

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| PREFACE .....  | III       |
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....  | VII       |
| TABLE OF CASES .....   | XXXI      |
| <b>Chapter 1. Representing Business Organizations .....</b>  | <b>1</b>  |
| Problem .....  | 2         |
| I. Rules of Professional Responsibility .....  | 3         |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.13: Organization as Client.....  | 5         |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2: Scope of Representation<br>and Allocation of Authority Between Client and Lawyer .....              | 8         |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 2.1: Advisor .....   | 10        |
| II. The Role of the Business Lawyer .....  | 11        |
| Professional Responsibility and the Corporate Lawyer .....   | 11        |
| Corporate Governance and a Business Lawyer’s Duty of<br>Independence .....   | 20        |
| III. Inside Counsel .....  | 27        |
| Lawyers as Professionals and as Citizens: Key Roles and<br>Responsibilities in the 21st Century .....  | 28        |
| IV. Advising the Board of Directors .....  | 36        |
| Where to Turn for Legal Advice? Both Inside and Outside Corporate<br>Counsel Play an Important Role in Advising the Board of<br>Directors..... | 37        |
| Time Warner Cable, Inc. Audit Committee Charter.....   | 42        |
| <b>Chapter 2. Privilege and Confidentiality Part One .....</b>   | <b>51</b> |
| I. Introduction .....  | 51        |
| Problem .....  | 52        |
| II. Scope of the Attorney-Client Privilege.....  | 53        |
| A. Limitation of Privilege to Communications with the Corporation’s<br>“Control Group” .....   | 53        |
| Consolidation Coal Co. v. Bucyrus-Erie Co. ....  | 53        |
| B. Rejection of “Control Group” Test .....   | 56        |
| Upjohn Co. v. United States .....  | 57        |
| C. Extension of the Privilege to Communications Through Corporate<br>Agents.....   | 64        |
| In re Bieter Co. ....  | 64        |
| D. Application of the Privilege to Communications with Outside<br>Consultants.....   | 67        |
| 1. Privilege Applicable.....   | 67        |
| U.S. v. Kovel.....   | 67        |
| 2. Privilege Not Applicable.....   | 70        |
| U.S. v. Ackert .....   | 70        |

|      |   |            |
|------|---|------------|
| E.   | Advice from Non-Lawyer Consultants .....                        | 73         |
|      | Commissioner of Revenue v. Comcast Corp. ....                   | 73         |
| III. | Legal Versus Business Advice .....                              | 79         |
| A.   | In General .....  | 79         |
|      | In re Kellogg Brown & Root, Inc. ....                           | 79         |
| B.   | Impact of Lawyers Serving on Business Committees or Boards .... | 82         |
|      | Neuder v. Battelle Pacific Northwest Nat'l Laboratory .....     | 82         |
| IV.  | Work Product Doctrine .....                                     | 85         |
| A.   | Protection for Opinion Work Product.....                        | 86         |
|      | Sporck v. Peil .....  | 86         |
| B.   | Protection for Tangible and Intangible Work-Product .....       | 88         |
|      | U.S. v. Deloitte LLP .....                                      | 88         |
| C.   | Prepared "In Anticipation of Litigation" .....                  | 90         |
|      | U.S. v. Adlman .....  | 90         |
|      | U.S. v. Textron, Inc. ....                                      | 94         |
| V.   | Waiver .....  | 96         |
| A.   | Attorney-Client Privilege .....                                 | 96         |
|      | 1. Authority to Assert/Waive Privilege.....                     | 96         |
|      | Las Vegas Sands Corp. v. Eighth Judicial Dist. Court .....      | 96         |
|      | Problem .....   | 100        |
|      | 2. Inadvertent Disclosures of Privileged Information .....      | 101        |
|      | Parkway Gallery Furniture, Inc. v. Kittenger/Pennsylvania       |            |
|      | House Group, Inc. ....  | 101        |
|      | 3. Deliberate Disclosures—Common Interest Doctrine .....        | 103        |
|      | U.S. v. BDO Seidman, LLP .....                                  | 103        |
| B.   | Work Product Protection .....                                   | 105        |
|      | 1. Disclosures to Auditors .....                                | 105        |
|      | Medinol, Ltd. v. Boston Scientific Corp. ....                   | 105        |
|      | Merrill Lynch & Co., Inc. v. Allegheny Energy, Inc. ....        | 109        |
|      | 2. Audit Letter Responses .....                                 | 115        |
| C.   | Effect of Waiver .....  | 115        |
