

The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt® PUBLICATION

JUNE 2017

EDITOR'S NOTE: WHAT SHOULD CONGRESS DO?

Steven A. Meyerowitz

"HEY AGENCIES: IF YOU ARE LOOKING FOR RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONGRESS, HERE'S ONE FOR YOU – HOW ABOUT GIVING GSIB SECURITIES FIRMS ACCESS TO DEPOSIT FUNDING?"

Douglas Landy and James Kong

LATIN AMERICAN AND CARIBBEAN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS: POTENTIAL IMPACT OF THE U.S. ELECTIONS

Lawton M. Camp, Gregory Harrington, Raul R. Herrera, Edward Vergara, and Andrew Joseph Shipe

EXECUTIVE ORDER OUTLINES "CORE PRINCIPLES" FOR EVALUATING U.S. FINANCIAL REGULATIONS

Thomas J. Delaney, Jeffrey P. Taft, and Alicia K. Kinsey

OPPORTUNITIES FOR STRATEGIC DEBT REPURCHASES

Eric Sibbitt and Adam Ajlouni

FIFTH CIRCUIT REJECTS ARGUMENTS TO EXPAND SCOPE OF LIABILITY UNDER THE EQUAL CREDIT OPPORTUNITY ACT

Thomas F. Loose, Robert T. Mowrey, and Alexandra LoCasto

ELEVENTH CIRCUIT AGREES WITH SEVENTH CIRCUIT THAT AN UNAUTHORIZED BANKRUPTCY COURT ORDER IS NOT A "JUDGMENT, ORDER, OR DECREE" FOR PURPOSES OF 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2)(A)

Amy Michelle Oden

U.S. DISTRICT COURT UPHOLDS CLO RISK RETENTION RULE

Todd R. Kornfeld and John P. Falco

TRIBUNE DECISION CREATES SPLIT OVER STANDARD FOR IMPUTING OFFICER AND DIRECTOR INTENT TO A CORPORATION

Alexander Condon

ALL CLAIMS DISMISSED IN THE FIRST MAJOR JUDGMENT INVOLVING THE ALLEGED MANIPULATION OF LIBOR

Charles Evans, William Charles, and Rebecca Norris

GERMAN INSOLVENCY AVOIDANCE ACTION REFORM AND ITS IMPACT ON FINANCIAL AND TRADE CREDITORS

Bernd Meyer-Löwy and Carl Pickerill



LexisNexis

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 134

NUMBER 6

June 2017

Editor's Note: What Should Congress Do? Steven A. Meyerowitz	307
"Hey Agencies: If You are Looking for Recommendations to Congress, Here's One for You—How about Giving GSIB Securities Firms Access to Deposit Funding?" Douglas Landy and James Kong	310
Latin American and Caribbean Financial Institutions: Potential Impact of the U.S. Elections Lawton M. Camp, Gregory Harrington, Raul R. Herrera, Edward Vergara, and Andrew Joseph Shipe	318
Executive Order Outlines "Core Principles" for Evaluating U.S. Financial Regulations Thomas J. Delaney, Jeffrey P. Taft, and Alicia K. Kinsey	326
Opportunities for Strategic Debt Repurchases Eric Sibbitt and Adam Ajlouni	331
Fifth Circuit Rejects Arguments to Expand Scope of Liability under the Equal Credit Opportunity Act Thomas F. Loose, Robert T. Mowrey, and Alexandra LoCasto	335
Eleventh Circuit Agrees with Seventh Circuit that an Unauthorized Bankruptcy Court Order Is Not a "Judgment, Order, or Decree" for Purposes of 28 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2)(A) Amy Michelle Oden	339
U.S. District Court Upholds CLO Risk Retention Rule Todd R. Kornfeld and John P. Falco	342
<i>Tribune</i> Decision Creates Split over Standard for Imputing Officer and Director Intent to a Corporation Alexander Condon	347
All Claims Dismissed in the First Major Judgment Involving the Alleged Manipulation of LIBOR Charles Evans, William Charles, and Rebecca Norris	351
German Insolvency Avoidance Action Reform and Its Impact on Financial and Trade Creditors Bernd Meyer-Löwy and Carl Pickerill	359

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)
ISBN: 978-0-7698-8020-4 (eBook)
ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)
ISSN: 2381-3512 (Online)

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 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. Sheshunoff is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2017 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 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.

