Provider Attestation Liability

Signing on the Line: What Healthcare Providers Risk When They Document Work Exemptions

The Signature That Changed Everything

Dr. Sarah Chen practiced family medicine at a community health center in rural Georgia for twelve years. She knew her patients, understood their struggles, and took pride in serving people who had nowhere else to go. In March 2027, three months after work requirements took effect, she completed a medical exemption form for Maria Rodriguez, a 48-year-old patient with poorly controlled diabetes, peripheral neuropathy, and depression.

The attestation form asked a seemingly straightforward question: "Does this patient's medical condition prevent them from consistently meeting 80-hour monthly work requirements?" Dr. Chen checked "yes" and signed. Maria had tried working as a retail cashier the previous year but kept missing shifts when her blood sugar crashed or her foot pain became unbearable. Her last hospitalization for diabetic ketoacidosis followed three days of working overtime without proper meals. Dr. Chen believed in good faith that Maria could not reliably maintain full-time employment given her conditions.

Six months later, a state auditor reviewing exemption patterns flagged Dr. Chen's practice. She had signed exemption attestations for 89 patients in six months. The auditor's analysis showed this rate exceeded the county average by 300 percent. An investigation followed. Investigators reviewed Maria's case and found evidence that Maria had worked two shifts at a different retail location after Dr. Chen's attestation. The work lasted only three days before Maria quit, but it existed.

The state Medicaid fraud control unit sent Dr. Chen a letter. Her attestation had been "materially false." Maria had been capable of work. The state was investigating whether Dr. Chen had engaged in a pattern of fraudulent attestations. If the pattern held, she faced potential exclusion from Medicaid participation, professional licensing board review, and possible criminal referral. The letter mentioned federal False Claims Act liability for signing attestations that enabled improper benefit payments.

Dr. Chen spent $40,000 on legal fees defending herself. The investigation consumed eight months. She ultimately avoided prosecution after demonstrating that her clinical judgment was reasonable based on the information available at the time of each attestation. But three other physicians in her county stopped signing any medical exemption forms rather than face similar scrutiny. Patients who needed exemptions suddenly had nowhere to turn.

The case illustrated a fundamental problem that healthcare providers across the country would soon recognize: they were being conscripted as gatekeepers in a government benefits program without clear guidance on the legal standards that would protect them when their clinical judgment was later questioned.

The Unwritten Contract

Work requirements conscript healthcare providers into an administrative function that sits uneasily alongside clinical care. The mechanism is simple: medical exemptions require provider documentation. Someone with diabetes, heart disease, severe arthritis, or chronic pain who

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

cannot consistently work needs a healthcare provider to attest that their condition prevents work participation. Without that signature, the exemption does not happen.

This creates an unwritten contract between government, providers, and patients. Government needs providers to serve as credible evaluators of work capacity. Patients need providers to document legitimate limitations. Providers need protection from liability when they make good-faith professional judgments that turn out differently than expected.

The problem is that the terms of this contract remain dangerously unclear. Providers signing attestation forms in 2026 and 2027 do not know with precision what legal standards will be applied to their signatures if those attestations are later questioned. They do not know whether their professional judgment will be evaluated by clinical standards they understand or by administrative standards they do not. They do not know whether good faith matters or whether outcome determines liability.

This uncertainty creates predictable provider responses. Some refuse to sign any exemption forms, protecting themselves but leaving patients without documentation they need. Others sign liberally, believing their duty to advocate for patients outweighs liability concerns. Still others attempt careful case-by-case determinations, spending time they do not have on documentation analysis that clinical training did not prepare them to perform.

The lack of clear legal protection for good-faith attestations threatens to break the system before it fully begins.

The Four Liability Exposures

Healthcare providers signing work requirement exemption attestations face four distinct categories of legal risk: fraud prosecution, professional discipline, malpractice claims, and credentialing consequences.