|      | Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 502.....                        | 115        |
| VI.  | Privilege, Work Product, and Rule 1.6 Compared .....            | 117        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.6: Confidentiality of   |            |
|      | Information .....   | 117        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.13: Organization as     |            |
|      | Client .....  | 118        |
|      | Problem .....   | 121        |
|      | <b>Chapter 3. Privilege and Confidentiality Part Two.....</b>   | <b>123</b> |
| I.   | Introduction .....  | 123        |
|      | Problem .....   | 124        |
| II.  | Shareholder Lawsuits .....                                      | 126        |
|      | Garner v. Wolfenbarger .....                                    | 126        |
|      | Valente v. PepsiCo, Inc. ....                                   | 132        |
| III. | Parents and Subsidiaries: Who Holds the Privilege? .....        | 138        |
|      | In re Teleglobe Communications Corp., et al. v. BCE Inc. ....   | 138        |

|      |   |            |
|------|---|------------|
| IV.  | Corporate Acquisitions.....   | 153        |
|      | Tekni-Plex, Inc. v. Meyner and Landis.....  | 153        |
|      | Great Hill Equity Partners IV, LP v. Sig Growth Equity Fund I,<br>LLP.....  | 162        |
| V.   | Waiver and Choice of Law.....   | 166        |
|      | 3Com Corporation v. Diamond II Holdings, Inc.....   | 167        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 8.5: Disciplinary Authority;<br>Choice of Law.....  | 172        |
| VI.  | Crime-Fraud Exception.....  | 172        |
|      | In re Grand Jury Subpoena.....  | 173        |
|      | <b>Chapter 4. Conflicts of Interest.....</b>  | <b>181</b> |
| I.   | Prospective Clients.....  | 182        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.18: Duties to Prospective<br>Client.....  | 182        |
|      | Problems.....   | 183        |
| II.  | Current Clients.....  | 183        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.7: Conflict of Interest:<br>Current Clients.....  | 184        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.10: Imputation of Conflicts<br>of Interest: General Rule.....   | 186        |
|      | Problems.....   | 187        |
| III. | Former Clients.....   | 187        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.9: Duties to Former<br>Clients.....   | 188        |
|      | Analytica, Inc. v. NPD Research, Inc.....   | 188        |
|      | Problems.....   | 192        |
| IV.  | Advance Waivers.....  | 193        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.7: Conflict of Interest:<br>Current Clients.....  | 193        |
|      | The Association of the Bar of the City of New York Committee on<br>Professional and Judicial Ethics Formal Opinion 2006–1.....  | 194        |
|      | Problems.....   | 196        |
| V.   | Corporate Family Conflicts.....   | 197        |
|      | Problems.....   | 197        |
| VI.  | Unforeseen Conflicts.....   | 199        |
|      | The Association of the Bar of the City of New York Committee on<br>Professional and Judicial Ethics Formal Opinion 2005–05:<br>Unforeseeable Concurrent Client Conflicts..... | 199        |
|      | D.C. Rule 1.7: Conflict of Interest: General.....   | 209        |
|      | Problems.....   | 210        |
|      | <b>Chapter 5. Civil Litigation.....</b>   | <b>211</b> |
| I.   | Introduction.....   | 211        |
|      | Problem 1.....  | 211        |
|      | Problem 2.....  | 212        |

|      |   |            |
|------|---|------------|
| II.  | Filings in Court .....  | 214        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 3.1: Meritorious Claims and<br>Contentions .....  | 215        |
|      | Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11: Signing Pleadings, Motions, and<br>Other Papers; Representations to the Court; Sanctions.....                                   | 216        |
|      | Garr v. U.S. Healthcare, Inc. ....  | 218        |
| III. | Preservation and Destruction of Evidence .....  | 226        |
| A.   | Rules of Professional Conduct .....   | 227        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4: Fairness to<br>Opposing Party and Counsel .....  | 227        |
| B.   | Criminal Statutes .....   | 228        |
|      | Arthur Andersen LLP v. United States .....  | 229        |
|      | Question .....  | 233        |
| C.   | Common Law Spoliation .....   | 234        |
| D.   | Gross Negligence .....  | 234        |
|      | The Pension Committee of the University of Montreal Pension<br>Plan, et al., v. Banc of America Securities, LLC, Citco Fund<br>Services (Curacao) N.V., et al. .... | 234        |
| E.   | Bad Faith .....   | 243        |
