

Attorneys for UniRush LLC

PAUL HASTINGS LLP
Thomas P. Brown (CA Bar Number 182916)
55 Second Street
Twenty-Fourth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
Telephone: 1(415) 856-7248
tombrown@paulhastings.com

Gerald S. Sachs (DC Bar Number 493507)
875 15th Street NW
Washington, DC 20910
Telephone: 1(202)551-1975
geraldsachs@paulhastings.com

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

BEFORE THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU

In the matter of
UNIRUSH LLC

**UNIRUSH LLC'S PETITION TO
MODIFY OR SET ASIDE THE OCTOBER
27, 2015 CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE
DEMAND**

NOVEMBER 9, 2015

Respectfully submitted to:

Ms. Monica Jackson
Office of the Executive Secretary
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
1700 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20552-0003
ExecSec@cfpb.gov

Mr. Anthony Alexis
Office of the Enforcement Director
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
1700 G Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20552-0003
Enforcement@cfpb.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 2

III. LEGAL STANDARDS 7

IV. ARGUMENT 9

 A. The CID is Unduly Burdensome Due to the Extraordinary Short Response
 Deadline 9

 B. The CID is Overly Broad in the Information that it Seeks 12

 C. It is not Fair to Require UniRush to Waive its Legal Rights to
 Demonstrate “Responsible Conduct” 15

 D. Counsel for UniRush has Attempted in Good Faith to Negotiate a
 Modification of the CID Prior to Filing this Petition..... 16

V. CONCLUSION..... 17

I. INTRODUCTION

UniRush LLC (“UniRush”) files this petition to modify or set aside the Civil Investigative Demand (“CID”) issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (“CFPB” or “the Bureau”) to UniRush¹ on October 27, 2015. The Bureau’s CID, couples eighty-seven discrete requests (56 requests with 31 subparts) with a requirement that UniRush fully comply with the Bureau’s request, certifying under the penalty of perjury that it has done so completely and accurately by November 10, 2015 (10 business days after issuance of the CID). Although the Bureau’s CID is overly broad and unduly burdensome, UniRush, acting in good faith, repeatedly requested that the Bureau modify its CID to narrow its scope appropriately and allow for a reasonable time by which UniRush could comply. The Bureau has refused to extend the return date on the CID and has forced UniRush to file this Petition to seek formal review of the reasonableness of this CID. It is our hope that the Bureau, through this Petition, will change its course and work with UniRush to develop a realistic schedule for the production of the information that Bureau reasonably believes will assist with its investigation into what happened and UniRush’s efforts to both fix the problems and remediate the harm suffered by its users. UniRush requests that the Bureau either modify the CID or set it aside pursuant to 12 U.S.C. § 5562(f) and 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(e).²

¹ Paul Hastings LLP represents UniRush LLC and has accepted service on its behalf.

² Although the Bureau has been unwilling to voluntarily extend the date of its CID, UniRush has been and fully intends to continue cooperating with this investigation in adherence with the Bureau’s “Responsible Conduct Bulletin.” *Responsible Business Conduct: Self-Policing, Self-Reporting, Remediation, and Cooperation*, CFPB Bulletin 2013-06 (June 25, 2013) available at http://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201306_cfpb_bulletin_responsible-conduct.pdf (stating that a party’s self-policing, self-reporting, remediation to consumers, and cooperation with the Bureau are considered in the Bureau’s exercise of its enforcement discretion). Moreover, UniRush intends to begin its rolling production of documents in response to the Bureau’s CID while this petition is pending. Indeed, as of this filing, UniRush believes that it will make its first production of documents and data next week.

II. BACKGROUND

UniRush is a small business with its headquarters in the greater Cincinnati, Ohio metropolitan area.³ UniRush employs approximately 100 individuals and a number of independent vendors or contractors.⁴ UniRush is the consumer facing program manager for a prepaid card program issued by MetaBank.⁵ As the Bureau is well aware, UniRush had to change processors in 2015.⁶ Such a major undertaking requires substantial preparation. Over the course of a year UniRush devoted a team of full-time employees to setting up this process.⁷ At least eleven full-time employees, certain senior executives, and various partners of the company worked on the processor conversion.⁸ In addition, the UniRush Board had been continually updated as to the status of this significant project.⁹ The actual conversion took place during the evening of October 11, 2015 and the morning of October 12, 2015.¹⁰ Unfortunately, the conversion did not go according to plan and a number of technical issues affected some consumer's ability to use their prepaid cards.¹¹ However, at no time were any consumer funds at risk.¹² All consumer funds are held in an account of a federally insured depository institution.¹³ In addition, UniRush believes that all systemic technical issues resulting from the conversion have since been resolved. Moreover, UniRush is working diligently to address appropriately any consumer harm that was directly related to the conversion issues.¹⁴

³ Exhibit A: Sachs Affidavit ¶¶ 2-3.

⁴ *Id.* ¶ 2, 5.

⁵ MetaBank is a depository financial institution with assets under \$10 billion, which exempts it from the Bureau's supervisory and enforcement jurisdiction. MetaBank is supervised by the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

⁶ Exhibit A: Sachs Affidavit ¶ 6.

⁷ *Id.* ¶ 7-8.

⁸ *Id.* ¶ 8-9.

⁹ *Id.* ¶ 29.

¹⁰ *Id.* ¶ 10.

¹¹ *Id.* ¶ 11.

¹² *Id.* ¶ 12.

¹³ *Id.* ¶ 13.

¹⁴ *Id.* ¶ 14-15.

On October 23, 2015, the Bureau first contacted UniRush seeking to set up a telephone conference call with its Chief Executive Officer (“CEO”) and Bureau Director, Richard Cordray.¹⁵ Although, the Bureau had made public statements¹⁶ regarding UniRush, prior to this call with Director Cordray, this telephone call was the first time the company had interacted directly with the Bureau regarding the processor conversion and its effects on UniRush consumers.¹⁷ Seeking to immediately cooperate with the Bureau, UniRush’s CEO, Rick Savard, some of his staff, and outside counsel rearranged their schedules to set a time within two hours of the original Bureau request to voluntarily speak with Director Cordray.¹⁸ During a very professional and cordial telephone call, Director Cordray discussed the Bureau’s concerns, which generally stemmed from consumer complaints it had received relating to the UniRush’s processor conversion.¹⁹ To assist the Bureau with gathering more accurate information than what was publically available, Mr. Savard briefly discussed with Director Cordray the company’s preliminary understanding of what transpired during the processing conversion and why consumers may have experienced some issues with their accounts.²⁰ In addition, Mr. Savard explained how the company had been working virtually around the clock and had devoted nearly all of its resources both to remedying the issues that occurred during the conversion and appropriately remediating consumer harm.²¹ Director Cordray specifically stated

¹⁵ *Id.* ¶ 16.

¹⁶ See CFPB Facebook page, available at:

https://m.facebook.com/story.php?story_fbid=1013445535366503&id=141576752553390&refid=17&tn_=%2A%20

¹⁷ *Id.* ¶ 17. Statement of Gail Hillebrand, Associate Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau’s Consumer Education and Engagement Office calls on consumers to stop direct deposits into their card accounts, available at: http://www.gulfive.com/news/index.ssf/2015/10/russell_simmons_Unirush_prob.html; Gail Hillebrand calls UniRush’s actions outrageous and notes that the Bureau is looking into this very troubling issue, available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/10/21/business/dealbook/after-technical-snap-fury-and-no-cash.html>.

¹⁸ Exhibit A: Sachs Affidavit ¶ 18. Also on this call were Acting Deputy Director Fuchs, and various other Bureau Staff. *Id.* ¶ 19(e)(f).

¹⁹ *Id.* ¶ 20(a).

²⁰ *Id.* ¶ 21(b).

²¹ *Id.* ¶ 21(c)(d).

that, while he believed UniRush was on the right path in dealing with this issue, the Bureau would still need to verify what went wrong and insure that harmed consumers had received compensation.²² It is in this context that the Bureau issued its CID.

On October 27, 2015, Bureau staff spoke with counsel regarding whether service could be effectuated via email. The undersigned counsel agreed to this request, but at the same time explained to the Bureau how it might be more productive to first meet with the company prior to issuing a CID. To assuage any fears of document preservation issues, the company offered to issue a document retention and preservation requirement throughout the company prior to any meeting. UniRush made this offer to facilitate producing more information to the Bureau without the stringent data standards and other legal obligations that adhere to the issuance of a CID. The Bureau did not accept this offer and issued its CID.

Since receiving the CID, UniRush immediately informed the Bureau that it would not be possible to comply with its broad and overly burdensome requests by the designated date.²³ UniRush held a “meet and confer” with Bureau Staff on November 2, 2015.²⁴ At this meeting, UniRush explained that it would begin conducting interviews of document custodians the week of November 9, 2015 in Cincinnati and that it believed that most of the information sought by the Bureau had been stored electronically and could be retrieved. Again, UniRush reiterated that this process—even if done as expeditiously as possible—would take more than 10 days and, thus, require an extension of time in which to respond.²⁵ Notwithstanding the Bureau’s unwillingness to grant the requested extension prior to the meet and confer, UniRush spent more than two hours during the “meet and confer” recounting its entire preliminary understanding of the

²² *Id.* ¶ 20(b)(c).

²³ *Id.* ¶ 22.

²⁴ *Id.* ¶ 23. Unirush could have waited until November 6, 2015 to hold a “meet and confer,” but chose to expedite such a meeting to assist the Bureau. *Id.* ¶ 24.

²⁵ *Id.* ¶ 26(a).

processor conversion failure, the effect this failure had on UniRush consumers, and how the company plans on remediating consumer harm.²⁶

Following the “meet and confer,” on November 5, 2015, UniRush sent a formal written request to the Bureau seeking an extension of time to respond to its CID.²⁷ This request noted, among other things, that UniRush had agreed to prioritize production of the Bureau’s prioritized list and produce these materials on a rolling document production schedule.²⁸ Further, UniRush requested a reasonable extension of time to comply with the CID by seeking sixty days after issuance.²⁹ Considering the December holidays, UniRush suggested that January 15, 2016 would be a more reasonable deadline than December 25, 2015.³⁰

To address the Bureau’s concerns about unnecessary delay, UniRush offered some concrete representations. It explained that it was scheduling interviews with employees for the week of November 9, 2015 and that it would begin a rolling production the week of November 16, 2015. UniRush explained that this extension should minimize the need to devote resources to asking for further significant extensions and maximize its time remediating consumer harm, as well as responding to the Bureau’s CID, as quickly as possible.³¹ In essence, UniRush expressed its desire to work with the Bureau and assist it in narrowing the scope of its immediate information requests to the most pertinent information relating to the processor conversion, consumer harm, and consumer remediation.

While UniRush’s request and offer of assistance pended with the Bureau, UniRush made significant process in working toward compliance with the CID. It instituted a document hold

²⁶ *Id.* ¶ 26(c).

²⁷ See Exhibit B: Correspondence from counsel for UniRush seeking an extension of time to respond to the Bureau’s CID.

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ *Id.*

regarding information sought by the CID, and hired a vendor to assist in the collection, production, and review of documents. To ascertain the scope of potentially relevant information, the company scheduled interviews with more than 20 employees and executives whose primary responsibility is running the company, including getting the program righted on its new processing platform and addressing the consumer issues that resulted from the change in processors.³² Once these interviews are complete, the company will then be in a position to process and review hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of discrete documents, produce a complete log of all of its transaction data since the change in processors and offer specific request-by-request suggestions about how the Bureau might narrow its request to ensure that UniRush can comply as quickly as possible. The process detailed above is necessary, at a minimum, to develop the understanding of the processing failure required to provide an explanation that any reasonable person would be willing to sign under the penalty of perjury, as required by the Bureau's rules. This process will take considerably longer than the ten business days allowed pursuant to its CID.

On Friday, November 6, 2015, at the close-of-business, the Bureau responded to UniRush's reasonable proposal seeking an extension of time to respond to the CID and denied that request.³³ In the denial, the Bureau noted that to evaluate any request for an extension of time to a CID the Bureau must have a date certain by which UniRush would begin production in response to the CID, specifically state the timing and content of any rolling production, and list a justification as to why UniRush needs additional time to respond to the specific requests in the CID.³⁴ Moreover, the Bureau noted that UniRush must submit "a detailed letter identifying a specific timetable for responding to each interrogatory, document request, and request for written

³² Exhibit A: Sachs Affidavit ¶ 27.

³³ Exhibit C, Email Correspondence from CFPB Senior Litigation Counsel, Ms. Carolyn Hahn.

³⁴ *Id.*

report as well as a justification for the extension.”³⁵ Of course, the Bureau knows that UniRush cannot provide any of this information until it has, at a minimum, conducted its interviews of all relevant document custodians. UniRush told the Bureau during its “meet and confer” that it is in the process of obtaining a document production vendor that can comply with the Bureau’s data standards and that the relevant document custodians will be interviewed during the week of November 9, 2015 (approximately 10 business days after issuance of the CID).³⁶ Again, UniRush offered to start a rolling document production as early as the week of November 16, 2015.³⁷ The Bureau has deemed this unacceptable and resolutely refused any extension of time for UniRush beyond the initially provided 10 business days to respond to its CID.³⁸

III. LEGAL STANDARDS

The Bureau’s CID requires a certification of compliance for production of documents.³⁹ This entails “a diligent inquiry of all persons who likely have possession of responsive documents and information.”⁴⁰ The person providing the certification must assert that he/she has “confirmed that a diligent search has been made of all the locations and files that likely contained responsive documents and information in the possession, custody, or control of UniRush”⁴¹ Further, the certification must “certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.”⁴² This certification extends beyond document production and includes interrogatory answers and reports where the certification must state that “[i]n preparing all answers and reports in response to the enclosed [CID], I have made a diligent inquiry of all persons who likely have possession of responsive documents and information, and I have confirmed that a diligent search

³⁵ *Id.*

³⁶ Exhibit A: Sachs Affidavit ¶ 26(d).

³⁷ *Id.* ¶ 26(e).

³⁸ Exhibit C, Email Correspondence from CFPB Senior Litigation Counsel, Ms. Carolyn Hahn.

³⁹ CID Instructions, H.

⁴⁰ CID Certificate of Compliance – Documents.

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² *Id.*

has been made. . . .”⁴³ This certification must also require that the declarant “certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.”⁴⁴

Federal agencies’ requests for information and documents may not be unreasonable.⁴⁵ Government investigations can grow to such a sweeping scope that that they must be quashed or limited in scope or breadth.⁴⁶ The D.C. Circuit has recognized that the broad power to conduct investigations granted to federal agencies must be limited to reasonable demands that are not indefinite nor unduly burdensome.⁴⁷ For a document production request to be reasonable, it must be “adequate, but not excessive, for the purposes of the relevant inquiry.”⁴⁸ “The Fourth Amendment requires that the subpoena be sufficiently limited in scope, relevant in purpose, and specific in directive so that compliance will not be unreasonably burdensome.”⁴⁹ Government investigations can be deemed “unduly burdensome if ‘compliance threatens to unduly disrupt or seriously hinder normal operations of a business.’”⁵⁰ Ultimately, “[t]he federal courts stand guard . . . against [such] abuses. . . .”⁵¹

Although a recipient of a CID may request a modification or set aside, such requests must state the specific grounds upon which the petition relies in seeking relief, based on any constitutional or other legal right or privilege.⁵² Each Petition must be signed by a statement representing that counsel for the petitioner has conferred with counsel for the Bureau in a good-faith effort to resolve by agreement any issues raised by the petition. The timely filing of a

⁴³ CID Certificate of Compliance – Interrogatory Answers and Reports.

⁴⁴ *Id.*

⁴⁵ *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652-53 (1950) (stating that “a governmental investigation into corporate matters may be of such a sweeping nature and so unrelated to the matter properly under inquiry as to exceed the investigatory power” and that a demand may be “too indefinite and [not] . . . reasonably relevant”).

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ *Sec. & Exch. Comm'n v. Arthur Young & Co.*, 584 F.2d 1018, 1023-24 (D.C. Cir. 1978).

⁴⁸ *Id.* at 1030.

⁴⁹ *Id.* at 1024.

⁵⁰ *F.T.C. v. Invention Submission Corp.*, 965 F.2d 1086, 1090 (D.C. Cir. 1992).

⁵¹ *Arthur Young*, 584 F. 2d at 1024.

⁵² 12 U.S.C. § 5562(f)(3).

petition for an order modifying or setting aside a civil investigative demand stay the time permitted for compliance with the portion challenged.⁵³

IV. **ARGUMENT**

The Bureau's CID is facially flawed. It makes overbroad and unduly burdensome demands, and it insists that UniRush comply with those demands within a period of time, ten business days, that makes compliance impossible.

A. **The CID is Unduly Burdensome Due to the Extraordinary Short Response Deadline**

UniRush objects to the Bureau's CID because it is unduly burdensome and requires compliance in an usually short time frame. The Bureau's CID requires full compliance within 10 business days. UniRush cannot meet this deadline and has explained this to the Bureau repeatedly since it received the CID.⁵⁴

The Bureau's CID, as stated above, seeks detailed and voluminous information, contains fifty-six separate interrogatories, document requests, and requests for reports with eighty-seven discrete subparts and requires that UniRush fully comply with the Bureau's request, certifying under the penalty of perjury, that it has done so completely and accurately. The individual requests seek detailed and voluminous information. For example, two of the interrogatories ask UniRush to explain in detail why it was changing processors, what happened in connection with

⁵³ 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(f).

⁵⁴ The most obvious analog to the Bureau's CID to UniRush is the so-called second request that the FTC and the Department of Justice issue under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act related to mergers that the antitrust agencies believe may pose a threat to competition. This can provide a workable framework for what is reasonable in the context of such a large request for information and documents. Those requests seek a similar amount of information and require a similar certification of substantial compliance. *See* FTC, Model Second Request for Additional Information and Documentary Material (Second Request) June 2010 (available at <https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/attachments/premerger-introductory-guides/guide3.pdf>). It typically takes parties that receive a second request six months and several million dollars to comply. *See* Cecile Kohrs Lindell, Majoras Hopes to Streamline Reviews, *Daily Deal*, (May 11, 2005) (quoting then FTC Chairwoman Majoras). And unless the Bureau decides to reduce the scope of its demand, there is no reason to believe that this process will be any faster or cheaper.

change in processors, and how the change affected consumers.⁵⁵ One of the document requests asks the company to produce all documents related to its change in processing platforms.⁵⁶ And one of the requests for written reports seeks all data associated with each account that was affected by the processing change.⁵⁷

Those requests seek information related to the company's most significant undertaking over the course of the entire time period covered by the CID. From January 1, 2015 through the October 11, 2015, UniRush had a team of at least eleven people working on the project full time. Those eleven people coordinated with teams at one federal bank, MetaBank, and one very significant publicly traded payment-processing company, MasterCard. The activities of that core team were supervised on a daily basis by two members of the senior management team at UniRush, the chief operating officer and the chief technology officer, on a weekly basis by the entire senior management of the company, and on a less frequent, though regular, basis by the company's board of directors.

Moreover, even if UniRush had been able to collect the information called for by the CFPB within the 10 business day deadline set by the CID, it would not have been able to produce it consistent with the instructions in the CID. For example, the Bureau requires all responses to be certified under the penalty of perjury. No reasonable person would make such a certification until a thorough investigation into what responsive material UniRush possesses. Such significant diligence cannot be completed within ten business days, and no one should assume the risk of criminal sanction without that diligence.

⁵⁵ See Interrogatory No. 10 ("Describe the System Update that was scheduled to occur on or about October 12, 2015, including by explaining [sic] why the System Update was occurring."); Interrogatory No. 14 ("Describe any issues that resulted in Cardholders not having access to funds or after October 12, 2015).

⁵⁶ See Request for Documents No. 8.

⁵⁷ See Request for Written Report No. 3.