Fraud prosecution represents the most serious exposure. Federal law prohibits knowingly making false statements to obtain federal funds. Medicaid is a federal-state program. An exemption attestation that enables someone to maintain Medicaid coverage involves federal money. If a provider knowingly attests that someone cannot work when the provider knows they can, that attestation could theoretically trigger criminal fraud liability under 18 U.S.C. 1001 or civil False Claims Act liability under 31 U.S.C. 3729.

The word "knowingly" does enormous work in fraud law. Fraud requires intent or reckless disregard for truth. A provider who makes a good-faith professional judgment that later proves incorrect has not committed fraud. But the distinction between incorrect judgment and reckless disregard is not always clear. An aggressive prosecutor might argue that a provider who signed exemptions at high rates without adequate documentation was recklessly disregarding truth even if each individual attestation seemed reasonable at the time.

Professional discipline through state medical boards represents a second risk layer. Medical boards have authority to discipline physicians for conduct that violates professional standards. If a board determines that a physician signed attestations without adequate clinical foundation or engaged in a pattern of inappropriate exemption documentation, the board could impose discipline ranging from reprimand to license suspension or revocation.

This risk exists even without fraud. A physician could make honest mistakes repeatedly without criminal intent yet still face professional discipline for falling below the standard of care in medical

documentation. The question becomes: what is the standard of care for work requirement exemption attestations? No established medical literature defines this standard because the requirement is new. Boards will be making judgments about professional conduct in an area where professional standards have not yet formed.

Malpractice claims present a third exposure. Could a patient sue a provider who refused to sign an exemption attestation, arguing that the refusal constituted abandonment or failure to advocate? Could a patient sue a provider who signed an attestation that was later denied, claiming the provider gave false hope? These theories seem unlikely to succeed, but unlikely is not impossible. Providers face litigation risk whenever their decisions affect patient welfare.

Credentialing and network participation create a fourth consequence layer. Hospitals, health systems, and insurance networks credential providers based on their professional standing. Fraud investigations, licensing board actions, or patterns of disputed attestations could affect credentialing even without formal discipline. A provider under investigation might be suspended from hospital privileges pending resolution. A provider with multiple questioned attestations might be excluded from Medicaid managed care networks. These consequences damage careers even when formal liability never attaches.

The cumulative effect of these four risk layers is chilling. Providers understand that signing attestation forms exposes them to scrutiny that could cascade through multiple enforcement mechanisms. The rational response is to minimize exposure by limiting attestations, which harms patients who legitimately need exemptions.

The Safe Harbor That Does Not Exist

Legal safe harbors protect people who engage in risky but socially valuable activities by defining circumstances under which liability will not attach. Good Samaritan laws protect doctors who provide emergency care outside hospital settings. Qualified immunity protects government officials making discretionary decisions. Statutory safe harbors for medical exemption attestations could protect providers who follow specified procedures and act in good faith.

As of early 2026, no such federal safe harbor exists. OB3 / H.R.1 authorizes work requirements but does not establish liability protections for providers who document exemptions. Some states have included safe harbor language in their work requirement regulations. Others have not. The result is a patchwork where provider protection depends on geography and implementation decisions that remain fluid.

The elements of an effective safe harbor are straightforward. ***First,*** establish that attestations based on clinical relationships are protected. A provider who has examined a patient, reviewed their medical history, and documented their assessment should not face liability for making a professional judgment that the patient cannot consistently work. ***Second,*** require that the attestation reflect reasonable professional judgment at the time it was made. Retrospective analysis showing a patient later worked does not prove the original attestation was unreasonable if circumstances changed. ***Third,*** protect providers from liability when states deny exemptions despite provider recommendations. A state's administrative decision should not expose the provider to legal risk. ***Fourth,*** document the clinical basis in the medical record so that the provider's reasoning is clear if later questioned.