|      | Micron Technology, Inc. v. Rambus, Inc. ....  | 243        |
| F.   | Federal Rules of Civil Procedure .....  | 256        |
|      | Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 37: Failure to Make Disclosures<br>or to Cooperate in Discovery; Sanctions.....   | 257        |
| IV.  | Presentation of Evidence .....  | 258        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 3.3: Candor Toward the<br>Tribunal .....  | 258        |
|      | <b>Chapter 6. Regulatory Compliance.....</b>  | <b>261</b> |
|      | Problem.....  | 262        |
| I.   | Organizational Sentencing Guidelines .....  | 263        |
|      | U.S. Sentencing Commission Guidelines Manual Chapter Eight—<br>Sentencing of Organizations.....   | 264        |
| II.  | Corporate Law .....   | 268        |
|      | In re Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation.....  | 268        |
| III. | Implementing the Compliance Program.....  | 277        |
|      | In the Matter of John H. Gutfreund, Thomas W. Strauss, and John<br>W. Meriwether, Respondents.....  | 277        |
|      | In the Matter of JPMorgan Chase & Co. ....  | 296        |
| IV.  | Best Practices .....  | 299        |
|      | Learning the Hard Way: Ethics and Compliance Program Lessons<br>Gleaned from Recent U.S. Resolution Agreements.....   | 299        |
| V.   | Regulatory Counseling.....  | 308        |
|      | Counseling at the Limits of the Law: An Exercise in the<br>Jurisprudence and Ethics of Lawyering .....  | 308        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Chapter 7. Criminal Liability of Corporations .....</b>   | <b>319</b> |
| I. Introduction .....  | 319        |
| Problem .....  | 322        |
| II. The Basis of Corporate Criminal Liability .....  | 323        |
| A. Respondeat Superior .....   | 323        |
| New York Cent. & H.R.R. Co. v. U.S.....  | 323        |
| U.S. v. Sun-Diamond Growers of California.....   | 324        |
| B. Collective Knowledge Doctrine .....   | 326        |
| U.S. v. Bank of New England .....  | 326        |
| Commonwealth v. Life Care Centers of America, Inc. ....  | 329        |
| Problem .....  | 331        |
| C. Strict Criminal Liability for Corporate Executives—The <i>Park</i><br>Doctrine .....  | 332        |
| U.S. v. Park.....  | 332        |
| U.S. v. Quality Egg, LLC .....   | 335        |
| D. Extensions of Criminal Liability to Senior Executives .....   | 338        |
| Mixed Reactions Come After Mixed Verdict in Don Blankenship<br>Trial .....   | 339        |
| III. The Impact of an Indictment on a Corporate Entity .....   | 340        |
| Stolt-Nielsen, S.A. v. U.S. ....   | 340        |
| Brief for the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America<br>and the Association of Corporate Counsel as Amicus Curiae in<br>Support of Petitioners in Stolt-Nielsen, S.A. v. U.S., on Petition<br>for Writ of Certiorari to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third<br>Circuit..... | 344        |
| Problem .....  | 347        |
| IV. Federal Guidelines for Prosecuting Corporations .....  | 347        |
| U.S. Attorneys’ Manual, Chapter 9–28.000, Principles of Federal<br>Prosecution of Business Organizations (McNulty<br>Memorandum) .....   | 348        |
| Memorandum: Individual Accountability for Corporate Wrongdoing<br>(Yates Memorandum).....  | 354        |
| SEC Enforcement Manual .....   | 357        |
| Federal Sentencing Guidelines Chapter Eight—Sentencing of<br>Organizations.....  | 358        |
| V. Cooperation and Waiver of Attorney-Client/Work-Product<br>Protections .....   | 359        |
| In re Qwest Communications Int’l, Inc. ....  | 359        |
| Rule 502 of the Federal Rules of Evidence and Pertinent Advisory<br>Committee Notes .....  | 360        |
| In re General Motors LLC Ignition Switch Litig. ....   | 361        |
| Problem .....  | 363        |
| VI. Double Jeopardy Issues .....   | 363        |
| A. Civil Enforcement Actions and Criminal Prosecutions .....   | 364        |
| SEC v. Palmisano .....   | 364        |
| B. Federal and State Prosecutions for Same Conduct, in General ....  | 366        |
| Claybrooks v. State.....   | 367        |

|      |  |            |
|------|--|------------|
| C.   | The Petite Policy .....  | 367        |
|      | 9–2.031—Dual and Successive Prosecution Policy (“Petite Policy”).....  | 368        |
| VII. | “Too Big to Fail”/“Too Big to Jail” .....  | 369        |
| A.   | In General .....   | 369        |
|      | Who Is Too Big to Fail: Are Large Financial Institutions Immune from Federal Prosecution? .....                    | 369        |
| B.   | Deferred Prosecution Agreements.....   | 370        |
|      | Assistant Attorney General Caldwell, Remarks at the ACAMS Anti-Money Laundering and Financial Crime Conference.... | 371        |
