

# Financial Fraud Law Report

AN A.S. PRATT & SONS PUBLICATION

SEPTEMBER 2014

**EDITOR'S NOTE: INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS**

Steven A. Meyerowitz

**MAD II ADOPTED BY EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND COUNCIL**

David Toube and Matthew Fisher

**GOVERNMENT SUPPORTS INDEFINITE TOLLING OF CIVIL FRAUD CASES UNDER WARTIME  
SUSPENSION OF LIMITATIONS ACT**

Bruce Baird, Kate Goodloe, Brett Reynolds, Sarah Wilson, and Ethan Posner

**EXTRATERRITORIAL APPLICATION OF U.S. SECURITIES LAWS**

Stan Chelney, Ryan M. Philp, and David R. Kolker

**REVERSE CHURNING: DO NOT FALL ASLEEP AT THE WHEEL**

Benjamin B. Coulter and Rhett Owens

**FOREIGN CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT UPDATE: MID-YEAR 2014**

Gregory Deis and Michael D. Frisch

**CYBERCRIME, IDENTITY THEFT, AND LEGAL PREVENTION**

Zia Akhtar



LexisNexis

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

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

Catherine Dillon at ..... 908-673-1531

Email: ..... catherine.dillon@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) 487-3000

Fax Number ..... (518) 487-3584

Customer Service Web site ..... <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 ..... (518) 487-3000

Library of Congress Card Number: 80-68780

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7816-4 (print)

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7958-1 (eBook)

Cite this publication as:

Financial Fraud Law Report § [sec. no.] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Financial Fraud Law Report § 1.01 (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 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 Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2014 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, 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.

*An A.S. Pratt™ Publication*

Editorial Offices  
630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800  
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief & Board of Editors*

---

## EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

**Steven A. Meyerowitz**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## BOARD OF EDITORS

**Frank W. Abagnale**

*Author, Lecturer, and Consultant  
Abagnale and Associates*

**William J. Kelleher III**

*Partner  
Robinson & Cole LLP*

**Sareena Malik Sawhney**

*Director  
Marks Paneth & Shron LLP*

**Stephen L. Ascher**

*Partner  
Jenner & Block LLP*

**James M. Keneally**

*Partner  
Kelley Drye & Warren LLP*

**Mara V.J. Senn**

*Partner  
Arnold & Porter LLP*

**Thomas C. Bogle**

*Partner  
Dechert LLP*

**Richard H. Kravitz**

*Founding Director  
Center for Socially  
Responsible Accounting*

**John R. Snyder**

*Partner  
Bingham McCutchen LLP*

**David J. Cook**

*Partner  
Cook Collection Attorneys*

**Frank C. Razzano**

*Partner  
Pepper Hamilton LLP*

**Jennifer Taylor**

*Partner  
McDermott Will & Emery LLP*

**David A. Elliott**

*Partner  
Burr & Forman LLP*

**Bruce E. Yannett**

*Partner  
Debevoise & Plimpton LLP*

The FINANCIAL FRAUD LAW REPORT is published 10 times per year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2014 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. 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 permission to photocopy or use material electronically from the *Financial Fraud Law Report*, please access [www.copyright.com](http://www.copyright.com) or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750- 8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., PO Box 7080, Miller Place, NY 11764, [smeyerow@optonline.net](mailto:smeyerow@optonline.net), 631.331.3908 (phone) / 631.331.3664 (fax). Material for publication is welcomed — articles, decisions, or other items of interest. 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 *Financial Fraud Law Report*, LexisNexis

Matthew Bender, 121 Chanlon Road, North Building, New Providence, NJ 07974. Direct inquiries for editorial department to catherine. dillon@lexisnexis.com. ISBN: 978-0-76987-816-4

# Second Circuit Clarifies the Limits on the Extraterritorial Application of U.S. Securities Laws

*By Stan Chelney, Ryan M. Philp, and David R. Kolker\**

*In this article, the authors discuss a recent U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit decision affirming the dismissal of a putative securities class action brought by purchasers of foreign issued-securities on a foreign exchange.*

## Introduction

Recently, in *City of Pontiac Policemen's and Firemen's Ret. Sys. et al. v. UBS AG et al.*,<sup>1</sup> the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed the dismissal of a putative securities class action brought by purchasers of foreign issued-securities on a foreign exchange. The court held that the claims were barred by the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Morrison v. National Australia Bank Limited*.<sup>2</sup> Addressing issues of first impression, the court refined Second Circuit precedent regarding the contacts necessary for a transaction to be considered "domestic" under *Morrison*. The court rejected plaintiffs' argument that application of U.S. securities laws is justified merely because a foreign security is cross-listed on a domestic exchange—the so-called "listing theory." The court also held that placing a buy order in the U.S., by itself, is insufficient to render a transaction "domestic" so as to warrant application of U.S. securities laws.

## Case Summary

Plaintiffs, a group of foreign and domestic institutional investors, brought suit against UBS AG ("UBS") and a number of UBS officers and directors (collectively, "defendants"), alleging, *inter alia*, violations of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (the "Exchange Act"). The suit arose out of plaintiffs' purchase of UBS shares, which were listed on foreign exchanges and the New York Stock Exchange ("NYSE"). Plaintiffs alleged defendants, in conjunction with the issuance of the shares, made fraudulent

---

\* Stan Chelney is a partner, Ryan M. Philp is senior counsel, and David R. Kolker is an associate at Bracewell & Giuliani LLP. The authors may be contacted at stan.chelney@bgllp.com, ryan.philp@bgllp.com, and david.kolker@bgllp.com, respectively.

