

The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt™ PUBLICATION

OCTOBER 2022

Editor's Note: Fintechs Take Note

Victoria Prussen Spears

What Fintech Companies Need to Know About Key Federal and State Privacy Requirements

Daniel Forester, Melissa Baal Guidorizzi, Sulina Gabale and Ryan McKenney

The Gloves Come Off: CFTC Takes Swing at Alleged Bitcoin Fraud

Alexandra C. Scheibe and Ethan M. Heller

Cryptocurrency as Commodities? Bipartisan Senate Bill Proposes Comprehensive Legislation to Regulate Digital Assets

Phillip C. Bauknight and Benjamin M. Ebbink

Responsible Financial Innovation Act: Proposed Tax and Reporting for Digital Assets

Andrea S. Kramer, John T. Lutz, William R. Pomierski and Andrew M. Granek

Second Circuit Considers Whether Syndicated Term Loans Are Securities

Peter I. Altman, Douglas A. Rappaport, Daniel I. Fisher, Jaisohn Jungbin Im and Jesse Michael Brush

Adviser's ESG Disclosures End Up in SEC's Greenwashing Crosshairs

Daniel M. Hawke, Jane Norberg, Christian D. H. Schultz, Erik Walsh, Ellen Kaye Fleishhacker, Jonathan E. Green and Jonathan S. Martel

Department of Labor Sued in Crypto 401(k) Guidance Lawsuit

Phillip C. Bauknight and Ron M. Pierce

What the C-Suite and Board Should Know About the New CCO Certification Requirement From DOJ

Mark A. Rush and Nadia J. Brooks

First Settlement with Non-Bank Lender Exemplifies DOJ's Commitment to Its "Combatting Redlining Initiative"

Paul F. Hancock, Olivia Kelman and Lanette Suárez Martín

U.S. Supreme Court Decision Reconfirms Availability of Municipal Bond Financing for Religious Organizations

Jenna Magan, Stephen Spitz, and Marc Bauer

European Regulatory Overhaul for Crypto Firms on the Horizon

Christopher Hurn and Joshua Kaplan



LexisNexis

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 139

NUMBER 9

October 2022

Editor's Note: Fintechs Take Note Victoria Prussen Spears	495
What Fintech Companies Need to Know About Key Federal and State Privacy Requirements Daniel Forester, Melissa Baal Guidorizzi, Sulina Gabale and Ryan McKenney	498
The Gloves Come Off: CFTC Takes Swing at Alleged Bitcoin Fraud Alexandra C. Scheibe and Ethan M. Heller	507
Cryptocurrency as Commodities? Bipartisan Senate Bill Proposes Comprehensive Legislation to Regulate Digital Assets Phillip C. Bauknight and Benjamin M. Ebbink	513
Responsible Financial Innovation Act: Proposed Tax and Reporting for Digital Assets Andrea S. Kramer, John T. Lutz, William R. Pomierski and Andrew M. Granek	516
Second Circuit Considers Whether Syndicated Term Loans Are Securities Peter I. Altman, Douglas A. Rappaport, Daniel I. Fisher, Jaisohn Jungbin Im and Jesse Michael Brush	520
Adviser's ESG Disclosures End Up in SEC's Greenwashing Crosshairs Daniel M. Hawke, Jane Norberg, Christian D. H. Schultz, Erik Walsh, Ellen Kaye Fleishhacker, Jonathan E. Green and Jonathan S. Martel	525
Department of Labor Sued in Crypto 401(k) Guidance Lawsuit Phillip C. Bauknight and Ron M. Pierce	529
What the C-Suite and Board Should Know About the New CCO Certification Requirement From DOJ Mark A. Rush and Nadia J. Brooks	532
First Settlement with Non-Bank Lender Exemplifies DOJ's Commitment to Its "Combatting Redlining Initiative" Paul F. Hancock, Olivia Kelman and Lanette Suárez Martín	536
U.S. Supreme Court Decision Reconfirms Availability of Municipal Bond Financing for Religious Organizations Jenna Magan, Stephen Spitz, and Marc Bauer	540
European Regulatory Overhaul for Crypto Firms on the Horizon Christopher Hurn and Joshua Kaplan	543

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Matthew T. Burke at (800) 252-9257
Email: matthew.t.burke@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call
Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7878-2 (print)

ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)

Cite this publication as:

The Banking Law Journal (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

BARKLEY CLARK

Partner, Stinson Leonard Street LLP

CARLETON GOSS

Counsel, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP

MICHAEL J. HELLER

Partner, Rivkin Radler LLP

SATISH M. KINI

Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP

DOUGLAS LANDY

White & Case LLP

PAUL L. LEE

Of Counsel, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP

TIMOTHY D. NAEGELE

Partner, Timothy D. Naegele & Associates

STEPHEN J. NEWMAN

Partner, Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL (ISBN 978-0-76987-878-2) (USPS 003-160) is published ten times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2022 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW, Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207.

