

Actavis: Reverse-Payment Settlements, Generic Competition, and Corporate Succession

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

1. Executive assessment: why the Actavis name still matters

Actavis is both a historical corporate name and the name attached to a major United States Supreme Court competition decision. In *FTC v. Actavis*, decided June 17, 2013, the Court held that the challenged type of reverse-payment patent settlement could be examined under antitrust law. It reversed dismissal of the FTC's case and returned the matter for further proceedings.¹ It did not award patient refunds, set a drug price, or rule that every pharmaceutical patent settlement is unlawful.

Corporate history requires equal care. Actavis acquired Allergan, Inc. in March 2015. The generic business subsequently known as Actavis Generics was acquired by Teva in 2016, while AbbVie completed its acquisition of Allergan plc in 2020.^{2,3,4} These transactions mean that “Actavis” does not identify one unchanged present-day business responsible for every product once associated with the name. Product rights and particular legal entities must be traced separately.

The central access issue in the Supreme Court case concerned potential generic competition to AndroGel. The FTC alleged that a brand manufacturer and generic challengers entered arrangements that delayed competition in exchange for value. The parties characterized the commercial arrangements differently.¹ The economic question was whether compensation reflected legitimate services and settlement considerations or an unjustified exchange for delayed entry. That distinction cannot be resolved merely by noticing that a payment accompanied a patent settlement.

The litigation later ended through settlements. The FTC's docket records a 2019 dismissal with prejudice as to Actavis defendants, and the agency's account describes a broader Teva resolution addressing future settlement practices.^{5,6} A report stopping at the 2013 reversal would leave readers with an incomplete procedural history.

Our assessment is that this record is most valuable as a study of how competition can affect medicine access and how legal outcomes must be described precisely. A landmark precedent is not itself a quantified finding of all patient harm. A merger remedy is not a recall or product-safety ruling. Corporate renaming is not evidence that a company disappeared with every responsibility erased.

This newly prepared report uses primary legal records and company announcements. It is a new research edition, not an original historical Foundation publication. It offers no individual treatment, investment, or litigation advice and does not claim to reconstruct the Foundation's past analysis.

2. Timeline: the AndroGel dispute and a changing corporate structure

The Supreme Court's factual account describes a patent dispute involving Solvay's AndroGel and generic applicants including the company then known as Watson. In 2006, the parties settled. The Court described an agreed Actavis entry date in August 2015, earlier-entry conditions, and commercial arrangements characterized by the parties as compensation for services. The FTC alleged that the services did not justify the transfers.¹ These facts formed the setting for review of the complaint, not a final damages calculation.

The FTC challenged the arrangements in 2009. Its legal-library record identifies the original defendants, case numbers, transfer between districts, and lower-court dismissal. The Supreme Court reversed the relevant appellate ruling in 2013.⁷ Keeping a case number alongside the title is useful because other AndroGel disputes involved different defendants, transactions, claims, and remedies.

Meanwhile, corporate transactions changed the relevant names and businesses. Actavis announced the completion of its Allergan acquisition on March 17, 2015.² Teva's 2016 announcement then described acquisition of Actavis Generics and integration of that business.³ These are not interchangeable with AbbVie's later purchase of Allergan.⁴

Date	Event	Why it matters
2006	AndroGel patent settlements	Challenged commercial arrangements
2009	FTC litigation begins	Allegations enter federal court
June 2013	Supreme Court reversal and remand	Antitrust review permitted
March 2015	Actavis acquires Allergan, Inc.	Corporate structure changes
2016	Teva acquires Actavis Generics	Generic-business successor
February 2019	Actavis/Teva claims resolved	Procedural outcome
May 2020	AbbVie acquires Allergan plc	Separate successor pathway

The 2016 generic-business acquisition also received an FTC remedy. Teva agreed to divest rights and assets associated with 79 pharmaceutical products to eleven firms to address competition concerns, with additional protections for certain active-ingredient supply relationships.⁸ That remedy concerns merger-related competition, a different mechanism from the challenged patent settlements.

The timeline supports a disciplined ownership ledger. Each product entry should retain the relevant legal entity, transaction date, and current marketing-rights holder. A single arrow reading “Actavis became AbbVie” would omit the generic-business sale; a single arrow reading “Actavis became Teva” would omit the separate branded-business history. Both shortcuts can misdirect someone seeking current product or assistance information.

3. Principal finding: the Court opened the door to antitrust review

The Supreme Court rejected the proposition that a settlement was generally immune from antitrust scrutiny simply because its restrictions fell within a patent's potential exclusionary scope. It also declined the FTC's request to treat the agreements as presumptively unlawful under a shortened approach. The Court selected a rule-of-reason analysis and allowed the FTC an opportunity to prove its claim.¹ This middle position is the report's central legal finding.