In addition, the Bureau's CID requires all information be provided in a specified data format. UniRush does not hold data in the form specified by the CID, and complying with this requirement will take more than 10 business days. For example, the CID requires the following: all documents to be Bates numbered⁵⁸; the provision of full custodian lists; certain meta-data; lists of relevant media; standardization of email time zones; electronic productions in original electronic format; secure and encrypted production in a format agreed upon in advance; and the separate provisions of passwords for any password protected documents.⁵⁹ Many of these steps require complex, time-consuming e-discovery processes and careful analysis. The Bureau has not discussed any of these data standards, including the necessary encrypted production format with UniRush. In short, the complex and exacting standards of the Bureau's CID impose significant challenges, and additional necessary reports, which by their nature require time—easily more than 10 business days.

Those facts should make clear why UniRush cannot possibly comply with the Bureau's demand within the ten day business days provided by the CID. In order to develop the level of understanding of the processing failure required to provide an explanation that any reasonable person would be willing to sign under penalty of perjury, UniRush must interview and collect documents from at least twenty people. It must review hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of discrete documents, and produce a complete log of all transaction data. It must do all these things while continuing to operate its business and remediate the problems that flowed from the processing failure that took place just four weeks ago.

Simply put, complying with the Bureau's onerous CID will take time and consume significant resources. In the short time since it received the CID from Bureau, UniRush has

⁵⁸ The CID instructions require bates-labeling in single page Tiff images that have been run through an OCR process. *See* CID at 7.

⁵⁹ CID Document Submission Standards, Transmittal Instructions at 6.

made significant process in complying with it. It has put in place a document hold, hired a vendor to assist in the production of data and documents, and scheduled interviews with the executives whose primary responsibility is getting the program righted on its new processing platform and addressing the consumer issues that resulted from the change in processors. But the process is not complete, and until the interviews that are scheduled for this week are completed, UniRush will not be in a position to provide a reasonable estimate of when it believes the process will be complete.⁶⁰

It is important to note, that UniRush did not seek to stall any document retrieval, review, or production based on the unduly burdensome nature of the CID. Instead, UniRush asked the Bureau for its priorities and agreed to start a rolling production as soon as possible—noting that it would likely be possible within two weeks of the “meet and confer.” In furtherance of UniRush’s cooperation with the Bureau, we seek on the first instance a modification of the CID based on the unduly burdensome nature of its requirement to fully comply within 10 business days. If such a modification cannot be granted, UniRush seeks in the alternative that the CID be set aside.

B. The CID is Overly Broad in the Information that it Seeks

UniRush also objects to the Bureau’s CID because it is overly broad. The Bureau has requested documents and information for all categories as far back as January 1, 2015. While some of this information may be relevant to the processor conversion, most of it is not. Again, UniRush did not seek to forestall compliance based on the overly broad nature of the Bureau’s CID. Instead, UniRush suggested to the Bureau that it might be more reasonable to prioritize the

⁶⁰ Petition of Old Republic International to Set Aside or Modify (2012) available at http://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201311_cfpb_old-republic-international_petition.pdf.

retrieval, review, and production of information related specifically to the processor conversion and its impact on consumers.

The written reports, document production requests, and interrogatories below are mere examples of the overly broad nature of the Bureau's request. The requests for written reports demand detailed, transaction-level data for every single customer whose access to funds was disrupted as a result of the processor conversion error. Although consumer accounts were only affected for a short period of time—ranging from a matter of a few hours to days – the Bureau seeks all of UniRush's consumer account data for over eleven months. UniRush has a duty to protect its consumers from government overreach and unnecessary intrusion into its consumers spending habits and private account information. Much, if not almost all of the consumer account information requested by the Bureau is irrelevant to the processing conversion failure that occurred on October 11-12, 2015. In yet another instance, the CID Requests for Written Reports 1-3, require that UniRush list the full names, addresses, Account IDs, and complete transaction histories for the hundreds of thousands of UniRush users who experienced the processor conversion.⁶¹ Furthermore, the CID Written Report requests would require UniRush to report on the total fees paid by each cardholder, broken down by fee type, over this period of time. This report requests data that UniRush does not generate in the normal course of business and the company would have to extract and calculate this data to respond. Again, this request would require UniRush to turnover its entire consumer account history to the Bureau without any connection as to how this would help the Bureau understand what occurred during the processor

⁶¹ See Requests for Written Reports 1 – 3.

conversion and how consumers have been or are being redressed for any harm from that conversion.⁶²

The interrogatories are also overly broad. For example, Interrogatory number fourteen requires UniRush to “[d]escribe any issues that resulted in Cardholders not having access to funds on or after October 12, 2015.” To answer this question, UniRush must first come to an understanding, through this investigation, of exactly how and why the errors in the processor conversion occurred. Within a 10 day period, UniRush cannot conduct a full and complete investigation into the processor conversion. UniRush, could at best provide a preliminary assessment as to what occurred, rather than provide the full and complete answer the Bureau questions. The requirement that UniRush provide answers under penalty of perjury requires a much sharper degree of clarity for any reasonable person to give a concise answer, which cannot be done with overly broad requests.

Determining exactly how and why the processor conversion error occurred is not a simple process. The processor conversion was a significant undertaking for UniRush involving at least eleven full-time employees working on the project for over a year, weekly meetings and frequent correspondence among executives, along with close work with a number of third-parties. An investigation into why this processor error occurred must wade into the extensive factual landscape of the processor conversion, including the hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of relevant documents that may shed light on a complex technological process. It is only through analysis of the events that surrounded the processor conversion that UniRush can

⁶² The request also raises an issue that the Bureau may not have foreseen related to the Bureau’s ongoing rulemaking related to prepaid cards, which would apply to UniRush. As the Bureau is likely aware, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (“Dodd-Frank Act”) allows the Bureau to collect information while undertaking a rulemaking. However, the Dodd-Frank Act also prohibits the Bureau from using this authority to obtain records from companies, such as UniRush, for purposes of gathering or analyzing the personally identifiable financial information of consumers. 12 U.S.C. § 5512(b)(4)(C). The Bureau’s request seems to be in conflict with this provision of the Dodd-Frank Act.

provide can provide an answer as to how or why the processor conversion error occurred and the Bureau has not been willing to narrow the scope of its CID to allow UniRush to focus on the producing information related only to the processor conversion.

The document production requests are also overly broad. Document production request number eight requires UniRush to produce “[a]ll documents related to the System Update that was scheduled to occur on October 12, 2015.” As stated above, the processing conversion was a significant undertaking involving daily work for the better part of a year, including frequent contact with a number of third-parties. The request, therefore, while inclusive of documents relevant to the errors that are the focus of the Bureau’s investigation, also seeks a vast number of documents that would be not possibly germane to the inquiry. Most likely, the vast majority of documents relating to the processor conversion in general will have little to do with the underlying errors that caused the issues with the processor conversion in October, 2015. While UniRush does not necessarily object to producing irrelevant documents to the Bureau, it cannot do so within the 10 day response time frame required by the Bureau’s CID.

C. It is Not Fair to Require UniRush to Waive its Legal Rights to Demonstrate “Responsible Conduct”

The CID seems deliberately crafted to force UniRush to waive its legally protected rights. Even if it were possible for UniRush to physically produce the hundreds of thousands of documents required under the CID in the form specified by the CID in ten business days, it would not be possible to review those documents for privilege within that time frame and then log those documents in the form specified by the CID. Without a modification extending time, per the Bureau’s rules, UniRush risks waiving its ability to withhold information per its legally granted privileges.⁶³ Making matters worse, Bureau staff has further implied that unless

⁶³ 12 C.F.R. § 1080.8(a).

UniRush complies with the Bureau's 10 business day compliance deadline (necessitating such a waiver), UniRush will be deemed uncooperative (not demonstrating "responsible conduct"). This suggests that the Bureau is requiring that UniRush waive its legal rights to receive the benefit of the Bureau's "Responsible Conduct" guidelines. This is precisely the kind of conduct that the Bureau has labeled as unfair when directed at consumers⁶⁴ and that other federal regulators take pains to avoid.⁶⁵

D. Counsel for UniRush has Attempted in Good Faith to Negotiate a Modification of the CID Prior to Filing this Petition.

As noted above, Counsel for UniRush, originally sought to voluntarily assist the Bureau prior to the issuance of a CID by instituting a document retention and preservation policy while conducting a diligent and thorough investigation into UniRush's processor conversion issues. However, once the Bureau issued its CID, Counsel repeatedly informed the Bureau – prior to the "meet and confer," during the "meet and confer" and after the "meet and confer" – that compliance with its twenty-six pages of document requests, interrogatories, and written reports cannot be completed within 10 business days. During the "meet and confer," however, UniRush agreed to prioritize production of the Bureau's prioritized list, which included the answer to a variety of general questions, as well as eleven interrogatories, twelve document production requests, and two written reports. UniRush agreed to produce these materials on a rolling document production schedule, starting the week of November 16, 2015, if not sooner. UniRush has consistently requested an extension of time to comply with the CID to sixty days after issuance. Given that this time frame would provide a return date of December 25, 2015, during

⁶⁴ CFPB Supervision Report Highlights Mortgage Servicing Problems, January 30, 2013. <http://www.consumerfinance.gov/newsroom/cfpb-supervision-report-highlights-mortgage-servicing-problems-in-2013/>


⁶⁵ U.S. Department of Justice revises Thompson Memo. http://www.justice.gov/sites/default/files/dag/legacy/2007/07/05/mcnulty_memo.pdf

the winter holiday season, UniRush suggested a return date of January 15, 2015. This date was selected because of the winter holidays, but also to provide the Bureau and UniRush with the flexibility to turn its focus away from discussing extensions of time to comply with the Bureau's CID, but rather to allow both groups to focus on discovering what occurred and how it is being fixed. The Bureau has rejected UniRush's request.

V. CONCLUSION

Notwithstanding the filing of this Petition, UniRush will continue to work toward complying with the Bureau's CID and continue to cooperate with the Bureau per its "responsible conduct" parameters. As such, UniRush respectfully requests a modification of the CID compliance date to at least January 15, 2016 or in the alternative that the Director set aside this CID.

Dated: *Nov. 9, 2015*


Thomas P. Brown.

Dated: *Nov. 9, 2015*



Gerald S. Sachs

EXHIBIT A

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU**

In the matter of
UniRush LLC.

:
:
: **EXHIBIT A: AFFIDAVIT OF UNIRUSH**
: **LLC OUTSIDE COUNSEL GERALD S.**
: **SACHS, ESQ. IN SUPPORT OF**
: **UNIRUSH’S PETITION TO MODIFY OR**
: **SET ASIDE THE CFPB’S OCTOBER 27,**
: **2015 CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND**
:
: **NOVEMBER 9, 2015**

I, GERALD S. SACHS, ESQ. state as follows:

1. I am representing UniRush as outside counsel in responding to the Civil Investigative Demand issued by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (“CFPB”).
2. UniRush LLC (“UniRush”) is the consumer facing program manager for the RushCard, a prepaid card issued by MetaBank.
3. UniRush employs approximately 100 people.
4. UniRush is headquartered in the greater Cincinnati, Ohio metropolitan area.
5. UniRush employs a number of independent vendors or contractors.
6. UniRush planned to change processors through what is known as a processor conversion in 2015.
7. UniRush’s processor conversion required substantial preparation over the course of a year.

8. At least eleven full-time employees worked primarily on the processor conversion.
9. Senior executives and various partners of the company worked on the processor conversion. Board members were routinely updated on the processor conversion project.
10. The processor conversion took place during the evening of October 11, 2015 and the morning of October 12, 2015.
11. A number of technical issues, which among other things affected some consumer's ability to use their prepaid cards during the processor conversion.
12. At no time were consumers' funds at risk.
13. All consumers' funds and accounts are held in an account at MetaBank, a federally insured depository institution.
14. All major technical issues resulting from the conversion have been resolved.
15. UniRush is working diligently to address appropriately any consumer harm that was directly related to the processor conversion issues.
16. On October 23, 2015, the Bureau first contacted UniRush's General Counsel, Stephen T. Middlebrook, to request a telephone conference be set up with the company's CEO, Richard "Rick" J. Savard and CFPB Director, Richard Cordray.
17. This telephone call was the first time the company had interacted directly with the Bureau regarding the processor conversion and its effects on UniRush consumers.

18. The telephone conference held on October 23, 2015 included CEO Rick Savard, General Counsel, Stephen T. Middlebrook, and outside counsel including myself. We rearranged our schedules to speak with Director Cordray within two hours of the original Bureau request. The CEO, Rick Savard, conducted the telephone call in an airport.

19. On the call, to my knowledge, were the following individuals:

- a) UniRush CEO Rick Savard.
- b) UniRush General Counsel, Stephen T. Middlebrook
- c) UniRush outside counsel, Thomas P. Brown of Paul Hastings LLP.
- d) UniRush outside counsel, Gerald S. Sachs of Paul Hastings LLP.
- e) CFPB Director Richard Cordray.
- f) CFPB Acting Deputy Director Meredith Fuchs.
- g) An unknown number of CFPB staff.

20. During the call, Director Cordray stated the following:

- a) The Bureau's concerns related to UniRush's processor conversion, because it had received and heard numerous consumer complaints.
- b) He believed UniRush was on the right path in dealing with its processor conversion issues.

c) The Bureau would need to verify what went wrong with UniRush's processor conversion and insure that harmed consumers had received compensation.

21. On the call, Rick Savard explained to Director Cordray the following:

a) Our preliminary understanding of what transpired during the processor conversion.

b) Our preliminary understanding of why consumers may have experienced some issues with their accounts.

c) That UniRush employees had been working virtually around the clock and devoted nearly all of its resources to remedying the issues that occurred during the processor conversion and appropriately remediating consumer harm derived from the conversion.

22. Since receiving the CID, UniRush immediately informed the Bureau that it would not be possible to comply with its broad and overly burdensome requests by the designated compliance date (10 business days).

23. UniRush held a "meet and confer" with Bureau Staff in Washington, DC on November 2, 2015.

24. Although my understanding is that UniRush could have waited until November 6, 2015 to hold a "meet and confer," it chose to expedite such a meeting to assist the Bureau.

25. At the "meet and confer," to my knowledge, were the following individuals:

a) UniRush outside counsel, Thomas P. Brown of Paul Hastings LLP

b) UniRush outside counsel, Gerald S. Sachs of Paul Hastings LLP.

c) UniRush General Counsel, Stephen T. Middlebrook.

d) Enforcement Attorneys Carolyn Hahn, Adrienne Warrell, Michael Salemi, and various other Bureau Staff.

26. At the “meet and confer” meeting, the following occurred:

a) UniRush reiterated its inability to comply with the Bureau’s onerous request in such a short timeframe and asked the Bureau for an extension of time in which to respond.

b) UniRush agreed to prioritize document requests, interrogatories, and written reports that the Bureau felt would be helpful to its investigation.

c) UniRush spent more than two hours explaining its entire preliminary understanding of the processor conversion failure, the effect this failure had on UniRush consumers, and how the company plans on remediating consumer harm.

d) UniRush stated that it is in the process of obtaining a document production vendor that can comply with the Bureau’s data standards and that the relevant document custodians will be interviewed during the week of November 9, 2015 at its offices in Blue Ash, Ohio.

e) UniRush offered to start a rolling document production as early as the week of November 16, 2015 – if not sooner.

27. Prior to the November 2, 2015 meet and confer, UniRush put instituted a document hold regarding sought by the CID. After the meet and confer, UniRush finalized its scheduling of interviews with more than 20 employees and executives whose primary responsibility is running the company, including getting the program righted on its new


processing platform and addressing the consumer issues that resulted from the change in processors, and engaged a document production vendor.

28. A true and accurate copy of the Bureau's extensive Civil Investigative Demand issued to UniRush LLC on October 27, 2015 is attached.

29. The UniRush Board had been continually updated as to the status of this significant project.

I hereby swear, under penalty of perjury, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1749, that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

Dated: November 9, 2015



Gerald S. Sachs, Esq.

EXHIBIT B

PAUL HASTINGS

1(202) 551-1975
geraldsachs@paulhastings.com

November 5, 2015

CONFIDENTIAL
SENT VIA EMAIL TO CAROLYN.HAHN@CFPB.GOV

Ms. Deborah Morris, Litigation Director
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
Office of Enforcement
1625 Eye Street, NW
Washington D.C. 20006

Re: UniRush LLC Civil Investigative Demand

Dear Ms. Morris:

In response to our meet and confer discussions, held on November 2, 2015 with the CFPB Enforcement Attorneys handling this matter and at their direction, we are formally requesting a written extension of time and modification to the Civil Investigative Demand ("CID") issued to UniRush LLC ("RushCard") on October 27, 2015. During the meet and confer, the Enforcement Attorneys provided a list of priority interrogatories, requests for documents, and requests for written reports. Please see the attached list. Unirush (a/k/a RushCard) has reviewed the CID and the Bureau's list of priority requests and submits this preliminary proposal for modification to the CID.¹

During the meet and confer, RushCard agreed to prioritize production of the Bureau's prioritized list. Additionally, RushCard agreed to produce these materials on a rolling document production schedule. Pursuant to §1080.6(d), RushCard requests a reasonable extension of time to comply with the CID. The CID lists a return date of fourteen days after issuance, November 10, 2015. RushCard requests an extension of time to comply with the CID to sixty days after issuance. This time frame would provide a return date of December 25, 2015. However, given the holiday, RushCard suggests that the return date should be extended to January 15, 2015. As mentioned above, we anticipate starting a rolling production the week of November 16, 2015, if not sooner. We have requested the January 15th extension to minimize the need to devote resources to asking for further significant extensions and maximize our time in responding to the Bureau's CID, as quickly as possible.

Due to the impending return date listed in the CID, any petition to modify or set aside would have to be filed on Monday, November 9, 2015. Again, in an effort to focus our resources on responding to the Bureau's CID instead of drafting a petition to modify or set aside, we respectfully request that the Bureau provide a decision regarding our request for extension by close-of-business on Friday, November 6, 2015.


¹ RushCard reserves the right to make additional proposals as our efforts towards compliance are ongoing and we may identify further areas where the CID can be streamlined.

PAUL
HASTINGS

Ms. Deborah Morris, Litigation Director
November 5, 2015
Page 2

We look forward to working with the Bureau to resolve its concerns and insuring that all of RushCard's consumers are redressed appropriately for any harm caused by RushCard's processor conversion. If you have any questions or would like to discuss this request for an extension of time to respond to the Bureau's CID, please call me directly at 202.551.1975 or email me at geraldsachs@paulhastings.com.

Sincerely,



Gerald S. Sachs
of PAUL HASTINGS LLP

Attachment

cc: Ms. Carolyn Hahn, Senior Litigation Counsel, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
Ms. Adrienne Warrell, Enforcement Attorney, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
Mr. Stephen T. Middlebrook, General Counsel, Unirush LLC

EXHIBIT C

Exhibit C

From: "Hahn, Carolyn (CFPB)" <Carolyn.Hahn@cfpb.gov>
Date: November 6, 2015 at 5:07:44 PM CST
To: "geraldsachs@paulhastings.com" <geraldsachs@paulhastings.com>, "Brown, Thomas (tombrown@paulhastings.com)" <tombrown@paulhastings.com>
Cc: "Warrell, Adrienne (CFPB)" <Adrienne.Warrell@cfpb.gov>
Subject: RushCard

Gerry,

Following up on our conversation today, we cannot evaluate any request for a modification of the CID based on the letter you sent to us yesterday. First, your letter doesn't contain a date certain by which Rush will begin production in response to the CID. Second, your letter failed to provide any information regarding the timing and content of any rolling production, but merely attached the Bureau's list of priorities. Third, your letter doesn't provide any justification for why your client needs additional time to respond to the specific requests in the CID. As we have previously stated, we are amenable to a rolling production. However, in order for the Deputy Enforcement Director to consider any modification of the CID, please submit by midday Monday a detailed letter identifying a specific timetable for responding to each interrogatory, document request, and request for written report as well as a justification for the extension. We appreciate your continued cooperation in this matter.