Georgia's 2025 regulations include language approaching this safe harbor model: "Healthcare providers submitting medical exemption documentation based on clinical relationship and

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

professional judgment shall not be subject to professional discipline or fraud prosecution for good faith attestations, even if subsequent review determines exemption was not warranted." This language protects judgment even when outcome disappoints.

Other states have no equivalent protection. Their regulations simply describe what documentation is required without addressing provider liability. This silence leaves providers subject to general fraud and professional responsibility statutes without specific protection for the work requirement context.

The variation matters practically. ***A primary care physician practicing in three states under different Medicaid programs faces three different liability frameworks for the same clinical activity.*** A physician in Georgia has explicit safe harbor protection. A physician in Arkansas operates under regulations that do not mention provider liability. A physician in Kentucky faces regulations that emphasize fraud prevention without establishing professional judgment protection. The physician must navigate these differences while maintaining clinical standards that should be consistent regardless of administrative jurisdiction.

Even in states with safe harbor language, protection has limits. Safe harbors do not protect fraudulent conduct. A provider who accepts payment to sign false attestations has no safe harbor. A provider who signs attestations for people who are not actually patients has no safe harbor. A provider who engages in systematic fraud, signing exemptions for dozens of people who clearly can work, has no safe harbor. These exceptions are appropriate, but they create ambiguity around the edges. When does aggressive advocacy for patients become inappropriate attestation? When does high exemption volume reflect a patient population with genuine needs versus inadequate scrutiny?

The Functional Assessment Problem

Medical exemption attestations for work requirements typically ask functional questions rather than diagnostic ones. The relevant inquiry is not whether someone has diabetes but whether their diabetes prevents them from consistently meeting an 80-hour monthly work requirement. This functional focus creates assessment challenges that diagnostic documentation does not.

Consider a 52-year-old patient with moderate osteoarthritis affecting knees and hands. The patient has a confirmed diagnosis. Imaging shows joint space narrowing. Pain is documented. But does this prevent the patient from working 80 hours monthly? The answer depends on factors extending beyond clinical assessment: what jobs are available in the patient's area, what physical demands those jobs require, whether accommodations are available, how well pain management works, how reliably the patient takes medication, whether the patient has transportation to work, whether the patient has care responsibilities that limit working hours.

A physician asked to attest whether this patient "can work" is being asked to make a judgment that incorporates economic, social, and practical considerations alongside medical ones. The physician is being conscripted to evaluate not just medical status but the entire situation in which the patient must function. This extends beyond traditional clinical expertise.

The functional assessment burden intensifies with invisible disabilities. Mental health conditions, chronic pain, fatigue, cognitive impairment, and episodic illnesses do not present with obvious clinical signs. A person might appear capable in a 15-minute office visit but be unable to maintain employment over time. Depression that is manageable with treatment might become

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

disabling when treatment access is disrupted. Anxiety that does not prevent functioning in familiar environments might prevent the job interviews and new work situations that employment requires.

Providers face impossible judgments. A patient with depression asks for an exemption attestation, explaining that they tried working last year but had a breakdown after three weeks and were hospitalized. The patient is currently stable on medication and in therapy. Can the patient work now? Probably yes, if stability continues. Will stability continue under the stress of employment, schedule demands, and workplace pressures? Unknown. Should the provider attest that the patient cannot work, protecting them from a requirement they might not meet? Or should the provider refuse the attestation, believing the patient could succeed if they tried?

There is no clear clinical standard for these judgments. Evidence-based medicine does not provide guidelines for predicting work capacity under specific policy requirements. Providers are making educated guesses about functional capacity in environments they do not control, using criteria that policy defines but medicine does not.

This ambiguity creates liability exposure. A provider who is conservative, signing exemptions for anyone whose condition might interfere with consistent employment, faces accusations of over-attesting. A provider who is strict, requiring clear evidence that work is impossible before signing exemptions, faces accusations of abandoning patients who need advocacy. The middle ground is subjective and therefore vulnerable to second-guessing.

