

LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions
2013 Emerging Issues 6890

[Click here for more Emerging Issues Analyses related to this Area of Law.](#)

Since the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB or Bureau) came on line in July 2011, it has been aggressively investigating whether financial institutions and service providers, among others, have been engaging in conduct that, if proven, violates a Federal consumer financial law. Among the many tools in the CFPB's investigative arsenal are civil investigative demands (CIDs).

While the use of CIDs in regulatory investigations is nothing new, the power of CIDs has been brought into focus by two recent CFPB decisions denying petitions to modify or set aside CIDs. These decisions provide guidance for parties assessing whether to challenge the CFPB's request for documents and responses. In this article, we analyze the reasoning behind these decisions and identify issues that companies must be cognizant of while navigating the investigation and petitioning phases.¹

The CFPB's Rules Regarding CIDs. Section 1052 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 (Dodd-Frank Act) and the CFPB's final Rules Relating to Investigations (Final Rules) set forth the parameters that govern the Bureau's investigations. Under Section 1052(c), "[w]henver the Bureau has reason to believe that any person may be in possession, custody, or control of any documentary material or tangible things, or may have any information, relevant to a violation," the Bureau may issue a CID.² CIDs can be issued to compel documentary material, tangible things, written reports, answers to questions, and oral testimony. The recipient of a CID can petition the Director of the Bureau for an order modifying or setting aside the CID.³ The CFPB Final Rules impose several requirements on such petitions. First, any petition must be filed with the Executive Secretary of the Bureau

1. Amanda M. Raines is Counsel and A.J. Dhaliwal is Associate Attorney at BuckleySandler LLP. They are actively advising financial services clients in connection with examinations and investigations involving the CFPB.

2. Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, (HR 4173), Pub. L. No. 111-203, 124 Stat. 1376 (July 21, 2010), Section 1052(c)(1); *see also* Rules Relating to Investigations, [12 C.F.R. Part 1080](#) *et seq.*

3. Dodd-Frank Act, § 1052(f).

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)

 LexisNexis®

LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

with a copy to the Assistant Director of the Office of Enforcement within 20 calendar days after service of the CID, or, if the return date is less than 20 calendar days after service, then the petition must be filed prior to the return date.⁴ Extensions of this deadline are disfavored.⁵

Second, the petition “shall set forth all factual and legal objections to the civil investigative demand, including all appropriate arguments, affidavits, and other supporting documentation.”⁶ The attorney who objects to the CID must sign any objection.

Third, a petition must be accompanied by a signed statement representing that petitioner’s counsel has conferred with counsel for the Bureau in good faith pursuant to section 1080.6(c), and the parties have been unable to reach an agreement.⁷ Section 1080.6(c) requires the parties to meet-and-confer within 10 calendar days after receipt of the CID or before the deadline for filing a petition, whichever is earlier.⁸ The signed statement must recite the date, time, and place of each such meet-and-confer session, and the names of all parties participating.⁹ If some of the issues in controversy have been resolved, the statement shall specify the issues resolved and those remaining unresolved.¹⁰

The filing of a timely petition stays the time permitted for compliance with the portion of the CID being challenged.¹¹ Further, if the petition is denied in whole or in part, the Director’s ruling will set a new return date for compliance with the CID.¹²

The petition to modify the CID will be sent, along with the CFPB investigator’s statement in reply to the petition,¹³ to the Director of the CFPB who will issue an order accepting or

4. [12 C.F.R. § 1080.6\(e\)](#).

5. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(e)(2).

6. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(e).

7. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(e)(1).

8. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(c).

9. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(e)(1).

