# EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: IRS EXPANDS LIST OF HSA-COMPATIBLE PREVENTIVE CARE SERVICES

The IRS recently issued guidance expanding the types of preventive care services that can be provided by a high-deductible health plan (HDHP), before the deductible is met, without eliminating a covered individual's eligibility to participate in a Health Savings Account (HSA). The new guidance was published on July 17, 2019 and took legal effect on that same day.

Employers who sponsor HDHPs should now consider whether any plan documentation or communication changes are required to implement the expanded preventive care coverage rules. Alternately, employers who have not previously adopted a HDHP should assess whether the new rules may now make the HDHP/HSA model a more attractive way to control health care costs.

Background

An HSA is a tax-favored account that may receive contributions from an employee, an employer, or both. HSAs are subject to various rules that govern the individual account holder's eligibility to make and receive contributions and whether or not withdrawals are taxable.

To be eligible for HSA contributions, an individual must be covered under a HDHP and may generally not have any health coverage other than HDHP coverage. Certain preventive care services, however, are not considered to constitute health coverage so as to disqualify an individual from HSA eligibility.

Previously, preventive care (within the meaning of the HSA and HDHP rules) has not included any service or benefit intended to treat an *existing* illness, injury, or condition.

The IRS is aware, however, that cost barriers for care have resulted in the failure by some individuals who are diagnosed with certain chronic health conditions to seek or to use effective and necessary care that would prevent exacerbation of such conditions. Accordingly, and in consultation with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), the IRS determined that certain medical care services received and items purchased, including prescription drugs, should now be classified as preventive care for someone with the corresponding chronic condition.

Newly Established HSA-Compatible Preventive Care

To address the stated concerns, the expanded list of HSA-Compatible preventive care expenses includes fourteen cost-effective items and services that are likely to prevent the

worsening of eleven specified chronic conditions, as follows:

| Preventive Care for Specified Conditions | For Individuals Diagnosed with |
|---|---|
| Angiotensin Converting Enzyme (ACE) inhibitors | Congestive heart failure, diabetes, or coronary artery disease |
| Anti-resorptive therapy | Osteoporosis or osteopenia |
| Blood pressure monitor | Congestive heart failure or coronary artery disease |
| Inhaled corticosteroids | Asthma |
| Insulin and other glucose-lowering agents | Diabetes |
| Retinopathy screening | Diabetes |
| Peak flow meter | Asthma |
| Glucometer | Diabetes |
| Hemoglobin A1c testing | Diabetes |
| International Normalized Ratio (INR) testing | Liver disease or bleeding disorders |
| Low-density Lipoprotein (LDL) testing | Heart disease |
| Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (SSRIs) | Depression |
| Statins | Heart disease and diabetes |

The IRS and HHS will together review the list approximately every five to ten years to determine whether any items or services should be removed or added.

Changes Arose from Executive Order and Policy Advocacy

The immediate impetus of the change is Section 6 of Executive Order 13877, "Improving Price and Quality Transparently in American Healthcare to Put Patients First," which was signed by President Trump on June 24, 2019, and which mandated the issuance of guidance permitting HSAs to cover low-cost preventive care to help "maintain health status for individuals with chronic conditions."

The change also reflects the efforts of various health-policy advisors and advocates, who have long called for allowing first-dollar HDHP coverage for targeted, evidence-based, preventive services that prevent chronic disease progression and related complications.

Key HDHP Sponsor Issues and Next Steps

- In preparation for the 2020 open enrollment season, employer-sponsors of HDHPs should work to educate employees and dependents to assist them in understanding and benefitting from the new pre-deductible preventive care services.

