

Mylan N.V.: EpiPen Pricing, Public Rebates, and Disclosure

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

1. Executive assessment and company identity

Mylan's EpiPen history illustrates how one medicine can generate several different accountability questions. The price charged for a product, the rebate owed to a public insurance program, the information supplied to investors, and restrictions allegedly imposed on competitors are related subjects, but they require different evidence. This report examines those distinctions through the federal Medicaid rebate settlement, the subsequent Securities and Exchange Commission case, and selected developments through September 2026. It is a newly researched assessment; it does not reproduce an unavailable earlier report.

In August 2017, Mylan Inc. and Mylan Specialty L.P., then subsidiaries of Mylan N.V., agreed to pay \$465 million to resolve federal False Claims Act allegations concerning EpiPen's classification in the Medicaid Drug Rebate Program. The government alleged that treating the product as generic reduced rebates owed to public programs. The Justice Department explicitly stated that the resolved claims remained allegations and that there had been no determination of liability. The settlement therefore supports a finding of substantial civil enforcement exposure and a negotiated resolution, not a criminal conviction.¹

The SEC brought a separate case against Mylan N.V. in 2019. Its concern was whether the company disclosed and accounted for the potential financial consequences of the rebate investigation promptly enough. Mylan settled without admitting or denying the allegations. A later SEC case-status page confirms that the court ordered the \$30 million civil penalty on October 1, 2019, and that Mylan paid it. This later record establishes a completed judgment and payment rather than merely a proposed resolution.^{2,3,4}

Entity names require care. Mylan N.V. replaced Mylan Inc. as the public reporting company in February 2015. In November 2020, Mylan combined with Pfizer's Upjohn business in the transaction that created the current Viatris group. The transaction was more than a simple Mylan name change: Viatris Inc. had previously been Upjohn Inc., while Mylan was the accounting acquirer.^{2,7}

The principal assessment is that EpiPen's commercial success depended on decisions that crossed pricing, reimbursement, legal, and financial reporting functions. The strongest documented concern is the gap regulators alleged between information available within Mylan and the classifications or disclosures presented externally. Historical price comparisons help explain the public importance of those decisions, but do not independently establish fraud. Later state settlements also show why the history should not end with the better-known federal announcements.^{9,10}

2. How the rebate dispute became a disclosure case

The SEC complaint reconstructs a chronology beginning before the public controversy peaked. It states that Mylan acquired EpiPen marketing rights in 2007 and continued a generic classification previously used for Medicaid rebate reporting. The company relied on a 1997 letter from a CMS employee as support. According to the complaint, CMS questioned the category in emails in 2013 and 2014, and Mylan responded by providing that earlier letter.²

The alleged turning point was an October 29, 2014 call. The SEC said a CMS division director told Mylan that the classification was incorrect and that the 1997 letter should not be relied on as guidance. Several executives and legal representatives participated. The complaint further alleged that Mylan considered the financial effect of changing the category but continued using the disputed classification. These are detailed allegations in an enforcement complaint; the later consent settlement did not convert every factual assertion into a trial finding.^{2,3}

Date	Documented event or allegation	Significance
November 2014	DOJ subpoena, according to the SEC complaint	Formal civil investigation underway
Third quarter 2015	SEC alleged disclosure was required by this reporting period	Possible loss became a reporting issue
July 2016	DOJ meeting and Mylan settlement offer, as alleged	Negotiations informed loss assessment
October 2016	\$465 million agreement in principle disclosed	Earlier than the final settlement
August 2017	DOJ announced executed civil resolution	Federal rebate claims resolved
October 2019	Court ordered SEC penalty; SEC later confirmed payment	Separate disclosure case resolved

Sources: SEC complaint and case-status record; DOJ settlement announcement.^{1,2,4}

The intervening steps matter. The SEC described additional subpoenas, investigative demands, tolling agreements, and estimates of potential government damages. In its account, DOJ presented its position at a July 12, 2016 meeting, Mylan offered \$50 million later that month, and DOJ rejected that offer in August. A company can dispute an investigation while still possessing enough information to assess whether a material loss is possible or probable. That distinction is central to the SEC's theory.²

The complaint identified October 7, 2016 as the first public disclosure of the DOJ investigation and associated liability. That date should not be confused with August 17, 2017, when DOJ announced the final \$465 million agreement. A timeline that collapses those events loses the very delay examined in the accounting case. It also obscures the difference between an agreement in principle, an executed settlement, and a later judicial order in a different proceeding.^{1,2,4}

3. What the evidence supports - and what it does not

The rebate issue concerned regulatory classification, rather than the everyday meaning of a medicine containing a familiar active ingredient. During the relevant period, branded products generally faced higher Medicaid rebates and additional rebates when price increases exceeded inflation. Generic products faced lower rebates and, for the period described by DOJ, did not have the same inflation adjustment. The government alleged that Mylan obtained the economic advantages of increasing EpiPen's price while avoiding the corresponding branded-product rebate obligations.¹

