

The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt® PUBLICATION

OCTOBER 2017

EDITOR'S NOTE: MORE REFORM

Steven A. Meyerowitz

**TREASURY ISSUES REGULATORY REFORM RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR THE BANKING INDUSTRY**

Dwight C. Smith III, Eitan Levisohn, Randy Benjenk,
James Kwok, and Luis Urbina

**CFPB ISSUES FINAL RULE ON ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS IN FINANCIAL
PRODUCTS AND SERVICES CONTRACTS**

Jonathan I. Blackman, Matthew D. Slater, Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr.,
Inna Rozenberg, and Lindsey N. Simmons

CFPB FINALIZES TRID RULE CLARIFICATIONS

R. Colgate Selden, Stephen Ornstein, Nanci L. Weissgold,
and Elizabeth A. Corbett

**NAVIGATING THE REGULATORY COMPLIANCE ENVIRONMENT FOR
INVESTMENT AND BUSINESS-PURPOSE MORTGAGE LOANS**

Allison Botos Schilz and Abigail M. Lyle

**FASTER PAYMENTS TASK FORCE SETS GOALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FASTER PAYMENTS BY 2020**

Obrea O. Poindexter, Jeremy R. Mandell, and Calvin D. Funk

**U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDS DEBT COLLECTORS ARE NOT LIABLE UNDER
THE FDCPA FOR PURSUING TIME-BARRED CLAIMS IN BANKRUPTCY COURT**

Jonathan M. Robbin, Edward W. Chang, Diana M. Eng, and
Sholom Wohlgeleinter

**DELAWARE BANKRUPTCY COURT APPROVES INDENTURE TRUSTEE FEES
IN FACE OF FEE OBJECTION BY CERTAIN NOTEHOLDERS**

Adam F. Jachimowski and Alessandra Glorioso

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

VOLUME 134

NUMBER 9

OCTOBER 2017

Editor's Note: More Reform

Steven A. Meyerowitz

473

Treasury Issues Regulatory Reform Recommendations for the Banking Industry

Dwight C. Smith III, Eitan Levisohn, Randy Benjenk,
James Kwok, and Luis Urbina

476

CFPB Issues Final Rule on Arbitration Agreements in Financial Products and Services Contracts

Jonathan I. Blackman, Matthew D. Slater, Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr.,
Inna Rozenberg, and Lindsey N. Simmons

500

CFPB Finalizes TRID Rule Clarifications

R. Colgate Selden, Stephen Ornstein, Nanci L. Weissgold,
and Elizabeth A. Corbett

506

Navigating the Regulatory Compliance Environment for Investment and Business-Purpose Mortgage Loans

Allison Botos Schilz and Abigail M. Lyle

512

Faster Payments Task Force Sets Goals and Recommendations for Faster Payments by 2020

Obrea O. Poindexter, Jeremy R. Mandell, and Calvin D. Funk

517

U.S. Supreme Court Holds Debt Collectors are Not Liable under the FDCPA for Pursuing Time-Barred Claims in Bankruptcy Court

Jonathan M. Robbin, Edward W. Chang, Diana M. Eng,
and Sholom Wohlgelernter

521

Delaware Bankruptcy Court Approves Indenture Trustee Fees in Face of Fee Objection by Certain Noteholders

Adam F. Jachimowski and Alessandra Glorioso

525

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.

CFPB Issues Final Rule on Arbitration Agreements in Financial Products and Services Contracts

*Jonathan I. Blackman, Matthew D. Slater, Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr., Inna Rozenberg, and Lindsey N. Simmons**

The authors of this article discuss a Consumer Financial Protection Bureau final rule governing arbitration agreements in consumer finance contracts. The rule should apply to agreements entered into more than 241 days after the rule's publication, but it remains to be seen whether the rule will become effective, as Congress has already begun the process of enacting legislation to repeal the rule.

The Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (“CFPB”) has finalized a rule governing arbitration agreements in consumer finance contracts. Most importantly, the new rule prohibits providers of certain consumer financial products and services from including in their contracts arbitration clauses that waive any right to bring class action lawsuits. Covered providers involved in an arbitration pursuant to a pre-dispute arbitration agreement would also be required to submit specified arbitral records to the CFPB. The rule, if it comes into force, would significantly curtail the current industry practice of including arbitration clauses with class action waivers in these types of contracts, which the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled are valid in a recent series of cases. The rule should apply to agreements entered into more than 241 days after the rule’s publication, but it remains to be seen whether the rule will become effective, as Congress has already begun the process of enacting legislation to repeal the rule.

BACKGROUND

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (“Dodd-Frank”), passed in 2010, authorized the creation of the CFPB, an agency responsible for consumer protection in the financial sector. The CFPB began operation in 2011. Dodd-Frank also directed the CFPB to study the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements in consumer financial products and services

* Jonathan I. Blackman, Matthew D. Slater, and Carmine D. Boccuzzi Jr. are partners at Cleary Gottlieb Steen & Hamilton LLP. Inna Rozenberg is a senior attorney and Lindsey N. Simmons is an associate at the firm. The authors may be reached at jblackman@cgsh.com, m Slater@cgsh.com, cboccuzzi@cgsh.com, irozenberg@cgsh.com, and lsimmons@cgsh.com, respectively.

contracts and authorized the CFPB to regulate their use if it would protect consumers and promote the public interest.¹

In 2015, the CFPB published a study on this issue (the “Study”).² Based on a review of contracts for credit cards, checking accounts, prepaid cards, payday loans, student loans, and mobile wireless services, the Study found that consumer financial contracts routinely include arbitration agreements, with larger providers even more likely to use them.³ The Study also found that roughly 90 percent of these arbitration agreements contain provisions prohibiting class action arbitrations, with most of those containing an “anti-severability” provision stating that the entire arbitration agreement is unenforceable if the class arbitration waiver is deemed unenforceable. The Study further noted that following a quantitative analysis with respect to the credit card marketplace, no statistically significant evidence could be found that prices for or the availability of credit were affected by the existence of arbitration agreements.⁴

The most significant finding of the Study—and the one on which the CFPB ultimately relied for its rulemaking—is that pre-dispute arbitration agreements are being used to prevent consumers from seeking relief from legal violations on a class basis. At the same time, few consumers bring individual lawsuits or arbitrations against their financial service providers because their individual injuries are so small that it is difficult to find an attorney to handle the case to pursue an individual remedy. Thus, the CFPB expressed concern that many consumers are prevented from obtaining remedies to which they are entitled.⁵

In response to the results of the Study, on October 7, 2015, the CFPB issued an outline of proposals to regulate the use of arbitration agreements in

¹ Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010, Pub. L. No. 111-203, § 1028, 124 Stat. 1376, 2004.

² See CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU, “Arbitration Study: Report to Congress, pursuant to Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act § 1028(a)” (Mar. 2015).

³ *Id.* at 9–10. The study found that 53 percent of the credit card market, 44 percent of the insured deposits in the checking account market, 92 percent of a sample of prepaid card agreements, 99 percent of payday loan agreements from California and Texas and 99 percent of the mobile wireless market use arbitration agreements. See CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU, “Small Business Advisory Review Panel for Potential Rulemaking on Arbitration Agreements: Outline of Proposals Under Consideration and Alternatives Considered,” at 8 (Oct. 2015).

⁴ Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, *Arbitration Agreements*, 12 Fed. Reg. 1040 (proposed May 5, 2016) at 79.

⁵ See Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 90.

consumer financial products and services contracts. These proposals were presented to the Small Business Review Panel, which issued a report on December 11, 2015 encouraging the CFPB to “continue to evaluate the costs to small entities of defending class actions.”⁶ The CFPB also met with other stakeholders and industry representatives and considered their recommendations.⁷

DESCRIPTION OF THE RULE

On May 5, 2016, the CFPB issued a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to prohibit class action waivers and to regulate the use of pre-dispute arbitration agreements in contracts between consumers and covered providers of consumer financial products and services.⁸ On July 10, 2017, the CFPB issued the final rule, which was substantively identical to the proposed rule.⁹