Have a nice weekend
Carolyn

Carolyn Hahn
Senior Litigation Counsel
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
Tel: 202-435-7250
Mob: 202-713-6541
Carolyn.Hahn@cfpb.gov
consumerfinance.gov

EXHIBIT D

From: Brown, Thomas [<mailto:tombrown@paulhastings.com>]
Sent: Monday, November 09, 2015 11:07 AM
To: Hahn, Carolyn (CFPB)
Cc: Warrell, Adrienne (CFPB); Salemi, Michael (CFPB); Morris, Deborah (CFPB); Sachs, Gerald S.
Subject: Re: RushCard

Carolyn,

First, we have consistently taken the position in words and actions that Bureau's demands are overbroad and unduly burdensome. We have urged the Bureau both to narrow and prioritize its requests. The Bureau, however, has refused to engage in that exercise. Instead, the Bureau has rejected our suggestions that it either narrow its demands (e.g., that the Bureau start with a sample of transaction data or that it focus its demands for all documents related to the core team of people who worked on the transition) or seek information elsewhere (e.g., that it seek information related to consumer complaints from ██████████) as uncooperative. We will continue to assert that position and believe that the CID is facially overbroad and unduly burdensome.

Second, we have previously indicated that we intend to begin our rolling production on November 16th. Barring unforeseen issues with the initial interview and collections which, as you know, will begin tomorrow, we continue to believe that is a realistic start date. We will let you know if that changes.

Third, we do not understand your demand for a schedule for the rolling not production. It will begin on Monday, and it will end when we satisfy the Bureau's demands. We hope that he Bureau will narrow those demands. At this point, for reasons that we have explained several times, we cannot commit to an end date. We have not fully mapped the scope of the production that would be required to satisfy the Bureau's facially unreasonable CID. That process begins in earnest tomorrow in Cincinnati.

Fourth, we can continue to circle this issue indefinitely, but we cannot give you a schedule for the production of information responsive to any particular request until we determine where he information resides. We will begin that exercise tomorrow as you have known for a week. With that said, we intend to prioritize the items identified by the Bureau in our search and production effort, and we hope that made significant progress on those items by the end of the week beginning November 30th.

We hope this meets your demands. If we do hear an affirmative response by 1 pm et, we will join issue through the Bureau's internal process.

Best,

Thomas Brown | Attorney
Paul Hastings LLP
San Francisco, California
Direct: [+1.415.856.7248](tel:+14158567248) |
Mobile: [+1.415.225.1277](tel:+14152251277) |
tombrown@paulhastings.com | www.paulhastings.com

Sent from my iPhone with all the customary disclaimers

On Nov 9, 2015, at 9:35 AM, Hahn, Carolyn (CFPB) <Carolyn.Hahn@cfpb.gov> wrote:

Tom,

As I reiterated in my email on November 6, 2015, the Bureau remains amenable to any reasonable request for a modification of the CID, including a rolling production schedule. You raise for the first time in your email below your position that the CID is "overbroad and unduly burdensome," and we will consider any reasonable request to narrow the scope of the CID. However, as I made clear in my prior email, the general request made for a modification contained in the November 5, 2015 letter (Letter) to Ms. Morris from Mr. Sachs is insufficient. First, the Letter itself describes Rush's proposal for modification of the CID as "preliminary." Second, the Letter does not contain a date certain by which Rush will begin producing documents responsive to the CID, but merely states that Rush "anticipate[s] starting a rolling production the week of November 16, 2015, if not sooner." Third, the Letter fails to provide any schedule of the rolling productions that Rush represents will be completed by January 15, 2016. Fourth, while the Letter references that "RushCard agreed to prioritize production of the Bureau's prioritized list," it does not include any information about when Rush will actually respond to any particular request. We too, seek to avoid any unnecessary litigation. However, until Rush presents an adequate request for a modification of the CID, the Bureau is not in a position to grant a modification of the CID.

Thank you,
Carolyn

From: Brown, Thomas [<mailto:tombrown@paulhastings.com>]

Sent: Sunday, November 08, 2015 7:57 PM

To: Hahn, Carolyn (CFPB)

Cc: Warrell, Adrienne (CFPB); Salemi, Michael (CFPB); Morris, Deborah (CFPB); Sachs, Gerald S.

Subject: RE: RushCard

Carolyn,

We read your response to seek to close off discussions related to our request of an extension of the response date of the Bureau's CID to Unirush LLC related to the processing failure that occurred on October 12, 2015 and the aftermath of that failure, including our client's effort to mitigate and remediate the consumer harm that flowed from that failure. But we are writing one last time in an effort to avoid needless litigation over the Bureau's overbroad and unduly burdensome CID. As we explained in the meet and confer that took place in your offices on November 2, 2015, Unirush cannot comply with the Bureau's CID.

Indeed, from our perspective, the CID seems deliberately crafted to make compliance impossible. The CID contains fifty-six separate interrogatories, document requests, and requests for reports. Including subparts, the CID asks eighty-six discrete questions. The individual requests seek detailed and voluminous information. For example, two of the interrogatories ask Unirush to explain in detail why it was changing processors, what happened in connection with change in processors, and how the change affected consumers. See Interrogatory No. 10 ("Describe the System Update that was scheduled to occur on or about October 12, 2015, including by explaining [sic] why the System Update was occurring."); Interrogatory No. 14 ("Describe any issues that resulted in Cardholders not having access to funds or after October 12, 2015). One of the document requests asks the company to produce all documents related to its change in processing platforms. See Request for Documents No. 8. And one of the requests for written reports seeks all data associated with each account that was affected by the processing change. See Request for Written Report No. 3.

Those requests seek information related to the company's most significant undertaking over the course of the entire time period covered by the CID. As we discussed, from January 1, 2015 through the October 11, 2015, Unirush had a team of at least eleven people working on the project full time. Those eleven people coordinated with teams at one federal bank, Meta Bank, and one very significant publicly traded payment-processing company, MasterCard. The activities of that core team were supervised on a daily basis by two members of the senior management team at Unirush, the chief operating officer and the chief technology officer, on a weekly basis by the entire senior management of the company, and on a less frequent, though regular, basis by the company's board of directors.

Those facts should make clear why Unirush cannot possibly comply with the Bureau's subpoena within the ten day business days provided by the CID. In order to develop the level of understanding of the processing failure required to

provide an explanation that any reasonable person would be willing to sign under penalty of perjury, Unirush must interview and collect documents from at least twenty people. It must review hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of discrete documents and produce a complete log of all of its transaction data since the change in processors. It must do all these things while continuing to operate its business and remediate the problems that flowed from the processing failure that took place just three weeks ago. Simply put, complying with the Bureau's onerous CID will take considerably longer than ten business days.

In the short time since it received the CID from Bureau, Unirush has made significant process in complying with it. It has putting in place a document hold, hired a vendor to assist in the production of data and documents, and scheduled interviews with the executives whose primary responsibility is running the company, including getting the program righted on its new processing platform and addressing the consumer issues that resulted from the change in processors. But the effort to comply with the CID is not complete, and until the interviews that are scheduled for next week are completed, Unirush will not be in a position to provide a reasonable estimate of when it believes the process will be complete.

The most obvious analog to the Bureau's CID to Unirush is the so-called second request that the FTC and the Department of Justice issue under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act related to mergers that the antitrust agencies believe may pose a threat to competition. Those requests seek a similar amount of information and require a similar certification of substantial compliance. See FTC, *Model Second Request for Additional Information and Documentary Material (Second Request)* June 2010 (available at <https://www.ftc.gov/sites/default/files/attachments/premerger-introductory-guides/guide3.pdf>). It typically takes parties that receive a second request six months and several million dollars to comply. See Cecile Kohrs Lindell, *Majoras Hopes to Streamline Reviews*, Daily Deal, (May 11, 2005) (quoting then FTC Chairwoman Majoras). And unless the Bureau decides to reduce the scope of its demand, there is no reason to believe that this process will be any faster or cheaper.

Unirush very much wants to work cooperatively with the Bureau. Indeed, we believe that the Bureau made a mistake in serving the CID. It would be much easier for Unirush to make information available to the Bureau on an informal basis than to kick start a rolling production within the formal rules dictated by the Bureau's instructions. But having decided to insist on formality, the Bureau must accept that formal adherence with its very specific rules, including the requirement that the response be certified under penalty of perjury, takes time.

But in its desire to work cooperatively with the Bureau and adhere to the Bureau's "Responsible Conduct Bulletin," Unirush will not sacrifice its legally protected rights. Unirush needs time to answer the detailed questions posed by the Bureau's CID; to collect, analyze, produce documents responsive to the Bureau's subpoena; to log responsive but privileged documents; and to produce the extensive reports called for by the subpoena. If the Bureau is unwilling to grant the necessary time, we will ask the Bureau's Director to modify or quash the CID. And if the Director chooses not to do so, be sure that we intend to take the request to the D.C. Circuit

We renew our request, originally framed by our November 5, 2015 letter to Ms. Morris, to extend the return date on the subpoena to January 15, 2015. As we explained in our earlier letter, we believe that such an extension will provide Unirush with the ability to make meaningful progress on the Bureau's CID and minimize the need for future extensions. Please let us know by 1 pm est on Monday, November 9, 2015, whether you will grant the requested extension. If we do not hear from you or if the Bureau is unwilling to extend the return date as we have requested, we will have little choice but to petition the Bureau's Director to modify or, in the alternative, set it aside.

Best,

**PAUL
HASTINGS**

Thomas Brown | Attorney

Paul Hastings LLP | 55 Second Street, Twenty-Fourth Floor, San Francisco, CA 94105 |

Direct: +1.415.856.7248 |

Mobile: +1.415.225.1277 | Fax: +1.415.856.7348 | tombrown@paulhastings.com |

From: Hahn, Carolyn (CFPB) [<mailto:Carolyn.Hahn@cfpb.gov>]
Sent: Friday, November 06, 2015 5:08 PM
To: Sachs, Gerald S.; Brown, Thomas
Cc: Warrell, Adrienne (CFPB)
Subject: RushCard

Gerry,

Following up on our conversation today, we cannot evaluate any request for a modification of the CID based on the letter you sent to us yesterday. First, your letter doesn't contain a date certain by which Rush will begin production in response to the CID. Second, your letter failed to provide any information regarding the timing and content of any rolling production, but merely attached the Bureau's list of priorities. Third, your letter doesn't provide any justification for why your client needs additional time to respond to the specific requests in the CID. As we have previously stated, we are amenable to a rolling production. However, in order for the Deputy Enforcement Director to consider any modification of the CID, please submit by midday Monday a detailed letter identifying a specific timetable for responding to each interrogatory, document request, and request for written report as well as a justification for the extension. We appreciate your continued cooperation in this matter.

Have a nice weekend

Carolyn

Carolyn Hahn
Senior Litigation Counsel
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
Tel: 202-435-7250
Mob: 202-713-6541
Carolyn.Hahn@cfpb.gov
consumerfinance.gov

Confidentiality Notice: If you received this email by mistake, you should notify the sender of the mistake and delete the e-mail and any attachments. An inadvertent disclosure is not intended to waive any privileges.

This message is sent by a law firm and may contain information that is privileged or confidential. If you received this transmission in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the message and any attachments.

For additional information, please visit our website at

EXHIBIT E



Consumer Financial Protection Bureau

United States of America
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau

Civil Investigative Demand

To **UniRush LLC also d/b/a as UniRush Financial Services, Rush Communications, LLC, and Unifund CCR Partners, Inc.**

This demand is issued pursuant to Section 1052 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 and 12 C.F.R. Part 1080 to determine whether there is or has been a violation of any laws enforced by the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

Action Required (choose all that apply)

Appear and Provide Oral Testimony

Location of Investigational Hearing	Date and Time of Investigational Hearing
	Bureau Investigators

Produce Documents and/or Tangible Things, as set forth in the attached document, by the following date 11/10/2015

Provide Written Reports and/or Answers to Questions, as set forth in the attached document, by the following date 11/10/2015

Notification of Purpose Pursuant to 12 C.F.R. § 1080.5

The purpose of this investigation is to determine whether prepaid debit card issuers, processors, card networks, service providers to prepaid debit card issuers, or other unnamed persons have engaged in or are engaging in unlawful acts and practices in connection with the offering, operating, or servicing of prepaid debit cards in violation of Sections 1031 and 1036 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. §§ 5531, 5536), or any other Federal consumer financial law. The purpose of this investigation is also to determine whether Bureau action to obtain legal or equitable relief would be in the public interest.

Custodian / Deputy Custodian

Deborah Morris/ John Marlow
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
1625 Eye Street
ATTN: Office of Enforcement
Washington, DC 20006

Bureau Counsel

Carolyn Hahn/Adrienne Warrell
Tel: (202) 435-7250

Date Issued

10/27/2015

Signature

Deborah Morris

Digitally signed by Deborah Morris
DN: cn=Deborah Morris, o=CFPB, ou=SEFL,
email=deborah.morris@cfpb.gov, c=US
Date: 2015.10.27 12:26:46 -0400

Name / Title

Deborah Morris/Deputy Enforcement Director

Service

The delivery of this demand to you by any method prescribed by the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, 12 U.S.C. § 5562, is legal service. If you fail to comply with this demand, the Bureau may seek a court order requiring your compliance.

Travel Expenses

Request a travel voucher to claim compensation to which you are entitled as a witness before the Bureau pursuant to Section 1052 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, 12 U.S.C. § 5562.

Right to Regulatory Enforcement Fairness

The CFPB is committed to fair regulatory enforcement. If you are a small business under Small Business Administration standards, you have a right to contact the Small Business Administration's National Ombudsman at 1-888-REGFAIR (1-888-734-3247) or www.sba.gov/ombudsman regarding the fairness of the compliance and enforcement activities of the agency. You should understand, however, that the National Ombudsman cannot change, stop, or delay a federal agency enforcement action.

Paperwork Reduction Act

This demand does not require approval by OMB under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980.

**CIVIL INVESTIGATIVE DEMAND FOR
PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, WRITTEN REPORTS, AND ANSWERS TO
INTERROGATORIES**

I. Requests.

Interrogatories

1. Describe the complete organizational structure of the Company, identifying all parents, owners (whether natural persons or entities), subsidiaries, joint ventures, and affiliates.
2. Describe your business, including identifying all services and products offered or provided by the Company at any time during the Applicable Period, including the dates on which you provided the service or product.
3. Provide the total number of Cardholders with an activated RushCard as of October 11, 2015, and state:
 - a. The number of Cardholders enrolled in Direct Deposit;
 - b. The number of Cardholders enrolled in the Unlimited Plan;
 - c. The number of Cardholders enrolled in the Pay as You Go Plan.
4. Describe how Cardholders' funds are held (i.e. in individual accounts, sub-accounts, or one account held by the Company).
5. State the average active RushCard balance as of October 11, 2015.
6. State the average direct deposit amount to Cardholders broken down by:
 - a. Average direct deposit to Cardholders receiving their direct deposit on a weekly basis;
 - b. Average direct deposit to Cardholders receiving their direct deposit on a bi-weekly basis; and
 - c. Average direct deposit to Cardholders receiving their direct deposit on a monthly basis.
7. Identify all Third Party Service Providers you used for processing Payment Network transactions and loading funds to the RushCard, and for each Third Party Service Provider provide the following information:
 - a. The time period during which you used each Third Party Service Provider;
 - b. The service the Third Party Service Provider provided;
 - c. The average number of transactions handled by the Third Party Service Provider for you each month;
 - d. The fee structure you used to compensate the Third Party Service Provider; and
 - e. The total amount of money you paid to the Third Party Service Provider during the Applicable Period.
8. Identify all persons responsible for oversight of Third Party Service Providers.

9. Identify any policies and procedures related to the Company's processing of ACH credits.
10. Describe the System Update that was scheduled to occur on or about October 12, 2015, including by explaining why the System Update was occurring.
11. Identify all persons responsible for planning and implementing the System Update. For each person, describe the individual's responsibilities relating to the System Update.
12. Identify all persons responsible for attempting to fix the issues relating to the System Update, including persons with responsibilities relating to:
 - a. Ensuring that Cardholders have access to their funds;
 - b. Correcting balance information displayed to Cardholders through any website;
 - c. Processing ACH files to ensure that ACH credits were posted by the required settlement date;
 - d. Correcting any duplicate ACH credit created as a result of manual entry;
 - e. Correcting ACH credits returned due to incorrect account information;
 - f. Correcting cards designated as inactive or blocked because of incorrect account information, including due to transposition of expiration dates;
 - g. Resolving any backlog of debit transactions resulting from issues relating to the System Update; and
 - h. Resolving any problems in processing ACH payroll transactions for Cardholders.
13. Identify all persons who participated in attempting to restore Cardholders' access to their funds on or after October 12, 2015.
14. Describe any issues that resulted in Cardholders not having access to funds on or after October 12, 2015.
15. Describe any issues that occurred on or after October 12, 2015 relating to the following. For each subpart, identify the person responsible for the issue and describe all steps the Company has taken to correct or resolve these issues.
 - a. Incorrect balance information being displayed to Cardholders through any website;
 - b. Delayed or slow processing of ACH files;
 - c. The creation of any duplicate ACH credits;
 - d. The return of ACH credits due to incorrect account information;
 - e. Cards being designated as inactive or blocked because of incorrect account information, including due to transposition of expiration dates; and
 - f. The creation of a backlog of debit transactions.
16. Provide a systems architecture diagram for all systems used by the Company, or

used by Third Party Providers on behalf of the Company.

17. Identify all databases or other information repositories used by the Company for maintaining Cardholder accounts. For each, provide the following information:
 - a. The database system name, commercial software name (if different from system name), technology platform, and the computing model (i.e. client / server, multi-tier, etc.);
 - b. An entity-relationship diagram and fully annotated data dictionary for each system, including at minimum a list of databases, tables, data fields, types, and narrative descriptions, as well as all unique and foreign keys;
 - c. The purpose for which the database is used;
 - d. A description of the Persons who have access to the database;
 - e. The identity of the Person(s) most knowledgeable about the database;
 - f. The timeframe for which information is stored and/or maintained including backup, archiving, and disaster recovery procedures;
 - g. The timeframe for how long the system has been in operation;
 - h. System predecessors and legacy system integrations; and
 - i. How the database interacts with other systems, file systems, and databases the Company uses.

18. Provide an inventory of web applications/web forms relating to the System Update and provide the following information:
 - a. State whether an inventory of applications/forms was taken during the System Update;
 - b. Identify any compatibility tool used in connection with the System Update; and
 - c. State whether the inventory of applications/forms was performed manually (i.e. using excel or SharePoint), and, if so, identify the individuals responsible for performing that inventory.

19. Regarding prioritization efforts relating to the System Update:
 - a. State whether management was involved in making the inventory a critical process;
 - b. Describe what type of prioritization for compatibility testing took place;
 - c. State whether an inventory of applications/forms related to the System Update exists;
 - d. State when the inventory of applications/forms related to the System Update was created;
 - e. State whether the applications/forms for the System Update were prioritized and whether the prioritization was documented.

20. Regarding testing the form or web application compatibility and Systems Development Life Cycle (SDLC):
 - a. State the application configured to look for specific data fields, and any discrepancies in those fields;
 - b. Describe the compatibility testing scenarios developed, tested, and

- documented;
 - c. State whether and how end user and SDLC compliance staff were involved in the development, testing, and documentation of scenarios; and
 - d. State whether the input control related to the card balance data was tested and documented as part of the application compatibility testing.
21. Regarding the remediation of applications and forms related to the System Update:
- a. State any compatibility issues identified with applications and forms related to the System Update;
 - b. Describe how all identified compatibility issues were documented;
 - c. Describe how all identified compatibility issues were remediated; and
 - d. State whether and how end user and SDLC compliance staff were involved in the identification, testing, and documentation of issue remediation.
22. Regarding User Acceptance Testing (UAT) for the System Update:
- a. Describe any UAT that occurred in preparation for the System Update;
 - b. State whether and how end user and SDLC compliance staff were involved in the development, testing, and documentation of UAT; and
 - c. State whether UAT occurred in the production or testing environment.
23. State when the System Update migrated from testing to the production environment, and whether the migration was transparent to the end user.
24. Describe all actions the Company took to attempt to fix the issues that arose from the System Update and all attempts taken to restore Cardholders' access to funds including but not limited to:
- a. Engaging in Cardholder outreach;
 - b. Engaging the services of outside consultants;
 - c. Establishing additional consumer service centers and or hiring additional personal to handle consumer complaints;
 - d. Undertaking additional systems testing; and
 - e. Conducting internal and external audits.
25. Identify any investigation, inquiry, action, arbitration or other proceeding conducted within the past 5 years by or on behalf of any governmental agency or private consumer protection entity (e.g., Better Business Bureau) involving the Company. For each, identify the parties, the investigator(s), the dates such action(s) commenced and ended, a brief description of the nature of the investigation(s), and the final outcome.
26. If, for any request, there are documents that would have been responsive but that are now unavailable, identify each document and its last known location or custodian, and explain why the document cannot be produced.
27. Identify all Persons who participated in responding to this CID and the specific tasks performed by each Person.

