TRENDS IN ARBITRATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Businesses in the United States have used arbitration clauses in contracts for many years. The purpose of these clauses is to encourage (or require) that contract disputes be settled in arbitration rather than by litigation and trial. Consumer and employment contracts frequently include arbitration clauses.

As Internet-based businesses have exploded over the past fifteen years, so have the number and types of business contracts containing arbitration clauses. Businesses frequently include mandatory arbitration provisions in their online "terms and conditions" for use of their sites, products or services. Businesses engaging in international transactions, whether online or offline, also may include arbitration provisions in their agreements to limit litigation in countries throughout the world.

While business contracts have changed to reflect changes in alternative dispute resolution, litigation, and the business environment, the arbitration process in the United States also has changed to reflect a more technologically-interconnected world in which arbitration, not litigation, is being used to resolve many types of business disputes.

As a result, arbitration proceedings now often include many of the rules for the handling of electronically stored information (ESI) that U.S. courts already have enacted. Due to its "electronic" nature, ESI can present challenges involving discovery, security, and authentication that traditional paper-based recordkeeping does not.

Courts have addressed these challenges by creating specific rules addressing ESI issues, as well as by adapting existing rules for paper-based documentation to try to accommodate ESI. Since arbitration proceedings frequently handle disputes involving businesses that create, store, and use large quantities of electronic information, many arbitrators have adopted similar rules. But the rules governing ESI usually differ between litigation and arbitration and one potential advantage of arbitration therefore is the possibility of a limited discovery process. Arbitration often can reduce the amount of "big data" a party must parse in order to find what is relevant to the proceeding at hand.

Arbitration remains the second most popular form of alternative dispute resolution in the United States, after mediation. The formal and binding nature of most arbitration – along with the fact that parties can choose arbitrators with specialized technical knowledge helpful to understand the details of the dispute – makes arbitration an appealing alternative to litigation (and trial), particularly when international jurisdictions may be in play.

If you have any question, please contact Grant Killoran at grant.killoran@wilaw.com or

414-276-5000.

PROTECTING THE ELDERLY FROM FRAUD BY CAREGIVERS

In what has become an all-too-common story, it was recently reported that a 92 year-old Wisconsin woman suffering from dementia was defrauded by her caregiver. The caregiver, who allegedly stole $25,000, recently pled guilty to fraud and identity theft. More details on the story, which was reported by Milwaukee WISN 12, can be found here.

Like many who suffer from dementia, the victim of this crime was living in her home, with the assistance of caregivers. While most caregivers are certainly professional and trustworthy, in this case, the caregiver—Andrea Gooseberry who worked for Home Care Assistance—allegedly was not.

The criminal complaint alleges that the caregiver used Marilyn's debit card and identity to steal approximately $25,000 through 47 separate ATM transactions, all of which occurred over the course of one month. According to victim's son, Marilyn was no longer capable of using an ATM card on her own.

The sad news does not end there, unfortunately. The police are also investigating whether four family friends stole another $20,000 from Marilyn.

There are steps that can be taken to reduce the risk that a loved one will be defrauded. For one thing, it is important that steps be taken to monitor a loved one's bank account to identify suspicious transactions. In addition, arrangements can be made to have a financial power of attorney put in place. If necessary, court proceedings can also be filed to seek the court appointment of a representative to take charge of the finances of one who is no longer able to handle his or her finances alone.

Whenever fraudulent activity of the sort described above is discovered, it is important to contact the local authorities. In addition, depending on the circumstances, the filing of a lawsuit may be the best option to put yourself in a position to investigate suspected fraud, particularly if that fraud is not discovered until after your loved one has passed.

If you would like more information on this topic, you are welcome to call Trevor Lippman at 414-276-5000 or trevor.lippman@wilaw.com

DEBT COLLECTION SAFE HARBOR MAY NOT BE SO SAFE

Debt collectors recently received clarification on the contents of the collection letters they send on behalf of creditors: The “safe harbor” language set forth by the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals to avoid liability under the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act is not meant to be copied and pasted into collection letters in every situation. Earlier this month, the Seventh Circuit concluded debt collectors cannot refer to late charges in collection letters sent to consumers if the creditor is prohibited from collecting late charges—even if a debt collector is quoting the safe harbor language that typically precludes FDCPA liability. Rather, debt collectors must ensure the safe harbor language is tailored to the circumstances.