The rule applies to providers of consumer financial products and services in the markets of lending money, storing money, and moving or exchanging money. Specifically, most providers engaged in the following activities will be affected: extending or servicing consumer credit; extending or brokering of automobile leases; providing services to assist with debt management or settlement; providing consumer reports or credit scores; providing certain account and remittance transfers; transmitting or exchanging funds and other payment processing services such as check cashing; and collecting debt arising from these kinds of products and services.¹⁰ Thus, the rule applies to a widespread group of entities, including banks, credit unions, credit card issuers, auto and auto title lenders, payday, installment and open-end lenders, student loan lenders, prepaid card issuers, virtual currency providers, debt settlement firms, and providers of credit monitoring services.

The principal features of the new arbitration rule are the following.

First, covered providers are prohibited from using a pre-dispute arbitration agreement to block consumer class actions in court, and providers must insert language into their arbitration agreements reflecting this limitation.¹¹ This rule stems from the CFPB’s findings in its Study and its further analysis—in

⁶ SMALL BUSINESS REVIEW PANEL, “Final Report of the Small Business Review Panel on the CFPB’s Potential Rulemaking on Pre-Dispute Arbitration Agreements,” at 34 (Dec. 11, 2015).

⁷ See Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 130.

⁸ See generally *id.*

⁹ See <https://www.consumerfinance.gov/arbitration-rule/>.

¹⁰ Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, Final Rule, Arbitration Agreements, 12 CFR Part 1040 (published July 10, 2017) (“Final Rule”), at 3–5.

¹¹ See *id.* at 1–3.

particular, that “individual dispute resolution mechanisms are an insufficient means of ensuring that consumer financial protection laws and consumer financial product or service contracts are enforced” and that “the class action procedure provides an important mechanism to remedy consumer harm.”¹²

Second, covered providers using pre-dispute arbitration agreements are required to submit to the CFPB certain records relating to the arbitral proceedings, including the claim, the arbitration agreement, the award, and certain communications with the arbitrator and administrator. The CFPB plans to use this information to monitor arbitral proceedings to determine whether there are developments that raise consumer protection concerns warranting further action. In addition, the materials will be published, in some form, on the CFPB website, with redactions as necessary.¹³

Compliance with the new rule is required for any pre-dispute arbitration agreement entered into on or after the date that is 241 days after publication of the final rule in the Federal Register.¹⁴

THE FUTURE OF ARBITRATION IN CONSUMER FINANCIAL CONTRACTS?

The CFPB has stated that its aim is not “to prohibit arbitration agreements entirely.”¹⁵ In its Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, the CFPB wrote that “providers would still be able to include them in consumer contracts and invoke them to compel arbitration in court cases not filed in court as class actions. In addition, the class proposal would not foreclose the possibility of class arbitration so long as the consumer chooses arbitration as the forum in which he or she pursues the class claims and the applicable arbitration agreement does not prohibit class arbitration.”¹⁶

At the same time, the CFPB has explained that “[s]ome companies and industry trade associations have argued that, if the class proposal were adopted, providers would likely remove their arbitration agreements entirely and this would impair consumers’ ability to resolve their individual disputes. . . . [I]f providers can no longer block class actions some stakeholders have stated that

¹² *Id.* at 150, 180.

¹³ *See id.* at 3, 340–54.

¹⁴ *See id.* at 614–15.

¹⁵ Notice of Proposed Rulemaking at 139.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 138–39.

the arbitration agreement serves no purpose.”¹⁷ Thus, the new arbitration rule may end up being the final blow to any kind of arbitration clauses in consumer financial contracts, or make them of little relevance, since few consumers would pursue individual remedies that would be subject to arbitration, and financial institutions would be unwilling to risk class litigation in arbitral forums, which tends to be less rigorous than in courts and from which there is no right to appeal.