10. *Id.*

11. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(f)

12. *Id.*

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)

 LexisNexis®

LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

denying the petition. Unlike the confidential treatment provided to CID material and the investigation generally, once a recipient files a petition, and unless good cause can be shown otherwise at the time the petition is filed, the petition and Director's order in response are made public.¹⁴

The CFPB's First Orders Deny Petitions to Modify or Set Aside CIDs. Although the CFPB has been conducting investigations since July 2011, it did not issue its first ruling on a petition to modify or set aside a CID until September 20, 2012.¹⁵ In that case, the petition challenged a CID issued to a non-bank mortgage servicer (the Company) seeking responses to 21 interrogatories and 33 document requests.¹⁶ Director Cordray denied the petition in its entirety and ordered the Company to comply with the CID within 21 days.¹⁷ In doing so, he adopted the legal framework that would apply to such petitions and provided specific guidance for parties in determining their conduct in similar matters.¹⁸

The CID, served on May 22, was issued in connection with an investigation regarding whether ceding premiums from private mortgage insurance companies to captive reinsurance subsidiaries of certain mortgage lenders violates Section 8 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (RESPA).¹⁹ On May 29, the Company and the Bureau conducted a telephonic meet-and-confer, during which the Company objected to the applicable time periods and substantive aspects of the requests.²⁰ A day later, the CFPB sent a letter indicating a willingness to take a flexible approach to

13. The Bureau investigator may provide the Director with a statement setting forth any factual and legal response to a petition. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(e)(3). That statement, however, does not have to be served on the petitioner. *Id.*

14. 12 C.F.R. § 1080.6(g)

15. *Decision and Order on PHH Corporation's Petition to Modify or Set Aside Civil Investigative Demand*, In Re PHH Corporation, 2012-MISC-PHHCorp-0001 (Sept. 20, 2012), available at http://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201209_cfpb_phhcorp_petition_0001.pdf [hereinafter September Order].

16. *PHH Corporation's Petition to Modify or Set Aside Civil Investigative Demand* (June 1, 2012), available at http://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201209_cfpb_phhcorp_petition_0001.pdf [hereinafter June Petition].

17. See September Order, *supra* note 15, at 1.

18. *Id.*

19. *Id.*

20. *Id.* at 2.

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)

 LexisNexis®

LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

the CID to accommodate any identifiable undue burdens and offering to recommend four specific modifications to the CID in light of the Company's concerns.²¹

On June 4, 2012, the Company responded by specifying numerous objections and requesting an extension of time to file a petition. The CFPB replied on June 7 by accepting certain proposed resolutions and providing justifications for rejecting others. The CFPB further denied the Company's request for an extension to file a petition. The Company responded that it remained committed to working with the CFPB to resolve differences and again sought an extension of the deadline to file a petition. The CFPB denied the request to extend the deadline on June 11, thereby causing the Company to file its petition to modify or set aside the CID.

In the petition filed on June 12, the Company raised three main objections: (i) the CID did not state the nature of the conduct under the investigation;²² (ii) the CID was overly broad, unduly burdensome, and irrelevant;²³ and (iii) the CID requested materials going back more than 11 years when RESPA's statute of limitations was 3 years and the CFPB's enforcement power cannot be predicated on acts prior to July 21, 2010.²⁴

In denying the petition, the Bureau began by explaining that CIDs play a "crucial role" in the Bureau's ability to carry out its duty to enforce consumer financial laws.²⁵ It stated that the purpose of CIDs are to "close the [information] gap" between the Bureau and the subject company and/or individual in order for the Bureau to determine whether the investigation is worth pursuing, and if so, to what extent.²⁶

The CFPB then set forth the standard it will use to consider and resolve petitions to modify or set aside CIDs, adopting the deferential standard of review relied upon by Circuit Courts of Appeals in proceedings to enforce administrative subpoenas. That standard provides that a CID will be en-

21. *Id.*

22. See June Petition, *supra* note 16, at 2.

23. *Id.* at 5.

24. *Id.* at 3. The Company also asserted eight general objections to the CID.

25. See September Order, *supra* note 15, at 3.

26. *Id.* (emphasis added).

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)

 LexisNexis®

LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

forced if it satisfies the following requirements: (i) the investigation is for a lawfully authorized purpose; (ii) the information requested is relevant to the investigation; and (iii) procedural requirements are followed.²⁷ If the Bureau establishes these factors, the CID will be enforced unless the petitioner demonstrates the CID imposes an “undue burden” or constitutes an abuse of process.