The optional safe harbor language used in Wisconsin, Illinois, and Indiana includes an explanation of variable debts—that “[b]ecause of interest, late charges, and other charges that may vary from day to day, the amount due on the day you pay may be greater” than the amount listed as owed in the collection letter. This safe harbor language may allow debt collectors to avoid liability under the FDCPA because it provides a template for explaining the variable nature of some debts. In the recent case of *Boucher v. Finance System of Green Bay, Inc*., the Seventh Circuit held that this safe harbor precludes liability for inaccurately stating the amount of a variable debt regardless of which FDCPA provision that liability is based upon. But for it to be a truly safe harbor, the debt collector must be sure that the language accurately describes the nature of the debt. In *Boucher*, the debt collector used the safe harbor language as quoted above, even though no late charges or other charges could be added to the debt. The Seventh Circuit held this violated the FDCPA because the average unsophisticated consumer would believe late charges could be added and would thus be misled about the amount or character of the debt.

For more information on debt collection laws, contact Christa Wittenberg at 414-276-5000 or christa.wittenberg@wilaw.com

A DEEPER DIVE INTO THE ARBITRATION PROCESS AND A LOOK AT THE ADVANTAGES

AND DISADVANTAGES OF ARBITRATION

During arbitration, evidence and testimony are presented at a formal arbitration hearing. Discovery may occur before then, but its scope usually is limited by the parties' agreement or the arbitrator rules. After the arbitration hearing, the arbitrator issues a decision, known as an "award."

Arbitration may be binding or non-binding. Most arbitrations held in the U.S. today are binding arbitrations. In a "binding" arbitration, the arbitrator's decision is final, binding, and enforceable in court, similar to a court judgment. Both Wisconsin state and federal courts will enforce binding arbitration decisions. A "non-binding" arbitration does not have these elements of a binding arbitration, but can be helpful for evaluating a case or creating a basis for settlement negotiations between the parties.

The utility of arbitration (and other forms of alternative dispute resolution) in a particular dispute depends on various factors, including the nature of the dispute, the contract at issue and the state and federal laws in question, as well as the potential financial and time-related costs of litigation.

So why do parties choose arbitration? They do so because the arbitration process offers certain advantages. For instance, arbitration allows the parties to choose the place, time, rules, law, and people who will make the decision on the dispute. This flexibility, in turn, can make it easier for the parties to present technical facts since they can often choose a person or panel with expertise to understand a complex situation. The arbitration process also is typically shorter and faster than litigation and a trial due to limited, private discovery and streamlined procedural rules. Finally, most arbitration decisions are final and binding, with no appeals.

As with every dispute resolution process, however, arbitration also has certain disadvantages. Arbitration does not offer the right to a judge or a jury. Discovery is limited not only by the "ground rules" of the selected arbitration forum, but also by the limited power arbitrators have to force non-parties to submit to discovery or to issue subpoenas. Third parties cannot be added to arbitration without their consent, making complex multi-party disputes more difficult to resolve. Court rules of evidence and procedure do not apply. Since complex arbitration can be costly, parties with limited financial resources may be at a disadvantage in arbitration, and may not have the leverage litigation can provide to share or shift costs.

Arbitrators have wide discretion in their decision-making and have no obligation to explain their reasoning to the parties. Appeals from arbitration awards are rare. Typically, an arbitration award can be overturned only as a result of corruption, fraud, partiality, or

prejudicial misconduct by the arbitrator.

If you have any question, please contact Grant Killoran at grant.killoran@wilaw.com or 414-276-5000.

SEVENTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS REJECTS "WORTHLESS" SUBWAY CLASS ACTION SETTLEMENT

On August 25, 2017, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals rejected a settlement of a class action lawsuit that alleged Subway's "footlong" sandwiches failed to measure up. *In re Subway Footlong Sandwich Marketing and Sales Practices Litig.*, 869 F.3d 551 (7th Cir. 2017). The settlement offered "zero benefits for the class" and only served to enrich class counsel, according to the Court of Appeals. Thus, the class action settlement was rejected and the case was remanded to the district court.

The Subway footlong litigation was ill-advised from the start. It was filed after Subway customers posted pictures on social media allegedly showing that some "footlong" sandwiches measured closer to 11 inches. Several class action law firms jumped on board and quickly filed lawsuits alleging violations of state consumer-protection statutes. But the facts didn't support the claims. Subway used the same size "raw dough sticks" at all its stores, and that raw dough always weighed exactly the same. Although baking variations caused some of the raw dough sticks to bake up a bit short of 12 inches, those customers who bought slightly smaller sandwiches received no less bread, by volume, than any other. And, the quantity of meat and cheese was the same on each sandwich. Customers also could add a wide range of other toppings to their sandwiches. So, in the end, there was no evidence that any customer was short-changed any food.

The settlement of the Subway lawsuit, which was approved by the district court, required Subway to take certain steps over a period of four years to reduce the likelihood that there would be "short" footlong sandwiches in the future. Although the district court and the parties found value in Subway taking these additional steps, the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals disagreed. Specifically, the Court of Appeals focused on language in the parties' settlement agreement stating that, even after these steps were taken, it was still possible that Subway's footlong sandwiches would be slightly shorter than 12 inches because of baking variations. In the Court of Appeals' view, the settlement accomplished nothing that would benefit the consumers who made up the class.

Upon concluding that the Subway class action settlement offered “zero benefits” to the class, the Court of Appeals vacated the district court’s order approving the settlement. The case was recently remanded to the district court, where it currently awaits further action.

For more information about the benefits and drawbacks of class action litigation generally, you may contact Doug Dehler at 414-276-5000 or doug.dehler@wilaw.com.

DO YOUR DUE DILIGENCE

Most attorneys during their career have the opportunity or obligation to effectuate service of process of a legal document pursuant to a rule or statute. It can be in any area of the law. My practice area of creditors’ rights litigation requires me to serve process of a lawsuit under a statute that, at first glance, is complex, but over time has become engrained in my mind.

For a Wisconsin court to have jurisdiction over an individual defendant in a civil action, a summons must be served personally upon the defendant or, if with reasonable diligence the defendant cannot be served personally, by leaving a summons with a competent family member at the defendant’s home. If with reasonable diligence the defendant cannot be served by the above methods, then service may be made by publication and mailing.

I recently represented a client who, two years earlier, had obtained a large money judgment against a defendant/guarantor. Prior to obtaining a judgment in the case, the process server attempted to personally serve the guarantor 4 times – once at his parents’ house and, upon learning that the guarantor no longer resided there, 3 more times at his place of business. While attempting to serve at the guarantor’s place of business, the process server left his business card asking that he be contacted. The server testified to the court that the guarantor eventually called him, told the server that he would not make himself available for service, and instructed the server to publish. Based on the guarantor’s statements, service by publication was initiated. A default judgment was eventually entered against the guarantor after he failed to timely respond to the publication summons. Thereafter, the client initiated and continued to attempt to enforce and collect upon the judgment using supplementary collection procedures.

Twenty months after the judgment was entered, the guarantor filed a motion to reopen the case, asking the court to void its own judgment on the basis that the court lacked personal jurisdiction over him. The guarantor claimed that the creditor did not exercise due diligence in trying to find and serve him personally, thus rendering service by publication ineffective to establish jurisdiction.

Under Wisconsin law, there is no time limitation in bringing such a motion since ineffective service of process renders a court without jurisdiction over a defendant. It matters not whether the judgment is aged nor whether a client has spent thousands of dollars trying to enforce and collect upon the judgment. To make matters more difficult, a defendant's actual knowledge of a lawsuit is not a factor in a court's determination of whether a plaintiff has undertaken due diligence in attempting to serve a defendant.

