

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

Specialtycare Inc., Remote Neuromonitoring Physicians, PC, and
Sentient Physicians, PC v. Meritain Health, Inc.

Specialtycare · No. C.A. No. 25-198 (MN) · Decided March 17, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Delaware overruled Plaintiffs’ objections to a magistrate judge’s Report and Recommendation and adopted the Report. The court held that the No Surprises Act does not create a private right of action and that Plaintiffs could not circumvent that omission by asserting a state-law theory, granting Defendant’s motion to dismiss and denying its motion to stay as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Maryellen Noreika
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Delaware
DECIDED	March 17, 2026
DOCKET	C.A. No. 25-198 (MN)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs objected to a magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation recommending dismissal of the amended complaint. The district court reviewed the objected-to portions de novo, overruled the objections, adopted the Report and Recommendation, granted Defendant's motion to dismiss, and denied the motion to stay as moot.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review of the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections were made; reasoned consideration of unobjected-to portions.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; memorandum order of a United States district court
PARTIES	Specialtycare Inc., Remote Neuromonitoring Physicians, PC, Sentient Physicians, PC v. Meritain Health, Inc.

TOPICS

- motions to dismiss
- health law
- statutory interpretation
- commercial litigation
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

health law

commercial litigation

statutory interpretation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the No Surprises Act creates a private right of action.
2. Whether Plaintiffs may circumvent the No Surprises Act's omission of a private right of action by seeking to enforce a federal right through a state-law theory.
3. Whether Defendant's motion to dismiss should be granted and its motion to stay denied as moot.

HOLDINGS

1. The No Surprises Act does not create a private right of action.
2. Plaintiffs may not circumvent Congress's omission of a private right of action in the No Surprises Act by seeking to enforce a federal right through a state-law theory.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Specialtycare Inc., Remote Neuromonitoring Physicians, PC, and Sentient Physicians, PC brought an action against Meritain Health, Inc. involving rights allegedly arising under the No Surprises Act and related state-law theories. Plaintiffs filed an amended complaint and Meritain moved to dismiss, while also moving to stay the action pending resolution of the dismissal motion. The district court adopted the magistrate judge's recommendation that the amended complaint be dismissed.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On February 9, 2026, Magistrate Judge Hatcher issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that Meritain's motion to dismiss be granted and its motion to stay be denied as moot. Plaintiffs timely objected, and Meritain responded. The district court considered the objections de novo, gave reasoned consideration to the unobjected-to portions, adopted the Report and Recommendation, granted the motion to dismiss, and dismissed the amended complaint.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- EEOC v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 99-100 (3d Cir. 2017)
- Guardian Flight, L.L.C. v. Health Care Serv. Corp., 140 F.4th 271, 277 (5th Cir. 2025)

OPINION

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE
SPECIALTYCARE INC., REMOTE)
NEUROMONITORING PHYSICIANS, PC,) and

SENTIENT PHYSICIANS, PC,)) Plaintiffs,)) C.A. No. 25-198 (MN) v.)) MERITAIN HEALTH, INC.,)) Defendant.) MEMORANDUM ORDER At Wilmington, this 17th day of March 2026; WHEREAS, on February 9, 2026, Magistrate Judge Hatcher issued a 14-page Report and Recommendation (D.I.

39) (“the Report”) recommending that Defendant’s motion to dismiss (D.I. 19) be granted and Defendant’s motion to stay this action pending resolution of the motion to dismiss (D.I. 25) be denied as moot; WHEREAS, on February 23, 2026, Plaintiffs timely filed objections to the Report (D.I. 40) and Defendant responded (D.I. 41); WHEREAS, the Court has reviewed the objections (D.I.

40) and the response thereto (D.I. 41), and considered de novo the objected-to portions of the Report, the amended complaint (D.I. 15), the underlying motions and supporting documentation as well as the responses and replies thereto (D.I. 19, 20, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31); and also afforded reasoned consideration to any unobjected-to portions of the Report (EEOC v. City of Long Branch, 866 F.3d 93, 99-100 (3d Cir.

2017)); and WHEREAS, having done so, the Court agrees with the careful and thorough reasoning of Report, in particular the determinations (1) to follow the majority in finding the No Surprises Act (“NSA”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 300gg-111, does not create a private right of action for the reasons articulated in the Fifth Circuit’s decision in Guardian Flight Guardian Flight, L.L.C. v. Health Care Serv.

Corp., 140 F.4th 271, 277 (Sth Cir. 2025), and (2) that Plaintiffs may not circumvent Congress’ omission of a private right of action in the NSA by seeking to enforce a federal right under a state law theory. THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ objections are overruled and the Report and Recommendation (D.I. 39) is ADOPTED. Defendant’s motion to dismiss (D.I.

19) is GRANTED and Defendant’s motion to stay is DENIED as MOOT. Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint (D.I. 15) is dismissed. Maal Noracko Thte Honorable Maryellen Noreika United States District Judge