- Sponsors of HDHPs should review whether or not existing plan documentation should be amended to encompass the expanded categories of covered care (or whether the current definitions remain legally sufficient).
- Because the out-of-pocket costs for some types of chronic care will now shift to the employer, sponsors of HDHPs should analyze whether the current deductible and premium levels are sufficient to meet the increased benefit expenses, or whether adjustments are warranted.
- Employers who offer both HDHPs/HSAs and on-site health clinics may provide only preventive care services in the on-site clinic in order to avoid jeopardizing employee HSA eligibility. Affected employers may now reconsider and expand the types of pre-deductible services to be provided to employees in the on-site clinic.
- Increased coverage of chronic condition expenses may increase the attractiveness of HDHP coverage to participants who are managing chronic conditions. The new rules may provide an opportunity to either increase future employee participation in, or to newly adopt, HDHP/HSA coverage.

---

# THE WILAW QUARTERLY NEWSLETTER

**Newsletter Article Highlights:**

- Objecting to an Opposing Party's Request for Attorney Fees Can Have Ramifications
- United States Supreme Court Clarifies Standard on Sanctions for Violating Bankruptcy Discharge
- Not Feeling so SECURE: Proposed Law Could be Costly for Non-Spouse IRA Beneficiaries
- Creation of New Task Force Signals Increased State Scrutiny of Wisconsin Worker Classification
- The Five Objectives of Good Succession Planning

**Firm News:**

- The Firm Welcomes Britany E. Morrison
- Firm Wins Trifecta
- Attorney Dean Laing Named "Lawyer of the Year"
- Attorney Christa Wittenberg Wins 2019 Judge Terence T. Evans Humor and Creativity in Law Competition
- Attorney Grant Killoran Appointed Co-Chair of the Wisconsin Fellows of the American Bar Foundation

Click the image below to read more.

# ERICA REIB REELECTED TO THE BOARD OF THE STATE BAR'S LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT SECTION

Attorney Erica N. Reib was recently reelected to the Board of the Labor and Employment Section of the State Bar. The State Bar of Wisconsin provides opportunities for lawyers to work on issues that matter to them and the public they serve. The Labor and Employment Section includes new and experienced attorneys who practice labor and employment law. The section keeps members up-to-date on recent developments in the law. The section also allows members to exchange information and opinions on various labor topics and legal issues in the workplace.

Erica is a member of O'Neil Cannon's Employment Law Practice Group. She assists clients with employment discrimination litigation, non-competition and trade secret litigation, OSHA matters, wage and hour issues, NLRB and unfair labor practice matters, employment policy and agreement drafting and review, unemployment compensation, investigations and proper employment practices to avoid litigation. She volunteers her time at Marquette Volunteer Legal Clinic and Milwaukee Justice Center, and is a board member and legal committee chair at the Audio and Braille Literacy Enhancement, Inc.

If you would like to contact Erica, she can be reached at 414-276-5000 or erica.reib@wilaw.com.

.

# EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: THE EEOC HAS STARTED COLLECTING REQUIRED PAY DATA: DO YOU NEED TO REPORT AND ARE YOU READY?

On July 15, 2019, after a protracted legal battle, the EEOC began collecting employers' EEO-1 2017 and 2018 payroll data, which may be referred to as Component 2 data. The reporting requirement was originally announced by the Obama administration in 2016, but in 2017, the Trump administration stayed the collection of Component 2 data, citing the burden it

imposed on employers. However, in March 2019, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia issued an order reinstating the requirement.

Therefore, between now and the deadline of September 30, 2019, all employers with 100 or more employees (both full-time and part-time) must submit the requisite information from calendar years 2017 and 2018 for all employees employed during the relevant "workforce snapshot period," which is an employer-selected payroll period between October 1 and December 31 of the reporting year. Employers, including federal contractors, that have less than 100 employees are not subject to these reporting requirements. Subject employers must provide the EEOC with the following data for employees in the workforce snapshot period: the employees' race/ethnicity and sex; the employee's EEO-1 job classification; the actual hours worked by non-exempt employees; actual hours worked by or proxy hours worked (e.g., 40 hours per week for full-time employees) for exempt employees; and Form W-2 payroll information. Such information does not have to be submitted for each individual employee but can be submitted by identifying, based on race/ethnicity and sex, the number of employees in each EEO-1 job category that fall into each of 12 EEO-1 compensation bands and the aggregate number of hours worked by all employees in each EEO-1 compensation band. The EEOC's stated purpose for collecting such information is to identify and remediate unlawful pay disparities in pay that are based on race/ethnicity and/or sex. Therefore, providing complete and accurate information in all categories is essential.