Requests for Documents

1. All contracts and agreements between you and [REDACTED].
2. All contracts and agreements between you and [REDACTED].
3. All contracts and agreements between you and [REDACTED].
4. All contracts and agreements between you and [REDACTED].
5. All contracts and agreements between you and any Third Party Service Provider.
6. All versions of the RushCard Cardholder Agreement.
7. All policies and procedures related to the handling of Cardholder complaints.
8. All documents related to the System Update that was scheduled to occur on October 12, 2015.
9. All template communications sent to Cardholders regarding the System Update and any system changes, outages, or upgrades.
10. All template communications sent to Cardholders related to restoring to Cardholders' access to funds stored on the RushCard after October 11, 2015.
11. All documents related to attempts to restore Cardholders' access to funds stored on the RushCard after October 11, 2015.
12. All documents related to remediating Cardholders who were unable to access their funds beginning on or around October 12, 2015.
13. All communications between you and [REDACTED] regarding the System Update.
14. All communications between you and [REDACTED] regarding attempts to restore Cardholders' access to funds stored on the RushCard after October 11, 2015.
15. All communications between you and [REDACTED] regarding the System Update.
16. All communications between you and [REDACTED] regarding attempts to restore Cardholders' access to funds stored on the RushCard after October 11, 2015.
17. All communications between you and [REDACTED] regarding the System Update.
18. All communications between you and [REDACTED] regarding attempts to restore Cardholders' access to funds stored on the RushCard after October 11, 2015.

19. All communications between you and ██████████ regarding the System Update.
20. All communications between you and ██████████ regarding attempts to restore Cardholders' access to funds stored on the RushCard after October 11, 2015.
21. All communications from individuals identified in response to Interrogatories 11-12 regarding the System Update.
22. All communications from individuals identified in response to Interrogatory 13 regarding attempts to restore Cardholders' access to funds stored on the RushCard after October 11, 2015.
23. All documents and communications between the Company and any other person that relate to the issues identified in Interrogatory 15.
24. Please provide the Company's and Third Party Service Provider's policies, procedures, and key controls covering the following as it relates to forms/applications related to the System Update:
 - a. Backup plan;
 - b. Backup management;
 - c. Databases restore testing;
 - d. Backup and recovery service level agreements and their communication to all relevant stakeholders;
 - e. Disaster recovery plan (DRP) database documentation; and
 - f. Relevant staff training and continuous education on database and operating system backup and recovery tools.
25. Please provide the Company's and Third Party Service Provider's policies, procedures, and key controls covering the following as it relates to forms/applications related to the System Update:
 - a. Data verification with regard to completeness, accuracy, validity, and restricted access;
 - b. Data transfer secured communications requirements;
 - c. Data transfer auditability; and
 - d. The company's use of MFT (Managed File Transfer), as applicable.
26. All financial or profit and loss statements for the Company for the past 3 years.

Requests for Written Reports

1. For each Cardholder whose access to funds was disrupted on or after October 11, 2015, provide the following information:
 - a. Cardholder's first name;
 - b. Cardholder's last name;
 - c. Cardholder's middle name;

- d. Cardholder's address on file;
 - e. When the Cardholder lost access to funds; and
 - f. When access to those funds was restored.
2. For every account associated with each Cardholder included in your response to Written Report Request 1, identify in a quoted, tab-separated text file, all associated data elements as stored in your or your providers' databases at an account level, including, at a minimum:
 - a. Unique Account ID;
 - b. Account number;
 - c. Unique Cardmember ID as in WR1;
 - d. Date of account open;
 - e. Date of account close (if applicable); and
 - f. Total of fees paid (separate column for each fee type).
 3. For every transaction associated with each account included in your response to Written Report Request 2, identify in a quoted, tab-separated text file, all associated data elements as stored in your or your providers' databases at a transaction level, including, at a minimum:
 - a. A unique identifier for the transaction;
 - b. The unique identifier of the account as specified in Written Report Request 2a;
 - c. Transaction date and time;
 - d. Transaction type (ACH, Visa, Internal fee or credit);
 - e. Transaction amount;
 - f. Outstanding balance as of the time of transaction; and
 - g. Outstanding balance after the transaction.

II. Definitions.

- A. "**And**" and "**or**" must be construed both conjunctively and disjunctively.
- B. "**Any**" includes "**all**," and "**all**" includes "**any**."
- C. "**Cardholder**" means Cardholders issued a RushCard that is currently active or was active as of October 11, 2015.
- D. "**CID**" means the Civil Investigative Demand, including the Requests, Definitions, and Instructions.
- E. "**CFPB**" or "**Bureau**" means the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.
- F. "**Company**" or "**you**" or "**your**" means UniRush LLC also d/b/a as UniRush Financial Services, Rush Communications, LLC, and Unifund CCR Partners, Inc, and any successor in interest.

- G. **“Deputy Enforcement Director”** refers to a Deputy Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement.
- H. **“Document”** means any written matter of every type and description, including electronically stored information. “Document” includes any non-identical copy (such as a draft or annotated copy) of another document.
- I. **“Each”** includes **“every,”** and **“every”** includes **“each.”**
- J. **“Electronically Stored Information,”** or **“ESI,”** means the complete original and any non-identical copy (whether different from the original because of notations, different metadata, or otherwise) of any electronically created or stored information, including but not limited to e-mail, instant messaging, videoconferencing, SMS, MMS, or other text messaging, and other electronic correspondence (whether active, archived, unsent, or in a sent or deleted-items folder), word-processing files, spreadsheets, databases, unorganized data, document metadata, presentation files, and sound recordings, regardless of how or where the information is stored, including if it is on a mobile device.
- K. **“Enforcement Director”** refers to the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement.
- L. **“Identify”** means to provide: (a) for natural persons, their name, title or position, present business affiliation, present business address, e-mail address, and telephone number, or if a present business affiliation or present business address is not known, the last known business address, home address, e-mail address, and telephone number; (b) for businesses or other organizations, the name, address, identities of officers, directors, or managers of the business or organization, and contact persons with e-mail addresses and telephone numbers, where applicable; and (c) for documents, the title, date, authors, recipients, Bates numbers, if applicable, type of document or some other means of identifying the document, and the present or last known location or custodian.
- M. **“Payment Network”** means the provider of the electronic network through which transactions are processed (e.g. Visa, MasterCard, and ACH networks).
- N. **“Person”** means an individual, partnership, company, corporation, association (incorporated or unincorporated), trust, estate, cooperative organization, or other entity.
- O. **“System Update”** means any change in platform, software, hardware, payment network, database, or Third Party Service Provider that occurred on or around October 12, 2015.
- P. **“Third Party Service Provider”** means payment processors, fulfillment and transaction processors, and any other provider of services related to the

maintaining, tracking, and distributing of Cardholder funds, exclusive of [REDACTED].

III. Instructions.

- A. **Sharing of Information:** This CID relates to a nonpublic, law-enforcement investigation being conducted by the Bureau. The Bureau may make its files available to other civil and criminal federal, state, or local law-enforcement agencies under 12 C.F.R. §§ 1070.43(b)(1) and 1070.45(a)(5). Information you provide may be used in any civil or criminal proceeding by the Bureau or other agencies. As stated in 12 C.F.R. § 1080.14, information you provide in response to this CID is subject to the requirements and procedures relating to the disclosure of records and information set forth in 12 C.F.R. pt. 1070.
- B. **Meet and Confer:** As stated in 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(c), you must contact Enforcement Attorney **Carolyn Hahn at 202-435-7250** as soon as possible to schedule a meeting (telephonic or in person) to discuss your response to the CID. The meeting must be held within **10** calendar days after you receive this CID or before the deadline for filing a petition to modify or set aside the CID, whichever is earlier.
- C. **Applicable Period for Responsive Materials:** Unless otherwise directed, the applicable period for the request is from January 1, 2015 until the date of full and complete compliance with this CID.
- D. **Privilege Claims:** If any material responsive to this CID is withheld on the grounds of privilege, you must make the privilege claim no later than the date set for the production of the material. As stated in 12 C.F.R. § 1080.8(a), any such claim must include a schedule of the documents, information, or tangible things withheld that states, for each:
1. its type, specific subject matter, and date;
 2. the names, addresses, positions, and organizations of all authors and direct or indirect recipients;
 3. the specific grounds for claiming the privilege;
 4. the request to which the privileged document, information, or thing is responsive; and
 5. its Bates number or range.

In addition, the person who submits the schedule and the attorney stating the grounds for the privilege must sign it. A person withholding material solely based on a claim of privilege must comply with the requirements of 12 C.F. R. § 1080.8 rather than file a

petition for an order modifying or setting aside a demand under 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(e). Please follow the enclosed Document Submission Standards for further instructions about producing redacted privileged documents.

- E. **Document Retention:** Until you are notified otherwise, you are required to retain all documents and other tangible things that you used or relied on in responding to this CID. In addition, you must retain, and suspend any procedures that may result in the destruction of, documents, information, or tangible things that are in any way relevant to the investigation, as described in the CID's Notification of Purpose. You are required to prevent the destruction of relevant material irrespective of whether you believe such material is protected from future disclosure or discovery by privilege or otherwise. *See* 18 U.S.C. §§ 1505, 1519.
- F. **Modification Requests:** If you believe that the scope of the search or response required by this CID can be narrowed consistent with the Bureau's need for documents or information, you are encouraged to discuss such possible modifications, including modifications of the requirements of these instructions, with Enforcement Attorney **Carolyn Hahn** at **202-435-7250**. Modifications must be agreed to in writing by the Enforcement Director or a Deputy Enforcement Director. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(d).
- G. **Petition for Order Modifying or Setting Aside Demand:** Under 12 U.S.C. § 5562(f) and 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(e), you may petition the Bureau for an order modifying or setting aside this CID. To file a petition, you must send it by e-mail to the Bureau's Executive Secretary at ExecSec@cfpb.gov, copying the Enforcement Director at Enforcement@cfpb.gov, within 20 calendar days of service of the CID or, if the return date is less than 20 calendar days after service, before the return date. The subject line of the e-mail must say "Petition to Modify or Set Aside Civil Investigative Demand." If a request for confidential treatment is filed, you must file a redacted public petition in addition to the unredacted petition. All requests for confidential treatment must be supported by a showing of good cause in light of applicable statutes, rules, Bureau orders, court orders, or other relevant authority.
- H. **Certification:** The person to whom the CID is directed or, if it is directed to an entity, any person having knowledge of the facts and circumstances relating to the production, must certify that the response to this CID is true and complete. This certification must be made on the form declaration included with this CID.
- I. **Scope of Search:** This CID covers materials and information in your possession, custody, or control, including but not limited to documents in the possession, custody, or control of your attorneys, accountants, other agents or consultants, directors, officers, and employees.
- J. **Document Production:** The Bureau encourages the electronic production of

all material responsive to this CID; please follow the enclosed Document Submission Standards.

All productions sent by U.S. Postal Service should be addressed to:

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
1700 G Street, NW
ATTN: **John Marlow**, SEFL, Office of Enforcement, Seat **4059**
Washington, DC 20552

All productions sent by FedEx, UPS, or other courier should be addressed to:

Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
1625 Eye Street NW
ATTN: **John Marlow**, SEFL, Office of Enforcement, Seat **4059**
Washington, DC 20006

Please provide your intended method of production and any tracking numbers by e-mail or telephone to Enforcement Attorney **Carolyn Hahn** at **Carolyn.hahn@cfpb.gov** or **202-435-7250**.

- K. **Document Identification:** Documents that may be responsive to more than one request of this CID need not be submitted more than once. All documents responsive to this CID must be accompanied by an index that identifies: (i) the name of each custodian of each responsive document; (ii) the corresponding Bates number or range used to identify that person's documents; and (iii) the request or requests to which each document responds.
- L. **Sensitive Personally Identifiable Information:** If any material called for by these requests contains sensitive personally identifiable information or sensitive health information of any individual please contact Enforcement Attorney **Carolyn Hahn** at **202-435-7250** before sending those materials to discuss ways to protect the information during production. You must encrypt electronic copies of such materials with encryption software acceptable to the Bureau. When submitting encrypted material, you must provide the encryption key, certificate, or passcode in a separate communication.

For purposes of this CID, sensitive personally identifiable information includes an individual's Social Security number alone or an individual's name, address, or phone number *in combination with* one or more of the following: date of birth, Social Security number, driver's-license number or other state-identification number, or a foreign country equivalent, passport number, financial-account number, credit-card number, or debit-card number. Sensitive health information includes medical records and other individually identifiable health information relating to the past, present, or future physical or mental health or conditions of an individual, the provision of health care to an individual, or the past, present, or future payment for the provision of health care to

an individual.

- M. **Information Identification:** Each request for written report or interrogatory in this CID must be answered separately and fully in writing under oath. All information submitted must clearly and precisely identify the request or requests to which it is responsive.
- N. **Submission of Documents in lieu of Answers:** Documents in existence before your receipt of this CID that contain the information requested in any interrogatory may be submitted as part of or in lieu of an answer to the interrogatory. If you submit documents as part of or in lieu of an answer, you must clearly indicate the specific request to which the documents are responsive, and you must clearly identify the specific portion of the documents that are responsive, including page, paragraph, and line numbers, as applicable.
- O. **Declaration Certifying Records of Regularly Conducted Business Activity:** Attached is a Declaration Certifying Records of Regularly Conducted Business Activity, which may limit the need to subpoena you to testify at future proceedings to establish the admissibility of documents produced in response to this CID. Please execute this Declaration and provide it with your response.
- P. All references to “**year**” or “**annual**” refer to the calendar year. Where information is requested “for each year,” provide it separately for each year; where yearly data is not available, provide responsive information for the calendar year to date, unless otherwise instructed.
- Q. **Duty to Estimate:** If you are unable to answer any interrogatory fully, supply such information as is available. Explain why such answer is incomplete, the efforts you made to obtain the information, and the source from which the complete answer may be obtained. If books and records that provide accurate answers are not available, enter best estimates and describe how the estimates were derived, including the sources or bases of such estimates. Estimated data should be followed by the notation “est.” If there is no reasonable way to make an estimate, provide an explanation.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE – DOCUMENTS

I, _____, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declare that:

1. I have made a diligent inquiry of all persons who likely have possession of responsive documents and information, and I have confirmed that a diligent search has been made of all of the locations and files that likely contained responsive documents and information in the possession, custody, or control of UniRush LLC also d/b/a as UniRush Financial Services, Rush Communications, LLC, and Unifund CCR Partners, Inc.
2. All of the documents and information identified through the search described in paragraph 1 above required by the Civil Investigative Demand dated 10/27/15 that are within the possession, custody, or control of UniRush LLC also d/b/a as UniRush Financial Services, Rush Communications, LLC, and Unifund CCR Partners, Inc. have been submitted to the Bureau custodian or deputy custodian identified in this Civil Investigative Demand.
3. If a document or tangible thing responsive to this Civil Investigative Demand has not been submitted, a claim of privilege in compliance with 12 C.F.R. § 1080.8 has been submitted.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on _____, 2015.

Signature

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE – INTERROGATORY ANSWERS AND
REPORTS

I, _____, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
1746, declare that:

1. In preparing all answers and reports in response to the enclosed Civil Investigative Demand, I have made a diligent inquiry of all persons who likely have possession of responsive documents and information, and I have confirmed that a diligent search has been made of all of the locations and files that likely contained responsive documents and information within the possession, custody, control, or knowledge of UniRush LLC also d/b/a as UniRush Financial Services, Rush Communications, LLC, and Unifund CCR Partners, Inc.
2. Based on the information identified through the search described in paragraph 1 above, all answers and reports prepared in response to the enclosed required by the Civil Investigative Demand dated 10/27/15 are true, correct, and complete.
3. If an interrogatory or a portion of an interrogatory has not been fully answered or a report or a portion of a report has not been completed, a claim of privilege in compliance with 12 C.F.R. § 1080.8 has been submitted.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on
_____, 2015.

Signature

**DECLARATION CERTIFYING RECORDS OF
REGULARLY CONDUCTED BUSINESS ACTIVITY**
Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746

I, _____, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, declare that:

1. I am employed by _____ as _____
and by reason of my position am authorized and qualified to certify the authenticity of the records produced by UniRush LLC also d/b/a as UniRush Financial Services, Rush Communications, LLC, and Unifund CCR Partners, Inc. and submitted with this Declaration.
2. The documents produced and submitted with this Declaration by UniRush LLC also d/b/a as UniRush Financial Services, Rush Communications, LLC, and Unifund CCR Partners, Inc. are true copies of records of regularly conducted activity that were:
 - a. made at or near the time of the occurrence of the matters set forth, by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge of those matters;
 - b. kept in the course of the regularly conducted business activity; and
 - c. made by the regularly conducted business activity as a regular practice.

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on _____, 2015.

Signature

Civil Investigative Demand Document Submission Standards

CFPB Office of Enforcement

CID Document Submission Standards

This describes the technical requirements for producing electronic document collections to the Consumer Finance Protection Bureau (“the Bureau”)’s Office of Enforcement. All documents shall be produced in complete form, in color, unredacted unless privileged, and shall not be edited, cut, or expunged. These standards must be followed for all documents you submit in response to the CID. Any proposed file formats other than those described below must be discussed with the legal and technical staff of the Bureau’s Office of Enforcement prior to submission.

Table of Contents

<i>CID Document Submission Standards</i>	2
<i>Table of Contents</i>	3
<i>A. Transmittal Instructions</i>	4
<i>B. Delivery Formats</i>	6
1) General ESI Standards	6
2) Native and image Production	7
a) Metadata File	7
b) Document Text.....	9
c) Linked Native Files.....	10
d) Images.....	10
e) Image Cross Reference File	10
3) PDF File Production	11
4) Transactional Data	11
5) Audio/Video/Electronic Phone Records	12
<i>C. Production of Partially Privileged Documents</i>	14

A. Transmittal Instructions

- 1) A cover letter should be included with each production. The following information should be included in the letter:
 - a) Name of the party making the production and the date of the CID to which the submission is responsive.
 - b) List of each piece of media (hard drive, thumb drive, DVD or CD) included in the production (refer to the media by the unique number assigned to it, see ¶ 4)
 - c) List of custodians, identifying:
 - i) The Bates Range (and any gaps therein) for each custodian,
 - ii) Total number of images for each custodian, and
 - iii) Total number of native files for each custodian
 - d) List of fields in the order in which they are listed in the metadata load file.
 - e) Time zone in which emails were standardized during conversion (email collections only).
 - f) The specification(s) or portions thereof of the CID to which the submission is responsive.
- 2) Documents created or stored electronically MUST be produced in their original electronic format, not converted to another format such as PDF.
- 3) Data may be produced on CD, DVD, USB thumb drive, or hard drive; use the media requiring the least number of deliverables.
 - a) Magnetic media shall be carefully packed to avoid damage and must be clearly marked on the outside of the shipping container:
 - i) "MAGNETIC MEDIA – DO NOT USE METAL DETECTOR"
 - ii) "MAY BE OPENED FOR POSTAL INSPECTION"
 - b) CD-R CD-ROMs should be formatted to ISO 9660 specifications;
 - c) DVD-ROMs for Windows-compatible personal computers are acceptable;
 - d) USB 2.0 thumb drives for Windows-compatible personal computers are acceptable;

- e) USB 3.0 or USB 3.0/eSATA external hard disk drives, formatted in a Microsoft Windows-compatible file system (FAT32 or NTFS), uncompressed data are acceptable.
- 4) Label all media with the following:
 - a) Production date
 - b) Bates range
 - c) Disk number (1 of X), if applicable
 - d) Name of producing party
 - e) A unique production number identifying each production
- 5) All productions must be produced free of computer viruses. Infected productions may affect the timing of your compliance with the CID.
- 6) All produced media must be encrypted. Encryption format must be agreed upon prior to production.
 - a) Data deliveries should be encrypted at the disc level.
 - b) Decryption keys should be provided separately from the data delivery via email or phone.
- 7) Passwords for documents, files, and compressed archives should be provided separately either via email or in a separate cover letter from the data.