With respect to the Company’s claim that the CID failed to state the nature of the conduct at issue, the Company argued that the CID’s description of the purpose of the investigation was broad enough to encompass every aspect of mortgage lending, and thus did not satisfy the notice requirement established by the Dodd-Frank Act.²⁸ In rejecting this contention, the Bureau found that “notice was provided from the outset and repeatedly thereafter” beginning as early as January 3 and through to May 22 in the CID’s “Notification of Purpose.” In support of this finding, the CFPB cited cases standing for the proposition that the subject matter of investigations can be provided “quite generally.”²⁹

With respect to the Company’s assertion that the CID was an overly broad and unduly burdensome “fishing expedition,”³⁰ the Bureau noted that the petition “offered little or no detail to make the kind of showing required to substantiate these claims.”³¹ It explained that in order to meet its legal burden, the petitioner needed to show the specific nature and the magnitude of the hardship and state specifically how compliance will harm its business. The CFPB noted also that it could not properly evaluate the burden of requesting responsive material because the Company failed to include its information technology personnel in the meet-and-confer discussions, despite the enforcement team’s request.³² The Bureau further noted that it already had made substantial modifications to the CID

27. *Id.* at 5.

28. See June Petition, *supra* note 16, at 2.

29. See September Order, *supra* note 15, at 6.

30. See June Petition, *supra* note 16, at 7.

31. See September Order, *supra* note 15, at 6.

32. *Id.* at 2-3.

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)



LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

through the meet-and-confer process, and the Bureau's enforcement team had stated that it was willing to consider other potential limitations.³³

Finally, with respect to the Company's objection that the CID sought documents, items, and information exceeding the applicable limitations period, the CFPB maintained that the relevant issue was not whether the information itself was actionable but rather whether that information was relevant to conduct that was actionable.³⁴ It cited authority that allowed discovery beyond the statute of limitations period and noted the importance of collecting relevant information in order to accurately and completely investigate a matter.³⁵

On October 5, the CFPB issued its second decision on a petition to modify or set aside a CID.³⁶ The petitioner, Next Generation Debt Settlement, Inc. (Next Generation), challenged a CID instructing it to appear for an investigational hearing, which is similar to a deposition, on September 12.³⁷ Director Cordray denied the petition in its entirety and ordered Next Generation to appear at an investigational hearing within 10 days of the Order.³⁸

The CID, served on August 3, was issued in connection with an investigation into whether certain companies engaged in unlawful acts or practices in the advertising, marketing, or sale of debt settlement services. On August 20, the Bureau contacted Next Generation to confirm its attendance at the investigational hearing.³⁹ Receiving no response, on August 29, the

33. *Id.* at 7.

34. *Id.* at 7-8.

35. *Id.* at 8.

36. *Decision and Order on Next Generation Debt Settlement, Inc.'s Petition to Modify or Set Aside Civil Investigative Demand*, In Re Next Generation Debt Settlement, Inc., 2012-MISC-Next Generation Debt Settlement-0001 (Oct. 5, 2012), available at http://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201210_cfpb_2012-MISC-Next-Generation-Debt-Settlement-0001-Order.pdf [hereinafter Next Generation Order].

37. *Id.* at 1. Investigational hearings are conducted by Bureau for the purpose of hearing the testimony of witnesses and receiving documentary material, tangible things, or other information relating to any subject under investigation. See [12 C.F.R. § 1080.7\(b\)](#). These hearings are conducted under oath or affirmation and stenographically reported. *Id.*

38. See Next Generation Order, *supra* note 36, at 1.

39. *Id.*

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)