DOJ reported approximately 400 percent price growth between 2010 and 2016 while Mylan paid a fixed 13 percent rebate. Those figures describe the government's historical account, not the current Medicaid formula. They also do not mean that every Medicaid prescription generated a patient payment equal to the commercial list price. The alleged loss was to public programs through insufficient manufacturer rebates; patients' benefit designs and pharmacy payments are a different layer of the transaction.¹

The SEC complaint supplies another kind of evidence: alleged failures in moving regulatory and legal information into financial reporting. It distinguishes disclosure of a material contingency when loss is reasonably possible from recording a charge when loss is probable and reasonably estimable. The SEC alleged that disclosure was necessary by at least the third quarter of 2015 and an accrual by at least the second quarter of 2016. These were the agency's applications of accounting requirements to Mylan's circumstances, not a claim that every investigation must immediately produce a booked liability.²

The complaint also challenged the use of hypothetical risk language. It alleged that Mylan's 2014 and 2015 annual reports warned that authorities might disagree with Medicaid submissions even though CMS had already communicated disagreement. In analytical terms, a warning about a possible future event can omit important information when a related event has already happened. The report does not conclude that any particular present-day risk disclosure is unlawful; it identifies the concrete mismatch the SEC alleged in this case.^{2,3}

There are meaningful evidentiary limits. DOJ's settlement announcement is explicit about the absence of a liability determination. The SEC settlement was without admission or denial. Neither establishes a criminal verdict against Mylan or its executives for EpiPen pricing. Conversely, a no-admission settlement does not erase its payment, injunction, monitoring requirements, or the documentary specificity of the allegations. An accurate assessment preserves both sides: serious regulatory concerns and enforceable resolutions, with the legal status of the underlying claims stated precisely.^{1,3,4}

4. Pricing and access: keep the units and channels visible

EpiPen price discussions often become misleading when they mix individual devices, two-packs, wholesale prices, and patient spending. The SEC complaint describes a U.S. price increase from approximately \$100 per two-pack when Mylan acquired the marketing rights in 2007 to more than \$600 per two-pack by 2016. Its summary uses an increase exceeding 500 percent. DOJ's approximately 400 percent figure covers 2010-2016. Different starting dates explain why the two government accounts need not be contradictory; they should not be presented as estimates of an identical interval.^{1,2}

Historical comparison	U.S. dollar amount	Unit and qualification
EpiPen, 2007	Approximately \$100	Two-pack; SEC complaint's historical account
EpiPen, 2016	More than \$600	Two-pack; same SEC account
Mylan authorized generic launch, December 2016	\$300	Two-pack wholesale acquisition cost

Sources: SEC complaint and Mylan's launch announcement. These are historical figures, not current pharmacy quotations.^{2,5}

On December 16, 2016, Mylan announced an authorized generic at a \$300 wholesale acquisition cost per two-pack. The company described the formulation and device functionality as the same as EpiPen's and acknowledged that families faced affordability problems. It also attributed part of those difficulties to the broader U.S. pricing system and the shift of costs toward consumers. This records Mylan's response and its announced price; it does not independently verify the savings ultimately received by patients.⁵

The distinction between an authorized generic and another manufacturer's approved generic is relevant to competition. Mylan's launch created a lower-priced option within its own commercial portfolio. FDA subsequently approved Teva's separate abbreviated application on August 16, 2018, finding its 0.15 mg and 0.3 mg products bioequivalent and therapeutically equivalent to the corresponding EpiPen references. Approval establishes regulatory authorization; it does not by itself establish the launch date, pharmacy inventory, net price, or market share of that product.⁶

The report's access analysis is therefore conditional. A lower list price can reduce exposure for some purchases, but it is not a measured reduction in every patient's out-of-pocket cost. Manufacturer rebates, insurance deductibles, formulary placement, and assistance eligibility may produce different results. No patient claims dataset or pharmacy transaction sample was examined here. The historical prices demonstrate the scale and direction of the controversy; they cannot establish the number of prescriptions abandoned, the number of medical emergencies caused, or a total dollar value of patient harm.

5. Resolutions, company position, and developments through 2026

The federal rebate settlement included institutional requirements as well as money. DOJ reported a five-year corporate integrity agreement with HHS's Office of Inspector General, annual reviews by an independent organization, and accountability requirements for executives and board members. It also identified Sanofi-Aventis US LLC as the whistleblower and approximately \$38.7 million as its share of the federal recovery. That share was part of the recovery's distribution, not an additional fine to add to \$465 million. This report has not independently audited the integrity agreement's performance.¹

The SEC matter produced a separate \$30 million penalty, a permanent injunction, and a Fair Fund process for harmed investors. The SEC confirms payment and records court approval of a distribution plan in August 2021. Its published page does not supply a complete final ledger of distributions. The penalty is therefore a verified payment by Mylan; it should not automatically be described as \$30 million already received by claimants. The historical claims deadline is not presented as a current invitation to file.^{3,4}

The issue also continued at state level. On April 30, 2026, North Carolina announced an \$11 million settlement resolving allegations involving exclusionary conduct, rebate classification, and two-pack purchases. Its announcement allocated \$4.2 million each to Medicaid and the State Health Plan and explicitly stated that Mylan denied wrongdoing. It also reported an agreement to increase the authorized generic copay coupon from \$25 to \$40. Those are announced settlement terms, not evidence that every purchaser qualifies or that every payment had already been distributed.⁹