B. Delivery Formats

1) General ESI Standards

Before submitting any Electronically Stored Information (“ESI”) or any other documents submitted in electronic form that do not conform completely to the listed specifications, you must confirm with the Bureau that the proposed formats and media types that contain such ESI will be acceptable. You are encouraged to discuss your specific form of submission, and any related questions with the Bureau as soon as is practicable and not later than the Meet and Confer required pursuant to 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(c).

All productions must follow the specifications outlined below:

De-duplication

De-duplication of documents should be applied across custodians (global); each custodian should be identified in the Custodian field in the metadata load file separated by semi-colon. The first name in the Custodian list should represent the original holder of the document.

Bates Numbering Documents

The Bates number must be a unique, sequential, consistently formatted identifier, i.e., an alpha prefix unique to each producing party along with a fixed length number, i.e., ABC0000001. This format must remain consistent across all productions. There should be no space in between the prefix and the number. The number of digits in the numeric portion of the format should not change in subsequent productions, nor should hyphens or other separators be added or deleted.

Document Retention / Preservation of Metadata

The recipient of this CID should use reasonable measures to maintain the original native source documents in a manner so as to preserve the metadata associated with these

electronic materials as it existed at the time of the original creation.

2) Native and Image Production

In general, and subject to the specific instructions below: (1) produce electronic documents in their complete native/original format along with corresponding bates-labeled single page TIFF images; (2) scan and process all paper documents into single page TIFF images, OCR the images, and apply bates numbers to each page of the image; (3) produce fully searchable document level text for every produced document; and (4) produce metadata for every produced document in a data file that conforms to the specific instructions below.

a) Metadata File

All produced documents, regardless of their original file format, must be produced with the below-described metadata fields in a data file (.DAT).

- i) The first line of the .DAT file must be a header row identifying the field names.
- ii) The .DAT file must use the following default delimiters:

TABLE 1: DAT FILE DELIMITERS

Comma	,	ASCII character (020)
Quote	"	ASCII character (254)
Newline	␣	ASCII character (174)

- iii) Date fields should be provided in the format: mm/dd/yyyy
- iv) All attachments should sequentially follow the parent document/email.
- v) All documents shall be produced in both their native/original form and as a corresponding bates-labeled single page TIFF image; provide the link to the original/native document in the NATIVELINK field.
- vi) Produce extracted metadata for each document in the form of a .DAT file, and include these fields (fields should be listed but left blank if not applicable):

TABLE 2: DAT FILE FIELDS

Field Name	Description
BATES_BEGIN	First Bates number of native file document/email
BATES_END	Last Bates number of native file document/email **The BATES_END field should be populated for single page documents/emails
ATTACH_BEGIN	First Bates number of attachment/family range
ATTACH_END	Last Bates number of attachment/family range
GROUP_ID	A unique family identifier used to link documents/emails and attachments
PRIV	Indicate "YES" if document has a Privilege claim
ROG_NUM	Indicate Interrogatory number(s) document is responsive to. (ROG ##) If multiple, separate by semi-colon
DR_NUM	Indicate Document Request document is responsive to. (DR ##) if multiple, separate by semi-colon
RECORDTYPE	Email: Populate field as "E-Mail" Attachment: Populate field as "Attachment" Email Attachment: Populate field as "Attachment (E-mail)" Loose Native: Populate field as "E-Document" Scanned Paper: Populate field as "Paper"
CUSTODIAN	Individual(s) or department(s) from which the record originated **semi-colon should be used to separate multiple entries
FROM	Email: Sender of email Non-email: (empty) **semi-colon should be used to separate multiple entries
TO	Email: Recipient(s) of email **semi-colon should be used to separate multiple entries
CC	Carbon copy recipient(s) **semi-colon should be used to separate multiple entries
BCC	Blind carbon copy recipient(s) **semi-colon should be used to separate multiple entries
SUBJECT	Subject line of the email
DATE_SENT	Email: Date the email was sent
TIME_SENT	Email: Time the email was sent **This data must be a separate field and cannot be combined with the DATE_SENT field

DATE_RECVD	Email: Date the email was received
TIME_RECVD	Email: Time the email was received
NATIVELINK	Hyperlink to the email or native file document **The linked file must be named per the BATES_BEGIN Number
FILE_EXT	The file extension representing the email or native file document
AUTHOR	Email: (empty) Non-email: Author of the document
DATE_CREATED	The date the electronic file was created
TIME_CREATED	The time the electronic file was created
DATE_MOD	Date an electronic file was last modified
TIME_MOD	Time an electronic file was last modified
PRINT_DATE	Date the document was last printed
PRINT_TIME	Time the document was last printed
FILE_SIZE	Size of native file document/email in KB
PGCOUNT	Number of pages in document/email
SOURCE	Email: Path to email container and email container name Non-email: Original path to source archive folder or files
FOLDERPATH	Email: Folder path within email container Non-email: Folder path to file
FILENAME	Email: Filename of loose email or subject of non-loose email Non-email: original file name
MD5HASH	The 32 digit value representing each unique document
TEXTPATH	Contains path to OCR/Extracted text file that is titled after the document BATES_BEGIN

b) Document Text

Searchable text of the entire document must be provided for every record, at the document level.

i) Extracted text must be provided for all documents that originated in electronic format.

Note: Any document in which text cannot be extracted must be OCR'd.

ii) For documents redacted on the basis of any privilege, provide the OCR text for unredacted/unprivileged portions.

iii) The text should be delivered in the following method: As multi-page ASCII text

files with the files named the same as the Bates_Begin field. Text files can be placed in a separate folder or included with the .TIFF files.

c) Linked Native Files

Copies of original email and native file documents/attachments must be included for all electronic productions.

- i) Native file documents must be named per the BATES_BEGIN number (the original file name should be preserved and produced in the FILENAME metadata field).
- ii) The full path of the native file must be provided in the .DAT file in the NATIVELINK field.

d) Images

- i) Images should be single-page, Group IV TIFF files, scanned at 300 dpi.
- ii) File names should be titled per endorsed bates number.
- iii) Color should be preserved when necessary to interpret the document.
- iv) Bates numbers should be endorsed on the lower right corner of all images.
- v) For documents partially redacted on the basis of any privilege, ensure the redaction box is clearly labeled "REDACTED".

e) Image Cross Reference File

- i) The image cross-reference file is needed to link the images to the database. It is a comma-delimited file consisting of seven fields per line. There must be a line in the cross-reference file for every image in the database.

TABLE 3: IMAGE CROSS REFERENCE FILE FIELDS

Field Title	Description
ImageID	The unique designation use to identify an image.
	<i>Note: This imageID key must be a unique and fixed length number. This number will be used in the.DAT file as the ImageID field that links the database to the images. The format of this image key must be consistent across all productions. We recommend that the format be an eight digit number to allow for the possible increase in the size of a production.</i>
VolumeLabel	Optional
ImageFilePath	The full path to the image file.
DocumentBreak	The letter "Y" denotes the first page of a document. If this field is blank, then the page is not the first page of a document.
FolderBreak	Leave empty

BoxBreak	Leave empty
PageCount	Optional
<i>*This file should not contain a header row.</i>	

SAMPLE:

IMG0000001,OPTIONALVOLUMENAME,E:\001\IMG0000001.TIF,Y,,,3
 IMG0000002,OPTIONALVOLUMENAME,E:\001\IMG0000002.TIF,,,,
 IMG0000003,OPTIONALVOLUMENAME,E:\001\IMG0000003.TIF,,,,
 IMG0000004,OPTIONALVOLUMENAME,E:\001\IMG0000003.TIF,Y,,,1
 IMG0000005,OPTIONALVOLUMENAME,E:\001\IMG0000003.TIF,Y,,,2
 IMG0000006,OPTIONALVOLUMENAME,E:\001\IMG0000003.TIF,,,,

3) PDF File Production

When approved, Adobe PDF files may be produced in lieu of TIFF images for scanned paper productions (metadata must also be produced in accordance with the instructions above):

- a) PDF files should be produced in separate folders named by the Custodian.
- b) All PDFs must be unitized at the document level, i.e. each PDF should represent a discrete document; a single PDF cannot contain multiple documents.
- c) All attachments should sequentially follow the parent document.
- d) All PDF files must contain embedded text that includes all discernible words within the document, not selected text only. This requires all layers of the PDF to be flattened first.
- e) If PDF files are Bates endorsed, the PDF files must be named by the Bates range
- f) The metadata load file listed in 2.a. should be included.

4) Transactional Data

If transactional data must be produced, further discussion must be had to ensure the intended export is properly composed. If available, a data dictionary should accompany the production, if unavailable; a description of fields should accompany transactional data productions. The following formats are acceptable:

- SQL Backup file
- MS Access
- XML
- CSV

- TSV
- Excel (with prior approval)

5) Audio/Video/Electronic Phone Records

- a) Audio files must be produced in a format that is playable using Microsoft Windows Media Player. Types of audio files that will be accepted include:
- Nice Systems audio files (.aud). AUD files offer efficient compression and would be preferred over both NMF and WAV files.
 - Nice Systems audio files (.nmf).
 - WAV Files
 - MP3, MP4
 - WMA
 - AIF

Produced audio files must be in a separate folder compared to other data in the production.

Additionally, the call information (metadata) related to each audio recording must be produced if it exists. The metadata file must be produced in delimited text format (DAT, CSV, or TXT), using a tab or pipe delimiter. Field names must be included in the first row of the metadata file. Please note that the field names are case sensitive and should be created as listed below. The metadata must include, if available, the following fields:

TABLE 4: AUDIO METADATA FIELDS

Field Name	Description
AgentName	Name of agent/employee
AgentId	Unique identifier of agent/employee
Group	Name for a collection of agents
Supervisor	Name of the Agent's supervisor
Site	Location of call facility
DNIS	Dialed Number Identification Service, identifies the number that was originally called

Extension	Extension where call was routed
CallDirection	Identifies whether the call was inbound, outbound, or internal
CallType	Purpose of the call
DURATION	Duration of call
CustomerId	Customer's identification number
CustomerCity	Customer's city of residence
CustomerState	Customer's state of residence
CallDateTime	Date and start time of call (MM/DD/YYYY HH:MM:SS)
CUSTOMERNAME	Name of person called
FileName	Filename of audio file
BATES_BEGIN	Unique number of the audio file
CALLEDPARTYNUMBER	The call center or phone number called
CALLSIZE	File size of audio file
CALLSERVICE	Call service code
MD5HASH	The 32 digit value representing each unique document
DOC_REQ	Document request number to which the file is responsive
CUSTODIAN	Individual(s) or department(s) from which the recording originated
FOLDERPATH	Folder path of the audio file in the original source
SOURCE	Original path to where the source file resided
TIMEZONE	The time zone of the original call
GROUPID	A unique group identifier for grouping multiple calls
CODEC	Encoding/decoding of the audio digital stream
BITRATE	The number of bits that are conveyed or processed per unit of time

Supported Date Format	Example
mm/dd/yyyy hh:mm:ss am/pm	01/25/1996 10:45:15 am

The filename is used to link the metadata to the produced audio file. The file name in the metadata and the file name used to identify the corresponding audio file must match exactly.

- b) Video files must be produced in a format that is playable using Microsoft Windows

Media Player along with any available metadata. If it is known that the video files do not contain associated audio, indicate this in the accompanying transmittal letter.

Types of video files accepted include:

- MPG
- AVI
- WMV
- MOV
- FLV

C. Production of Partially Privileged Documents

If a portion of any material called for by this CID is withheld based on a claim of privilege, those portions may be redacted from the responsive material as long as the following conditions are met.

- a) If originally stored as native electronic files, the image(s) of the unredacted portions are submitted in a way that preserves the same appearance as the original without the redacted material (i.e., in a way that depicts the size and location of the redactions). The OCR text will be produced from the redacted image(s). Any redacted, privileged material should be clearly labeled to show the redactions on the tiff image(s). Any metadata not being withheld for privilege should be produced in the DAT file; any content (e.g., PowerPoint speaker notes, Word comments, Excel hidden rows, sheets or columns) contained within the native and not being withheld for privilege should be tiffed and included in the production.
- b) If originally in hard copy form, the unredacted portions are submitted in a way that depicts the size and location of the redactions; for example, if all of the content on a particular page is privileged, a blank, sequentially numbered page should be included in the production where the responsive material, had it not been privileged, would have been located.

§ 1081.405 Decision of the Director.

(a) Upon appeal from or upon further review of a recommended decision, the Director will consider such parts of the record as are cited or as may be necessary to resolve the issues presented and, in addition, will, to the extent necessary or desirable, exercise all powers which he or she could have exercised if he or she had made the recommended decision. In proceedings before the Director, the record shall consist of all items part of the record below in accordance with § 1081.306; any notices of appeal or order directing review; all briefs, motions, submissions, and other papers filed on appeal or review; and the transcript of any oral argument held. Review by the Director of a recommended decision may be limited to the issues specified in the notice(s) of appeal or the issues, if any, specified in the order directing further briefing. On notice to all parties, however, the Director may, at any time prior to issuance of his or her decision, raise and determine any other matters that he or she deems material, with opportunity for oral or written argument thereon by the parties.

(b) Decisional employees may advise and assist the Director in the consideration and disposition of the case.

(c) In rendering his or her decision, the Director will affirm, adopt, reverse, modify, set aside, or remand for further proceedings the recommended decision and will include in the decision a statement of the reasons or basis for his or her actions and the findings of fact upon which the decision is predicated.

(d) At the expiration of the time permitted for the filing of reply briefs with the Director, the Office of Administrative Adjudication will notify the parties that the case has been submitted for final Bureau decision. The Director will issue and the Office of Administrative Adjudication will serve the Director's final decision and order within 90 days after such notice, unless within that time the Director orders that the adjudication proceeding or any aspect thereof be remanded to the hearing officer for further proceedings.

(e) Copies of the final decision and order of the Director shall be served upon each party to the proceeding, upon other persons required by statute, and, if directed by the Director or required by statute, upon any appropriate State or Federal supervisory authority. The final decision and order will also be published on the Bureau's Web site or as otherwise deemed appropriate by the Bureau.

§ 1081.406 Reconsideration.

Within 14 days after service of the Director's final decision and order, any party may file with the Director a petition for reconsideration, briefly and specifically setting forth the relief desired and the grounds in support thereof. Any petition filed under this section must be confined to new questions raised by the final decision or final order and upon which the petitioner had no opportunity to argue, in writing or orally, before the Director. No response to a petition for reconsideration shall be filed unless requested by the Director, who will request such response before granting any petition for reconsideration. The filing of a petition for reconsideration shall not operate to stay the effective date of the final decision or order or to toll the running of any statutory period affecting such decision or order unless specifically so ordered by the Director.

§ 1081.407 Effective date; stays pending judicial review.

(a) Other than consent orders, which shall become effective at the time specified therein, an order to cease and desist or for other affirmative action under section 1053(b) of the Dodd-Frank Act becomes effective at the expiration of 30 days after the date of service pursuant to § 1081.113(d)(2), unless the Director agrees to stay the effectiveness of the order pursuant to this section.

(b) Any party subject to a final decision and order, other than a consent order, may apply to the Director for a stay of all or part of that order pending judicial review.

(c) A motion for stay shall state the reasons a stay is warranted and the facts relied upon, and shall include supporting affidavits or other sworn statements, and a copy of the relevant portions of the record. The motion shall address the likelihood of the movant's success on appeal, whether the movant will suffer irreparable harm if a stay is not granted, the degree of injury to other parties if a stay is granted, and why the stay is in the public interest.

(d) A motion for stay shall be filed within 30 days of service of the order on the party. Any party opposing the motion may file a response within five days after receipt of the motion. The movant may file a reply brief, limited to new matters raised by the response, within three days after receipt of the response.

(e) The commencement of proceedings for judicial review of a final decision and order of the Director does not, unless specifically ordered by the Director or a reviewing court, operate as a stay of any order issued by the

Director. The Director may, in his or her discretion, and on such terms as he or she finds just, stay the effectiveness of all or any part of an order pending a final decision on a petition for judicial review of that order.

Dated: June 4, 2012.

Richard Cordray,
Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2012-14061 Filed 6-28-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P

BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

12 CFR Part 1080

[Docket No.: CFPB-2011-0007]

RIN 3170-AA03

Rules Relating to Investigations

AGENCY: Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: After considering the public comments on its interim final rule for the Rules Relating to Investigations, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (Bureau), pursuant to the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (Dodd-Frank Act), is making revisions to its procedures for investigations under section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act.

DATES: The final rule is effective June 29, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Peter G. Wilson, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552, (202) 435-7585.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (Dodd-Frank Act) was signed into law on July 21, 2010. Title X of the Dodd-Frank Act established the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (Bureau) to regulate the offering and provision of consumer financial products or services under the Federal consumer financial laws. The Dodd-Frank Act transferred to the Bureau the consumer financial protection functions formerly carried out by the Federal banking agencies, as well as certain authorities formerly carried out by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC). As required by section 1062 of the Dodd-Frank Act, 12 U.S.C. 5582, the Secretary of the Treasury selected a

designated transfer date and the Federal banking agencies' functions and authorities transferred to the Bureau on July 21, 2011.

The Dodd-Frank Act authorizes the Bureau to conduct investigations to ascertain whether any person is or has been engaged in conduct that, if proved, would constitute a violation of any provision of Federal consumer financial law. Section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act sets forth the parameters that govern these investigations. 12 U.S.C. 5562. Section 1052 became effective immediately upon transfer on July 21, 2011 and did not require rules to implement its provisions. On July 28, 2011, the Bureau issued the interim final rule for the Rules Relating to Investigations (Interim Final Rule) to provide parties involved in Bureau investigations with clarification on how to comply with the statutory requirements relating to Bureau investigations.

II. Summary of the Final Rule

Consistent with section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act, the final rule for the Rules Relating to Investigations (Final Rule) describes a number of Bureau policies and procedures that apply in an investigational, nonadjudicative setting. Among other things, the Final Rule sets forth (1) the Bureau's authority to conduct investigations, and (2) the rights of persons from whom the Bureau seeks to compel information in investigations.

Like the Interim Final Rule, the Final Rule is modeled on investigative procedures of other law enforcement agencies. For guidance, the Bureau reviewed the procedures currently used by the FTC, the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC), and the prudential regulators, as well as the FTC's recently proposed amendments to its nonadjudicative procedures. In light of the similarities between section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act and section 20 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (FTC Act), 15 U.S.C. 41 *et seq.*, the Bureau drew most heavily from the FTC's nonadjudicative procedures in constructing the rules.

The Final Rule lays out the Bureau's authority to conduct investigations before instituting judicial or administrative adjudicatory proceedings under Federal consumer financial law. The Final Rule authorizes the Director, the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement, and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement to issue civil investigative demands (CIDs) for documentary material, tangible things, written reports, answers to questions, or oral testimony. The

demands may be enforced in district court by the Director, the General Counsel, or the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement. The Final Rule also details the authority of the Bureau's investigators to conduct investigations and hold investigational hearings pursuant to civil investigative demands for oral testimony.

Furthermore, the Final Rule sets forth the rights of persons from whom the Bureau seeks to compel information in an investigation. Specifically, the Final Rule describes how such persons should be notified of the purpose of the Bureau's investigation. It also details the procedures for filing a petition for an order modifying or setting aside a CID, which the Director is authorized to rule upon. And it describes the process by which persons may obtain copies of or access to documents or testimony they have provided in response to a civil investigative demand. In addition, the Final Rule describes a person's right to counsel at investigational hearings.

