# Department of Veterans Affairs

## Memorandum

Date: January 4, 2010

**VAOPGCPREC 1-2010** 

From:

General Counsel (022)

Subj:

To.

Overpayment and Requirement to Offset from Compensation Paid Under 38 U.S.C. § 1151 Amounts Recovered Under the Federal Tort Claims Act

Regional Counsel (339/02)

#### **QUESTION PRESENTED:**

May the amount of a tort claim settlement required to be offset from 38 U.S.C. § 1151 disability compensation be reduced by the amount of an overpayment of such compensation, due to untimely discontinuance of compensation, that does not result in the creation of a debt or is waived?<sup>1</sup>

#### **HELD:**

If a veteran who has established entitlement to compensation for a disability under 38 U.S.C. § 1151(a) is awarded a judgment or enters into a settlement or compromise under the Federal Tort Claims Act based on the same disability, section 1151(b)(1) prohibits the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) from paying compensation for that disability for any month beginning after the judgment, settlement, or compromise becomes final until the aggregate amount of compensation that would otherwise have been paid equals the amount of the judgment, settlement, or compromise. If VA erroneously continues to pay compensation to the veteran and the resulting overpayment does not result in establishment of a debt or VA waives recovery of the overpayment, VA may not apply the amount of the overpayment or the waived amount to reduce the amount required to be offset from future compensation payments.

#### **DISCUSSION:**

1. In the case underlying the request for this opinion, a veteran who was in receipt of compensation under 38 U.S.C. § 1151 in March 1997 obtained a settlement from the United States under the Federal Tort Claims Act (FTCA) in the amount of \$775,000 based on the same disability for which he is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Although the opinion request characterizes VA's overpayment of 38 U.S.C. § 1151 compensation as having been waived by the Board of Veterans' Appeals (Board), the Board did not waive the overpayment amount but, rather, concluded that it was an "invalid" debt.

### Regional Counsel (339/02)

compensated under section 1151.<sup>2</sup> If an individual is awarded a judgment or enters into a settlement or compromise under the FTCA based on a disability treated under section 1151(a) as if it were service connected, VA is prohibited from paying section 1151 benefits for that disability for any month beginning after the date such judgment, settlement, or compromise becomes final until the aggregate amount of benefits that would otherwise have been paid equals the total amount included in such judgment, settlement, or compromise. 38 U.S.C. §t1151(b)(1). Thus, the regional office (RO) in this case should havet discontinued compensation payments under section 1151 starting with thet payment for April 1997 until the aggregate amount of compensation that wouldt otherwise have been paid equaled \$775,000, the amount of the settlement.t However, the RO failed to discontinue the veteran's section 1151 paymentst beginning with the payment for April 1997 and, instead, continued to pay thet veteran compensation for the period from April 1997 through December 2005.t

2.t In July 2005, after the Director of the Compensation and Pension Servicet directed the RO to begin the required offset of section 1151 compensation, thet RO notified the veteran of VA's proposal to discontinue section 1151t compensation payments effective April 1997 until \$775,000, the amount of thet tort claim settlement, was offset. The RO stopped paying compensation int January 2006 and eventually made the discontinuance of compensation effectivet from April 1, 1997, which created an overpayment of \$234,372. The veterant both challenged the validity of the asserted debt and requested waiver of thet overpayment through the RO's Committee on Waivers and Compromises. Int February 2008, the Committee determined that the overpayment of VAt compensation was validly created and denied a waiver of the overpayment int that amount. The veteran appealed to the Board.t

3.t In July 2008, the Board determined that the RO's payment of compensationt for the period April 1997 through December 2005 resulted in an overpayment int the amount of \$234,372. The Board also determined that an overpayment in thet amount of \$222,128 for the period from April 1997 through July 2005 was ant "invalid" debt because it was solely the result of administrative error on the part oft

<sup>2</sup> Under 38 U.S.C. § 1151(a), a disabled veteran or, in the case of a veteran's death, a survivor may under certain circumstances involving negligent VA medical treatment establish entitlement to compensation or dependency and indemnity compensation, respectively, "as if" the veteran's disability or death were service connected. Under the FTCA, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1346(b), 2671-2680, an action may be brought on a claim against the United States for money damages for personal injury or death caused by the negligent or wrongful act or omission of a Government employee acting within the scope of his or her employment. 28 U.S.C. § 1346(b)(1).

