

# The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt™ PUBLICATION

JANUARY 2023

**Editor's Note: Banking While Black**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**Banking While Black: It Is Past Time for an Equal Deposit Opportunity Act – Part I**

Mark B. Greenlee

**Banks Take Notice: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Continues Regulatory Scrutiny of Fees Charged to Consumers**

Paul F. Hancock, Olivia Kelman and Victoria Oguntoye

**Third Time Is the Charm: Eleventh Circuit Allows Creditor's Use of Commercial Mail Vendor**

Andrew C. Glass, Gregory N. Blase, David E. Fialkow, Sean R. Higgins and Keith J. McCarthy

**What Inquiring Minds Should Have Known: Circuit Court Ruling on Inquiry Notice Saves Citibank from \$900 Million Payment Mistake**

Benjamin D. Feder

**SEC Proposes Treasury Clearing Mandate**

Clayton I. Simmons, Penelope L. Christophorou, Brandon M. Hammer, Lauren E. Semrad, Kathryn Witchger, Wankun Wang and Benjamin Hayes



LexisNexis

# THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

---

---

VOLUME 140

NUMBER 1

January 2023

---

<b>Editor's Note: Banking While Black</b> Victoria Prussen Spears	1
<b>Banking While Black: It Is Past Time for an Equal Deposit Opportunity Act—Part I</b> Mark B. Greenlee	3
<b>Banks Take Notice: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Continues Regulatory Scrutiny of Fees Charged to Consumers</b> Paul F. Hancock, Olivia Kelman and Victoria Oguntoye	37
<b>Third Time Is the Charm: Eleventh Circuit Allows Creditor's Use of Commercial Mail Vendor</b> Andrew C. Glass, Gregory N. Blase, David E. Fialkow, Sean R. Higgins and Keith J. McCarthy	40
<b>What Inquiring Minds Should Have Known: Circuit Court Ruling on Inquiry Notice Saves Citibank from \$900 Million Payment Mistake</b> Benjamin D. Feder	43
<b>SEC Proposes Treasury Clearing Mandate</b> Clayton I. Simmons, Penelope L. Christophorou, Brandon M. Hammer, Lauren E. Semrad, Kathryn Witchger, Wankun Wang and Benjamin Hayes	47

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 © 2023 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](http://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 2023 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](mailto: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](mailto: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.

# Third Time Is the Charm: Eleventh Circuit Allows Creditor's Use of Commercial Mail Vendor

*By Andrew C. Glass, Gregory N. Blase, David E. Fialkow, Sean R. Higgins and Keith J. McCarthy\**

*The authors discuss a recent circuit court of appeals decision that is good news for loan servicers and collection agencies seeking to use third-party mail vendors to formulate, print, and mail collection letters.*

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit, sitting en banc, has ruled that a debt collector's communication of a customer's information to the debt collector's private, third-party commercial mail vendor was not actionable under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA").

In issuing the most recent iteration of *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection and Management Services, Inc.*,<sup>1</sup> the Eleventh Circuit reversed the panel decision.<sup>2</sup> The Eleventh Circuit examined, in particular, whether a bare procedural violation of the FDCPA on its own sufficed to establish a concrete injury for Article III standing purposes.<sup>3</sup> The Eleventh Circuit answered "no."<sup>4</sup> This is good news for loan servicers and collection agencies seeking to use third-party mail vendors to formulate, print, and mail collection letters, though institutions should still review, and update as needed, their mailing procedures to minimize and prevent potential disclosures.

## BACKGROUND

In *Hunstein*, the plaintiff incurred a debt stemming from his minor son's medical treatment.<sup>5</sup> The hospital transferred the debt to the defendant, a

---

\* The authors, attorneys at K&L Gates LLP, may be contacted at [andrew.glass@klgates.com](mailto:andrew.glass@klgates.com), [gregory.blase@klgates.com](mailto:gregory.blase@klgates.com), [david.fialkow@klgates.com](mailto:david.fialkow@klgates.com), [sean.higgins@klgates.com](mailto:sean.higgins@klgates.com) and [keith.mccarthy@klgates.com](mailto:keith.mccarthy@klgates.com), respectively.

<sup>1</sup> *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Servs., Inc.*, No. 19-14434 (11th Cir. Sept. 8, 2022) ("*Hunstein III*").

