The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt™ PUBLICATION

JUNE 2023

Editor's Note: Yes, the Law Is Still Continuing to Develop Victoria Prussen Spears

U.S. Supreme Court Clarifies Scope of Nondischargeable Debt in Favor of Victims of Fraud Lawrence J. Kotler and Drew S. McGehrin

U.S. Supreme Court Rules that FBAR Penalties Are Per-FBAR Form, Rejecting IRS's Per-Account Position
Susan Combs

U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Rules That the Funding Structure for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Is Constitutional
Diana M. Eng, Louise Bowes Marencik and Jonathan K. Moore

Decision by New York's Highest Court Results in Account Debtor Owing Its Counterparty's Debts Deborah J. Enea and Steven Soffer

Royalty Rights as Unsecured Claims: The Relevance of *Mallinckrodt* to M&A, Revenue or Royalty Interest Financings, and Other Transactions Involving Future Payment Streams

Martin E. Beeler, Dianne F. Coffino and Peter A. Schwartz

Denial of Assumption of Pre-Bankruptcy Workout Agreement Demonstrates How Settlement Value Can Change with Time and Circumstances

Patrick E. Fitzmaurice and Claire K. Wu

New York's "Small Business" Commercial Financing Disclosure Law Leonard A. Bernstein, Bob Jaworski and Richard Smith

Subscription Credit Facilities: Continuation FundsKiel A. Bowen and McKay S. Harline

Lenders May Be the Next Government Focus for PPP Fraud Christopher L. Nasson, Hayley Trahan-Liptak, Robert M. Tammero, Jr and Christopher F. Warner



THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 140	NUMBER 6	June 2023
Editor's Note: Yes, the Law Victoria Prussen Spears	275	
U.S. Supreme Court Clarific Victims of Fraud Lawrence J. Kotler and Drew	es Scope of Nondischargeable Debt in Favor of S. McGehrin	278
U.S. Supreme Court Rules (Rejecting IRS's Per-Accoun Susan Combs	that FBAR Penalties Are Per-FBAR Form, t Position	281
Structure for the Consumer	ne Second Circuit Rules That the Funding Financial Protection Bureau Is Constitutional Marencik and Jonathan K. Moore	284
Decision by New York's Hig Its Counterparty's Debts Deborah J. Enea and Steven	thest Court Results in Account Debtor Owing Soffer	289
		292
•	e-Bankruptcy Workout Agreement Demonstrates	292
	Change with Time and Circumstances	298
New York's "Small Business Leonard A. Bernstein, Bob Ja	"Commercial Financing Disclosure Law worski and Richard Smith	302
Subscription Credit Facilitie Kiel A. Bowen and McKay S		316
· ·	Government Focus for PPP Fraud by Trahan-Liptak, Robert M. Tammero, Jr and	321



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call or email:			
Matthew T. Burke at	(800) 252-9257		
Email: matthew.t.burke	@lexisnexis.com		
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.

Lenders May Be the Next Government Focus for PPP Fraud

By Christopher L. Nasson, Hayley Trahan-Liptak, Robert M. Tammero, Jr and Christopher F. Warner*

In this article, the authors explain why federal regulators may be focusing on lenders when attacking Paycheck Protection Program fraud.

Earlier this year, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (the FRB) announced that it had entered into a consent order (Consent Order) with a member bank imposing an approximately US\$2.3 million civil money penalty against the bank for its role in processing and funding six fraudulent Paycheck Protection Program (PPP or the Program) loans, despite identifying "significant indicia of potential fraud" in the loan applications.¹

The Consent Order marked the first public action by the FRB against a PPP bank lender.²

To date, government investigations and actions connected to PPP loan fraud have largely centered on borrowers, not lenders. Yet, following a report last December by the House Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis (the Select Subcommittee) that encouraged prosecutions of fraud by those who administered the Program, and a recent false claims action brought by the Department of Justice (DOJ) against a PPP lender, the FRB's actions indicate a shifting focus from borrowers to lenders.

THE PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

The PPP, established by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act, was designed to provide small businesses with loans to pay a series of specified costs, including payroll, mortgage interest, rent, and utilities, among other things.³ Borrowers could qualify for full PPP loan forgiveness provided

^{*} The authors, attorneys with K&L Gates LLP, may be contacted at christopher.nasson@klgates.com, hayley.trahan-liptak@klgates.com, rob.tammero@klgates.com and chris.warner@klgates.com, respectively.

¹ In re Popular Bank, New York, New York, Docket No. 22-034-CMP-SM (Jan. 20, 2023).