III. Legal Authority

As noted above, section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act outlines how the Bureau will conduct investigations and describes the rights of persons from whom the Bureau seeks information in investigations. This section became effective immediately upon the designated transfer date, July 21, 2011, without any requirement that the Bureau first issue procedural rules. Nevertheless, the Bureau believes that the legislative purpose of section 1052 will be furthered by the issuance of rules that specify the manner in which persons can comply with its provisions.

Section 1022 of the Dodd-Frank Act authorizes the Director to prescribe rules as may be necessary or appropriate for the Bureau to administer and carry out the purposes and objectives of Federal consumer financial laws and to prevent evasion of those laws. 12 U.S.C. 5512. The Bureau believes that the Final Rule will effectuate the purpose of section 1052 and facilitate compliance with Bureau investigations.

IV. Overview of Public Comments on the Interim Final Rule

After publication of the Interim Final Rule on July 28, 2011, the Bureau accepted public comments until September 26, 2011. During the comment period, the Bureau received seven comments. Two of the comments were submitted by individual consumers. Four trade associations and a mortgage company also submitted comments. The trade associations represent credit unions, banks, consumer credit companies, members of

the real estate finance industry, and other financial institutions.

The commenters generally support the Interim Final Rule. Most sections of the Interim Final Rule received no comment and are being finalized without change. The comments did, however, contain questions and recommendations for the Bureau.

Several of the commenters expressed concern that the Interim Final Rule appeared to provide staff-level Bureau employees with unchecked authority to initiate investigations and issue CIDs, or that the Interim Final Rule otherwise did not provide sufficient oversight for particular actions.

A number of commenters expressed concern about sections of the Interim Final Rule that relate to CIDs. One trade association recommended that a statement of "the purpose and scope" of a Bureau investigation—in addition to a notification of the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged violation under investigation and the applicable provisions of law—be included in CIDs. A commenter suggested that the Bureau require a conference between CID recipients and the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement to negotiate the terms of compliance with the demand. Three of the trade associations noted concern with the statement that extensions of time are disfavored for petitions to modify or set aside CIDs. Two commenters questioned who would rule on such petitions without a confirmed Director. One trade association commented that witnesses should be permitted to object to questions demanding information outside of the scope of the investigation during an investigational hearing pursuant to a CID for oral testimony.

A number of commenters expressed concern about maintaining the confidentiality of demand material, sharing information with other State and Federal agencies, and the duties of the custodians of those materials. For example, one trade association and the mortgage company recommended that investigations should remain confidential in all circumstances. Another trade association asserted that the Bureau is not permitted to engage in joint investigations with State attorneys general.

The Bureau reviewed all of the comments on its Interim Final Rule thoroughly and addresses the significant issues they raise herein. Although most sections of the Interim Final Rule received no comment and are being finalized without change, the Bureau has made several changes to the Interim Final Rule based on the comments it received. The comments and these

changes are discussed in more detail in parts V and VI of the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**.

V. General Comments

Some comments on the Interim Final Rule were not directed at a specific section but rather concerned issues of general applicability. The Bureau addresses those comments in this section and addresses comments related to specific sections of the Interim Final Rule in part VI.

One commenter asked the Bureau to specify who would rule on petitions to set aside or modify CIDs while the Bureau lacked a Director. This commenter also asked who would review requests to the Attorney General under § 1080.12 for authority to immunize witnesses and to order them to testify or provide other information. The President appointed a Director of the Bureau on January 4, 2012. Therefore, both questions posed by this commenter are moot. The Director or any official to whom the Director has delegated his authority pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 5492(b) will rule on petitions to set aside or modify CIDs. Furthermore, the Bureau has revised § 1080.12 to clarify that only the Director has the authority to request approval from the Attorney General for the issuance of an order immunizing witnesses.

A commenter asserted that section 1052(c)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Act prohibits the Bureau from issuing CIDs after the institution of any proceedings under Federal consumer financial laws, including proceedings initiated by a State or a private party. The commenter argued that a CID should be accompanied by a certification that the demand will have no bearing on any ongoing proceeding. Section 1052(c)(1) provides, in relevant part, that "the Bureau may, before the institution of any proceedings under the Federal consumer financial law, issue in writing, and cause to be served upon such person, a civil investigative demand." The language "before the institution of any proceeding under Federal consumer financial law" refers to the institution of proceedings by the Bureau. It does not limit the Bureau's authority to issue CIDs based upon the commencement of a proceeding by other parties.

Another commenter requested that the Bureau exempt all credit unions from Bureau investigations. The Bureau believes that granting an exemption from the Bureau's enforcement authority through the Final Rule would be inappropriate and that there is an insufficient record to support such an exemption.

A commenter recommended that covered persons be allowed to recover attorneys' fees and costs incurred by defending against an investigation that is shown to be without merit. The Dodd-Frank Act does not provide the right to recover fees and costs by defending against an investigation. Further, as explained below, the Bureau believes that the procedures for petitioning to modify or set aside a CID set forth in § 1080.6(d) of the Interim Final Rule (now 1080.6(e) of the Final Rule) provide sufficient protections to a recipient of a demand it believes lacks merit.

VI. Section-by-Section Summary

Section 1080.1 Scope

This section describes the scope of the Interim Final Rule. It makes clear that these rules only apply to investigations under section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act. The Bureau received no comment on § 1080.1 of the Interim Final Rule and is adopting it as the Final Rule without change.

Section 1080.2 Definitions

This section of the Interim Final Rule defines several terms used throughout the rules. Many of these definitions also may be found in section 1051 of the Dodd-Frank Act.

A commenter questioned the breadth of the definition of the term "Assistant Director of the Division of Enforcement." The commenter argued that because that term was defined to include "any Bureau employee to whom the Assistant Director of the Division of Enforcement has delegated authority to act under this part," the Interim Final Rule could give Bureau employees inappropriately broad authority to take certain actions, such as issuing CIDs.

The Bureau has revised the Final Rule in response to these comments. The Final Rule identifies those with authority to take particular actions under each section of the Final Rule. Sections 1080.4 (initiating and conducting investigations) and 1080.6 (civil investigative demands) of the Final Rule clarify that the authority to initiate investigations and issue CIDs cannot be delegated by the identified officials. The Final Rule also changes the defined term "Division of Enforcement" to "Office of Enforcement" to reflect the Bureau's current organizational structure.

Section 1080.3 Policy as to Private Controversies

This section of the Interim Final Rule states the Bureau's policy of pursuing investigations that are in the public

interest. Section 1080.3 is consistent with the Bureau's mission to protect consumers by investigating potential violations of Federal consumer financial law. The Bureau received no comments on § 1080.3 of the Interim Final Rule and is adopting it as the Final Rule without change.

Section 1080.4 Initiating and Conducting Investigations

This section of the Interim Final Rule explains that Bureau investigators are authorized to conduct investigations pursuant to section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act.

A commenter observed that this section of the Interim Final Rule did not explicitly provide a procedure for senior agency officials to authorize the opening of an investigation. The commenter argued that only senior agency officials should decide whether to initiate investigations. The commenter questioned whether staff-level employees could open investigations and issue CIDs without sufficient supervision, and noted that the FTC's analogous rule specifically lists the senior officials to whom the Commission has delegated, without power of redelegation, the authority to initiate investigations.

A commenter also expressed concern that the FTC's analogous rule explicitly provides that FTC investigators must comply with the laws of the United States and FTC regulations. According to the commenter, such language is necessary to ensure that the Bureau complies with the Right to Financial Privacy Act (RFPA) to the extent that statute applies to the Bureau. The commenter also believes that this language is needed to guard against investigations undertaken for what the commenter characterized as the impermissible purpose of aiding State attorneys general or State regulators. The commenter suggested that the Bureau add a statement to this section of the Interim Final Rule similar to the FTC's rule requiring compliance with Federal law and agency regulations.

The Final Rule clarifies that only the Assistant Director or any Deputy Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement has the authority to initiate investigations. The Bureau has significant discretion to determine whether and when to open an investigation, and the public benefits from a process whereby the Bureau can open and close investigations efficiently. But the Bureau did not intend its rules to be interpreted so broadly as to suggest that any staff-level employee could unilaterally open an investigation or issue a CID. The Final

Rule also provides that Bureau investigators will perform their duties in accordance with Federal law and Bureau regulations.

Section 1080.5 Notification of Purpose

This section of the Interim Final Rule specifies that a person compelled to provide information to the Bureau or to testify in an investigational hearing must be advised of the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged violation under investigation and the applicable provisions of law. This section of the Interim Final Rule implements the requirements for CIDs described in section 1052(c)(2) of the Dodd-Frank Act.

Commenters noted that although the Dodd-Frank Act and the FTC Act both require CIDs to state "the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged violation which is under investigation and the provision of law applicable to such violation," the two agencies' implementing regulations on this topic differ. Both agencies' regulations require a statement of the nature of the conduct at issue and the relevant provisions of law, but the FTC rule also requires that the recipient of the CID be advised of "the purpose and scope" of the investigation. Commenters argued that the Bureau should add this phrase to its rule because excluding it would lead to requests for materials outside the scope of an investigation. One commenter argued that only senior agency officials should authorize investigations to ensure that CIDs are relevant to the purpose and scope of the Bureau's investigations.

The language in § 1080.5 of the Interim Final Rule mirrors the language of the Dodd-Frank Act, which provides that "[e]ach civil investigative demand shall state the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged violation which is under investigation and the provision of law applicable to such violation." The Bureau believes that the information covered by this statutory language provides sufficient notice to recipients of CIDs. As discussed above, § 1080.4 (initiating and conducting investigations) of the Final Rule limits the authority to open investigations to the Assistant Director or any Deputy Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement. Similarly, § 1080.6 of the Final Rule (civil investigative demands) limits the authority to issue CIDs to the Director of the Bureau, the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement, and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement. Thus, one of these identified officials will review and approve the initiation of all investigations and the issuance of all

CIDs. In addition, to the extent recipients of CIDs consider the demands to be for an unauthorized purpose or outside the scope of the investigation, they will have an opportunity to negotiate the terms of compliance pursuant to § 1080.6(c) of the Interim Final Rule (now § 1080.6(d) of the Final Rule) or to petition to set aside or modify the demand pursuant to § 1080.6(d) of the Interim Final Rule (now § 1080.6(e) of the Final Rule).

The Bureau therefore adopts this section of the Interim Final Rule as the Final Rule without change.

Section 1080.6 Civil Investigative Demands

This section of the Interim Final Rule lays out the Bureau's procedures for issuing CIDs. It authorizes the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement to issue CIDs for documentary material, tangible things, written reports, answers to questions, and oral testimony. This section of the Interim Final Rule details the information that must be included in CIDs and the requirement that responses be made under a sworn certificate. Section 1080.6 of the Interim Final Rule also authorizes the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement to negotiate and approve the terms of compliance with CIDs and grant extensions for good cause. Finally, this section of the Interim Final Rule describes the procedures for seeking an order to modify or set aside a CID, which the Director is authorized to rule upon.

One commenter argued that § 1080.6(a) permits almost any Bureau employee to issue CIDs without sufficient supervision. The commenter stated that this lack of oversight is problematic and does not reflect Congress' intent when it enacted the Act.

Section 1080.6(a) of the Final Rule limits the authority to issue CIDs to the Director, the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement, and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement. This change to the Final Rule balances the efficiency of the Bureau's investigative process with appropriate supervision and oversight.

A commenter suggested that the Bureau require a conference between the CID recipient and the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement within ten days of service of the CID to negotiate and approve the terms of compliance. The commenter envisioned a conference analogous to a discovery planning conference under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, during which the parties could discuss requests for information, appropriate limitations on

the scope of requests, issues related to electronically stored information (ESI), issues related to privilege and confidential information, and a reasonable time for compliance. The commenter stated that this type of conference would better ensure prompt and efficient production of material and information related to the investigation.

The Bureau agrees that a conference between the parties within ten calendar days of serving a CID is likely to improve the efficiency of investigations, and § 1080.6(c) of the Final Rule provides for such a conference. The Final Rule does not, however, adopt the suggestion that the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement preside over all such conferences.

Several commenters also noted concern with the statement in § 1080.6(d) of the Interim Final Rule disfavoring extensions of time for petitioning for an order modifying or setting aside CIDs. One commenter argued that the 20-day period to file petitions, for which extensions of time are disfavored, is inconsistent with the "reasonable" period of time for compliance with the CID set forth in § 1080.6(a). The commenter also argued that this timeframe leaves a short period for the CID recipient to decide which documents are privileged or otherwise protected and to file a petition articulating privilege and scope objections. Another commenter noted that the analogous FTC rules do not include a provision disfavoring extensions for petitions to modify or set aside a CID. These commenters recommended that the Bureau delete the sentence related to disfavoring extensions. One commenter recommended that the rules be corrected to provide an independent review if a covered person believes a CID is without merit.

Like the Interim Final Rule, the Final Rule includes a provision disfavoring extensions of time for petitions to modify or set aside a CID. The Bureau believes its policy of disfavoring extensions is appropriate in light of its significant interest in promoting an efficient process for seeking materials through CIDs. By disfavoring extensions, the Bureau means to prompt recipients to decide within 20 days whether they intend to comply with the CID. The Final Rule also clarifies that this 20-day period should be computed with calendar days.

The Bureau notes that § 1080.6(d) of the Interim Final Rule (now § 1080.6(e) of the Final Rule) only provides the due date for a petition for an order modifying or setting aside a CID. It does not require recipients to comply fully

with CIDs within 20 days. In addition, the Final Rule provides several options to recipients of CIDs that need additional time to respond. For example, the recipient may negotiate for a reasonable extension of time for compliance or a rolling document production schedule pursuant to § 1080.6(c) of the Interim Final Rule (now § 1080.6(d) of the Final Rule).

Section 1080.6(e) of the Final Rule clarifies that recipients of CIDs should not assert claims of privilege through a petition for an order modifying or setting aside a CID. Instead, when privilege is the only basis for withholding particular materials, they should utilize the procedures set forth in § 1080.8 (withholding requested material) of the Final Rule. Section 1080.6(e) of the Final Rule also lays out the authority of Bureau investigators to provide to the Director a reply to a petition seeking an order modifying or setting aside a CID. Specifically, the Final Rule states that Bureau investigators may provide the Director with a statement setting forth any factual and legal responses to a petition. The Bureau will not make these statements or any other internal deliberations part of the Bureau's public records. Section 1080.6(g) of the Final Rule clarifies that the Bureau, however, will make publicly available both the petition and the Director's order in response. Section 1080.6(g) of the Final Rule also clarifies that if a CID recipient wants to prevent the Director from making the petition public, any showing of good cause must be made no later than the time the petition is filed. The Final Rule also adds a provision clarifying how the Bureau will serve the petitioner with the Director's order.

Finally, the Bureau believes the procedures for petitions to modify or set aside a CID set forth in the Final Rule adequately protect a covered person who believes a CID is without merit, and that an additional independent review is unnecessary.

Section 1080.7 Investigational Hearings

This section of the Interim Final Rule describes the procedures for investigational hearings initiated pursuant to a CID for oral testimony. It also lays out the roles and responsibilities of the Bureau investigator conducting the investigational hearing, which include excluding unauthorized persons from the hearing room and ensuring that the investigational hearing is transcribed, the witness is duly sworn, the transcript is a true record of the testimony, and the

transcript is provided to the designated custodian.

A commenter argued that the Bureau is not authorized to conduct joint investigations with State attorneys general under the Dodd-Frank Act and, correspondingly, State attorneys general cannot attend an investigational hearing as a representative of an agency with whom the Bureau is conducting a joint investigation. The commenter argued that Congress distinguished between State attorneys general and State regulatory agencies in section 1042 of the Dodd-Frank Act and that State attorneys general are therefore not "agencies" with whom the Bureau can partner. The commenter also asserted that the Bureau cannot share a copy of the transcript of an investigational hearing with another agency without the consent of the witness.

Another commenter argued that representatives of agencies with which the Bureau is conducting a joint investigation may be present at an investigational hearing only with the witness's consent. This commenter stated that the Bureau should recognize in the rules that a witness who does not consent to the presence of a representative of another agency at an investigational hearing should not be presumed guilty.

The Dodd-Frank Act states that the Bureau "may engage in joint investigations and requests for information, as authorized under this title." This statutory language permits the Bureau to engage in joint investigations with State or Federal law enforcement agencies, including State attorneys general, with jurisdiction that overlaps with the Bureau's. The Bureau's disclosure rules also permit the Bureau to share certain confidential information, including investigational hearing transcripts, with Federal or State agencies to the extent the disclosure is relevant to the exercise of an agency's statutory or regulatory authority. See 12 CFR 1070.43(b). In addition, neither the Dodd-Frank Act nor the rules require the consent of the witness to permit a representative of an agency with which the Bureau is conducting a joint investigation to be present at the hearing. Consent is required only when people other than those listed in the rule are included.

Thus, the Bureau adopts § 1080.7 of the Interim Final Rule as the Final Rule without change.

Section 1080.8 Withholding Requested Material

This section of the Interim Final Rule describes the procedures that apply when persons withhold material

responsive to a CID. It requires the recipient of the CID to assert a privilege by the production date and, if so directed in the CID, also to submit a detailed schedule of the items withheld. Section 1080.8 also sets forth the procedures for handling the disclosure of privileged or protected information or communications.

The Bureau received no comment on § 1080.8 of the Interim Final Rule and is adopting it as the Final Rule without substantive change.

Section 1080.9 Rights of Witnesses in Investigations

This section of the Interim Final Rule describes the rights of persons compelled to submit information or provide testimony in an investigation. It details the procedures for obtaining a copy of submitted documents or a copy of or access to a transcript of the person's testimony. This section of the Interim Final Rule also describes a witness's right to make changes to his or her transcript and the rules for signing the transcript.

Section 1080.9 of the Interim Final Rule lays out a person's right to counsel at an investigational hearing and describes his or her counsel's right to advise the witness as to any question posed for which an objection may properly be made. It also describes the witness's or counsel's rights to object to questions or requests that the witness is privileged to refuse to answer. This section of the Interim Final Rule states that counsel for the witness may not otherwise object to questions or interrupt the examination to make statements on the record but may request that the witness have an opportunity to clarify any of his or her answers. Finally, this section of the Interim Final Rule authorizes the Bureau investigator to take all necessary action during the course of the hearing to avoid delay and to prevent or restrain disorderly, dilatory, obstructionist, or contemptuous conduct, or contemptuous language.

A commenter noted that under the Interim Final Rule witnesses could not object during an investigational hearing on the ground that a question was outside the scope of the investigation. The commenter argued that a covered person's inability to raise such objections might allow "a fishing expedition." The commenter recommended amending § 1080.9(b) to allow objections based on scope.

Section 1052(c)(13)(D)(iii) of the Dodd-Frank Act states, in relevant part:

[a]n objection may properly be made, received, and entered upon the record when it is claimed that such person is entitled to

refuse to answer the question on grounds of any constitutional or other legal right or privilege, including the privilege against self-incrimination, but the person shall not otherwise object to or refuse to answer any question, and such person or attorney shall not otherwise interrupt the oral examination.

Thus, to the extent the scope objection was grounded in a witness's constitutional or other legal right, it would be a proper objection.

The Final Rule clarifies that counsel may confer with a witness while a question is pending or instruct a witness not to answer a question only if an objection based on privilege or work product may properly be made. The Final Rule also describes counsel's limited ability to make additional objections based on other constitutional or legal rights. The Final Rule provides that if an attorney has refused to comply with his or her obligations in the rules of this part, or has allegedly engaged in disorderly, dilatory, obstructionist, or contemptuous conduct, or contemptuous language during an investigational hearing, the Bureau may take further action, including action to suspend or disbar the attorney from further participation in the investigation or further practice before the Bureau pursuant to 12 CFR 1081.107(c). The Final Rule also includes other nonsubstantive changes, including clarifying that the 30-day period that the witness has to sign and submit his or her transcript should be computed using calendar days.