Employers subject to this requirement should have received correspondence via the U.S. mail and an email from NORC, the research group that is conducting the survey on behalf of the EEOC, notifying them of this obligation. Reminders are also scheduled to be sent in August and September. The EEOC has provided resources for filers at https://eeoccomp2.norc.org.

---

## DEAN P. LAING NAMED "LAWYER OF THE YEAR"

On July 16, 2019 Dean P. Laing was named "Lawyer of the Year" by the Milwaukee Bar Association at a reception attended by more than 300 attorneys. Dean was recognized for winning two cases at the Wisconsin Supreme Court for defendants and settling several million dollar plus cases on behalf of plaintiffs during the past year. In presenting Dean with the award, the President of the Milwaukee Bar Association stated that Dean is recognized as "one of Wisconsin's top trial attorneys."

Dean can be reached at 414-276-5000 or dean.laing@wilaw.com.

# OBJECTING TO AN OPPOSING PARTY'S REQUEST FOR ATTORNEY FEES CAN HAVE RAMIFICATIONS

You just lost a case in which the opposing party has a claim for attorney fees pursuant to a contract, statute or other fee-shifting mechanism. The opposing party has now filed a motion for attorney fees. Your initial reaction is to oppose the motion by arguing that the amount of time spent by the opposing party's attorneys was excessive and their hourly rates are unreasonable. Before pulling the trigger, however, you will want to consider a potential negative ramification of taking that position.

When a party requests an award of attorney fees, the party must establish that its request is reasonable, meaning that the time spent on the case by its attorneys was reasonable in the context of the factual and legal issues in dispute, and that its attorneys' hourly rates are reasonable in the community in which the case is venued. The party on the other end of the motion, of course, has the right to challenge the fee request. When such a challenge is made, the moving party may counter by seeking discovery of the objecting party's attorney fees in the case. This is usually done for two reasons: (1) to try to back off the objecting party by creating the risk that its own attorney fees will be discoverable, and (2) to argue to the court that the best evidence of what is reasonable is what the objecting party paid in litigating the same legal and factual issues in the case.

Wisconsin has not yet decided whether such discovery is permissible, but courts in other jurisdictions have frequently considered the issue and are split on their holdings. The majority of courts hold that discovery of an objecting party's attorney fees is permissible under these circumstances. As one court held, "the defendant's fees may provide the best available comparable standard to measure the reasonableness of plaintiffs' expenditures in litigating the issues of the case." *Chicago Prof'l Sports Ltd. P'ship v. Nat'l Basketball Ass'n*, 1996 WL 66111, at *3 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 13, 1996). As another court held, "the time spent by the defense counsel . . . may well be the best measure of what amount of time is reasonable," calling it a "logical yardstick." *Pollard v. E.I. DuPont De Nemours and Co.*, 2004 WL 784489, at *3 (W.D. Tenn. Feb. 24, 2004).

Numerous other cases hold the same way. *See*, *e.g.*, *Henson v. Columbus Bank and Tr. Co.*, 770 F.2d 1566, 1574-75 (11th Cir. 1985); *In re Fine Paper Antitrust Litig.*, 751 F.2d 562, 587 (3d Cir. 1984); *Frommert v. Conkright*, 2016 WL 6093998, at **2-3 (W.D.N.Y. Oct. 19, 2016); *Mendez v. Radec Corp.*, 818 F. Supp. 2d 667, 668-69 (W.D.N.Y. 2011); *Cohen v. Brown Univ.*, 1999 WL 695235, at **2-4 (D.R.I. May 19, 1999); *Murray v. Stuckey's Inc.*, 153 F.R.D. 151,