<sup>2</sup> See *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Servs., Inc.*, 994 F.3d 1341 (11th Cir. Apr. 21, 2021) ("*Hunstein I*"); *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Servs., Inc.*, 17 F.4th 1016 (11th Cir. Oct. 28, 2021) ("*Hunstein II*").

<sup>3</sup> *Hunstein III*.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> *Id.*

collection agency.<sup>6</sup> The defendant, in turn, hired a commercial mail vendor to prepare and mail out a collection letter on the defendant's behalf, using the defendant's prewritten form letter.<sup>7</sup> After receiving the letter, the plaintiff filed suit alleging that the defendant's disclosure of his information to the defendant's mail vendor violated the FDCPA's prohibition on communicating "in connection with the collection of any debt, with any person other than the consumer."<sup>8</sup> The district court dismissed the action.<sup>9</sup>

On appeal, an Eleventh Circuit panel reversed.<sup>10</sup> Shortly afterwards, the Supreme Court issued its decision *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*,<sup>11</sup> examining the basis for establishing Article III standing under another federal statute.<sup>12</sup> In light of *TransUnion*, the Eleventh Circuit panel vacated its opinion and issued another one, still finding that the defendant's communication to its mail vendor stated a FDCPA claim.<sup>13</sup> The Eleventh Circuit then voted to revisit the matter en banc.<sup>14</sup>

## THE CIRCUIT COURT'S DECISION

In reversing the panel decision, the Eleventh Circuit concluded that the plaintiff lacked Article III standing to proceed on the basis alleged.<sup>15</sup> In reaching this conclusion, the court found that the plaintiff had failed to plead that he had suffered a tangible, "real harm."<sup>16</sup> The court held that the subject communication did not constitute an allegation of a concrete harm.<sup>17</sup>

In particular, the Eleventh Circuit held that the alleged intangible-reputational injury failed to give rise to an Article III injury because the

---

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> *Id.* (quoting 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b)). Two additional claims were brought by the plaintiff, but were not subject to appeal.

<sup>9</sup> *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Servs., Inc.*, No. 19-CV-983-T-60SPF (M.D. Fla. Oct. 29, 2019).

<sup>10</sup> *Hunstein I*, 994 F.3d at 1352.

<sup>11</sup> *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*, 141 S. Ct. 2190 (2021) (examining basis for establishing Article III standing for alleged violation of the Fair Credit Reporting Act).

<sup>12</sup> *Id.* at 2200, 2203–07.

<sup>13</sup> *Hunstein II*, 17 F.4th at 1038.

<sup>14</sup> *Hunstein v. Preferred Collection & Mgmt. Servs., Inc.*, 17 F.4th 1103, 1104 (11th Cir. Nov. 17 2021).

<sup>15</sup> *Hunstein III*.

<sup>16</sup> *Id.*

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*

defendant's communication to the mail vendor was not "public."<sup>18</sup> Stressing a distinction between public and private communications, the Eleventh Circuit reasoned "publicity" requires more than "*any* communication" but rather requires dissemination of the communication to "the public at large."<sup>19</sup> Further, the "*effect* of a disclosure is what matters—not the number of people to whom it is made."<sup>20</sup>

In other words, "[t]ransmitting information" to a "single intermediary" who contacts a debtor through a private letter "without sharing it more broadly" is "simply not enough" to give rise to Article III standing under the FDCPA.<sup>21</sup>

In rendering its decision, the Eleventh Circuit held that the plaintiff was "simply no worse off because [defendant] delegated the task of populating data into a form letter to a mail vendor" and reiterated *TransUnion's* holding: "no concrete harm, no standing."<sup>22</sup>

## KEY TAKEAWAY

*Hunstein III* is notable for all debt-collection businesses that delegate customer-related mailing tasks to vendors. The Eleventh Circuit ruling provides support to debt collectors for the use of third-party mail vendors to formulate, print, and mail collection letters. Nonetheless, a business should continue to be mindful of its operations in light of this and under governing FDCPA law.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> *Id.* (emphasis in original).

<sup>20</sup> *Id.* (emphasis in original).

<sup>21</sup> *Id.*

<sup>22</sup> *Id.* (quoting *TransUnion*, 141 S. Ct. at 2214).