Section 1080.10 Noncompliance With Civil Investigative Demands

This section of the Interim Final Rule authorizes the Director, the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement, and the General Counsel to initiate an action to enforce a CID in connection with the failure or refusal of a person to comply with, or to obey, a CID. In addition, they are authorized to seek civil contempt or other appropriate relief in cases where a court order enforcing a CID has been violated.

The Bureau received no comment on § 1080.10 of the Interim Final Rule and is adopting it as the Final Rule without substantive change.

Section 1080.11 Disposition

This section of the Interim Final Rule explains that an enforcement action may be instituted in Federal or State court or through administrative proceedings when warranted by the facts disclosed by an investigation. It further provides that the Bureau may refer investigations to appropriate Federal, State, or foreign government agencies as appropriate. This section of the Interim Final Rule

also authorizes the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement to close the investigation when the facts of an investigation indicate an enforcement action is not necessary or warranted in the public interest.

One commenter indicated that the Bureau's authority to refer investigations to other law enforcement agencies should be limited to circumstances when it is expressly authorized to do so by the Dodd-Frank Act, an enumerated consumer financial law, or other Federal law, because of potential risks to the confidentiality of the investigatory files.

The Bureau's ability to refer matters to appropriate law enforcement agencies is inherent in the Bureau's authority and is a corollary to the Bureau's statutorily recognized ability to conduct joint investigations. The documentary materials and tangible things obtained by the Bureau pursuant to a CID are subject to the requirements and procedures relating to disclosure of records and information in part 1070 of this title. These procedures for sharing information with law enforcement agencies provide significant and sufficient protections for these materials.

The Bureau has amended § 1080.11 to clarify that the Assistant Director and any Deputy Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement are authorized to close investigations.

The Bureau adopts § 1080.11 of the Interim Final Rule with the changes discussed above.

Section 1080.12 Orders Requiring Witnesses To Testify or Provide Other Information and Granting Immunity

This section of the Interim Final Rule authorizes the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement to request approval from the Attorney General for the issuance of an order requiring a witness to testify or provide other information and granting immunity under 18 U.S.C. 6004. The Interim Final Rule also sets forth the Bureau's right to review the exercise of these functions and states that the Bureau will entertain an appeal from an order requiring a witness to testify or provide other information only upon a showing that a substantial question is involved, the determination of which is essential to serve the interests of justice. Finally, this section of the Interim Final Rule describes the applicable rules and time limits for such appeals.

A commenter questioned whether this section of the Interim Final Rule would permit any Bureau employee to request that the Attorney General approve the issuance of an order granting immunity

under 18 U.S.C. 6004 and requiring a witness to testify or provide information. The commenter noted that the Dodd-Frank Act authorizes the Bureau, with the Attorney General's permission, to compel a witness to testify under 18 U.S.C. 6004 if the witness invokes his or her privilege against self-incrimination. The commenter argued that this section should delegate the authority to seek permission to compel testimony to a specific individual to provide accountability and ensure that information is not disclosed to the Attorney General in a manner that violates the Right to Financial Privacy Act. The commenter noted that the FTC's analogous rule specifically lists the senior agency officials who are authorized to make such requests to the Attorney General, and identifies a liaison officer through whom such requests must be made. The commenter also suggested that § 1080.12(b) of the Interim Final Rule, which provides that the Assistant Director's exercise of this authority is subject to review by "the Bureau," specify who will conduct this review.

The Final Rule provides that only the Director of the Bureau has the authority to request approval from the Attorney General for the issuance of an order requiring a witness to testify or provide other information and granting immunity under 18 U.S.C. 6004. This change addresses the concern that requests for witness immunity would be made without oversight. Limiting this authority to the Director provides sufficient accountability.

Section 1080.13 Custodians

This section of the Interim Final Rule describes the procedures for designating a custodian and deputy custodian for material produced pursuant to a CID in an investigation. It also states that these materials are for the official use of the Bureau, but, upon notice to the custodian, must be made available for examination during regular office hours by the person who produced them.

A commenter suggested that the Bureau should detail the particular duties of custodians designated under this section and that, without an enumerated list of duties, the custodian would not have any responsibilities regarding CID materials. The commenter noted that the FTC Act requires the custodian to take specific actions, while the Dodd-Frank Act does not. The commenter suggested specifying a series of custodial duties, including (1) taking and maintaining custody of all materials submitted pursuant to CIDs or subpoenas that the Bureau issues,

including transcripts of oral testimony taken by the Bureau; (2) maintaining confidentiality of those materials as required by applicable law; (3) providing the materials to either House of Congress upon request, after ten days notice to the party that owns or submitted the materials; (4) producing any materials as required by a court of competent jurisdiction; and (5) complying at all times with the Trade Secrets Act.

Section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act sets forth the duties of the Bureau's custodian. Sections 1052(c)(3) through (c)(6) of the Dodd-Frank Act give the custodian responsibility for receiving documentary material, tangible things, written reports, answers to questions, and transcripts of oral testimony given by any person in compliance with any CID. Section 1052(d) of the Dodd-Frank Act, as well as the Bureau's Rules for Disclosure of Records and Information in part 1070 of this title, outline the requirements for the confidential treatment of demand material. Section 1052(g) addresses custodial control and provides that a person may file, in the district court of the United States for the judicial district within which the office of the custodian is situated, a petition for an order of such court requiring the performance by the custodian of any duty imposed upon him by section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act or by Bureau rule. These duties and obligations do not require additional clarification by rule.

The Final Rule clarifies that the custodian has the powers and duties of both section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act and 12 CFR 1070.3.

The Bureau adopts § 1080.13 of the Interim Final Rule with the changes discussed above.

Section 1080.14 Confidential Treatment of Demand Material and Non-Public Nature of Investigations

Section 1080.14 of the Interim Final Rule explains that documentary materials, written reports, answers to questions, tangible things, or transcripts of oral testimony received by the Bureau in any form or format pursuant to a CID are subject to the requirements and procedures relating to disclosure of records and information in part 1070 of this title. This section of the Interim Final Rule also states that investigations generally are non-public. A Bureau investigator may disclose the existence of an investigation to the extent necessary to advance the investigation.

A commenter recommended that the Bureau revise this section to mandate that Bureau investigations remain confidential. The commenter noted the

potential reputation risk to an entity if an investigation is disclosed to the public. In addition, the commenter argued that failing to conduct investigations confidentially will increase litigation risk. One commenter recommended that the Bureau issue a public absolution of a company if the Bureau does not maintain the confidentiality of an investigation.

Section 1080.14 of the Interim Final Rule provides that investigations generally will not be disclosed to the public, but permits Bureau investigators to disclose the existence of an investigation when necessary to advance the investigation. The Interim Final Rule does not contemplate publicizing an investigation, but rather disclosing the existence of the investigation to, for example, a potential witness or third party with potentially relevant information when doing so is necessary to advance the investigation. This limited exception sufficiently balances the concerns expressed by the commenter with the Bureau's need to obtain information efficiently.

Thus, the Bureau adopts § 1080.14 of the Interim Final Rule as the Final Rule without change.

VII. Section 1022(b)(2) Provisions

In developing the Final Rule, the Bureau has considered the potential benefits, costs, and impacts, and has consulted or offered to consult with the prudential regulators, HUD, the SEC, the Department of Justice, and the FTC, including with regard to consistency with any prudential, market, or systemic objectives administered by such agencies.³

The Final Rule neither imposes any obligations on consumers nor is expected to have any appreciable impact on their access to consumer financial products or services. Rather, the Final Rule provides a clear, efficient mechanism for investigating compliance with the Federal consumer financial laws, which benefits consumers by creating a systematic process to protect them from unlawful behavior.

³ Section 1022(b)(2)(A) of the Dodd-Frank Act addresses the consideration of the potential benefits and costs of regulation to consumers and covered persons, including the potential reduction of access by consumers to consumer financial products or services; the impact on depository institutions and credit unions with \$10 billion or less in total assets as described in section 1026 of the Dodd-Frank Act; and the impact on consumers in rural areas. Section 1022(b)(2)(B) addresses consultation between the Bureau and other Federal agencies during the rulemaking process. The manner and extent to which these provisions apply to procedural rules and benefits, costs and impacts that are compelled by statutory changes rather than discretionary Bureau action is unclear. Nevertheless, to inform this rulemaking more fully, the Bureau performed the described analyses and consultations.

The Final Rule imposes certain obligations on covered persons who receive CIDs in Bureau investigations. Specifically, as described above, the Final Rule sets forth the process for complying with or objecting to CIDs for documentary material, tangible things, written reports or answers to questions, and oral testimony. Most obligations in the Final Rule stem from express language in the Dodd-Frank Act and do not impose additional burdens on covered persons.

To the extent that the Final Rule includes provisions not expressly required by statute, these provisions benefit covered persons by providing clarity and certainty. In addition, the Final Rule vests the Bureau with discretion to modify CIDs or extend the time for compliance for good cause. This flexibility benefits covered persons by enabling the Bureau to assess the cost of compliance with a civil investigative demand in a particular circumstance and take appropriate steps to mitigate any unreasonable compliance burden.

Moreover, because the Final Rule is largely based on section 20 of the FTC Act and its corresponding regulations, it should present an existing, stable model of investigatory procedures to covered persons. This likely familiarity to covered persons should further reduce the compliance costs for covered persons.

The Final Rule provides that requests for extensions of time to file petitions to modify or set aside CIDs are disfavored. This may impose a burden on covered entities in some cases, but it may also lead to a more expeditious resolution of matters, reducing uncertainty. Furthermore, the Final Rule has no unique impact on insured depository institutions or insured credit unions with less than \$10 billion in assets as described in section 1026(a) of the Dodd-Frank Act. Nor does the Final Rule have a unique impact on rural consumers.

A commenter suggested that the Bureau conduct a nonpublic study of the impact of complying with a CID on the entities who have been subjected to them by other agencies, with specific focus on those that were found not to have violated the law. As the commenter implicitly recognizes, such data does not currently exist and thus was not reasonably available to the Bureau in finalizing the Interim Final Rule. Moreover, as explained above, most of the costs associated with complying with a CID result from the Dodd-Frank Act, which authorizes the Bureau to issue such demands.

A commenter asserted that disfavoring extensions of petitions to

modify or set aside CIDs will require the recipient to conduct a full review of the demanded material within the normal 20-day period in order to comply with the deadline for filing a petition. Under the Final Rule, recipients of a CID are not required to comply fully within twenty days; rather, they are required simply to decide whether they will comply with the demand at all. The Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement have the discretion to negotiate and approve the terms of satisfactory compliance with CIDs and, for good cause shown, may extend the time prescribed for compliance. Thus, the Final Rule provides reasonable steps to mitigate compliance burden while simultaneously protecting the Bureau's law enforcement interests.

Another commenter stated that the four interim final rules that the Bureau promulgated together on July 28, 2011 failed to satisfy the rulemaking requirements under section 1022 of the Dodd-Frank Act. Specifically, the commenter stated that "the CFPB's analysis of the costs and benefits of its rules does not recognize the significant costs the CFPB imposes on covered persons." The Bureau believes that it appropriately considered the benefits, costs, and impacts of the Interim Final Rule pursuant to section 1022. Notably, the commenter did not identify any specific costs to covered persons that are not discussed in Part C of the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION to the Interim Final Rule.

VIII. Procedural Requirements

As noted in publishing the Interim Final Rule, under the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 553(b), notice and comment is not required for rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice. As discussed in the preamble to the Interim Final Rule, the Bureau confirms its finding that this is a procedural rule for which notice and comment is not required. In addition, because the Final Rule relates solely to agency procedure and practice, it is not subject to the 30-day delayed effective date for substantive rules under section 553(d) of the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 551 *et seq.* Because no notice of proposed rulemaking is required, the requirements of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, 5 U.S.C. 601(2) do not apply. Finally, the Bureau has determined that this Final Rule does not impose any new recordkeeping, reporting, or disclosure requirements on covered entities or members of the public that would be collections of

information requiring approval under 44 U.S.C. 3501. *et seq.*

List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 1080

Administrative practice and procedure, Banking, Banks, Consumer protection, Credit, Credit unions, Investigations, Law enforcement, National banks, Savings associations, Trade practices.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection revises part 1080 to Chapter X in Title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations to read as follows:

PART 1080—RULES RELATING TO INVESTIGATIONS

Sec.

- 1080.1 Scope.
- 1080.2 Definitions.
- 1080.3 Policy as to private controversies.
- 1080.4 Initiating and conducting investigations.
- 1080.5 Notification of purpose.
- 1080.6 Civil investigative demands.
- 1080.7 Investigational hearings.
- 1080.8 Withholding requested material.
- 1080.9 Rights of witnesses in investigations.
- 1080.10 Noncompliance with civil investigative demands.
- 1080.11 Disposition.
- 1080.12 Orders requiring witnesses to testify or provide other information and granting immunity.
- 1080.13 Custodians.
- 1080.14 Confidential treatment of demand material and non-public nature of investigations.

Authority: Pub. L. 111–203, Title X, 12 U.S.C. 5481 *et seq.*

§ 1080.1 Scope.

The rules of this part apply to Bureau investigations conducted pursuant to section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act, 12 U.S.C. 5562.

§ 1080.2 Definitions.

For the purposes of this part, unless explicitly stated to the contrary:

Bureau means the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

Bureau investigation means any inquiry conducted by a Bureau investigator for the purpose of ascertaining whether any person is or has been engaged in any conduct that is a violation.

Bureau investigator means any attorney or investigator employed by the Bureau who is charged with the duty of enforcing or carrying into effect any Federal consumer financial law.

Custodian means the custodian or any deputy custodian designated by the Bureau for the purpose of maintaining custody of information produced pursuant to this part.

Director means the Director of the Bureau or a person authorized to

perform the functions of the Director in accordance with the law.

Documentary material means the original or any copy of any book, document, record, report, memorandum, paper, communication, tabulation, chart, log, electronic file, or other data or data compilation stored in any medium, including electronically stored information.

Dodd-Frank Act means the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010, as amended, Public Law 111–203 (July 21, 2010), Title X, codified at 12 U.S.C. 5481 *et seq.*

Electronically stored information (ESI) means any information stored in any electronic medium from which information can be obtained either directly or, if necessary, after translation by the responding party into a reasonably usable form.

Office of Enforcement means the office of the Bureau responsible for enforcement of Federal consumer financial law.

Person means an individual, partnership, company, corporation, association (incorporated or unincorporated), trust, estate, cooperative organization, or other entity.

Violation means any act or omission that, if proved, would constitute a violation of any provision of Federal consumer financial law.

§ 1080.3 Policy as to private controversies.

The Bureau shall act only in the public interest and will not initiate an investigation or take other enforcement action when the alleged violation is merely a matter of private controversy and does not tend to affect adversely the public interest.

§ 1080.4 Initiating and conducting investigations.

The Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement have the nondelegable authority to initiate investigations. Bureau investigations are conducted by Bureau investigators designated and duly authorized under section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Act, 12 U.S.C. 5562, to conduct such investigations. Bureau investigators are authorized to exercise and perform their duties in accordance with the laws of the United States and the regulations of the Bureau.

§ 1080.5 Notification of purpose.

Any person compelled to furnish documentary material, tangible things, written reports or answers to questions, oral testimony, or any combination of

such material, answers, or testimony to the Bureau shall be advised of the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged violation that is under investigation and the provisions of law applicable to such violation.

§ 1080.6 Civil investigative demands.

(a) *In general.* In accordance with section 1052(c) of the Act, the Director of the Bureau, the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement, and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement, have the nondelegable authority to issue a civil investigative demand in any Bureau investigation directing the person named therein to produce documentary material for inspection and copying or reproduction in the form or medium requested by the Bureau; to submit tangible things; to provide a written report or answers to questions; to appear before a designated representative at a designated time and place to testify about documentary material, tangible things, or other information; and to furnish any combination of such material, things, answers, or testimony.

(1) *Documentary material.* (i) Civil investigative demands for the production of documentary material shall describe each class of material to be produced with such definiteness and certainty as to permit such material to be fairly identified, prescribe a return date or dates that will provide a reasonable period of time within which the material so demanded may be assembled and made available for inspection and copying or reproduction, and identify the custodian to whom such material shall be made available. Documentary material for which a civil investigative demand has been issued shall be made available as prescribed in the civil investigative demand.

(ii) Production of documentary material in response to a civil investigative demand shall be made under a sworn certificate, in such form as the demand designates, by the person to whom the demand is directed or, if not a natural person, by any person having knowledge of the facts and circumstances relating to such production, to the effect that all of the documentary material required by the demand and in the possession, custody, or control of the person to whom the demand is directed has been produced and made available to the custodian.

(2) *Tangible things.* (i) Civil investigative demands for tangible things shall describe each class of tangible things to be produced with such definiteness and certainty as to permit such things to be fairly identified, prescribe a return date or

dates which will provide a reasonable period of time within which the things so demanded may be assembled and submitted, and identify the custodian to whom such things shall be submitted.

(ii) Submissions of tangible things in response to a civil investigative demand shall be made under a sworn certificate, in such form as the demand designates, by the person to whom the demand is directed or, if not a natural person, by any person having knowledge of the facts and circumstances relating to such production, to the effect that all of the tangible things required by the demand and in the possession, custody, or control of the person to whom the demand is directed have been submitted to the custodian.

(3) *Written reports or answers to questions.* (i) Civil investigative demands for written reports or answers to questions shall propound with definiteness and certainty the reports to be produced or the questions to be answered, prescribe a date or dates at which time written reports or answers to questions shall be submitted, and identify the custodian to whom such reports or answers shall be submitted.

(ii) Each reporting requirement or question in a civil investigative demand shall be answered separately and fully in writing under oath. Responses to a civil investigative demand for a written report or answers to questions shall be made under a sworn certificate, in such form as the demand designates, by the person to whom the demand is directed or, if not a natural person, by any person responsible for answering each reporting requirement or question, to the effect that all of the information required by the demand and in the possession, custody, control, or knowledge of the person to whom the demand is directed has been submitted to the custodian.

(4) *Oral testimony.* (i) Civil investigative demands for the giving of oral testimony shall prescribe a date, time, and place at which oral testimony shall be commenced, and identify a Bureau investigator who shall conduct the investigation and the custodian to whom the transcript of such investigation shall be submitted. Oral testimony in response to a civil investigative demand shall be taken in accordance with the procedures for investigational hearings prescribed by §§ 1080.7 and 1080.9 of this part.

(ii) Where a civil investigative demand requires oral testimony from an entity, the civil investigative demand shall describe with reasonable particularity the matters for examination and the entity must designate one or more officers, directors, or managing

agents, or designate other persons who consent to testify on its behalf. Unless a single individual is designated by the entity, the entity must designate the matters on which each designee will testify. The individuals designated must testify about information known or reasonably available to the entity and their testimony shall be binding on the entity.

(b) *Manner and form of production of ESI.* When a civil investigative demand requires the production of ESI, it shall be produced in accordance with the instructions provided by the Bureau regarding the manner and form of production. Absent any instructions as to the form for producing ESI, ESI must be produced in the form in which it is ordinarily maintained or in a reasonably usable form.

(c) *Meet and confer.* The recipient of a civil investigative demand shall meet and confer with a Bureau investigator within 10 calendar days after receipt of the demand or before the deadline for filing a petition to modify or set aside the demand, whichever is earlier, to discuss and attempt to resolve all issues regarding compliance with the civil investigative demand. The Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement may authorize the waiver of this requirement for routine third-party civil investigative demands or in other circumstances where he or she determines that a meeting is unnecessary. The meeting may be in person or by telephone.

(1) *Personnel.* The recipient must make available at the meeting personnel with the knowledge necessary to resolve any issues relevant to compliance with the demand. Such personnel could include individuals knowledgeable about the recipient's information or records management systems and/or the recipient's organizational structure.

(2) *ESI.* If the civil investigative demand seeks ESI, the recipient shall ensure that a person familiar with its ESI systems and methods of retrieval participates in the meeting.

(3) *Petitions.* The Bureau will not consider petitions to set aside or modify a civil investigative demand unless the recipient has meaningfully engaged in the meet and confer process described in this subsection and will consider only issues raised during the meet and confer process.