Barkley Clark

*Partner, Stinson Leonard Street
LLP*

John F. Dolan

*Professor of Law
Wayne State Univ. Law School*

David F. Freeman, Jr.

Partner, Arnold & Porter LLP

Satish M. Kini

*Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton
LLP*

Douglas Landy

*Partner, Milbank, Tweed,
Hadley & McCloy LLP*

Paul L. Lee

*Of Counsel, Debevoise &
Plimpton LLP*

Givonna St. Clair Long

*Partner, Kelley Drye & Warren
LLP*

Jonathan R. Macey

*Professor of Law
Yale Law School*

Stephen J. Newman

*Partner, Stroock & Stroock &
Lavan LLP*

Bimal Patel

Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

David Richardson

Partner, Dorsey & Whitney

Heath P. Tarbert

Partner, Allen & Overy LLP

Stephen B. Weissman

Partner, Rivkin Radler LLP

Elizabeth C. Yen

Partner, Hudson Cook, LLP

Regional Banking Outlook

James F. Bauerle
*Keevican Weiss Bauerle & Hirsch
LLC*

Intellectual Property

Stephen T. Schreiner
Partner, Goodwin Procter 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 2017 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 inquires 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, 718.224.2258 (phone). 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.

Opportunities for Strategic Debt Repurchases

*Eric Sibbitt and Adam Ajlouni**

The authors of this article discuss strategic debt repurchases, which may provide certain companies a cost-effective and efficient means of canceling outstanding debt, capturing discounts to par, reducing interest expense, enhancing flexibility by deleveraging and potentially removing restrictive covenants, or potentially improving the company's debt rating.

In the current environment of heightened market uncertainty and potential interest-rate changes, opportunities are emerging for companies to take advantage of market prices to reduce their liability profile through the strategic repurchase of outstanding debt securities from debtholders seeking liquidity or quicker returns. For companies with available cash holdings or the ability to raise additional debt or equity capital, strategic debt repurchases may provide a cost-effective and efficient means of canceling outstanding debt, capturing discounts to par, reducing interest expense, enhancing strategic flexibility by deleveraging and potentially removing restrictive covenants, or potentially improving the company's debt rating.

HOW BEST TO EFFECT DEBT REPURCHASES

Cash repurchases of debt generally can be structured as open-market or private repurchases, cash tender offers, or redemptions pursuant to the contractual terms of the governing indenture. These methods vary in terms of implementation time, cost, and the portion of a given debt series that can be repurchased at one time. The scale of repurchases and the structure used may also depend on restrictive covenants in the company's indentures and other agreements, as well as the availability of operating losses to offset any taxable gains resulting from the repurchases.

OPEN-MARKET OR PRIVATE REPURCHASES

A company can repurchase debt securities on the open market or through privately negotiated transactions, either directly or through an intermediary. However, such transactions must be structured in terms of timing and quantity

* Eric Sibbitt is a partner at O'Melveny & Myers LLP, where he structures and executes initial public offerings and other capital-raising transactions for companies and underwriters. Adam Ajlouni is a transactional associate at the firm representing public and private companies and investment banks in securities offerings and related transactions. The authors may be contacted at esibbitt@omm.com and aajlouni@omm.com, respectively.

so as to avoid triggering a *de facto*, or “creeping,” tender offer. This method allows companies to benefit from market volatility to repurchase an amount of securities discretely, quickly, and at a discount, with limited or no documentation.