153 (N.D. Iowa 1993); *Coal. to Save our Children v. State Bd. of Educ.*, 143 F.R.D. 61, 64-66 (D. Del. 1992); *Real v. Cont'l Grp., Inc.*, 116 F.R.D. 211, 213-14 (N.D. Cal. 1986); *Blowers v. Lawyers Coop. Publ'g Co.*, 526 F. Supp. 1324, 1325-28 (W.D.N.Y. 1981); *Naismith v. Prof'l Golfers Ass'n*, 85 F.R.D. 552, 562-64 (N.D. Ga. 1979); *Stastny v. S. Bell Tel. and Tel. Co.*, 77 F.R.D. 662, 663-64 (W.D.N.C. 1978); *Vulcan Materials Co. v. Chandler*, 992 So. 2d 1252, 1268 (Ala. 2008); *Paton v. Geico Gen. Ins. Co.*, 190 So. 3d 1047, 1050-53 (Fla. 2016); *Miller v. Kenny*, 325 P.3d 278, 303 (Wash. Ct. App. 2014).

A minority of courts go the other way, holding that what an objecting party paid in attorney fees to defend a case is not relevant on the issue of whether what the plaintiff paid to prosecute the case is reasonable. The most recent case to so hold is *In re Nat'l Lloyds Ins. Co.*, 532 S.W.3d 794 (Tex. 2017). In that case, the Texas Supreme Court held as follows:

To the extent factual information about hourly rates and aggregate attorney fees is not privileged, that information is generally irrelevant and nondiscoverable because it does not establish or tend to establish the reasonableness or necessity of the attorney fees an opposing party has incurred. A party's litigation expenditures reflect only the value that party has assigned to litigating the matter, which may be influenced by myriad party-specific interests. Absent a fee-shifting claim, a party's attorney-fee expenditures need not be reasonable or necessary for the particular case. Barring unusual circumstances, allowing discovery of such information would spawn unnecessary case-within-a-case litigation devoted to determining the reasonableness and necessity of attorney-fee expenditures that are not at issue in the litigation.

*Id.* at 799. Other cases similarly holding include *Hernandez v. George*, 793 F.2d 264, 268 (10th Cir. 1986); *Ohio-Sealy Mattress Mfg. Co. v. Sealy Inc.*, 776 F.2d 646, 659-60 (7th Cir. 1985); *Costa v. Sears Home Improvement Prods., Inc.*, 178 F. Supp. 3d 108, 113 (W.D.N.Y. 2016).

Because Wisconsin has not decided this issue as of yet, and other jurisdictions are split on the issue, it may be risky to oppose an opponent's request for attorney fees on the grounds that the time spent by its attorneys was excessive or its attorneys' hourly rates are unreasonable, particularly if it is anticipated that the attorney fees you spent likely exceed the attorney fees spent by your opponent.

Dean Laing is the President of O'Neil Cannon, and a member of its Litigation Practice Group. He can be reached at 414-276-5000.

# TAX AND WEALTH ADVISOR ALERT: NOT FEELING SO SECURE: PROPOSED LAW COULD BE COSTLY FOR NON-SPOUSE IRA BENEFICIARIES

On May 23, 2019, the House overwhelmingly voted (417-3) to approve the SECURE (Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement) Act and sent it to the Senate for their approval. The bipartisan bill is grabbing headlines for its modification to many retirement issues. Among those modifications is a requirement that could be costly for non-spouse IRA beneficiaries. The requirement forces non-spouse beneficiaries of inherited IRAs to withdraw funds from their account over a 10-year period after the original owner's death rather than the beneficiaries' life expectancy, ending the beneficial tax strategy known as the "stretch IRA."