Documentation Standards That Protect

Providers can reduce liability risk through documentation practices that establish the clinical basis for attestation decisions. The medical record should show what information the provider considered, what clinical findings supported the assessment, and how the provider reached their professional judgment. This documentation does not guarantee immunity from scrutiny, but it provides evidence that the attestation was not arbitrary or fraudulent.

The functional assessment documentation should describe what the patient can and cannot do reliably. "Patient has diabetes" is a diagnosis but not a functional assessment. "Patient experiences daily blood sugar fluctuations requiring frequent monitoring and has had three hypoglycemic episodes in the past month that caused confusion and impaired function for several hours" describes functional impact. "Patient reports difficulty maintaining employment due to diabetes" is patient report. "Patient's diabetes requires insulin adjustments three times weekly and has resulted in two emergency department visits in the past six months when blood sugar became uncontrolled" documents clinical events supporting functional limitation.

The documentation should note what the provider explained to the patient about expectations. Did the provider discuss that exemptions are temporary and subject to renewal? Did the provider explain that improved health status might change exemption eligibility? Did the provider document patient understanding? These conversations show that the provider approached exemptions as clinical judgments rather than as rubber-stamp approvals.

The record should note if the provider declined to sign an attestation and why. "Patient requested medical exemption attestation. Chart review shows no documented conditions that would prevent consistent work. Patient reports fatigue but workup has been negative. Exemption attestation not supported by clinical findings." This documentation protects the provider if the patient later complains.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

For episodic conditions, documentation should describe the pattern over time. "Patient has bipolar disorder with documented hospitalizations in 2023 and 2025 following manic episodes. Patient is currently stable on medication but history shows difficulty maintaining stability during periods of increased stress including previous employment attempts. Professional judgment is that patient cannot consistently meet monthly work requirements given pattern of decompensation." This establishes clinical reasoning based on longitudinal understanding rather than snapshot assessment.

When attestations are renewed, the record should note what changed or stayed the same. "Six-month exemption renewal. Patient's diabetes remains poorly controlled despite medication adjustments. A1C increased from 9.2 to 10.1. Patient reports continued difficulty with blood sugar management. Functional limitations remain unchanged. Exemption appropriate for continued period." This shows ongoing assessment rather than automatic renewal.

The record should never contain statements that undermine the attestation. "Patient probably could work but wants the exemption" creates evidence of inappropriate attestation. "Patient insists on exemption even though I think they could manage part-time work" suggests the provider signed despite believing the patient was capable. These statements expose the provider to liability if the attestation is later questioned.

What Providers Should Not Sign

Understanding when to decline attestation requests is as important as understanding when to provide them. Providers face pressure from patients who need exemptions, from social circumstances that make employment difficult, and from their own desire to help. But signing attestations without clinical basis exposes providers to liability and undermines the credibility of legitimate exemptions.

Providers should not sign attestations for people who are not their patients. Patients sometimes ask physicians to sign forms for family members, friends, or acquaintances who need medical documentation. The physician has no clinical relationship with these individuals, has not examined them, has not reviewed their medical history, and has no basis for professional judgment about their functional capacity. Signing attestations under these circumstances is fraudulent regardless of whether the underlying condition exists.

Providers should not sign attestations that are clinically unsupported. A patient with well-controlled hypertension and no other conditions asks for an exemption because finding work is difficult. The hypertension does not prevent work. The difficult job market is not a medical condition. The attestation would be false. The provider's sympathy for the patient's economic situation does not justify false medical documentation.

Providers should not sign attestations based solely on patient report without clinical corroboration. A patient claims to have severe back pain preventing work but has no imaging, no documented treatment, and no objective findings on examination. The provider cannot verify the claim. Signing an attestation based on uncorroborated patient report exposes the provider to accusations of inadequate assessment.

Providers should not sign attestations outside their scope of expertise. A family practice physician is asked to attest that a patient's schizophrenia prevents work. The patient sees a psychiatrist for mental health care. The family practice physician is not qualified to assess psychiatric work capacity. The attestation should come from the psychiatrist who is treating the

condition. Signing attestations outside one's expertise invites questions about professional judgment.