However, the political situation in Washington may rescue arbitration in this context. During the public comment period and thereafter, the CFPB received over 113,000 comments.¹⁸ Some of the comments were critical of the proposed rule, including those from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Federal Credit Unions.¹⁹ Notably, the House Committee on Financial Services commented that “testimony [at a subcommittee hearing] demonstrated the Bureau’s Proposed Rule may not be ‘in the public interest.’”²⁰

In fact, the Republican chair of the committee, Representative Jeb Hensarling of Texas, stated soon after finalization of the rule that it “should be thoroughly rejected by Congress” under the Congressional Review Act, which provides Congress about 60 legislative days to overturn agency rulemaking. The current Congress has already used the law to reverse 14 rules promulgated during the Obama Administration,²¹ but to date, no rule issued under the Trump Administration has been overturned, and indeed, Congress has never used the Act to successfully challenge the rulemaking of a sitting administration.²²

That situation might now change since on July 25, 2017, the House of Representatives voted 231-190, in a near party-line vote, to approve H.J. Res. 111, which would overturn the CFPB’s arbitration rule pursuant to the

¹⁷ *Id.* at 136.

¹⁸ See <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=CFPB-2016-0020-0001>.

¹⁹ U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Public Comment to CFPB-2016-0020, Aug. 22, 2016 (commenting that “the proposed rule would drastically limit, if not eliminate, the use of arbitration in consumer financial contracts while conferring little to no benefit on consumers in return”); National Association of Federal Credit Unions, Public Comment to CFPB-2016-0020, Aug. 19, 2016 (expressing “several serious concerns about the arbitration rule”).

²⁰ U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Financial Services, Public Comment to CFPB-2016-0020, Aug. 22, 2016.

²¹ Silver-Greenberg & Corkery, “U.S. Agency Moves to Allow Class-Action Lawsuits Against Financial Firms,” N.Y. TIMES, July 10, 2017.

²² Sherfinski, David, “House Votes to Undo Federal Consumer Bureau’s Arbitration Rule,” THE WASHINGTON TIMES, July 25, 2017.

Congressional Review Act.²³ In order to have the rule repealed, the same resolution would now need to pass the Senate before September 18, 2017, with only a simple majority. However, the Republicans have only a 52-48 margin in the Senate, and with several Republican Senators currently undecided on the issue, it is uncertain whether the arbitration rule will ultimately be blocked.²⁴

The White House has also weighed in on the issue, publicly stating that it supported the House Republicans' efforts to nullify the CFPB's arbitration rule. The White House's position is that "the CFPB's harmful rule would benefit trial lawyers by increasing frivolous class-action lawsuits; harm consumers by denying them the full benefits and efficiencies of arbitration; and hurt financial institutions by increasing litigation expenses and compliance."²⁵ The White House further stated that if H.J. Res. 111 were presented to President Trump in its current form as a joint resolution, his advisors would recommend that he sign it into law.²⁶ In light of the current uncertainty as to the arbitration rule's future, it may be advisable for affected companies not presently using arbitration agreements with class action waivers, but which would like to do so, to take action before the compliance date of the final rule. Under the Supreme Court's current jurisprudence, class action waivers in pre-dispute arbitration agreements with consumers are enforceable, even when the cost of pursuing an individual claim would be prohibitively expensive.²⁷ If the final rule survives, this precedent would no longer be applicable to covered contracts entered into between consumers and entities operating in the financial products and services sector after the rule's compliance date.

²³ See Providing for Congressional Disapproval Under Chapter 8 of Title 5, United States Code, of the Rule Submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Arbitration Agreements," H.J. Res. 111, 115th Congress (2017-2018).

²⁴ Republican Senators Susan Collins (R-ME) and Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) remain undecided, and Senator John McCain (R-AZ) may be unavailable to vote due to his recent cancer diagnosis. See Ackerman, Andrew, "GOP Effort to Overturn Arbitration Rule at Risk From Republican Defectors," WALL STREET JOURNAL, Aug. 6, 2017.

²⁵ State of Administration Policy, "H.J. Res. 111—Disapproving the Rule, Submitted by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, Known as the Arbitration Agreements Rule," White House Press Office, July 24, 2017.

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ See *DirecTV, Inc. v. Imburgia*, 136 S. Ct. 463 (2015); *American Express v. Italian Colors Restaurant*, 133 S. Ct. 2304 (2013); *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, 131 S. Ct. 1740 (2011).