Needless to say, my client was alarmed when it received the guarantor's motion. So what does a plaintiff like mine need to do to avoid such a situation? How may a plaintiff find comfort that it exercised due diligence in attempting to personally serve a defendant prior to publishing a summons as a means of service of the lawsuit? Does a plaintiff need to hire an expensive investigator to perform a search of the individual? Should a costly asset/information database search be ordered?

Due diligence is not defined by statute, but Wisconsin is not without judicial authority. A Wisconsin court of appeals has described reasonable diligence as the diligence to be pursued that is reasonable under the circumstances, but not all diligence which may be conceived. Nor is it that diligence which stops just short of the place where, if it were continued, might reasonably be expected to uncover an address of the person on whom service is being attempted. See *Loppnow v. Bielik*, 2010 WI App 66, ¶ 10, 324 Wis.2d 803.

While this judicial statement is somewhat amorphous, in my practice, I have gleaned that judges generally seem to require at least 3 attempts at personal service before service may be made by publication. Such attempts at service, however, may be viewed as futile if a server stops short in making a proper inquiry into the defendant's whereabouts before attempting service. See *Heaston v. Austin*, 47 Wis. 2d 67 (1970); *West v. West*, 82 Wis. 2d 158 (1972) (Due diligence was not established when a husband could have ascertained his wife's address by contacting any one of several relatives or in-laws). Courts may also take into consideration a defendant's statements as to his whereabouts or evasive actions on the part of a defendant in determining whether the due diligence standard was met. See *Welty v. Heggy*, 124 Wis. 2d 318 (Ct. App. 1985); *Emery v. Emery*, 124 Wis. 2d 613 (1985).

In my case, the court's determination ultimately boiled down to the existence of evasive actions on the part of the guarantor. An evidentiary hearing was held and, although the guarantor denied ever speaking to the process server, the court found the process server more credible than the guarantor in regard to the guarantor's evasive maneuvers and statements to the process server. Vital to the court's ruling was the existence of the process server's notes on the face of his affidavit stating that the defendant indicated he would not make himself available and advised the process server to publish.

From this experience, it is clear that meticulous notes, records and other documentary evidence must be kept in regard to a process server's communication with a defendant along

with the server's attempts to serve a defendant if publication is the method in which a plaintiff chooses to rely upon to effectuate service of process. Moreover, before choosing a process server it is a good idea to check the server's licensure history, including any reprimands or suspensions that may have been handed down by governing regulatory bodies. This will ensure no negative history exists that could render due diligence testimony from the server incredible.

For more information on this topic contact John Schreiber at 414-276-5000 or John.Schreiber@wilaw.com.

OCHDL PUBLIC SERVICE

One of the benefits of working at O'Neil Cannon is the firm's strong commitment to public service. The Firm encourages its attorneys to give back to our community. I am honored to serve on the Board of The Wisconsin Law Foundation. The Wisconsin Law Foundation is the charitable arm of the State Bar of Wisconsin. The mission statement for the organization notes that "the Wisconsin Law Foundation is a charitable and educational organization that serves to promote public understanding of the law, improvement of the administration of justice and other law-related public service through funding of innovative and creative programs that improve the vision of the American justice system." The Wisconsin Law Foundation accomplishes this mission through its numerous programs.

Two of the programs supported by the Wisconsin Law Foundation are the Wisconsin State High School Mock Trial Tournament and the Belle Case LaFollette Awards. The mock trial program teaches high school students about the court system and develops students' public speaking and research skills. The Belle Case LaFollette Award recognizes three recent law school graduates who represent under-served populations such as those of modest means and those who live in rural areas. These awards support the Wisconsin Law Foundation's mission of law-related public service. You can visit the State Bar of Wisconsin website to learn more about the many programs supported by the Wisconsin Law Foundation.