|      | <b>Chapter 8. External Investigations of Corporate Conduct .....</b>   | <b>373</b> |
| I.   | Introduction .....   | 373        |
|      | Problem .....  | 374        |
| II.  | Prohibition Against Contact with Person Represented by Counsel.....  | 376        |
| A.   | In General .....   | 376        |
|      | Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 4.2: Communications with Person Represented by Counsel .....                 | 376        |
| B.   | Scope of Corporate Counsel’s Representation in Context of Rule 4.2 .....   | 377        |
|      | ABA Formal Op. 95–396 .....  | 377        |
|      | Utah Eth. Op. 04–06 .....  | 378        |
|      | Camden v. Maryland.....  | 380        |
|      | Patriarca v. Center for Living & Working, Inc.....   | 384        |
|      | Problems.....  | 386        |
| C.   | Exception to No-Contact Rule—When Contact “Authorized by Law” .....  | 386        |
|      | Comment [5] to Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 4.2 .....   | 387        |
|      | U.S. v. Grass .....  | 387        |
|      | Can the Feds Interview Corporate Employees Without Your Counsel’s Consent? .....                                   | 390        |
| III. | Issues Inherent in Structuring the Defense .....   | 393        |
|      | Problems .....   | 396        |
| A.   | U.S. v. Stein and the 2008 Amendments to the Justice Department Manual.....  | 396        |
|      | U.S. v. Stein .....  | 396        |
|      | U.S.A.M. § 9–28.730—Obstructing the Investigation.....   | 401        |
| B.   | Obstruction of Justice .....   | 401        |
|      | 18 U.S.C. § 1510 .....   | 402        |
|      | United States v. Murray .....  | 402        |
|      | 18 U.S.C. § 1512 .....   | 402        |
|      | 18 U.S.C. § 1519 .....   | 403        |
|      | U.S. v. Kumar .....  | 404        |
|      | Problem .....  | 407        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| IV. Advice to Employees Regarding Contact with Government  |            |
| Investigators .....  | 407        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 4.3: Dealing with<br>Unrepresented Person.....   | 407        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 3.4(f): Fairness to Opposing<br>Party & Counsel .....  | 408        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, §§ 3:28–3:29 .....   | 408        |
| What Can You Tell Your Employees When the Feds Arrive to<br>Question Them?.....  | 409        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, § 5:8 [B].....   | 409        |
| Sample Memorandum from Counsel to Employees Advising Them<br>of Investigations and of Possible Contacts by Government<br>Agents..... | 411        |
| In re State Grand Jury Investigation .....   | 412        |
| <b>Chapter 9. Internal Corporate Investigations .....</b>  | <b>421</b> |
| Problem.....   | 422        |
| I. Reasons to Conduct the Internal Investigation.....  | 423        |
| A. Investigations to Fulfill the Fiduciary Duties of Directors,<br>Specifically <i>Caremark</i> and the Duty of Due Care .....       | 423        |
| In re <i>Caremark International Inc. Derivative Litigation</i> .....   | 423        |
| B. Investigations to Develop Information to Make a Voluntary<br>Disclosure or to Comply with a Reporting Requirement .....           | 426        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, § 5:20 .....   | 426        |
| C. Investigations to Address Disclosures Required by the Securities<br>Laws or to Assure Accuracy of a Financial Statement .....     | 430        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, § 5:22 .....   | 430        |
| Problem .....  | 433        |
| II. Conduct of the Investigation .....   | 434        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, § 1:18.....  | 434        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, § 5:11 .....   | 435        |
| III. Issues Encountered in Internal Investigations .....   | 437        |
| A. Corporate <i>Miranda</i> Warnings .....   | 437        |
| When and How to Issue Corporate <i>Miranda</i> Warnings .....  | 437        |
| Problem .....  | 440        |
| B. Company's Conduct of Its Own Undercover Investigation .....   | 441        |
| Allen v. International Truck and Engine Corp. ....   | 441        |
| C. Requiring Employees to Cooperate with the Investigation .....   | 446        |
| Harvey v. Wackenhut Corp.....  | 446        |
| IV. The Risks and Benefits of Preparing a Report of the Investigation .....  | 447        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, §§ 5:10–5:11 .....   | 447        |
| V. Use of Investigative Report for Business Purposes .....   | 451        |
| In re the Leslie Fay Companies, Inc. Securities Litigation.....  | 451        |
| VI. Submission of the Report of Investigation to a Federal Governmental<br>Agency .....  | 457        |
