

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

Editor’s Note: Banking While Black Victoria Prussen Spears	1
Banking While Black: It Is Past Time for an Equal Deposit Opportunity Act—Part I Mark B. Greenlee	3
Banks Take Notice: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Continues Regulatory Scrutiny of Fees Charged to Consumers Paul F. Hancock, Olivia Kelman and Victoria Oguntoye	37
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	40
What Inquiring Minds Should Have Known: Circuit Court Ruling on Inquiry Notice Saves Citibank from \$900 Million Payment Mistake Benjamin D. Feder	43
SEC Proposes Treasury Clearing Mandate 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

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. 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.

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

*By Paul F. Hancock, Olivia Kelman and Victoria Oguntoye**

In this article, the authors discuss a regulatory enforcement trend that warrants close attention by financial institutions that charge consumer fees.

New guidance from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (“FDIC”) regarding multiple re-presentment nonsufficient funds (“NSF”) fees suggests that banks eliminate the fees altogether and continues the recent onslaught of challenges by federal and state regulators, as well as private class actions, directed at a variety of consumer fees charged by financial institutions.¹ Companies should regularly review the business reasons for, and disclosures related to, fees charged to consumers, and make appropriate adjustments for legal or risk-tolerance reasons, ensuring documentation is appropriate to defend legitimate policies.

BACKGROUND

In January 2022, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (“CFPB”) launched an initiative to challenge what it believes to be “junk fees” charged to consumers by financial institutions.² Attacking what the CFPB calls a new “fee economy,” the agency cited “punitive late fees” and NSF fees as examples. In late June 2022, the CFPB also expressed concerns regarding “convenience fees” charged to consumers for making payments online or by phone.³ Much of the

* Paul F. Hancock (paul.hancock@klgates.com) and Olivia Kelman (olivia.kelman@klgates.com) are partners in the Miami office of K&L Gates LLP. Victoria Oguntoye (victoria.oguntoye@klgates.com) is an associate in the firm’s Dallas office.

¹ The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Fil-40-2022, Supervisory Guidance On Multiple Re-Presentment Nsf Fees (Aug. 2022), <https://www.fdic.gov/news/financial-institution-letters/2022/fil22040a.pdf>.

² The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Launches Initiative to Save Americans Billions in Junk Fees, Agency Seeks Public Input on Fees on Bank Accounts, Credit Cards, and Other Financial Products, (Jan. 26, 2022), <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/about-us/newsroom/consumer-financial-protection-bureau-launches-initiative-to-save-americans-billions-in-junk-fees/>.

³ Debt Collection Practices (Regulation F); Pay-to-Pay Fees, 87 Fed. Reg. 39733 (proposed Jul. 5, 2022) (to be codified at 12 CFR Pt. 1006), https://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/documents/cfpb_convenience-fees_advisory-opinion_2022-06.pdf.

regulatory focus has been on NSF fees, with the CFPB citing studies it performed that appear to show that NSF and overdraft fees made up nearly two-thirds of banks' reported fee revenue.⁴ The CFPB's research indicates that overdraft fee revenue is earned from a concentrated population of consumers: Nearly 80% of all overdraft revenue came from less than 9% of consumer accounts paying 10 or more overdraft fees per year.

State financial regulators in New York⁵ and Massachusetts⁶ have also notified regulated institutions that they stand ready to challenge what they believe to be improper fees. The focus, including in private consumer class actions filed in federal court, has been on the "re-presentment NSF" fees, where a consumer can incur multiple NSF fees if the consumer, or merchant, repeatedly attempts a transaction when sufficient funds are not available. However, banks, especially smaller banks, may face operational or technological challenges in distinguishing re-presentment fees from multiple unique attempted transactions.

DISCLOSURES

Historically, regulatory guidance on overdraft and NSF issues focused on ensuring proper consumer disclosures so customers understood the consequences of attempting transactions when funds are unavailable.⁷ Adequate disclosures help mitigate the risk of claims that fees are deceptive. While reiterating the importance of proper disclosures, the FDIC now suggests that re-presentment NSF fees might trigger a legal claim of unfairness, even if they are not deceptive.

The unfairness prong of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as well as similar provisions of the Dodd-Frank Act, focuses on injury to consumers, with the

⁴ The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB Research Shows Banks' Deep Dependence on Overdraft Fees Overdraft and Non-Sufficient Fund Penalties Made up Two-Third of Reported Fee Revenue, (Dec. 01, 2022), <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/about-us/newsroom/cfpb-research-shows-banks-deep-dependence-on-overdraft-fees/>.

⁵ The New York State Department of Financial Services, Industry Letter: Avoiding Improper Practices Related to Overdraft and Non-Sufficient Funds Fees, (Jul. 12, 2022), https://www.dfs.ny.gov/industry_guidance/industry_letters/il20220712_overdraft_nsf_fees.

⁶ Mary L. Gallagher, Supervisory Alert Letter: Representment Issue Supervisory Alert Regarding Charging Multiple Non-Sufficient Fund Fees (NSF) for Representment of Unpaid Transactions, The Massachusetts State Division of Banks, (Sep. 23, 2021), <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/supervisory-alert-letter-representment-issue>.

⁷ The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Fil-81-2010, Overdraft Payment Programs And Consumer Protection Final Overdraft Payment Supervisory Guidance (Nov. 2010), <https://www.fdic.gov/news/events/overdraft/faq.html>.

standard being whether (1) the injury is reasonably avoidable by the consumer, and (2) there are no countervailing benefits to either consumers or competition. It might be argued, of course, that consumers can reasonably avoid NSF fees by not attempting to make payments in amounts that exceed the funds available in their accounts. Also, NSF fees (like late fees on mortgage or credit card obligations) advance the goal of financially responsible consumers—an economic system where consumers could miss payments or overdraw accounts without consequence would be much different from the system in place today.

The recent FDIC guidance recognizes that much of the challenge with the re-presentment issues traces back to relationships with vendors, including core processors, but the agency also holds financial institutions responsible for proper third-party oversight. A beneficial aspect of the FDIC guidance for banks is that “[e]xaminers will generally not cite [Unfair or Deceptive Acts or Practices] UDAP violations that have been self-identified and fully corrected prior to the start of a consumer compliance examination.” The agency also recognized the difficulty in obtaining accurate historical information on re-presentments and stated that it “has accepted a two-year lookback period for restitution.”

CONCLUSION

This regulatory enforcement trend warrants close attention by financial institutions that charge consumer fees. Fee policies and disclosures should be evaluated now and regularly to ensure they are supported by business justifications and satisfy legal standards. Banks that derive significant revenue from NSF or overdraft fees may face the greatest legal risk, as the CFPB has said they will direct supervision and enforcement resources toward such institutions.