Under current law, if a person other than a spouse is named as a beneficiary of an IRA account, the beneficiary can take their IRA required minimum distributions over their life expectancy based on a table provided by the IRS. Therefore, withdrawal of the IRA account is "stretched" out over a presumably long period based on the beneficiary's life expectancy. For example, if a 25-year old inherited a $1 million IRA from his grandfather, he would take distributions over his life expectancy of 57.2 years (as provided by the IRS table). His required minimum distributions would be about $17,482 ($1,000,000/57.2), which he would need to withdraw yearly over a 57.2-year period. Each year, this would result in a federal tax bill anywhere between $548 (if he were in the lowest tax bracket) to $6,468 (if he were in the highest tax bracket). The "stretch IRA" is a beneficial tax strategy, especially for younger beneficiaries, because they have smaller required minimum distributions stretched out through their life expectancy and thus they incur smaller tax bills. Additionally, the stretch allows for tax-deferred growth over longer accumulation periods and a larger amount of money reaching the pockets of the beneficiaries.

The proposed SECURE Act, however, would require beneficiaries to withdraw all the money in the inherited IRA account within a 10-year period from the original owner's death rather than stretch the distributions out over the life expectancy of the beneficiary. The proposed Act allows the distributions to be whenever the beneficiary likes—the distributions can be made at regular intervals or at the end of the period—just as long as they are made sometime in the 10-year period.

Despite the flexibility in distributions, removing the stretch based on life expectancy in exchange for a 10-year period will have significant financial effects for non-spouse beneficiaries of inherited IRAs. The proposed Act will greatly accelerate tax collection,

pushing the beneficiaries into high tax brackets, resulting in beneficiaries paying a substantial amount more in taxes than under the life-expectancy stretch. To illustrate, using the previously mentioned example of the 25-year old beneficiary of a $1 million IRA, if he were to take equal distributions of $100,000 over the 10-year period, in the first year alone, his income would be bumped up by $82,517 ($100,000 versus $17,482 in life-expectancy stretch), which could easily land him in a higher tax bracket. He would then have a yearly tax bill between $24,000 (if the distributions were his only income) to $37,000 (if he were in the highest tax bracket). That is an incredible difference in tax bills, not to mention the loss of tax-free compounding that was allowed for longer periods of time under the life-expectancy stretch.

If the proposed SECURE Act goes into effect, it will no doubt be costly for non-spouse IRA beneficiaries. The landscape of IRA planning will need to change, and IRA owners might consider alternative planning strategies like charitable beneficiaries or investments in life insurance policies versus IRAs to minimize taxes for their loved ones. While we wait to see if the Senate will approve the SECURE Act, we will continue to advise our clients to ensure their compliance and counsel on effective tax minimizing alternatives should the SECURE Act go into effect.

If you are interested in learning more about tax minimizing alternatives for non-spouse IRA beneficiaries, please contact Attorney Britany E. Morrison at O'Neil Cannon to discuss how we are able to assist you in your needs.

---

## FIRM WINS TRIFECTA

O'Neil Cannon was victorious in three cases before the Wisconsin Supreme Court this year, all involving issues of first impression in Wisconsin.

In the first case, decided on January 29, 2019, the Supreme Court held that bad faith under the Uniform Fiduciaries Act ("UFA") requires proof by a bank customer of bank dishonesty whereby the bank willfully failed to investigate compelling and obvious known facts suggesting fiduciary misconduct because of a deliberate desire to evade knowledge of fiduciary misconduct.

In *Koss v. Park Bank*, 2019 WI 7, 385 Wis. 2d 261, 922 N.W.2d 20, an employee of Koss Corporation embezzled $34 million from the Company over a 10-year period. A significant portion of the embezzled funds came from cashier's checks obtained by the employee from the employer's bank accounts at Park Bank, which the employee used for her personal benefit. After the embezzlement was discovered, Koss Corporation sued Park Bank, alleging

that Park Bank should have discovered the embezzlement earlier and reported it to Koss Corporation, and its failure to do so was bad faith under the UFA, which precludes claims of negligence against banks. After five years of litigation, the trial court dismissed the case on summary judgment, finding that Koss Corporation failed to meet the high standard for establishing bad faith under the UFA. The Court of Appeals affirmed the dismissal, and the Supreme Court did so as well.