| Federal Rules of Evidence, Rule 502.....   | 457        |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>Chapter 10. Dual Representation</b> .....   | <b>459</b> |
| Problem .....  | 460        |
| I. Ethical Considerations .....  | 461        |
| A. Rules of Professional Conduct .....   | 461        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.7: Conflict of Interest:<br>Current Clients .....            | 461        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.13(d) and (e):<br>Organization as Client .....               | 461        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 4.3: Dealing with<br>Unrepresented Person .....                | 462        |
| Preamble to the Delaware Rules of Professional Conduct on the<br>Various Functions of a Lawyer ..... | 463        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.0(e): Definition of<br>“ <i>Informed Consent</i> ” .....     | 463        |
| B. Ethics Opinions .....   | 463        |
| D.C. Bar Legal Ethics Committee, Ethics Op. 269 .....  | 463        |
| C. Restatement (Third) of the Law Governing Lawyers (2000) .....                                     | 466        |
| Restatement (Third) of the Law Governing Lawyers, § 14.....  | 466        |
| Restatement (Third) of the Law Governing Lawyers, § 103.....   | 467        |
| II. Common Sources for Dual Representation Issues .....  | 469        |
| U.S. v. Aramony .....  | 469        |
| Home Care Industries, Inc., and VBI Partners, LLC v. Murray .....                                    | 474        |
| U.S. v. Bay State Ambulance and Hosp. Rental Service, Inc. ....                                      | 478        |
| III. Dual Representation Issues Arising During the Course of an<br>Employee’s Deposition .....       | 480        |
| Advanced Mfg. Technologies, Inc. v. Motorola, Inc. ....  | 481        |
| IV. Deliberate Representations of Both Company and Employee .....                                    | 486        |
| A. The “ <i>Accommodation Client</i> ” Rule .....  | 487        |
| Perils of Joint Representation of Corporations and Corporate<br>Employees .....                      | 487        |
| B. Joint Defense Agreements .....  | 493        |
| Sample Joint Defense Agreement .....   | 494        |
| U.S. v. Stepney .....  | 497        |
| All American Semiconductor, Inc. v. Hynix Semiconductor,<br>Inc. ....                                | 500        |
| <b>Chapter 11. Shareholder Derivative Actions</b> .....  | <b>507</b> |
| I. Introduction .....  | 507        |
| Problem .....  | 510        |
| II. Nature of Derivative Actions .....   | 510        |
| A. In General—The Demand Requirement .....   | 510        |
| Kamen v. Kemper Financial Services, Inc. ....  | 510        |
| B. Delaware Law .....  | 511        |
| Spiegel v. Buntrock .....  | 511        |
| III. Independence of Special Litigation Committee (SLC) .....  | 513        |
| A. Successful Challenges .....   | 514        |
| Biondi v. Scrushy .....  | 514        |



|  |            |
|--|------------|
| London v. Tyrell.....  | 517        |
| Booth Family Trust v. Jeffries.....  | 520        |
| B. Unsuccessful Challenges.....  | 522        |
| Bach v. National Western Life Ins. Co.....   | 523        |
| IV. Disclosure of Investigation Results.....   | 524        |
| A. Waiver of SLC Privilege by Assertion of Good Faith<br>Investigation.....                    | 524        |
| TP Orthodontics, Inc. v. Kesling.....  | 524        |
| B. Waiver of SLC Privilege Based on Disclosure of Investigation<br>Results to Target.....      | 527        |
| Ryan v. Gifford.....   | 527        |
| V. Representation and Ethical Issues.....  | 530        |
| Can You Ever Have Too Many Lawyers?.....   | 530        |
| Tenja v. Familymeds Groups, Inc. ....  | 533        |
| VI. Independence of SLC’s Counsel.....   | 538        |
| Blake v. Friendly Ice Cream Corp.....  | 538        |
| Einhorn v. Culea.....  | 539        |
| In re Par Pharmaceutical, Inc. Derivative Litigation.....                                      | 541        |
| <br>   |            |
| <b>Chapter 12. Close Corporations, Partnerships, and Limited<br/>Liability Companies.....</b>  | <b>545</b> |
| Problems.....  | 545        |
| I. Close Corporations.....   | 547        |
| A. Who Is the Client?.....   | 547        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.7: Conflict of Interest:<br>Current Clients.....       | 548        |
| Jesse by Reinecke v. Danforth.....   | 550        |
| State Bar of Arizona, Opinion No. 02–06.....   | 553        |
| Ethics in the Practice of Law.....   | 555        |
| B. Conflicts Within the Close Corporation.....   | 559        |
| Alaska Bar Association Ethics Committee Ethics Opinion<br>2012–3.....                          | 560        |