(d) *Compliance.* The Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement are authorized to negotiate and approve the terms of satisfactory compliance with civil investigative demands and, for good

cause shown, may extend the time prescribed for compliance.

(e) *Petition for order modifying or setting aside demand—in general.* Any petition for an order modifying or setting aside a civil investigative demand shall be filed with the Executive Secretary of the Bureau with a copy to the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement within 20 calendar days after service of the civil investigative demand, or, if the return date is less than 20 calendar days after service, prior to the return date. Such petition shall set forth all factual and legal objections to the civil investigative demand, including all appropriate arguments, affidavits, and other supporting documentation. The attorney who objects to a demand must sign any objections.

(1) *Statement.* Each petition shall be accompanied by a signed statement representing that counsel for the petitioner has conferred with counsel for the Bureau pursuant to section 1080.6(c) in a good-faith effort to resolve by agreement the issues raised by the petition and has been unable to reach such an agreement. If some of the matters in controversy have been resolved by agreement, the statement shall specify the matters so resolved and the matters remaining unresolved. The statement shall recite the date, time, and place of each such meeting between counsel, and the names of all parties participating in each such meeting.

(2) *Extensions of time.* The Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement are authorized to rule upon requests for extensions of time within which to file such petitions. Requests for extensions of time are disfavored.

(3) *Bureau investigator response.* Bureau investigators may, without serving the petitioner, provide the Director with a statement setting forth any factual and legal response to a petition for an order modifying or setting aside the demand.

(4) *Disposition.* The Director has the authority to rule upon a petition for an order modifying or setting aside a civil investigative demand. The order may be served on the petitioner via email, facsimile, or any other method reasonably calculated to provide notice of the order to the petitioner.

(f) *Stay of compliance period.* The timely filing of a petition for an order modifying or setting aside a civil investigative demand shall stay the time permitted for compliance with the portion challenged. If the petition is denied in whole or in part, the ruling will specify a new return date.

(g) *Public disclosure.* All such petitions and the Director's orders in response to those petitions are part of the public records of the Bureau unless the Bureau determines otherwise for good cause shown. Any showing of good cause must be made no later than the time the petition is filed.

§ 1080.7 Investigational hearings.

(a) Investigational hearings, as distinguished from hearings in adjudicative proceedings, may be conducted pursuant to a civil investigative demand for the giving of oral testimony in the course of any Bureau investigation, including inquiries initiated for the purpose of determining whether or not a respondent is complying with an order of the Bureau.

(b) Investigational hearings shall be conducted by any Bureau investigator for the purpose of hearing the testimony of witnesses and receiving documentary material, tangible things, or other information relating to any subject under investigation. Such hearings shall be under oath or affirmation and stenographically reported, and a transcript thereof shall be made a part of the record of the investigation. The Bureau investigator conducting the investigational hearing also may direct that the testimony be recorded by audio, audiovisual, or other means, in which case the recording shall be made a part of the record of the investigation as well.

(c) In investigational hearings, the Bureau investigators shall exclude from the hearing room all persons except the person being examined, his or her counsel, the officer before whom the testimony is to be taken, any investigator or representative of an agency with which the Bureau is engaged in a joint investigation, and any individual transcribing or recording such testimony. At the discretion of the Bureau investigator, and with the consent of the person being examined, persons other than those listed in this paragraph may be present in the hearing room. The Bureau investigator shall certify or direct the individual transcribing the testimony to certify on the transcript that the witness was duly sworn and that the transcript is a true record of the testimony given by the witness. A copy of the transcript shall be forwarded promptly by the Bureau investigator to the custodian designated in section 1080.13.

§ 1080.8 Withholding requested material.

(a) Any person withholding material responsive to a civil investigative demand or any other request for

production of material shall assert a claim of privilege not later than the date set for the production of material. Such person shall, if so directed in the civil investigative demand or other request for production, submit, together with such claim, a schedule of the items withheld which states, as to each such item, the type, specific subject matter, and date of the item; the names, addresses, positions, and organizations of all authors and recipients of the item; and the specific grounds for claiming that the item is privileged. The person who submits the schedule and the attorney stating the grounds for a claim that any item is privileged must sign it.

(b) A person withholding material solely for reasons described in this subsection shall comply with the requirements of this subsection in lieu of filing a petition for an order modifying or setting aside a civil investigative demand pursuant to section 1080.6(e).

(c) Disclosure of privileged or protected information or communications produced pursuant to a civil investigative demand shall be handled as follows:

(1) The disclosure of privileged or protected information or communications shall not operate as a waiver with respect to the Bureau if:

- (i) The disclosure was inadvertent;
- (ii) The holder of the privilege or protection took reasonable steps to prevent disclosure; and
- (iii) The holder promptly took

reasonable steps to rectify the error, including notifying a Bureau investigator of the claim of privilege or protection and the basis for it.

(2) After being notified, the Bureau investigator must promptly return, sequester, or destroy the specified information and any copies; must not use or disclose the information until the claim is resolved; must take reasonable steps to retrieve the information if he or she disclosed it before being notified; and, if appropriate, may sequester such material until such time as a hearing officer or court rules on the merits of the claim of privilege or protection. The producing party must preserve the information until the claim is resolved.

(3) The disclosure of privileged or protected information or communications shall waive the privilege or protection with respect to the Bureau as to undisclosed information or communications only if:

- (i) The waiver is intentional;
- (ii) The disclosed and undisclosed information or communications concern the same subject matter; and
- (iii) They ought in fairness to be considered together.

§ 1080.9 Rights of witnesses in investigations.

(a) Any person compelled to submit documentary material, tangible things, or written reports or answers to questions to the Bureau, or to testify in an investigational hearing, shall be entitled to retain a copy or, on payment of lawfully prescribed costs, request a copy of the materials, things, reports, or written answers submitted, or a transcript of his or her testimony. The Bureau, however, may for good cause deny such a request and limit the witness to inspection of the official transcript of the testimony. Upon completion of transcription of the testimony of the witness, the witness shall be offered an opportunity to read the transcript of his or her testimony. Any changes by the witness shall be entered and identified upon the transcript by the Bureau investigator with a statement of the reasons given by the witness for making such changes. The transcript shall then be signed by the witness and submitted to the Bureau unless the witness cannot be found, is ill, waives in writing his or her right to signature, or refuses to sign. If the signed transcript is not submitted to the Bureau within 30 calendar days of the witness being afforded a reasonable opportunity to review it, the Bureau investigator, or the individual transcribing the testimony acting at the Bureau investigator's direction, shall sign the transcript and state on the record the fact of the waiver, illness, absence of the witness, or the refusal to sign, together with any reasons given for the failure to sign.

(b) Any witness compelled to appear in person at an investigational hearing may be accompanied, represented, and advised by counsel as follows:

(1) Counsel for a witness may advise the witness, in confidence and upon the initiative of either counsel or the witness, with respect to any question asked of the witness where it is claimed that a witness is privileged to refuse to answer the question. Counsel may not otherwise consult with the witness while a question directed to the witness is pending.

(2) Any objections made under the rules in this part shall be made only for the purpose of protecting a constitutional or other legal right or privilege, including the privilege against self-incrimination. Neither the witness nor counsel shall otherwise object or refuse to answer any question. Any objection during an investigational hearing shall be stated concisely on the record in a nonargumentative and nonsuggestive manner. Following an objection, the examination shall proceed

and the testimony shall be taken, except for testimony requiring the witness to divulge information protected by the claim of privilege or work product.

(3) Counsel for a witness may not, for any purpose or to any extent not allowed by paragraphs (b)(1) and (2) of this section, interrupt the examination of the witness by making any objections or statements on the record. Petitions challenging the Bureau's authority to conduct the investigation or the sufficiency or legality of the civil investigative demand shall be addressed to the Bureau in advance of the hearing in accordance with § 1080.6(e). Copies of such petitions may be filed as part of the record of the investigation with the Bureau investigator conducting the investigational hearing, but no arguments in support thereof will be allowed at the hearing.

(4) Following completion of the examination of a witness, counsel for the witness may, on the record, request that the Bureau investigator conducting the investigational hearing permit the witness to clarify any of his or her answers. The grant or denial of such request shall be within the sole discretion of the Bureau investigator conducting the hearing.

(5) The Bureau investigator conducting the hearing shall take all necessary action to regulate the course of the hearing to avoid delay and to prevent or restrain disorderly, dilatory, obstructionist, or contemptuous conduct, or contemptuous language. Such Bureau investigator shall, for reasons stated on the record, immediately report to the Bureau any instances where an attorney has allegedly refused to comply with his or her obligations under the rules in this part, or has allegedly engaged in disorderly, dilatory, obstructionist, or contemptuous conduct, or contemptuous language in the course of the hearing. The Bureau will thereupon take such further action, if any, as the circumstances warrant, including actions consistent with those described in 12 CFR 1081.107(c) to suspend or disbar the attorney from further practice before the Bureau or exclude the attorney from further participation in the particular investigation.

§ 1080.10 Noncompliance with civil investigative demands.

(a) In cases of failure to comply in whole or in part with Bureau civil investigative demands, appropriate action may be initiated by the Bureau, including actions for enforcement.

(b) The Director, the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement,

and the General Counsel of the Bureau are authorized to:

(1) Institute, on behalf of the Bureau, an enforcement proceeding in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which a person resides, is found, or transacts business, in connection with the failure or refusal of such person to comply with, or to obey, a civil investigative demand in whole or in part if the return date or any extension thereof has passed; and

(2) Seek civil contempt or other appropriate relief in cases where a court order enforcing a civil investigative demand has been violated.

§ 1080.11 Disposition.

(a) When the facts disclosed by an investigation indicate that an enforcement action is warranted, further proceedings may be instituted in Federal or State court or pursuant to the Bureau's administrative adjudicatory process. Where appropriate, the Bureau also may refer investigations to appropriate Federal, State, or foreign governmental agencies.

(b) When the facts disclosed by an investigation indicate that an enforcement action is not necessary or would not be in the public interest, the investigational file will be closed. The matter may be further investigated, at any time, if circumstances so warrant.

(c) The Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement and the Deputy Assistant Directors of the Office of Enforcement are authorized to close Bureau investigations.

§ 1080.12 Orders requiring witnesses to testify or provide other information and granting immunity.

The Director has the nondelegable authority to request approval from the Attorney General of the United States for the issuance of an order requiring a witness to testify or provide other information and granting immunity under 18 U.S.C. 6004.

§ 1080.13 Custodians.

(a) The Bureau shall designate a custodian and one or more deputy custodians for material to be delivered pursuant to a civil investigative demand in an investigation. The custodian shall have the powers and duties prescribed by 12 CFR 1070.3 and section.1052 of the Act, 12 U.S.C. 5562. Deputy custodians may perform all of the duties assigned to custodians.

(b) Material produced pursuant to a civil investigative demand, while in the custody of the custodian, shall be for the official use of the Bureau in accordance with the Act; but such material shall upon reasonable notice to the custodian

be made available for examination by the person who produced such material, or his or her duly authorized representative, during regular office hours established for the Bureau.

§ 1080.14 Confidential treatment of demand material and non-public nature of investigations.

(a) Documentary materials, written reports, answers to questions, tangible things or transcripts of oral testimony the Bureau receives in any form or format pursuant to a civil investigative demand are subject to the requirements and procedures relating to the disclosure of records and information set forth in part 1070 of this title.

(b) Bureau investigations generally are non-public. Bureau investigators may disclose the existence of an investigation to potential witnesses or third parties to the extent necessary to advance the investigation.

Dated: June 4, 2012.

Richard Cordray,
Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

[FR Doc. 2012-14047 Filed 6-28-12; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P

BUREAU OF CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION

12 CFR Part 1082

[Docket No. CFPB-2011-0005]

RIN 3170-AA02

State Official Notification Rule

AGENCY: Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (Dodd-Frank Act) requires the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (Bureau) to prescribe rules establishing procedures that govern the process by which State Officials notify the Bureau of actions undertaken pursuant to the authority granted to the States to enforce the Dodd-Frank Act or regulations prescribed thereunder. This final State Official Notification Rule (Final Rule) sets forth the procedures to govern this process.

DATES: The Final Rule is effective June 29, 2012.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Veronica Spicer, Office of Enforcement, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 1700 G Street NW., Washington, DC 20552, at (202) 435-7545.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Background

The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (Dodd-Frank Act) was signed into law on July 21, 2010. Title X of the Dodd-Frank Act established the Bureau to regulate the offering and provision of consumer financial products or services under the Federal consumer financial laws. Section 1042 of the Dodd-Frank Act, 12 U.S.C. 5552, governs the enforcement powers of the States under the Dodd-Frank Act. Under section 1042(a), a State attorney general or regulator (State Official) may bring an action to enforce Title X of the Dodd-Frank Act and regulations issued thereunder. Prior to initiating any such action, the State Official is required to provide notice of the action to the Bureau and the prudential regulator, if any, pursuant to section 1042(b) of the Dodd-Frank Act. Section 1042(b) further authorizes the Bureau to intervene in the State Official's action as a party, remove the action to a Federal district court, and appeal any order or judgment.

Pursuant to section 1042(c) of the Dodd-Frank Act, the Bureau is required to issue regulations implementing the requirements of section 1042. On July 28, 2011, the Bureau promulgated the State Official Notification Rule (Interim Final Rule) with a request for comment. The comment period for the Interim Final Rule ended on September 26, 2011. After reviewing and considering the issues raised by the comments, the Bureau now promulgates the Final Rule establishing a procedure for the timing and content of the notice required to be provided by State Officials pursuant to section 1042(b) of the Dodd-Frank Act, 12 U.S.C. 5552(b).

II. Summary of the Final Rule

Like the Interim Final Rule, the Final Rule implements a procedure for the timing and content of the notice required by section 1042(b), sets forth the responsibilities of the recipients of the notice, and specifies the rights of the Bureau to participate in actions brought by State Officials under section 1042(a) of the Dodd-Frank Act. In drafting the Final Rule, the Bureau endeavored to create a process that would provide both the Bureau and, where applicable, the prudential regulators with timely notice of pending actions and account for the investigation and litigation needs of State regulators and law enforcement agencies. In keeping with this approach, the Final Rule provides for a default notice period of at least ten calendar days, with exceptions for emergencies and other extenuating circumstances,

and requires substantive notice that is both straightforward and comprehensive. The Final Rule further makes clear that the Bureau can intervene as a party in an action brought by a State Official under Title X of the Dodd-Frank Act or a regulation prescribed thereunder, provides for the confidential treatment of non-public information contained in the notice if a State so requests, and provides that provision of notice shall not be deemed a waiver of any applicable privilege. In addition, the Final Rule specifies that the notice provisions do not create any procedural or substantive rights for parties in litigation against the United States or against a State that brings an action under Title X of the Dodd-Frank Act or a regulation prescribed thereunder.

III. Legal Authority

Section 1042(c) of the Dodd-Frank Act authorizes the Bureau to prescribe regulations implementing the requirements of section 1042(b). In addition, the Bureau has general rulemaking authority pursuant to section 1022(b)(1) of the Dodd-Frank Act to prescribe rules to enable the Bureau to administer and carry out the purposes and objectives of the Federal consumer financial laws and to prevent evasions thereof.

IV. Overview of Comments Received

In response to the Interim Final Rule, the Bureau received several comments. Four letters were received from associations representing the financial industry, two letters were received from financial industry regulators and supervisors, and one letter was received from an individual consumer. The Bureau also received a comment letter from a financial industry regulator in response to its **Federal Register** notification of November 21, 2011, regarding the information collection requirements associated with the Interim Final Rule pursuant to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA), Public Law 104-13. All of the comments are available for review on www.regulations.gov.

The financial industry associations' comments fell into several general categories. Several comments expressed concerns about the Bureau's ability to maintain confidentiality for notification materials received by the Bureau. Other commenters requested clarity as to the type of actions for which the Bureau requires notification. One commenter requested that the Bureau require uniform interpretation by States of all Federal law within the Bureau's jurisdiction.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WITH RFPA

The Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (RFPA) does not apply to the disclosure of financial records or information to the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) “in the exercise of its authority with respect to a financial institution.” 12 U.S.C. § 3413(r). This civil investigative demand is also issued in connection with an investigation within the meaning of section 3413(h)(1)(A) of the RFPA. Therefore, in accordance with section 3403(b) of the RFPA, the undersigned certifies that, to the extent applicable, the provisions of the RFPA have been complied with as to the Civil Investigative Demand issued to UniRush LLC also d/b/a as UniRush Financial Services, Rush Communications, LLC, and Unifund CCR Partners, Inc., to which this Certificate is attached.

The information obtained will be used to determine whether the persons named or referred to in the attached Civil Investigative Demand are in compliance with laws administered by the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The information may be transferred to another department or agency consistent with the RFPA.

Under the RFPA, good faith reliance on this certificate relieves the recipient and its employees and agents of any liability to customers in connection with the requested disclosures of financial records of these customers. *See* 12 U.S.C. § 3417(c).

Deborah Morris

Digitally signed by Deborah Morris
DN: cn=Deborah Morris, o=CFPB, ou=SEFL
email=deborah.morris@cfpb.gov, c=US
Date: 2015.10.27 12:28:14 -04'00'

Deborah Morris
Consumer Financial Protection Bureau
Deputy Enforcement Director

CONSUMER FINANCIAL PROTECTION BUREAU
Washington, D.C. 20552

Notice to Persons Supplying Information

You have been asked to supply information or speak voluntarily, or directed to provide sworn testimony, documents, or answers to questions in response to a civil investigative demand (CID) from the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (Bureau). This notice discusses certain legal rights and responsibilities. Unless stated otherwise, the information below applies whether you are providing information voluntarily or in response to a CID.

A. False Statements; Perjury

False Statements. Section 1001 of Title 18 of the United States Code provides as follows:

[W]hoever, in any matter within the jurisdiction of the executive ... branch of the Government of the United States, knowingly and willfully-- (1) falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact; (2) makes any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation; or (3) makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry; shall be fined under this title ...[or] imprisoned not more than 5 years ..., or both.

Perjury. Section 1621 of Title 18 of the United States Code provides as follows:

Whoever ... having taken an oath before a competent tribunal, officer, or person, in any case in which a law of the United States authorizes an oath to be administered, that he will testify, declare, depose, or certify truly or that any written testimony, declaration, deposition, or certificate by him subscribed, is true willfully and contrary to such oath states or subscribes any material matter which he does not believe to be true ... is guilty of perjury and shall, except as otherwise expressly provided by law, be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. This section is applicable whether the statement or subscription is made within or without the United States.

B. The Fifth Amendment; Your Right to Counsel

Fifth Amendment. Information you provide may be used against you in any federal, state, local or foreign administrative, civil or criminal proceeding brought by the Bureau or any other agency. If you are an individual, you may refuse, in accordance with the rights guaranteed to you by the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to give any information that may tend to incriminate you or subject you to criminal liability, including fine, penalty or forfeiture.

Counsel. You have the right to be accompanied, represented and advised by counsel of your choice. For further information, you should consult Bureau regulations at 12 C.F.R. § 1080.9(b).

C. Effect of Not Supplying Information

Persons Directed to Supply Information Pursuant to CID. If you fail to comply with the CID, the Bureau may seek a court order requiring you to do so. If such an order is obtained and you still fail to supply the information, you may be subject to civil and criminal sanctions for contempt of court.

Persons Requested to Supply Information Voluntarily. There are no sanctions for failing to provide all or any part of the requested information. If you do not provide the requested information, the Bureau may choose to send you a CID or subpoena.

D. Privacy Act Statement

The information you provide will assist the Bureau in its determinations regarding violations of Federal consumer financial laws. The information will be used by and disclosed to Bureau personnel and contractors or other agents who need the information to assist in activities related to enforcement of Federal consumer financial laws. The information may also be disclosed for statutory or regulatory purposes, or pursuant to the Bureau's published Privacy Act system of records notice, to:

- a court, magistrate, administrative tribunal, or a party in litigation;
- another federal or state agency or regulatory authority;
- a member of Congress; and
- others as authorized by the Bureau to receive this information.

This collection of information is authorized by 12 U.S.C. §§ 5511, 5562.