Providers should not sign blank or incomplete attestation forms. Some patients ask physicians to sign forms that the patient will complete later. This is never appropriate. The provider must see the completed attestation, verify accuracy, and sign only after confirming the attestation reflects their judgment.

Providers should not continue signing renewal attestations without reassessment. Exemptions require periodic renewal. A provider cannot simply sign renewal forms based on previous attestations without evaluating whether clinical circumstances have changed. ***Automatic renewals without clinical review create patterns that investigators will question.***

The Compensation Gap

Provider time spent on exemption attestations is not reimbursed. Medicaid pays for clinical encounters, diagnostic procedures, and therapeutic interventions. It does not pay for completing administrative forms, even when those forms determine benefit eligibility that maintains patient coverage. This creates a perverse incentive structure where providers lose money by providing documentation that patients need.

The time required for exemption attestations varies by complexity. A straightforward attestation for a patient with well-documented conditions might take five to ten minutes: chart review, patient discussion, form completion, signature. A complex attestation requiring functional assessment, consideration of multiple conditions, and documentation of clinical reasoning might take 30 minutes or more. Multiply this by the volume of patients needing attestations, and the burden becomes substantial.

Practices serving high proportions of Medicaid patients face disproportionate attestation volume. Federally Qualified Health Centers, rural health clinics, and safety-net practices see the patients most likely to need work requirement exemptions. These practices already operate on thin margins with Medicaid reimbursement below cost of care. Adding unreimbursed attestation burden accelerates financial pressure that makes Medicaid participation unsustainable.

Some practices charge patients for exemption documentation, treating it as a non-covered service like completion of disability forms or employment physicals. This approach is legal but creates access barriers. Patients who cannot afford the fee cannot get the documentation. Charging for exemption forms contradicts the advocacy role providers play in helping patients maintain coverage.

The alternative is advocacy for reimbursement at the policy level. State Medicaid agencies could create billing codes for exemption attestations, paying providers modestly for the administrative work. The payment need not be high; $25 to $50 per attestation would cover the time involved and incentivize provider participation. Some states have implemented such payments. Others have not.

Professional associations representing physicians, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants should negotiate collectively for attestation reimbursement. Individual practices lack leverage to secure payment. Organized advocacy by state medical societies or specialty organizations could establish reimbursement standards that apply broadly. This advocacy has not yet materialized at scale, leaving most providers with the choice of absorbing costs or limiting participation.

The Path Forward

Provider liability protection requires state and federal policy action. The most direct solution is federal safe harbor legislation establishing that healthcare providers who provide medical exemption attestations based on clinical relationships and professional judgment are protected from fraud liability, professional discipline, and other legal consequences if they act in good faith.

The legislation should define good faith clearly. An attestation is made in good faith if it is based on clinical examination, reflects reasonable professional judgment given the information available at the time, is documented in the medical record, and follows accepted standards of medical practice. Good faith does not require that the attestation be correct in retrospect. It requires that the provider's judgment was reasonable when made.

The legislation should establish that subsequent evidence of work capacity does not disprove the original attestation. A patient who works after an attestation of incapacity may have experienced improved health, may have found accommodations that enabled work, or may be attempting to work despite limitations. The fact of subsequent employment does not prove the provider's judgment was wrong when made.

The legislation should protect providers from liability when states deny exemptions despite provider attestation. The state's administrative determination reflects policy judgment, not medical assessment. Providers should not face legal consequences for making medical judgments that states overrule for policy reasons.

States without federal safe harbor legislation should enact their own protections. State law can protect providers from state-level professional discipline and state fraud prosecution even if federal safe harbor legislation does not exist. State safe harbors provide partial protection that is better than no protection.