| Legal Ethics Comm. of the D.C. Bar, Op. 216.....   | 563        |
| Yatooma v. Zousmer.....  | 565        |
| II. Partnerships.....  | 572        |
| A. The Entity Theory.....  | 573        |
| Richter v. Van Amberg.....   | 573        |
| B. The Aggregate Theory.....   | 578        |
| Steven’s Distribs., Inc. v. Gold, Rosenblatt & Goldstein.....                                  | 578        |
| C. The Importance of Facts and Circumstances.....  | 582        |
| Johnson v. Superior Court.....   | 583        |
| D. Limited Partnerships.....   | 589        |
| Buford White Lumber Co. Profit Sharing & Sav. Plan & Trust v.<br>Octagon Properties, Ltd. .... | 590        |
| III. Limited Liability Companies.....  | 591        |
| Montgomery v. eTrepid Technologies, LLC.....   | 592        |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <b>Chapter 13. Mergers and Acquisitions</b> .....   | <b>599</b> |
| Conflicts of Interest in Corporate Transactions: The Leveraged Buyout of<br>the Harris Chemical Company .....                     | 600        |
| <b>Chapter 14. Attorney Liability</b> .....   | <b>629</b> |
| Problem 1 .....   | 629        |
| Problem 2 .....   | 630        |
| I. Malpractice .....  | 631        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.1: Competence .....   | 631        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.3: Diligence .....  | 631        |
| Developments in the Law: Lawyers' Responsibilities and Lawyers'<br>Responses .....  | 632        |
| II. Reporting Duties .....  | 637        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.13: Organization as<br>Client .....   | 637        |
| Sarbanes-Oxley Standards of Professional Conduct Under Rule<br>205 .....  | 638        |
| III. Duty to Establish Compliance System.....   | 647        |
| In re World Health Alternatives .....   | 648        |
| IV. Aiding and Abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty.....   | 649        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.2: Scope of Representation<br>and Allocation of Authority Between Client and Lawyer ..... | 649        |
| Thornwood v. Jenner & Block .....   | 651        |
| Reynolds v. Schrock.....  | 655        |
| Austin v. Bradley, Barry & Tarlow, P.C. ....  | 661        |
| V. Negligent Misrepresentation .....  | 664        |
| Restatement (Second) of the Law of Torts, § 552: Information<br>Negligently Supplied for the Guidance of Others .....             | 665        |
| Dean Foods Company et al. v. Arthur J. Pappathanasi et al. ....   | 669        |
| VI. Lessons for Inside Counsel .....  | 681        |
| SEC and Criminal Proceedings Against Inside Corporate Counsel .....   | 681        |
| <b>Chapter 15. Employment Rights of Inside Counsel</b> .....  | <b>687</b> |
| Problem .....   | 687        |
| I. Overview of Issues.....  | 688        |
| A. In General .....   | 688        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, Chapter 6: Individual Rights and<br>Liabilities of Corporate Counsel .....                          | 688        |
| B. Duty of Confidentiality.....   | 691        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 1.6(b): Confidentiality of<br>Information .....   | 691        |
| II. Particular Issues .....   | 692        |
| A. Corporate Counsel's Uncertain Rights with Respect to Ethical<br>Complaints .....   | 692        |
| Balla v. Gambro, Inc.....   | 692        |
| Spratley v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. ....   | 697        |

|  |   |            |
|--|---|------------|
| B.   | Corporate Counsel’s Right to Sue for Discrimination .....     | 700        |
|  | Kachmar v. SunGard Data Systems, Inc. ....                    | 700        |
|  | Problem .....   | 703        |
| C.   | Corporate Counsel’s Right to Voluntarily Disclose Information |            |
|  | Regarding the Corporate Employer .....                        | 704        |
|  | Douglas v. DynMcDermott Petroleum Operations Co. ....         | 704        |
| D.   | The Lawyer as Whistleblower .....                             | 711        |
|  | Kidwell v. Sybaritic, Inc. ....                               | 712        |
| E.   | Corporate Counsel’s Rights to Sue or Be Adverse to Former     |            |
|  | Employer .....  | 716        |
|  | 1. In Litigation .....  | 717        |
|  | Stitz v. Bethlehem Steel Corp. ....                           | 717        |
|  | 2. Ethics Opinion .....                                       | 718        |
|  | ABA Formal Op. 99–415 (1999) .....                            | 718        |
|  | Problem .....   | 719        |
| <br>   |   |            |
| <b>Chapter 16. Whistleblowers, <i>Qui Tam</i> Actions and Employee</b> |   |            |
|  | <b>Issues</b> .....   | <b>721</b> |