<sup>1</sup> *City of Pontiac Policemen's and Firemen's Ret. Sys. et al. v. UBS AG et al.*, No. 12-4355-CV (2d Cir. May 6, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> *Morrison v. National Australia Bank Limited*, 561 U.S. 247 (2010).

statements regarding UBS's mortgage-related assets portfolio and UBS's compliance with U.S. securities and tax laws. Plaintiffs claimed that UBS acquired and overvalued \$100 billion in mortgage-related assets, and concealed the scope of, and losses associated with, those assets, all without disclosing this to shareholders in contravention of its risk management policies. In addition, one plaintiff alleged defendants violated Sections 11, 12(a)(2), and 15 of the Securities Act of 1933 (the "Securities Act") by making misleading statements regarding alleged tax fraud in connection with UBS's June 13, 2008 Rights Offering.

### **Procedural History**

In 2011, the district court, relying on the Supreme Court's landmark 2010 decision in *Morrison*, dismissed the claims of plaintiffs who purchased UBS shares on foreign exchanges, and in 2012 dismissed all remaining claims. *Morrison* held that Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act only provides a private cause of action arising out of "[1] transactions in securities listed on domestic exchanges, and [2] domestic transactions in other securities"—as opposed to a cause of action brought by foreign plaintiffs against foreign defendants for misconduct in connection with securities traded on foreign exchanges. Plaintiffs subsequently appealed.

### **The Court's Holding and Reasoning**

The Second Circuit first addressed the securities claims brought by the foreign institutional investors—*i.e.*, "foreign cubed" claims: (1) foreign plaintiffs suing (2) foreign issuers based on transactions in (3) foreign countries. The foreign plaintiffs argued that, pursuant to their "so-called 'listing theory,' the fact that the relevant shares were cross-listed on the NYSE brings them within the purview of Rule 10(b), under the first prong of *Morrison*—'transactions in securities listed on domestic exchanges.'" The court rejected this argument, finding that "while this language, which appears in *Morrison* and its progeny, taken in isolation, supports plaintiffs' view, the 'listing theory' is irreconcilable with *Morrison* read as a whole." The court, quoting *Morrison*, emphasized that the decision "evinces a concern with 'the location of the securities *transaction* and not the location of an exchange where the security may be dually listed.'" The court concluded that, "[i]n sum, *Morrison* does not support the application of § 10(b) of the Exchange Act to claims by a foreign purchaser of foreign-issued shares on a foreign exchange simply because those shares are also listed on a domestic exchange."

The court next turned to so-called "foreign squared" claims: domestic plaintiffs suing (1) foreign issuers based on transactions in (2) foreign countries. U.S.-based plaintiff Oregon Public Employees Board ("OPEB") purchased UBS shares via a "buy order" in the U.S., which was then executed on a Swiss

exchange. OPEB contended, *inter alia*, that it satisfied *Morrison's* second prong because it purchased a security in the U.S. In rejecting this argument, the court relied on its recent decision in *Absolute Activist Value Master Fund Limited v. Ficeto*.<sup>3</sup> In that case, the Second Circuit clarified that a securities transaction is considered domestic for purposes of *Morrison's* second prong when the parties incur “irrevocable liability” to carry out the transaction within the U.S. or when title is passed within the U.S. Applying those principles, the court concluded that placing a buy order in the U.S. for a foreign security that is executed on a foreign exchange—standing alone—is insufficient to create irrevocable liability in the U.S., and thus does not bring the transaction within U.S. securities laws. The court also made clear that a purchaser’s citizenship or residency has no bearing on where a transaction occurs, thereby rendering the fact that OPEB was a U.S. entity irrelevant to determining whether the transaction was foreign or domestic.

The court also disposed of plaintiffs’ Securities Act claims, finding plaintiffs failed to plead any misstatements in the 2008 Rights Offering. In addition, the court held that plaintiffs’ Section 10(b) claims based on alleged fraud related to UBS’s mortgage-related assets also were properly dismissed for failure to plead materiality or a strong inference of scienter.

### **Conclusion**

This decision further clarifies the limits on the extraterritorial application of U.S. securities laws to transactions involving foreign securities issued by foreign issuers. It is now understood that the mere fact that a foreign security is dual listed on a U.S. exchange is insufficient to bring the transaction within the ambit of the U.S. securities laws if the purchase is consummated on a foreign exchange. Similarly, the mere fact that the purchaser is a domestic company is insufficient to justify the application of U.S. securities laws, and, in fact, may be entirely irrelevant to the analysis. Even if a buy order is placed in the U.S., that fact, standing alone, also is insufficient to support the application of U.S. securities laws to a transaction in foreign securities on a foreign exchange. Indeed, the Second Circuit’s decision suggests that even if a transaction is consummated on a U.S. exchange, that fact alone also may not be sufficient to support the application of U.S. securities laws. To ascertain whether irrevocable liability was incurred in the U.S., courts will consider additional facts such as where the underlying contracts were formed, where purchase orders were placed, where title to the securities passed, and where money was exchanged. Given the realities of modern securities transactions, the determination whether

---

<sup>3</sup> *Absolute Activist Value Master Fund Limited v. Ficeto*, 677 F.3d 60 (2d Cir. 2012).

U.S. securities laws apply to complicated, cross-border transactions likely will be made on a case-by-case basis.