In a 2-3-2 decision, the Supreme Court held that the following "foundational principles" are applicable in analyzing a bank's conduct when bad faith is asserted under the UFA: (1) bad faith is an intentional tort requiring that a bank employee suspected fiduciary misconduct but purposefully failed to investigate out of a fear of discovering the misconduct; (2) bad faith is reviewed on a transaction by transaction basis, such that the facts known by each individual bank employee are not aggregated to form collective knowledge of the bank; (3) whether a bank acted in bad faith is determined at the time of the breach of fiduciary duty, not by looking back at transactions that occurred many months earlier; and (4) considerations of bad faith require analyses of a bank's actions to determine its subjective intent.

In applying these bank-friendly standards and principles, the Supreme Court held that "none of Koss Corporation's factual allegations asserted, or even implied, that Park Bank acted dishonestly such as being motivated by self-interest with regard to the transactions [the customer's employee] initiated," and "none of Koss Corporation's allegations assert that Park Bank suspected that [the customer's employee] was acting improperly." Concluding, the Supreme Court held that, while "[t]here is much here from which a claim of negligence could be made," negligence is not sufficient to establish bad faith under the UFA.

In the second case, decided on March 14, 2019, the Supreme Court held that a business purpose is not required in order for land to be classified as "agricultural land" for property tax purposes. In *State ex rel. Ogden Family Tr. v. Bd. of Review*, 2019 WI 23, 385 Wis. 2d 676, 923 N.W.2d 837, the Ogdens owned property in the Town of Delafield that was originally classified as "agricultural land," thereby resulting in a low assessed value for property tax purposes. In 2016 the Town reclassified the property as "residential" on the grounds that the property was not being used for a business purpose, which resulted in a 50-times increase in the assessed value of the property. The Ogdens challenged the reclassification, arguing that the property is used primarily to harvest apples and hay for food and fiber, and to grow Christmas trees, which are agricultural uses. The Town failed to budge, determining that a business purpose is required for land to be classified as "agricultural land" for property tax purposes. The Ogdens filed a petition for certiorari review, which the trial court rejected, siding with the Town.

The Ogdens appealed, and the Court of Appeals reversed, concluding that a business purpose is not necessary for land to be classified as "agricultural land" for property tax purposes. The Supreme Court affirmed, in a unanimous decision, holding that section 70.32(2)(c)1g., Wis.

Stats., merely requires the "growing" of crops, not the marketing, selling, or profiting from them, for land to be classified as "agricultural." As a result, the Supreme Court held that "[a] business purpose is not required in order for land to be classified as 'agricultural' for property tax purposes."

In the third case, decided on May 23, 2019, the Supreme Court held that constructive trust is a remedy, not a cause of action. In *Tikalsky v. Friedman*, 2019 WI 56, 386 Wis. 2d 757, 928 N.W.2d 502, Tikalsky's parents disinherited him from their estates, leaving their entire estates to their other three children, equally. Following his parents' deaths, Tikalsky sued his siblings, alleging that two of them intentionally interfered with his expected inheritance. As to his third sibling, Tikalsky sued her for constructive trust arguing that, even though she was innocent of any wrongdoing, she is in possession of a portion of his expected inheritance and, if he prevails on his claims against his other two siblings, his innocent sibling should be required to disgorge the excess portion she received from her inheritance.

The trial court dismissed the innocent sibling from the lawsuit on the grounds that no cause of action for liability was asserted against her and, without a finding of liability against a party, no remedy can be ordered against that party. The Court of Appeals reversed, holding that constructive trust is available against an innocent beneficiary if wrongful conduct is found against any party and it would be inequitable for the innocent beneficiary to hold onto the property received as a result of the wrongdoing.