Illinois announced an \$8.25 million settlement on May 26, 2026 concerning alleged anticompetitive EpiPen practices. The attorney general identified alleged generic delays, restrictions involving pharmacy benefit managers, and misleading statements about competing products, and described a similar coupon change. A settlement announcement supports reporting that the state resolved those allegations; it does not establish that a court tried and proved each allegation.¹⁰

Viatis's June 2026 quarterly report, filed August 6, states that the EpiPen inquiries from Mississippi and certain other state attorneys general described there had been settled and were closed. That wording applies to those identified matters, rather than every possible EpiPen dispute. The filing also reports other continuing litigation, including broader generic pricing matters. Current corporate continuity and a closed settlement category should therefore not be confused with a clean bill of health for every business activity.⁸

The amounts above are deliberately not combined into a single total. They involve different claims, claimants, periods, and distribution mechanisms. A sum would not measure profits, public losses, or patient compensation, and this selected review is not an exhaustive settlement ledger.

6. Implications, research method, and limits

The first analytical lesson is that reimbursement classifications need an accountable evidence trail. In this case, the SEC described reliance on a much older CMS employee letter after later communications challenged the classification. A practical governance question is whether a company's process identifies the authority, date, assumptions, and continuing applicability of the guidance supporting a classification. Simply retaining an old document does not resolve a subsequent disagreement. This is an implication drawn from the chronology, not a new finding about Mylan's current controls.²

The second lesson concerns information movement. The SEC alleged that existing quarterly discussions did not ensure that material developments reached everyone assessing contingencies. A meeting can occur without all relevant evidence arriving at the meeting. The case points toward examining who receives regulator communications, who maintains exposure estimates, who updates risk language, and how disagreement is escalated. The useful object of scrutiny is the actual path from new information to a reporting decision, rather than the existence of a policy document alone.²

The third lesson is to assess commercial responses by outcomes appropriate to their purpose. An authorized generic announcement answers whether the company offered another product and at what announced wholesale price. FDA approval answers whether a particular application met regulatory requirements. Neither establishes that insurance coverage improved, that all pharmacies stocked a product, or that competition removed an alleged barrier. Those questions require different records, including launch data, formulary contracts, claims, and purchasing information. This report does not substitute marketing statements or regulatory approvals for those missing measurements.^{5,6}

Research used federal enforcement documents, FDA's approval letter, contemporaneous company disclosure, a transaction filing, the latest reviewed quarterly filing, and current state attorney general announcements. Central allegations were read in the SEC complaint itself. Later case-status material was used to distinguish proposed penalties from a paid judgment. A fresh search for current EpiPen litigation identified the 2026 state announcements and informed the current-status section. Corporate and legal updates are bounded by the research date; the cited quarterly filing reports events known at its own filing date.

The principal omissions are a complete court-docket review of every private EpiPen action, an audit of settlement distributions, current pharmacy pricing, and patient-level outcomes. Other Mylan or Viatris products and proceedings require their own analysis. No estimate of deaths, avoided rebates beyond the cited allegations, total unlawful profit, or current investment value is offered. The report supports a specific historical conclusion: EpiPen generated major civil rebate and disclosure resolutions, followed by further state settlements, while the legal status and economic meaning of each outcome must remain visible.

References

1. U.S. Department of Justice. *Mylan Agrees to Pay \$465 Million to Resolve False Claims Act Liability for Underpaying EpiPen Rebates*. August 17, 2017. [Open source](#)
2. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. *Securities and Exchange Commission v. Mylan N.V., Complaint, Case No. 1:19-cv-2904*. September 27, 2019. [Open source](#)
3. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. *Mylan to Pay \$30 Million for Disclosure and Accounting Failure Relating to EpiPen*. September 27, 2019. [Open source](#)
4. U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission. *SEC v. Mylan, N.V. 1:19-cv-2904 (RDM) (D.D.C.)*. Updated October 14, 2022; checked September 9, 2026. [Open source](#)
5. Mylan N.V. *Mylan Launches the First Generic for EpiPen® (epinephrine injection, USP) Auto-Injector as an Authorized Generic*. December 16, 2016. [Open source](#)
6. U.S. Food and Drug Administration. *Approval Letter for ANDA 090589*. August 16, 2018. [Open source](#)
7. Viatris Inc. *Form 8-K*. November 25, 2020. [Open source](#)
8. Viatris Inc. *Form 10-Q for the quarter ended June 30, 2026*. Filed August 6, 2026. [Open source](#)
9. North Carolina Department of Justice. *Attorney General Jackson Reaches \$11 Million EpiPen Settlement; Medicaid and State Health Plan to Receive Millions in Refunds*. April 30, 2026. [Open source](#)
10. Illinois Attorney General. *Attorney General Raoul Reaches \$8.25 Million Settlement with Pharmaceutical Company Over Alleged Anticompetitive EpiPen Practices*. May 26, 2026. [Open source](#)