AVOIDING PITFALLS WHEN ADDING SWEAT EQUITY MEMBERS IN AN LLC

Many owners and businesses desire to reward employees with ownership interests for

services rendered. This can be a valuable incentive that recognizes past accomplishments and improves employee engagement and retention by allowing them to share in the success of the business without requiring a capital investment. While bonuses, raises, or phantom equity can often accomplish similar goals with fewer structural considerations, the allure of being a true owner is sometimes hard to match. More likely than not, the flexibility and reduced formality of an LLC were factors in making it the entity of choice. However, because LLC ownership is unique, there are several key issues to consider when adding this sweat equity member to make sure all parties understand the consequences.

First, how is the LLC managed? If it is a member-managed LLC (default in Wisconsin), the new employee-member could have full agency power and could enter into contracts or agreements on behalf of the LLC. While the employee might already have significant authority according to his or her job title or responsibilities, this member agency authority extends to issues outside of the ordinary course of business, such as taking out a loan or purchasing real estate. On the other hand, a member of a manager-managed LLC is viewed more akin to a passive, limited partner, with no actual agency power. Therefore, before adding the employee as a member, the current members should review the ownership structure and possibly amend the LLC's articles of organization to align their goals.

Second, does the LLC have an operating agreement? Outside of being an essential tool to structure and manage the business, an operating agreement can modify default provisions of the Wisconsin statutes that govern LLCs (Wisconsin Statutes Chapter 183). For example, unless modified in an operating agreement, Wisconsin law provides that voting in member-managed LLCs is based on members' capital contributions, and not on members' ownership interests. An employee receiving a member's interest for services will have voting rights based on the value of his or her services as recognized on the LLC's capital account, regardless of the actual member's interest received. To remedy this situation, the LLC should document all members' capital contributions (including the value for services) and draft (or amend) an operating agreement that clearly defines voting rights for all members. There are many ways to accomplish this goal (unitizing the members' interest, etc.), but it is important to make sure all parties understand their respective rights and roles in the LLC.

Lastly, what are the tax consequences? If the LLC is taxed as a partnership (default), the employee receives a regular capital interest in the LLC, that member's interest would be considered compensation in exchange for services that will likely be taxed as ordinary income. Depending on the value of those services, the employee could have a significant tax burden in the year he or she receives the capital interest without any guarantee of receiving cash distributions from the LLC to help cover that tax. Think winning a car on *The Price is Right*, only to discover a several thousand dollar tax bill waiting off-stage. The LLC can address this by offering the employee an interest consisting of the future profits/losses of the business. A profits interest still allows the employee to have similar rights as a member in the LLC, but because there is no initial value assigned to the profits interest (and thus no

liquidation value), the employee has no immediate tax obligation. The employee-member would then owe tax only on his or her allocation of future company profits. While taxes are inevitable, proper planning can avoid surprises and headaches for the employee and company, alike.

In conclusion, while LLCs provide flexibility for adding sweat equity members, careful design and implementation is required to avoid any potential surprises.

401(K) PLAN ERRORS COST SELLERS OF COMPANY NEARLY $200,000

A recent Court of Appeals decision provides a tangible example of the costs of ignoring employee benefit compliance requirements. In *Tatum v. SFN Group, Inc.* (No. 16-11966, 6/23/17), the 11th Circuit affirmed that the purchase price paid for a CFO-outsourcing firm was properly reduced in light of compliance errors in the operation of the company's 401(k) Plan.

In February 2010, Tatum, LLC (Seller) and staffing company SFN Group (Buyer), entered into a merger agreement (Agreement) under which the Buyer agreed to acquire Seller's company for payment of several million dollars, which included payments in cash and stock, as well as the assumption of debt and liabilities. The Seller's 401(k) plan was assumed by the Buyer. Under the terms of the Agreement, part of the purchase price was held back for eighteen months after the closing in the form of an indemnification holdback fund. The purpose of the holdback fund was to compensate the Buyer in the event it incurred certain defined damages, including damages resulting from the Seller's breach of any representation or warranty contained in the Agreement.

After the closing, but just before the end of the eighteen-month holdback period, the Buyer notified the Seller of its discovery that the Agreement had misrepresented the Seller's 401(k) plan. Specifically, the Seller had represented and warranted in the Agreement that its 401(k) plan was operated in compliance with applicable law. The Buyer had learned, however, that the 401(k) plan was not in compliance, and was therefore subject to potential tax-disqualification by the IRS.