### Regional Counsel (339/02)

VA without the veteran knowing that it was erroneous. The question presented is whether the \$222,128 amount may be applied toward the aggregate amount (\$775,000) required to be offset from compensation payments.

4.nVA generally is required to recover erroneous VA payments or overpaymentn of benefits. See Edwards v. Peake, 22 Vet. App. 57, 59 (2008); 38 U.S.C.n. §rb314(a) (generally requiring VA to deduct from future benefit payments a debtn arising from a person's participation in a VA benefits program); 38 C.F.R.n. §rll.912a(a) (same); 38 U.S.C. § 5316 (authorizing VA to recover a benefitsrelated debt by bringing a suit if the person fails to appropriately respond ton reasonable administrative efforts to collect the debt). However, VA may waiven recovery of an indebtedness if a request for waiver is timely raised and recoveryn of the debt would be "against equity and good conscience." 38 U.S.C. § 5302(a).n. Before deciding a request for waiver, VA must first consider the validity of then debt. See 38 C.F.R. § 1.911 (once VA determines that a debt exists, VA mustn notify the debtor; the debtor may then challenge the existence or amount of then debt and request waiver of collection of the debt); Schaper v. Derwinski, 1 Vet.n. App. 430, 437 (1991) (holding that VA must first decide a veteran's challenge ton the lawfulness of a debt asserted against him or her before adjudicating then waiver application); Smith v. Derwinski, 1 Vet. App. 267, 272 (1991) (noting that,n "Ibly regulation, the VA has established a mechanism which permits an allegedn debtor to dispute the VA's conclusion that a debt actually exists").n

5.nIn this case, the Board properly first considered the validity of the debt beforen considering the veteran's request for waiver. The Board determined there hadn been an overpayment in the amount of \$234,372 because VA erroneously paidn compensation to the veteran for the period from April 1997 through Decembern 2005 following the veteran's tort settlement in March 1997, which violated 38n U.S.C. § 1151(b)(1)'s prohibition against duplicate payments. However, then Board also determined that, until the RO notified the veteran of the overpaymentn in July 2005, the veteran did not know that VA was prohibited from payingn section 1151 compensation following the tort claim settlement until the aggregaten amount of benefits that otherwise would have been paid equaled the totaln amount of the settlement. The Board concluded the veteran was not indebted ton VA for the overpayment in the amount of \$222,128 paid from April 1997 throughn July 2005 because it was solely the result of administrative error on the part ofn VA. See 38 U.S.C. § 5112(b)(10); 38 C.F.R. § 3.500(b)(2). Therefore, VA mayn not recover from the veteran the amount of \$222,128 in erroneous compensationn

<sup>3</sup> The Board remanded the case to the RO to readjudicate the issue of waiver for the valid debt of \$12,244, which constituted overpayment from August 2005 through December 2005 following VA's July 2005 notice to the veteran of the overpayment.

Regional Counsel (339/02)

payments. See 38 U.S.C. § 5314(b) (prohibiting offset of a debttfrom future benefit payments unless VA first makes a determination with respect to the beneficiary's dispute of existence or amount of debt).

6.t Regarding the question of whether VA may apply its overpayment in thet amount of \$222,128 to reduce the amount it is required to offset fromt section 1151 compensation payments, we answer in the negative. The fact thatt VA erroneously paid the veteran \$222,128 in section 1151 compensation for thet period from April 1997 through July 2005 or that the Board determined thet \$222,128 overpayment to be an "invalid" debt does not obviate the statutoryt prohibition against paying section 1151 compensation until the aggregate amountt of compensation that would otherwise have been paid equals the total amount oft the tort claim settlement. Section 1151(b)(1) unambiguously prohibits duplicationt of payments following a tort claim settlement and operates independently of thet laws governing overpayments and debt collection. No law authorizes VA tot reduce, due to a failure of VA to timely suspend benefit payments, the amount oft benefits required to be offset. Therefore, VA must discontinue payingt compensation to the veteran until the amount of compensation that wouldt otherwise have been paid equals \$775,000. Furthermore, we can discern not reason for distinguishing between an "invalid" debt and a waived debt. In eithert case, the veteran is permitted to keep compensation payments to which he wast not rightfully entitled. The law prohibits VA from paying compensation until thet entire amount of the tort settlement, \$775,000, is offset, and payments that thet veteran is permitted to keep cannot be considered payments that were not madet for purposes of this offset.t

Will A. Gunn

Attachment (claim folder)

2/21 A. /3v

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Consequently, the issue of waiver regarding the \$222,128 overpayment amount is moot.