CASH TENDER OFFERS

Initiating a public tender offer allows a company to purchase up to an entire series of debt in a public transaction available to all debtholders, but also requires compliance with a number of regulations under the securities laws. Tender offers can be effected through a variety of structures intended to encourage efficient pricing and investor participation:

- *Early tender premiums.* To incentivize early participation, early-tender premiums can be offered for tenders early in the tender-offer period.
- *Modified Dutch auction.* A company can retain a degree of flexibility in the tender price and quantity by using a “modified Dutch auction,” whereby the company specifies a tender price range within which debtholders may tender their securities. The company then decides on a tender price according to the number of securities that debtholders have agreed to tender at that price.
- *Fixed spread.* Alternatively, a company can set the tender price based on a fixed spread over the yield to maturity of a reference security (usually a U.S. Treasury bond) with a corresponding maturity. This provides a degree of protection against interest-rate fluctuation during the time the tender offer is open.
- *Waterfall structure.* Where there are multiple classes of debt securities outstanding, a company can make an offer for a maximum aggregate dollar value of all or select classes of debt with designated priorities.
- *Consent solicitation.* Debt tender offers can also be conducted in connection with consent solicitations, whereby the company’s debtholders are solicited to agree to an amendment to restrictive covenants or other provisions of the underlying indenture.

REDEMPTION

The most straightforward, but also generally the most expensive, method of repurchasing debt securities is to exercise the redemption provisions built into the underlying indenture. The pre-agreed procedures in the redemption provisions of the indenture set forth a clear and certain process that can be accomplished quickly and without the need for new documentation.

DISCLOSURE CONSIDERATIONS AND 10b5-1 PLANS

To mitigate potential risks, an issuer needs to consider whether it possesses “material non-public information” (“MNPI”) and must be cognizant of the timing of earnings releases and potential corporate developments such as strategic transactions. During a tender offer, these considerations sometimes require a company to delay or accelerate launch, extend deadlines, or provide supplemental disclosures.

One way to provide flexibility in implementing a debt repurchase is to establish a repurchase plan pursuant to Rule 10b5-1 of the Securities Exchange Act (a “10b5-1 repurchase plan”). A 10b5-1 repurchase plan is a written, prearranged plan setting out a schedule for repurchasing securities. As long as a 10b5-1 repurchase plan is adopted at a time when a company is not in possession of MNPI, the automated repurchases carried out pursuant to the plan will not be considered to have been completed on the basis of MNPI, even if the company subsequently comes into possession of MNPI during the course of the plan. Specified limits on repurchases under a 10b5-1 repurchase plan may be included to help avoid triggering a “creeping” tender offer.

TAX CONSIDERATIONS

The repurchase by a company of its outstanding debt securities at a discount generally gives rise to cancellation of debt income (“CODI”) and a reduction in net operating losses (subject to certain exceptions for bankrupt or insolvent companies). The amount of CODI is generally the difference between the principal amount of the debt repurchased (or its accreted value, if applicable) and the repurchase price.

SUMMARY OF DEBT REPURCHASE STRUCTURES

	Open-market or private repurchases	Cash tender offer	Redemption
Premium-to-market price	Low to none	High	High (generally equal to outstanding principal plus a premium)
Speed of implementation	Fast	Slow—must stay open for 20 business days, but may include an early settlement date and, in some cases, can be reduced to five business days	Fast, but can only be effected at prescribed times pursuant to the governing indenture

Documentation	Minimal to none	Tender-offer disclosure statement and related documentation	None
Advantages	Flexibility in terms of how much to repurchase and from whom	Allows entire classes of debt to be purchased at once for a designated price	Provides a pre-negotiated procedure for retiring all or a portion of an entire class of debt
Limitations	May only purchase a portion of outstanding debt over a certain period in order to avoid triggering a tender offer	Must comply with tender-offer rules under the securities laws, including offering to all debt-holders; convertible debt is subject to additional restrictions	Limited flexibility—must follow procedures laid out in the indenture

Issuers should consult with their financial, legal, and tax advisors to determine the most effective liability-management strategy for a particular company.