

March 2013



White Collar Roundup

SEC Examination Priorities for the Newish Year

The National Examination Program (NEP) of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) released its [Examination Priorities for 2013](#). The NEP's goal is to aid both investors and registrants and "to support the SEC's mission to protect investors, maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets, and facilitate capital formation." The NEP listed the following initiatives for 2013: (1) fraud detection and prevention; (2) corporate governance and enterprise risk management; (3) conflicts of interest; and (4) the use of technology in the capital markets.

Lobbying, Bribing and the Fine Line of Honest-Services Fraud

Tackling the ambiguity that can arise at the intersection of lobbying and bribery, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in [United States v. Ring](#) clarified what the government must prove to convict a lobbyist of honest-services fraud. The court noted that "[t]he distinction between legal lobbying and criminal conduct may be subtle, but...it spells the difference between honest politics and criminal corruption." Ring was a lobbyist who had relied on political campaign contributions to not only curry favor with politicians but also to treat some "to dinners, drinks, travel, concerts, and sporting events." Some of the beneficiaries of such treats acted favorably toward Ring and his clients. After conviction for honest-services fraud, Ring appealed, claiming the district court gave erroneous instructions. But the appeals court disagreed, holding that the district court's instructions that "the government had to show that Ring gave gifts with an 'intent 'to influence' an official act' by way of a corrupt quid pro quo" were correct.

Trying to Reinvent the Wheel

The Sixth Circuit in [United States v. Howley](#) upheld the theft-of-trade-secrets convictions of two tire engineers who had illegally photographed tires designed by Goodyear, in order to sell the photos to a Chinese competitor. After conviction, the defendants argued that the photographs they took did not constitute trade secrets because Goodyear had not taken "reasonable measures to keep the design of its tire-assembly machines secret." The Sixth Circuit held that Goodyear had, by fencing off the plant and requiring visitors to pass through a security checkpoint. Unfortunately for the defendants, who had received nonincarceratory sentences, the Sixth Circuit also vacated the sentences and remanded because the district court failed to make specific findings to justify its conclusion that the theft resulted in no loss to Goodyear.

Related practice areas:

[White Collar Defense and Internal Investigations](#)

For further information about how Day Pitney can assist you with government or internal investigations, please contact any of the following attorneys:

James R. DeVita^{NY}
jdevita@daypitney.com
(212) 297 2429

David J. Elliott^{CT}
djelliott@daypitney.com
(860) 275 0196

Helen Harris^{CT, NY}
hharris@daypitney.com
(203) 977 7418

Dennis T. Kearney^{NJ}
dkearney@daypitney.com
(973) 966 8039

Elizabeth A. Latif^{CT, MA}
elatif@daypitney.com
(860) 275 0166

Mark Salah Morgan^{NJ}
mmorgan@daypitney.com
(973) 966 8067

John J. O'Reilly^{NJ}
joreilly@daypitney.com
(973) 966 8043

Kenneth W. Ritt^{CT}
kwritt@daypitney.com
(203) 977 7318

Denise R. Rosenhaft^{NJ, NY}
drosenhaft@daypitney.com
(973) 966 8224

Stanley A. Twardy Jr.^{CT, DC}
satwardy@daypitney.com
(203) 977 7368

Daniel E. Wenner^{CT, MA, NY}
dwenner@daypitney.com
(860) 275 0465

Not Making a Statement—False or Otherwise

The Sixth Circuit also weighed in to the fray on a mortgage-fraud conviction in [*United States v. Kurlemann*](#). There, the government prosecuted Kurlemann, a straw buyer in a complex mortgage-fraud scheme, for making a false statement or report to a bank to secure a loan, in violation of [18 U.S.C. 1014](#). The allegation was that Kurlemann had failed to disclose that he had borrowed the down payment from the seller. At trial, the district court instructed the jury that a statement under the statute is false when "it contains half-truth or when it conceals a material fact." As the appeals court succinctly stated, "That is not right." The court concluded that under a statute criminalizing only "making a false or fraudulent statement" and not "failing to disclose any fact," making an omission or conveying a half-truth is not actionable. But the ruling was not all good for Kurlemann because the court affirmed his bankruptcy-fraud convictions.

Pushing for More on the FCPA

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and 32 other pro-business organizations wrote a [letter](#) to the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) and the SEC to ask for further clarification on the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) in light of the agencies' joint release of [A Resource Guide to the U.S. Foreign Corrupt Practices Act \(Guide\)](#). In the letter, the business organizations commend the DOJ and SEC for publishing the *Guide* but seek further guidance on the following issues: (1) how the DOJ and SEC will weigh in making charging decisions the use of a robust and well-implemented compliance program as well as voluntary disclosures; (2) the definitions of "foreign official" and "instrumentality"; (3) whether the *Guide* altered the pre-existing standard for determining parent-subsidary liability for anti-bribery violations; (4) successor liability against an acquiring company for pre-acquisition violations by an acquired entity; (5) further definition of the mens rea standard for corporate criminal liability for an FCPA violation; and (6) examples of how declination decisions have been made.

Enforcement of the FCPA Against Foreigners: Clear as Mud

As we noted in last month's *Roundup*, Judge Richard Sullivan of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York was considering the foreign defendants' motion to dismiss an FCPA action because they claimed to have had insufficient ties to the United States. Judge Sullivan denied their motion on February 8 in [SEC v. Straub](#). By happenstance, Judge Shira Scheindlin of the same court granted a similar motion on February 19 in [SEC v. Sharef](#), which was also an action against a foreigner for violating the FCPA. The takeaway: Whether a foreigner can be haled into court in the United States to answer for an alleged FCPA violation is a fact-intensive inquiry.

Doing the Hokey-Pokey at the SEC

The Project on Government Oversight (POGO) issued a report with the descriptive title [Dangerous Liaisons: Revolving Door at SEC Creates Risk of Regulatory Capture](#). As one might guess, the report assails the apparent practice of SEC attorneys leaving the commission to enter the private sector and returning to the SEC from the private sector. Senator

Charles Grassley, R-Iowa, issued a [statement](#) in which he commended the POGO and agreed with the problems inherent with this purported practice.

About Day Pitney LLP

Day Pitney LLP is a full-service law firm with more than 300 attorneys in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Boston and Washington, DC. The firm offers clients strong corporate and litigation practices, with experience on behalf of large national and international corporations as well as emerging- and middle-market companies and individuals.

Lawyers in our [White Collar Defense and Internal Investigations](#) practice have the resources, skills and experience necessary to protect our clients' interests whenever they are confronted by a government investigation, whether at the local, regional, national or international level. Our clients include Fortune 50 corporations, private companies, universities, hospitals and individuals. We have also conducted comprehensive and conclusive internal investigations for our clients and have helped them strengthen their regulatory compliance programs and ethics plans.

Bar Admissions: Connecticut ^{CT} Massachusetts ^{MA} New Jersey ^{NJ} New York ^{NY}
Washington, DC ^{DC}

This communication is provided for educational and informational purposes only and is not intended and should not be construed as legal advice. This communication may be deemed advertising under applicable state laws. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

If you have any questions regarding this communication, please contact Day Pitney LLP at 7 Times Square, New York, NY 10036, (212) 297 5800.

© 2013, Day Pitney LLP | 7 Times Square | New York | NY | 10036