S. Department of Justice. *Opioid Manufacturer Insys Therapeutics Agrees to Enter \$225 Million Global Resolution of Criminal and Civil Investigations*. 5 June 2019. [Open source](#)
3. U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Massachusetts. *Founder and Four Executives of Insys Therapeutics Convicted of Racketeering Conspiracy*. 2 May 2019. [Open source](#)
4. U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. *United States v. Kapoor and consolidated appeals, Nos. 20-1368 et al.* 25 August 2021. [Open source](#)
5. U.S. Attorney's Office, District of Massachusetts. *Founder and Former Chairman of the Board of Insys Therapeutics Sentenced to 66 Months in Prison*. 23 January 2020. [Open source](#)
6. Insys Therapeutics and affiliated debtors, SEC Exhibit 99.2. *Disclosure Statement for Second Amended Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Liquidation Proposed by Insys Therapeutics, Inc. and Its Affiliated Debtors*. 2019. [Open source](#)
7. Insys Therapeutics and affiliated debtors, SEC Exhibit 99.1. *Joint Chapter 11 Plan of Liquidation of Insys Therapeutics, Inc. and Its Affiliated Debtors*. 2019. [Open source](#)
8. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *Transmucosal Immediate-Release Fentanyl (TIRF) Medicines*. Notice dated 16 September 2024; checked 9 September 2026. [Open source](#)