In plain terms, a patent does not automatically answer every competition question about a settlement, but the presence of a transfer does not automatically establish liability either. The actual arrangement, its scale, its explanation, and its competitive effects require examination. That interpretation avoids two common reporting errors: describing the decision as a universal ban on settlements, or describing patent rights as an absolute shield for any associated agreement.

The companies' commercial-service explanation and the FTC's delayed-entry explanation represent opposing interpretations of the transaction. A transparent report should show both before reporting the later outcome. It should not relabel an asserted co-promotion payment as an adjudicated bribe or call the Court's procedural reversal a criminal conviction. The vocabulary chosen changes the substance of the claim.

The 2019 settlement materials provide a concrete later result. The FTC described a global resolution with Teva addressing reverse-payment arrangements in three cases, including *Actavis*. The terms addressed compensation through associated business dealings and commitments by brand companies not to launch authorized generics.⁶ These mechanisms matter because economically valuable consideration need not take the form of a simple check labeled "delay payment."

The docket's *Actavis* dismissal order records the disposition as to the named *Actavis* defendants.⁵ Teva's contemporaneous statement said the global settlement required no additional payment to the FTC and modified a prior consent decree.⁹ That statement helps distinguish the resolution from separate monetary settlements in other matters. It does not imply that compliance obligations had no practical cost or that every historical allegation was adjudicated in the company's favor.

Our analysis is that the strongest accountability conclusion is procedural and institutional: patent settlements became subject to a fuller competition inquiry, and the specific agency litigation reached a later negotiated conclusion. Estimating the precise effect on patient payments would require additional product-market evidence and a defined counterfactual. The legal record alone does not provide that estimate.

4. Pricing and access: studying delayed competition without inventing an overcharge

The access mechanism is straightforward in concept: when a lower-cost competitor enters, purchasers may gain options and negotiating leverage. If entry is improperly delayed, some of those benefits may occur later. However, determining whether a particular agreement caused delay, and how much expenditure changed as a result, requires more than comparing a settlement date with a patent-expiration date.

A counterfactual analysis would need to establish when a generic could lawfully and practically have launched without the challenged arrangement. Relevant evidence could include regulatory approval, litigation risk, manufacturing readiness, supply capacity, and other competitors. The analysis would then need transaction prices and volumes over a defined period. A report that assumes immediate entry on the day a lawsuit was filed would risk overstating effects.

The Supreme Court discussed the potential for reverse payments to preserve prices and divide the benefits of restricted competition, but it did not calculate a universal AndroGel price or assign each patient a loss.¹ This report therefore deliberately avoids a dollar estimate of overcharges. The absence of such a number is a limit of the reviewed evidence, not a finding that the alleged restraint had no economic significance.

The merger record supplies a separate quantitative anchor. The FTC's Teva/Allergan remedy involved 79 products and eleven divestiture purchasers, as well as supply-contract options in fifteen product markets with active-ingredient concerns.⁸ These counts describe the perimeter of a regulatory remedy. They do not mean 79 drugs were defective, that fifteen shortages occurred, or that all purchasers faced the same percentage price change.

Record	What the number or outcome measures	Incorrect shortcut
2013 reversal	Legal availability of antitrust review	Final patient-damages award
2019 settlement	Resolution and conduct obligations	New cash fine in every case
79 divested products	Merger-remedy portfolio	79 unsafe medicines
Eleven purchasers	Recipients of divested rights/assets	Guaranteed lasting competition

For future access analysis, prices should be labeled as manufacturer list, net realized, pharmacy acquisition, reimbursed, cash, or patient out-of-pocket amounts. Those series may move differently after entry or divestiture. Product strength, package, geography, and date must also be retained. A patient whose plan changes formulary placement may experience a different result from a purchaser negotiating bulk supply.

Our inference is that competition oversight can be relevant to affordability without directly regulating a retail price. The appropriate evaluation is whether meaningful independent competition emerged and persisted, followed by measurement of actual purchasing outcomes. The cited merger remedy and patent-settlement records identify where to investigate; they do not complete that outcomes study.

5. Outcomes, company response, and present-day relevance

The FTC's legal library records that the Actavis defendants were dismissed in 2019, while its later overview records the global Teva settlement and the final Solvay settlement that concluded the agency case.^{5,10} The report does not present that litigation as awaiting its originally scheduled 2019 trial. It also does not assume that resolution of one FTC action disposed of every private or international claim involving the same medicine.

Teva framed its settlement as removing uncertainty and administrative burdens around patent-related business decisions. Its release explicitly said no additional money would be paid to the FTC under that settlement.⁹ This is the company's position and reported financial term. It should be shown alongside the agency's account of restrictions intended to protect generic competition.⁶ Reporting only one side would obscure why the parties could agree to resolve the dispute while describing its benefits differently.