Professional liability insurance carriers should clarify whether existing policies cover work requirement attestation claims. Providers need to know if their malpractice insurance protects them from liability related to exemption documentation or if they need additional coverage. Clear guidance from insurers would reduce provider uncertainty.

Medical boards should establish standards for exemption attestations before disciplining providers for allegedly falling below standards. Professional organizations should develop guidance documents describing appropriate functional assessment practices, documentation standards, and decision frameworks for providers evaluating work capacity. These standards should emerge from professional judgment rather than government enforcement.

Healthcare systems should provide institutional support for providers facing attestation responsibilities. Legal guidance on what attestations should and should not contain. Template forms that structure documentation appropriately. Clear policies on when to provide attestations and when to decline. Protected time for attestation work that is not squeezed between patient appointments. These supports reduce individual provider risk while improving attestation quality.

Provider organizations should track patterns of questioned attestations and legal actions against providers. This surveillance would identify whether enforcement is targeting specific provider types, geographic areas, or practice patterns. Early identification of enforcement trends enables collective response before patterns become entrenched.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

The fundamental challenge is that healthcare providers are being conscripted into an administrative gatekeeping role without clear rules protecting them from liability when their good-faith clinical judgments are later questioned. Until that protection exists through legislation, regulation, or established practice, providers will rationally respond to liability risk by limiting their participation. The cost falls on patients who need exemptions they cannot obtain and on a verification system that depends on provider cooperation it has not secured.

References

1. Hinton E, et al. "Medicaid Work Requirements: Provider Perspectives on Implementation Challenges." Kaiser Family Foundation. January 2026.
2. American Medical Association. "Guidelines for Completion of Administrative Forms." AMA Policy H-315.979. 2024.
3. Government Accountability Office. "Medicaid Fraud Control: Provider Liability in Benefits Verification." GAO-25-234. December 2025.
4. Sommers BD, et al. "Health Care Provider Participation in Medicaid Work Requirement Implementation." Health Affairs. 2026;45(2):189-197.
5. National Association of Community Health Centers. "Work Requirement Attestation Burden Survey." NACHC Policy Brief. November 2025.
6. Rosenbaum S, et al. "Legal Liability for Medical Necessity Determinations." Milbank Quarterly. 2023;101(4):1034-1067.
7. State of Georgia Department of Community Health. "Pathways to Coverage Provider Handbook." Revised January 2026.
8. Arkansas Department of Human Services. "Arkansas Works Provider Attestation Analysis, 2018-2019." Post-Implementation Review. March 2020.
9. Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission. "Provider Participation in Medicaid Work Requirements." Issue Brief. February 2026.
10. American College of Physicians. "Ethical Considerations in Benefit Eligibility Documentation." ACP Ethics Manual, Seventh Edition. 2024.
11. Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. "State Medicaid Director Letter #26-001: Guidance on Work Requirement Implementation." January 2026.
12. False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729-3733 (2024).
13. 18 U.S.C. § 1001 (False Statements to Federal Agencies).
14. Federation of State Medical Boards. "Model Guidelines for Completion of Administrative Forms." April 2025.
15. Musumeci M, et al. "Medicaid Work Requirements: Implications for Health Care Providers." Kaiser Family Foundation. September 2025.
16. Hoffman C, Paradise J. "Health Care Access for Medicaid Enrollees: State Variation and Impact of Work Requirements." Commonwealth Fund Issue Brief. December 2025.
17. National Health Law Program. "Protecting Healthcare Providers in Work Requirement Implementation: Model Safe Harbor Legislation." February 2026.
18. Society of General Internal Medicine. "Functional Assessment in Clinical Practice: Tools and Approaches." SGIM Resource Library. 2025.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

19. Congressional Budget Office. "Medicaid Work Requirements: Administrative Costs and Provider Burden." CBO Report 58-234. August 2025.
20. Association of American Medical Colleges. "Teaching Hospitals and Work Requirement Attestations: Capacity Analysis." AAMC Policy Report. January 2026.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*