|  | Problem .....   | 722        |
| I.   | Employees’ Right to Privacy .....                             | 723        |
| A.   | Case Law .....  | 723        |
|  | Stengart v. Loving Care Agency, Inc. ....                     | 723        |
|  | Holmes v. Petrovich Dev. Co., LLC .....                       | 731        |
| B.   | Ethics Opinions .....   | 734        |
| II.  | Whistleblowers .....  | 735        |
| A.   | In General .....  | 735        |
|  | The Most Dangerous Game: Hunting the Corporate Mole .....     | 735        |
| B.   | Application of Anti-Retaliation Provisions of Sarbanes-Oxley  |            |
|  | and Dodd-Frank Acts .....                                     | 740        |
|  | Wiest v. Lynch .....  | 740        |
|  | Berman v. Neo@Ogilvy, LLC .....                               | 745        |
| C.   | Awards to Whistleblowers .....                                | 750        |
|  | 1. Whistleblowers Under the Sarbanes-Oxley and Dodd-Frank     |            |
|  | Acts .....  | 750        |
|  | a. In General .....   | 750        |
|  | SEC, Office of the Whistleblower 2015 Annual Report           |            |
|  | to Congress on the Dodd-Frank Whistleblower                   |            |
|  | Program .....   | 750        |
|  | b. Receipt of Whistleblower Awards by Attorneys .....         | 754        |
|  | New York County Lawyers’ Ass’n, Comm. on Prof’l               |            |
|  | Eth. Formal Op. 746 .....                                     | 754        |
|  | 2. Employees as <i>Qui Tam</i> Relators in False Claims Act   |            |
|  | Cases .....   | 762        |
|  | U.S. ex rel. Taxpayers Against Fraud v. General Elec. Co. ... | 762        |

|   |            |
|---|------------|
| Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Pays<br>United States More than \$4.2 Million to Resolve False<br>Claims Act Allegations—Whistleblower’s Lawsuit<br>Alleged Transit Agency Violated Federal Contracting<br>Rules ..... | 765        |
| Millennium Laboratories Pay \$256 Million to Resolve False<br>Billing and Kickback Claims.....  | 766        |
| U.S. Subsidiary of Belgian Pharmaceutical Manufacturer<br>Pleads Guilty to Off-Label Promotion; Company to Pay<br>More than \$34 Million .....  | 768        |
| <b>Chapter 17. Communications Outside the Company .....</b>   | <b>771</b> |
| Problem.....  | 772        |
| I. Limitations on Trial Publicity .....   | 773        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 3.6: Trial Publicity .....  | 773        |
| Advocacy Outside the Courtroom: To What Extent Can Counsel<br>Comment on Pending Litigation?.....   | 774        |
| Maldonado v. Ford Motor Co. ....  | 778        |
| II. Disclosures to Auditors .....   | 781        |
| Audit Letter Responses in the Wake of Sarbanes-Oxley.....   | 781        |
| SEC Litig. Rel. No. 18896; Accounting and Auditing Enforcement<br>Rel. No. 2109.....  | 785        |
| III. Disclosures Subject to Regulation FD, 17 C.F.R. § 243.100 .....  | 786        |
| SEC v. Siebel Sys., Inc. ....   | 786        |
| Problem .....   | 791        |
| IV. Use of Public Relations Firms .....   | 791        |
| In re Copper Market Antitrust Litig.....  | 792        |
| Problem .....   | 798        |
| <b>Chapter 18. Multinational Regulatory Issues .....</b>  | <b>801</b> |
| I. Introduction .....   | 801        |
| Letter to Shareholders .....  | 803        |
| Problem .....   | 804        |
| II. The Rise of Multijurisdictional Regulation and Enforcement.....   | 805        |
| A. The Theoretical Problem—No Double Jeopardy .....   | 805        |
| “Carbon Copy” Prosecutions: A Growing Anticorruption<br>Phenomenon in a Shrinking World .....   | 805        |
| Double Jeopardy and the New World of Antibribery Laws .....   | 806        |
| B. International Regulation and Multi-Sovereign Prosecutions.....   | 807        |
| Double Jeopardy and the New World of Antibribery Laws .....   | 807        |
| Double Jeopardy—Finding a Balance in Enforcement Actions<br>for Companies .....   | 811        |
| Multijurisdictional Anti-Bribery Enforcement: The OECD Anti-<br>Bribery Convention .....  | 813        |
| C. Coordination or Piling On? The OECD and International<br>Conventions for Criminal and Civil Prosecutions .....   | 814        |
| 2013 Data on Enforcement of the Anti-Bribery Convention .....   | 814        |

|      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
|      | Double Jeopardy and the New World of Antibribery Laws .....  | 817 |
|      | Multijurisdictional Anti-Bribery Enforcement: The OECD Anti-Bribery Convention .....   | 821 |
| III. | Multijurisdictional Regulation and Enforcement in the Context of U.S. Law.....   | 822 |
|      | A. The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.....  | 823 |