The 401(k) plan's significant compliance errors were ultimately resolved through the IRS's Voluntary Correction Program (VCP), under which a 401(k) plan sponsor may self-report a compliance issue to the IRS and receive approval for its proposed solution, thereby avoiding tax-disqualification. By the time the compliance errors were rectified, the total 401(k)-related legal expenses and VCP fees incurred by the Buyer totaled $192,000. As a result, the

indemnification holdback fund, minus the $192,000 amount, was disbursed to the Seller.

While the Seller asserted claims including breach of contract and conversion in an attempt to recover the withheld funds, the Court found that the Seller had breached its duties to the Buyer under the Agreement and that the Buyer was entitled to withhold the amount at issue.

Had the 401(k) plan errors been previously resolved by the Seller, or discovered by the Buyer before the transaction closing, the costs to the Seller (and burdensome correction process by the Buyer) may have been reduced or avoided. The ruling serves as a reminder of the importance of adherence to compliance with benefits requirements, as well as the need for performing careful due diligence and strategically drafting the purchase agreement in merger and acquisition transactions.

DON'T SELL YOURSELF SHORT: EARLY TAX PLANNING TO MAXIMIZE THE SALE OF YOUR BUSINESS

What part of selling a business is most important to sellers? Most would respond that receiving the highest purchase price is most important. At first blush, this makes sense. However, sellers often focus on the number of zeros in the purchase price and ignore the fact that paying a large amount of income taxes will effectively reduce the purchase price. *Really*, sellers hope to walk away with the most cash in their pockets, i.e. the most after-tax proceeds. Sellers can maximize their after-tax proceeds by engaging in tax planning early. Too often, sellers lose out on tax savings by not considering the tax consequences of a sale sooner.

Prior to engaging with a buyer, sellers can identify tax opportunities and risks that affect the purchase price through sell-side due diligence. Generally, buyers prefer to purchase assets (as opposed to stock) and will pay a premium to do so. Sellers prefer stock sales to take advantage of favorable capital gains rates. However, a seller could identify early on that its net operating losses (NOLs) create an opportunity that allows the seller to negotiate a higher purchase price in an asset sale with peace of mind that it can offset its gains with NOLs. Alternatively, if a seller can pass on its NOLs to a buyer through a stock sale, the seller could demand a higher purchase price as the NOLs create value to the buyer by reducing the buyer's future tax liabilities.

Sellers should also pinpoint tax risks that may drive down the purchase price. For example, a seller may discover any of the following in due diligence: failure to file all required income

and sales and use tax returns in all required jurisdictions; use of improper accounting methods; poorly designed compensation plans; and failure to comply with local tax laws and transfer pricing methodologies. Ideally, a seller will identify these issues before a buyer does and correct them before the buyer can knock down the purchase price.

Sellers should negotiate certain “minor” aspects of a transaction earlier. Generally, sellers lose leverage and buyers gain leverage as a transaction proceeds. Sellers would often benefit from negotiating certain terms as early as the letter-of-intent stage of a deal, because these “minor” terms have meaningful tax consequences to the seller. For example, parties usually negotiate purchase price allocation at the very end of a transaction when the seller has much less bargaining power even though the purchase price allocation will directly impact the seller’s bottom line. Also, if not negotiated early on, the seller may have difficulty renegotiating the form(s) of consideration used even though the range of possible forms of consideration – cash, debt, rollover equity, escrows, earn outs, etc. – creates a range of tax consequences to the seller.

Overwhelmed yet? Most business owners know that differing overall structures create differing tax consequences when selling a business; however, most do not think about the less obvious aspects of a transaction that could have a meaningful impact on the seller’s bottom line. By the time many of these tax planning opportunities and risks are identified, the seller has lost the leverage to make meaningful changes. Sellers should engage early in tax planning and sell-side due diligence if they plan to sell a business. Not doing so could leave the seller with a much smaller effective purchase price than expected.

For more information on this topic contact Samantha Amore at 414.276.5000 or samantha.amore@wilaw.com.