The corporate structure remains important for today's readers. Teva's acquisition notice identifies the Actavis Generics business, while AbbVie's 2020 announcement identifies acquisition of Allergan plc.^{3,4} The old name is retained here as a historical identifier; present product ownership and contact information require product-specific records. This review has not established a single current assistance program covering every legacy Actavis medicine.

A fresh search for this edition located the FTC's currently available pharmaceutical-enforcement overview, which retains the 2013 and 2019 Actavis milestones and includes more recent enforcement matters elsewhere.¹⁰ The overview corroborates the historical disposition; it is not a representation that the Supreme Court rule has never been interpreted or refined in subsequent cases. Any application to a new commercial arrangement would require current legal research beyond this report.

The central precedent remains useful for public education because it connects corporate contracting to the timing of generic options. That connection should be explained without suggesting that all patent litigation is obstruction or that all early-entry settlements are beneficial. Different agreements allocate risk and value differently; the facts determine the competition question.

The current-status conclusion is therefore bounded: this report documents the historical decision, later FTC resolution, and major successor transactions. It does not assess the legality of a present contract, independently verify all divestiture performance, or state that every legacy product now has adequate supply. Those are specific follow-up questions rather than conclusions that can be inferred from a famous case name.

6. Method, limitations, and a useful transparency agenda

Ten primary or first-party sources were used: the Supreme Court opinion hosted in the FTC record, the agency's docket and settlement materials, merger-remedy records, and corporate transaction and response announcements. The complete Supreme Court opinion was read from the FTC's official copy. The source list links that accessible copy so readers can verify the decision directly.

The review distinguishes holdings from factual background recited at an early procedural stage. A court can explain allegations in order to decide whether a case should proceed without deciding that every allegation is true. The later dismissal and settlement materials are therefore necessary complements to the 2013 opinion. This distinction is especially important when a report's title contains a company name that is also shorthand for a legal doctrine.

The research also treats commercial succession as a mapping problem rather than a moral conclusion. Acquisition documents establish transactions, not automatic responsibility for every act of every predecessor. A useful database would preserve historical defendant names and present owner information in separate fields. It would record asset divestitures and geographic rights where they affect public-facing product links.

For quantitative work, the next step would be a product-specific study of entry dates, independent suppliers, units sold, and transaction prices. It should explain the counterfactual entry assumption and test reasonable alternatives. Reported patient effects should use actual out-of-pocket data rather than multiplying a manufacturer benchmark by every prescription. If confidential terms prevent replication, uncertainty should be stated rather than hidden behind a single precise estimate.

This report does not use confidential contracts, proprietary claims data, interviews, or a comprehensive private-litigation docket. It does not calculate patient harm, a fair drug price, or an investment value. Its discussion of competition mechanisms is analytical explanation, not advice on structuring agreements or pursuing litigation.

Four facts define the conclusion: the 2013 Court permitted antitrust review under the rule of reason; it did not pronounce every reverse payment unlawful; the selected FTC litigation reached settlements in 2019; and major Actavis businesses subsequently followed different corporate paths. Those distinctions explain more than a list of company names and penalty totals. This evidence record remains open to correction and extension as new information becomes available.

References

1. Supreme Court of the United States, official copy hosted by FTC. *Federal Trade Commission v. Actavis, Inc., No. 12-416, opinion*. June 17, 2013. [Open source](#)
2. Actavis, exhibit filed with the SEC. *Actavis Completes Allergan Acquisition*. March 17, 2015. [Open source](#)
3. Teva. *Teva Completes Acquisition of Actavis Generics*. August 2, 2016. [Open source](#)
4. AbbVie. *AbbVie Completes Transformative Acquisition of Allergan*. May 8, 2020. [Open source](#)
5. U.S. District Court, official copy hosted by FTC. *Stipulation and Order Dismissing with Prejudice as to Defendants Actavis, Inc. and Actavis Holdco US, Inc.* February 2019. [Open source](#)
6. Federal Trade Commission. *FTC Enters Global Settlement to Resolve Reverse-Payment Charges against Teva*. February 19, 2019. [Open source](#)
7. Federal Trade Commission. *Watson Pharmaceuticals, Inc., et al. (FTC v. Actavis)*. Case record; checked September 9, 2026. [Open source](#)
8. Federal Trade Commission. *Teva and Allergan, In the Matter of*. 2016 case record. [Open source](#)
9. Teva. *Teva Finalizes Settlement with Federal Trade Commission to Resolve All Outstanding Litigation between the Parties*. February 19, 2019. [Open source](#)
10. Federal Trade Commission. *Overview of FTC Actions in Pharmaceutical Products and Distribution*. Current posted edition checked September 9, 2026. [Open source](#)