|      | “Carbon Copy” Prosecutions: A Growing Anticorruption Phenomenon in a Shrinking World .....   | 823 |
|      | Cross-Border Investigations Update .....   | 823 |
|      | “Carbon Copy” Prosecutions: A Growing Anticorruption Phenomenon in a Shrinking World .....   | 825 |
|      | Innospec Inc. Pleads Guilty to FCPA Charges and Defrauding the United Nations; Admits to Violating the U.S. Embargo Against Cuba.....  | 827 |
|      | B. Antitrust Regulation .....  | 829 |
|      | Hot Topics in Antitrust Compliance and Enforcement.....  | 831 |
|      | Understanding the Libor Scandal .....  | 832 |
|      | British Airways PLC and Korean Air Lines Co. Ltd. Agree to Plead Guilty and Pay Criminal Fines Totaling \$600 Million for Fixing Prices on Passenger and Cargo Flights .....                   | 835 |
|      | South Korea Fines 19 Airlines \$97 Million for Fixing Cargo Shipment Rates.....  | 839 |
|      | Antitrust: Commission Fines 11 Air Cargo Carriers €799 Million in Price Fixing Cartel .....  | 839 |
|      | Heaviest Antitrust Fine Is Imposed in China .....  | 841 |
|      | C. Anti-Money Laundering Regulation .....  | 842 |
|      | Banking Crimes, § 8.1 .....  | 843 |
|      | Banking Crimes, § 8.27 .....   | 843 |
|      | U.S. and Mexican AML/CTF Supervisors Sign First-Ever MOU to Exchange Financial Information to Thwart Drug Crime .....  | 845 |
|      | Statement of Jennifer Shasky Calvery, Director, Financial Crime Enforcement Network, upon Signing a Memorandum of Understanding with Mexico’s National Banking and Securities Commission ..... | 846 |
|      | HSBC Holdings PLC and HSBC Bank USA N.A. Admit to Anti-Money Laundering and Sanctions Violations, Forfeit \$1.256 Billion in Deferred Prosecution Agreement.....                               | 848 |
| IV.  | Cooperation and Waiver: The MNCs’ Dilemma .....  | 850 |
|      | “Carbon Copy” Prosecutions: A Growing Anticorruption Phenomenon in a Shrinking World.....  | 850 |
|      | FCPA Alert: New Risks Associated with Simultaneous U.S. FCPA and U.K. Bribery Act Investigations.....  | 853 |
|      | Latest International Assault on Attorney-Client Privilege Causes Headaches for Corporations’ Lawyers.....  | 855 |
|      | Privilege Waivers’ Role in Deferred and Non-Prosecution Agreements .....   | 856 |

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| Information Resources, Inc. v. The Dun & Bradstreet Corp., A.C.<br>Nielsen Co. and IMS International, Inc. ....              | 857        |
| Reinfeld v. Meshulam Riklis, et al. ....   | 858        |
| In re Vitamin Antitrust Litigation.....  | 858        |
| <b>Chapter 19. Multinational Professional Privilege and Ethics .....</b>   | <b>867</b> |
| Problem.....   | 869        |
| I. Multinational Professional Privilege .....  | 869        |
| A. Protecting the Privilege in Today's Global Economy .....  | 869        |
| Attorney-Client Privilege in an Interconnected World .....   | 869        |
| B. Are Employees' Communications with In-House Counsel<br>Covered by the Privilege?.....                                     | 871        |
| Akzo Nobel Chemicals and Akcros Chemicals v. Commission .....  | 872        |
| An Uncertain Privilege Is a Little Better than Venturing Across<br>the Pond Without a Life Preserver After <i>Akzo</i> ..... | 874        |
| Attorney-Client Privilege in an Interconnected World .....   | 876        |
| C. Are Communications with Counsel Not Licensed in the Relevant<br>Jurisdiction Privileged?.....                             | 877        |
| Akzo Nobel Chemicals and Akcros Chemicals v. Commission .....  | 878        |
| D. Litigating International Disputes in the United States: Whose<br>Privilege Applies? .....                                 | 878        |
| Wultz v. Bank of China Ltd. ....   | 879        |
| E. Potential Solutions .....   | 884        |
| An Uncertain Privilege Is a Little Better than Venturing Across<br>the Pond Without a Life Preserver After <i>Akzo</i> ..... | 884        |
| II. Waiver of Attorney-Client Privilege Resulting from Involuntary<br>Seizure .....  | 886        |
| Unweaving the Dawn Raid Waive: Smart Prevention of Privilege<br>Waiver for Multinational Corporations .....                  | 886        |
| III. Ethics in the International Practice of Law .....   | 889        |
| Ethics in International Arbitration.....   | 890        |
| A. U.S. Choice of Law Rules in the Application of Ethics<br>Principles .....   | 897        |
| Delaware Rule of Professional Conduct 8.5: Disciplinary<br>Authority; Choice of Law.....                                     | 898        |
| Corporate Counsel Guidelines, § 3:2 .....  | 899        |
| B. Key International Codes of Conduct .....  | 902        |
| The IBA's Code of Conduct .....  | 902        |
| INDEX.....   | 905        |