Second Circuit Considers Whether Syndicated Term Loans Are Securities

*By Peter I. Altman, Douglas A. Rappaport, Daniel I. Fisher,
Jaisohn Jungbin Im and Jesse Michael Brush**

This article discusses a case before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, which is considering whether syndicated term loans—i.e., loans to corporate entities provided by a group of lenders, rather than a single lender—are “securities.”

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is considering whether syndicated term loans—i.e., loans to corporate entities provided by a group of lenders, rather than a single lender—are “securities” under a U.S. Supreme Court decision known as *Reves*. The Loan Syndications and Trading Association (“LSTA”) recently filed an amicus curiae brief arguing that syndicated term loans are not securities and warning of the devastating effect on the \$1.4 trillion market any other conclusion would cause.

If the Second Circuit holds that syndicated term loans are securities under *Reves*, the resulting practical complications and compliance costs for loan and collateralized loan obligation (“CLO”) market participants could make it far more difficult for certain businesses to access debt financing and for those businesses to engage in liability management transactions. Such a ruling could even create a heightened risk of insider trading claims under the federal securities laws. This article discusses the issue and the implications.

BACKGROUND

The trustee of the Millennium Lender Claim Trust brought an action against numerous financial institutions alleging that a \$1.8 billion syndicated loan transaction violated state securities laws.

* Peter I. Altman (paltman@akingump.com) is partner at Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP focusing on white collar and other enforcement and regulatory matters, securities and investment fund-related litigation and internal investigations. Douglas A. Rappaport (darappaport@akingump.com) is a litigation partner at the firm focusing on complex commercial and securities disputes and a range of compliance, fiduciary and general business issues.

Daniel I. Fisher (dfisher@akingump.com), a partner at the firm and the leader of its integrated special situations group, practices at the nexus of restructuring, finance, M&A and securities. Jaisohn Jungbin Im (jim@akingump.com) is a partner at the firm concentrating on a wide variety of financing transactions, representing private equity sponsors, hedge funds, financial investors, special situation investors, portfolio companies and other corporate borrowers. Jesse Michael Brush (jbrush@akingump.com) is a partner at the firm focusing on public offerings and private placements of equity and debt securities and other capital markets transactions.

On May 22, 2020, Judge Paul G. Gardephe of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York granted defendants' motion to dismiss,¹ holding that the syndicated loan notes at issue (the "Notes") were not securities under the "family resemblance" test as articulated in *Reves v. Ernst & Young*.²

In *Reves*, the Supreme Court recognized that a presumption exists that notes are securities and that many kinds of notes are, in fact, securities. However, *Reves* also enumerated several categories of notes that are not securities under federal securities law, including, for example, notes secured by home mortgages, consumer financing notes and notes evidencing loans by commercial banks for current operations. Recognizing that many kinds of notes would not fall squarely within these enumerated categories, the Supreme Court held that where a particular note bears a "family resemblance" to notes commonly understood to be non-securities, the presumption that a note is a security may be rebutted.³

Judge Gardephe reasoned that the Notes were analogous to bank loans—not securities—because:

- (1) The plan of distribution for the Notes was relatively narrow such that it was not subject to common trading for speculation or investment.
- (2) The confidentiality language in the governing loan documents would lead a reasonable investor to conclude that the Notes constituted loans and not securities.
- (3) The sale of loan participations to "sophisticated purchasers" is subject to certain policy guidelines from the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency such that the Notes were subject to an existing regulatory scheme.

Judge Gardephe found that the remaining *Reves* factor (i.e., whether the transactional motivations were akin to a securities transaction) did not weigh heavily in either direction.

¹ *Kirschner v. JP Morgan Chase Bank, N.A.*, No. 17 Civ. 6334 (PGG) (S.D.N.Y. May 22, 2020).

² 494 U.S. 56 (1990). While plaintiff alleged defendants violated state rather than federal securities laws, the court accepted plaintiff's assertion that the *Reves* "family resemblance test" applied.

³ The four factors of the "family resemblance test" are: (1) "the motivations that would prompt a reasonable seller and buyer to enter into [the transaction]"; (2) "the plan of distribution of the instrument"; (3) "the reasonable expectations of the investing public" and (4) "the existence of another regulatory scheme [to reduce] the risk of the instrument, thereby rendering application of the Securities Act unnecessary." *Id.* at 66–67.

On October 28, 2021, the plaintiff appealed to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, arguing that the district court erroneously disregarded the *Reves* presumption that notes are securities, and that it misapplied the “family resemblance” test.