In a 4-3 decision, the Supreme Court reversed the Court of Appeals' decision and held that "constructive trust is a remedy, not a cause of action." The Supreme Court further held that, while "a constructive trust may be imposed on property in the possession of one who is wholly innocent of any" wrongdoing, that remedy is only available where the innocent beneficiary "came into possession of property that was already burdened with a constructive trust," *i.e.*, the owner of the property must have conveyed the property to an innocent beneficiary in violation of a duty to transfer it to the plaintiff (such as by a court order in a divorce proceeding). Concluding, the Supreme Court held that Tikalsky's parents "violated no duty to [Tikalsky] when they caused their estate planning documents to transfer part of their estate to [Tikalsky's innocent sibling]" and, as a result, "where there is no violated duty . . . there can be no constructive trust."

Dean Laing represented the bank in *Koss* and the innocent beneficiary in *Tikalsky*. He can be reached at 414-276-5000.

# ATTORNEY GRANT KILLORAN APPOINTED CO-CHAIR OF THE WISCONSIN FELLOWS OF THE AMERICAN BAR FOUNDATION

Grant Killoran recently was appointed to a three year term as Co-Chair of the Wisconsin Fellows of the American Bar Foundation, beginning September 1, 2019.

The Fellows of the American Bar Foundation is a global honorary society of attorneys, judges, law faculty, and legal scholars whose public and private careers have demonstrated outstanding dedication to the highest principles of the legal profession and the welfare of their communities. Established in 1955, the Fellows support the research of the American Bar Foundation and currently has a membership totaling over 14,000 individuals across the globe. Membership in the Fellows is limited to one percent of lawyers licensed to practice in each jurisdiction.

The American Bar Foundation is among the world's leading research institutes for the empirical and interdisciplinary study of law. An independent, nonprofit organization for more than 65 years, it seeks to advance the understanding and improvement of law through research projects on the most pressing issues facing the legal system in the United States and around the world today. It seeks to expand knowledge and advance justice through innovative, interdisciplinary, and rigorous empirical research on law, legal processes, and legal institutions. Its research findings are published in a wide range of forums, including leading academic journals, law reviews, and academic and commercial presses.

For more information on the Fellows of the American Bar Foundation and the American Bar Foundation, visit www.americanbarfoundation.org.

Grant Killoran is a shareholder with the law firm of O'Neil Cannon and is the Chair of its Litigation Practice Group. He has significant and diverse trial experience representing clients in Wisconsin State and Federal Courts, and courts around the country, focusing on complex business and health care disputes.

Grant Killoran can be reached at grant.killoran@wilaw.com or 414-276-5000.

---

# EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: EMPLOYERS

# SHOULD CONFIRM THAT THEIR I-9S ARE IN ORDER

Recently, President Trump announced that a new round of workplace immigration raids would be postponed until after July 4. Regardless of when or if these raids happen, all employers should take this time to ensure that they are in compliance with federal law by having proper work authorizations for all of their employees. Workplace authorization is governed by the Immigration and Reform Control Act, which allows U.S. companies to hire and employ only U.S. citizens, non-citizen nationals, lawful permanent residents, and aliens authorized to work in the U.S. Employers must have a Form I-9 on file for every current employee hired on or after November 6, 1986. I-9 forms for former employees must be kept until the later of three years from the employee's hire date or one year after their final date of employment. Such forms can be retained on paper or electronically.

To determine compliance with federal immigration laws for lawful work authorization, employers should conduct an audit of their I-9s to confirm, among other things, that each individual who should have an I-9 on file in fact has one on file; that any and all employment authorization documents are current; that all sections of the I-9 form have been fully filled out; and that any changes, such as a name change, have been properly documented. Corrections to I-9 forms must be handled carefully and in compliance with federal law. We have attorneys experienced in assisting employers with I-9 audits. Failure to properly follow the law regarding the maintenance of I-9 forms, including making corrections, can subject an employer to civil and criminal penalties.