² Jon Hill, Fed Fines Popular Bank \$2.3M For PPP Loan Fraud Lapses, LAW360 (Jan. 24, 2023), available at https://www.law360.com/whitecollar/articles/1568779.

³ U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY, Policy Issues, Paycheck Protection Program, available at https://home.treasury.gov/policy-issues/coronavirus/assistance-for-small-businesses/paycheck-protection-program#:-:text=The%20Paycheck%20Protection%20Program%20established,of% 20payroll%20costs%20including%20benefits; U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, Funding Programs, First Draw PPP loan, available at https://www.sba.gov/funding-programs/loans/covid-19-relief-options/paycheck-protection-program/first-draw-ppp-loan.

the borrower met specified criteria, including using loan proceeds only for eligible expenses.⁴ While funded by private lenders, PPP loans were backed by the U.S. Small Business Administration (SBA), which paid PPP lenders for the forgiven loans and any accrued interest, in addition to an origination fee.⁵

Notwithstanding the pivotal role played by banks and other lenders by processing PPP loan applications for the Program, the SBA required lenders only do the following during the application process:

- 1. Confirm receipt of borrower PPP application form certifications;
- 2. Confirm receipt of documentation demonstrating the borrower had qualifying employees;
- 3. Review the borrower's average monthly payroll costs; and
- 4. Follow Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) requirements.

For banks, credit unions, and institutions already subject to BSA requirements, lenders were required to follow only their existing BSA protocols.⁶ Existing customers did not require reverification under BSA requirements, unless reverification was otherwise required by the lender's existing BSA compliance program.⁷

GOVERNMENT ACTION AGAINST PPP BORROWERS

The Program's minimal documentation requirements,⁸ combined with the limited oversight from SBA and other government regulators, made PPP loans

⁴ U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, Funding Programs, First Draw PPP loan, available at https://www.sba.gov/funding-programs/loans/covid-19-relief-options/paycheck-protection-program/first-draw-ppp-loan.

⁵ FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION, The Importance of Community Banks in Paycheck Protection Program Lending, available at https://www.fdic.gov/analysis/quarterly-banking-profile/fdic-quarterly/2020-vol14-4/fdic-v14n4-3q2020-earlyrelease.pdf.

⁶ U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, SBA-2020-0015, 85 FR 20811, pp. 20811-17 (2020), available at https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/04/15/2020-07672/business-loan-program-temporary-changes-paycheck-protection-program; see also Duren, S&P Global Market Intelligence, Banks have PPP protection but still must identify clear fraud, lawyers say (May 11, 2020).

⁷ U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, SBA-2020-0015, 85 FR 20811, pp. 20811-17 (2020), available at https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/04/15/2020-07672/business-loan-program-temporary-changes-paycheck-protection-program.

⁸ Press Release, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis, SBA Made More Than 1 Million Referrals to IG for Potentially Fraudulent Loans (Mar. 25, 2021).

an attractive target for fraud.⁹ Government action against borrowers for blatantly fraudulent PPP loans was fast, with prosecutors bringing criminal charges against a myriad of borrowers less than a year after the loans were issued.¹⁰ These initial actions focused largely on individuals who submitted fraudulent PPP applications and then spent the funds for personal benefit, including on lavish items such as yachts, cars, and luxury watches.¹¹ These were the easy cases with the attention-grabbing headlines.

Less overt fraud has taken longer to uncover, and government officials have acknowledged that, despite the extension of the pandemic-related fraud statute of limitations from five years to 10, small-dollar cases may never be prosecuted. Kevin Chambers, former chief pandemic prosecutor at the DOJ, has stated he is "confident that [DOJ will] be using every last day of those 10 years." 13

GOVERNMENT ACTION AGAINST PPP LENDERS

The FRB's recent settlement is a reminder to lenders that their actions during the pendency of the PPP are subject to ongoing scrutiny. Given the minimal requirements for loan approval, whether the lender followed its own BSA policies and procedures, federal BSA rules and regulations, and SBA guidance is likely to be the focus of reviews and investigations. Notably, a staff report issued by the Select Subcommittee released on December 1, 2022, claimed that certain fintech companies charged with processing and screening PPP loans

⁹ Small Business Administration, Office of Inspector General, SBA's Handling of Potentially Fraudulent Paycheck Protection Program Loans (May 26, 2022) (Rept. No. 22-13), available at https://www.oversight.gov/sites/default/files/oig-reports/SBA/SBA-OIG-Report-22-13.pdf.

¹⁰ Press Release, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Justice Department Takes Action Against COVID-19 Fraud (Mar. 26, 2021), available at https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-takes-action-against-covid-19-fraud.