THE LSTA’S AMICUS BRIEF

On May 23, 2022, the LSTA submitted an amicus curiae brief to the Second Circuit arguing that syndicated term loans are not securities subject to state and federal securities laws. In support of the district court’s holding, the LSTA emphasizes that treating syndicated term loans as securities would jeopardize a trillion-dollar-plus market that is vital to the U.S. economy.

The LSTA argues that the additional practical and compliance issues that would arise from treating syndicated loans as securities would impose enormous costs and constraints on borrowers. Market participants would be obligated to comply with a patchwork of state and federal laws that would only drive up the costs of borrowing.

Further, loan syndication and trading activity would likely need to be conducted through broker-dealers registered with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”), and any market participant that receives compensation tied to loan transaction would need to determine whether it needs to register as a broker-dealer. Moreover, the LSTA highlights that treating syndicated term loans as securities would profoundly disrupt customary arrangements between borrowers and loan market participants.

POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL FAR-REACHING IMPLICATIONS

A ruling from the Second Circuit that syndicated term loans are securities could have potentially far-reaching implications, which go beyond the concerns laid out in the LSTA *amicus curiae* brief.

- *Insider Trading Implications:* Market participants that trade term loans often choose to access private-side data rooms, which may include confidential material that is arguably material non-public information (“MNPI”). Other participants may choose to trade term loans without accessing such private-side information, fully aware that their counterparties may be in possession of this potential MNPI.⁴ These transac-

⁴ The trade confirms that are typically used to settle syndicated loan transactions contain standardized “big boy” provisions that require the parties to acknowledge that they are willing to proceed with the transaction even if they have chosen not to access private side information that may have been reviewed by the other party. While these types of representations provide the

tions are premised on the assumption—and at this point, well-established market convention—that term loans are not securities. If the Second Circuit reverses the decision below, market participants with access to private-side information could face an increased risk of insider trading liability, particularly from regulators such as the SEC.

- *Tender Offer Issues*: A ruling that term loans are securities could subject certain transactions in the term loan market to the federal tender offer rules. Borrowers and third parties would need to consider whether a proposed offer to purchase term loans for cash or to exchange term loans for other consideration constitutes a “tender offer” under applicable case law. The tender offer rules could also potentially be implicated (under the “new security” doctrine) by proposed amendments to basic financial terms, such as a proposed change to the applicable interest rate or an extension of maturity. In the event a transaction constitutes a tender offer, the borrower or other offeror would need to comply with Regulation 14E under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, including the requirements that the offer be held open for 20 business days and that the offer remain open for at least 10 business days after any change in consideration or the percentage of the tranche being sought. Application of tender offer rules would greatly reduce loan market participants’ flexibility to propose liability management transactions and efficiently negotiate changes to terms.
- *Collateralized Loan Obligation Restrictions*: As the largest investor group in broadly syndicated leveraged bank loans, CLOs would be particularly adversely affected if such loans were deemed to be securities. Most CLOs permit only a small amount of securities to be included in their pools as eligible assets. A determination that certain types of syndicated loans are securities would diminish the universe of eligible assets for investment by CLOs. If banks need to hold more loans on their books as opposed to syndicating them out to CLOs and other traditional buyers of such loans, in response to such reduced liquidity, banks can be expected to fund fewer loans to eligible borrowers. As a result, it will be much more difficult for businesses to gain quick access to funding on flexible, bespoke terms, and for lenders to pool funds quickly and

parties with protections from private litigation in the syndicated loan market, the SEC has suggested that they would not be a defense to a regulatory enforcement action for insider trading. See SEC Litigation Release No. 20132, Barclays Bank Pays \$10.9 Million to Settle Charges of Insider Trading on Bankruptcy Creditor Committee Information (May 30, 2007), <http://www.sec.gov/litigation/litrelases/2007/lr20132.htm>.

easily to offer loans to borrowers that might not qualify for other types of financing, which will have a wide-ranging negative impact on the U.S. economy.

- *Potential Impact on Other Markets:* A broad ruling from the Second Circuit could have an impact on the burgeoning areas of decentralized finance (“DeFi”) and cryptocurrency. The SEC highlighted *Reves* in a recent settled administrative order that found certain digital tokens were securities.⁵ The SEC’s position on the application of *Reves* to DeFi has yet to be tested in court and a sweeping decision in *Kirschmer* could impact future decision-making by that agency in this completely separate and rapidly developing market.

Participants in the syndicated loan market—including private fund managers that employ strategies in the credit space—should pay close attention to the *Kirschmer* litigation going forward. Briefing on the appeal concluded in mid-June with the filing of plaintiff’s reply brief. Oral argument will likely be held sometime in the fall, and the Second Circuit can be expected to issue its opinion thereafter.

⁵ See *In the matter of Blockchain Credit Partners d/b/a DeFi Money Market, Gregory Keough, and Derek Acree* (SEC Aug. 6, 2021), available at <https://www.sec.gov/litigation/admin/2021/33-10961.pdf>.