¹¹ See, e.g., Press Release, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, New York Woman Sentenced for \$9.2 Million COVID-19 Relief Fraud (Jan. 27, 2023), available at https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/new-york-woman-sentenced-92-million-covid-19-relief-fraud; Press Release, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Long Island Physician Sentenced to 51 Months in Prison for COVID-19 Loan Fraud (Mar. 28, 2022), available at https://www.justice.gov/usao-edny/pr/long-island-physician-sentenced-51-months-prison-covid-19-loan-fraud; Press Release, U.S. DE-PARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Texas Man Pleads Guilty to \$24 Million COVID-Relief Fraud Scheme (Mar. 24, 2021), available at https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/texas-man-pleads-guilty-24-million-covid-relief-fraud-scheme.

¹² See David A. Fahrenthold, Prosecutors Struggle to Catch Up to a Tidal Wave of Pandemic Fraud, THE N.Y. TIMES (Aug. 16, 2022) (noting that "[w]hile fraud takes minutes, investigations take months and prosecutions take even longer."), available at https://www.nytimes.com/2022/08/16/business/economy/covid-pandemic-fraud.html.

¹³ Id.

"failed to stop obvious and preventable fraud." The Select Subcommittee recommended DOJ continue aggressive PPP loan investigations, with a "focus on fraud committed by individuals in positions of trust and authority related to the program," including lenders. 15

The FRB's recent action is an example of one type of enforcement action lenders might expect. Similar to the allegations in the Select Subcommittee's report, the FRB's recent Consent Order states that, by processing and funding the six PPP loans in question despite "significant indicia of potential fraud" and failing to timely report the potential fraud, the bank engaged in unsafe or unsound practices. The FRB found that the bank's inactions were sufficient to warrant a second-tier civil money penalty under Section 8(i)(2)(B) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act. The FRB did not impose any remedial measures, but noted the bank has already undertaken measures to address its "ineffective controls and procedures." 18

In addition to potential enforcement action under Section 8(i)(2)(B) against banks, PPP lenders may face government action for BSA failures in administering PPP loans, including investigations by DOJ or the Office of the Inspector General of the SBA, actions by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, or audits by SBA. Another avenue for liability may be civil charges under the False Claims Act, premised on a lender receiving a PPP loan origination fee. In September 2022, another bank agreed to pay US\$18,673 to resolve allegations that the lender approved a loan, and received a 5% processing fee, despite knowledge that the applicant had falsely attested that he was not facing criminal charges.¹⁹

¹⁴ Select Subcommittee on the Coronavirus Crisis, "We are Not the Fraud Police": How Fintechs Facilitated Fraud in the Paycheck Protection Program, Staff Report (Dec. 2022).

¹⁵ Id. at 84.

¹⁶ In re Popular Bank, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, No. 22-034-CMP-SM (Jan. 20, 2023) at p. 2, available at https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/pressreleases/files/enf20230124a1.pdf.

¹⁷ Id.

¹⁸ Id.

¹⁹ Press Release, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, First-ever False Claims Act settlement received from Paycheck Protection Program lender (Sept. 13, 2022), available at https://www.justice.gov/usao-sdtx/pr/first-ever-false-claims-act-settlement-received-paycheck-protection-program-lender.

WHAT'S NEXT AND HOW TO PREPARE

The government has indicated PPP fraud investigations are likely to continue for many years.²⁰ As investigations uncover fraudulent loans, the institutions that processed those loans may be pushed into the spotlight. Lenders should be aware that SBA's review of guaranteed loan applications or DOJ's review of fraudulent loans could evolve into reviews of the lender's own BSA practices.

Lenders should consider the following proactive steps so they are prepared, and can remediate any lapses in procedures, in the event that regulators or investigators come calling:

- Review records for PPP loans processed and funded by the lender that remain outstanding. Consider whether there are records of red flags identified during the processing or forgiveness processes, or if additional red flags for the loan or borrower have been identified since the initial review.
- For any such loan identified, consider whether the lender appeared to follow its BSA policies and other policies and procedures in connection with the loan processing and, if not, whether any significant lapses in compliance have since been remedied.
- For any such loan identified, consider discussing with counsel whether the loan should be reported to the SBA.
- Take the opportunity to consider whether the lender's BSA and anti-money laundering policies generally are adequate and up to date.

Lenders that receive government requests for documents with respect to specific PPP loans should be aware that regulators or investigators might start to look beyond the loan in question, particularly if multiple fraudulent loans were funded by the same lender. Lenders that receive requests, including both subpoenas and voluntary requests, for specific documentation may benefit from consultation with counsel as to whether further review of the loans, policies, or procedures should be undertaken.

²⁰ Fahrenthold, supra note 12.