 LexisNexis®

LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

Bureau sent a letter confirming Next Generation's attendance at the investigational hearing and alerting it to the fact that it had failed to meet-and-confer with the Bureau staff in accordance with the Bureau's rules regarding investigation.⁴⁰ On September 4, the Bureau received an e-mail from Next Generation's CEO, requesting that the CID be set aside.⁴¹ Next Generation offered eight reasons why it should not be required to respond to the CID, all of which focused on potential defenses.⁴²

The Director denied the petition for three reasons. First, the petition was not filed within the time permitted under the rules regarding investigations. Next Generation's petition was due on August 24, 2012 but was not filed until September 4, and Next Generation did not offer any arguments as to why its petition should be considered in spite of its untimeliness.⁴³ Second, the Company failed to meet-and-confer with Bureau staff before filing the petition, and the CFPB's rules are clear that only those issues discussed in the meet-and-confer process will be considered.⁴⁴ Finally, the Bureau ruled that even if Next Generation satisfied the rules of investigation, its petition had no merit.⁴⁵ In the petition, Next Generation asserted substantive defenses to charges the Bureau did not assert, arguing that Next Generation does not engage in direct consumer marketing or telemarketing or commit other acts that might violate federal consumer financial law.⁴⁶ But facts relating to whether Next Generation is covered by or has violated a federal consumer financial law are not defenses to the enforcement of a CID, even if they might eventually be defenses to legal claims contemplated in the CID.⁴⁷

Lessons of The CID Ruling. Petitioning a newly-founded government agency in un-chartered territories always is a difficult exercise. The increasing number of CFPB in-

40. *Id.*

41. *Next Generation Debt Settlement, Inc.'s Petition to Modify or Set Aside Civil Investigative Demand* (Sept. 4, 2012), available at http://files.consumerfinance.gov/f/201210_cfpb_2012-MISC-Next-Generation-Debt-Settlement-Inc-0001-3_Redacted.pdf [hereinafter *Next Generation Petition*].

42. *Id.* at 1-2.

43. See *Next Generation Order*, *supra* note 36, at 2.

44.[44] *Id.*

45. *Id.*

46. *Id.*

47. *Id.*

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)

 LexisNexis®

LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

investigations and enforcement actions will make that exercise even more challenging. In light of the Bureau's first two decisions on petitions to modify or set aside a CID, potential CID recipients may wonder: how is the CFPB likely to respond to future petitions?

First, within days of receiving the CID, petitioners must be prepared to assess the extent to which they wish to challenge the scope and breadth of the CID. As the meet-and-confer is required within 10 calendar days after receipt, it is crucial for recipients to hit the ground running with (i) appropriate personnel who can provide the basis for arguing the undue burden of responding to requests, and (ii) assistance from counsel to get recipients up to speed on the nature of the CID, forming responses, and time limits.

Second, the short turnaround time for filing a petition calls for quick strategic decision-making by the recipient. If the recipient chooses to file the petition, thereby preserving its objections and slowing down the CID process to gain time to examine its internal material, the petition and any order relating to it likely will be made public. Recipients may be forced to choose between preserving their right to object and public disclosure of a CFPB investigation.

Third, petitioners must be specific in their objections to a CID. Petitioners should specifically describe the burdens of supplying requested information and how the information sought is irrelevant to the investigation. The Bureau has criticized the use of "general objections," dismissing the arguments associated with those types of objections.⁴⁸

Fourth, petitioners must set forth objections that pertain to the requests presented in the CID. Next Generation argued in its petition that the CID should be waived or modified because the company had substantive defenses to any enforcement action. The CFPB rejected those arguments, stating that the Bureau has investigative authority "to discover and procure evidence, not to prove a pending charge or complaint, but upon which to make one if, in the Bureau's judgment, the facts thus discovered should justify doing so."⁴⁹ This part of the ruling sends a message *that a defense to the merits to the CFPB's investigations is not a defense to the CID itself.*

Last, given the deferential standard of review which will be applied to such petitions, the meet-and-confer sessions take on increased impor-

48. See September Order, *supra* note 15, at 8.

49. See, Next Generation Order, *supra* note 36, at 2.

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)

 LexisNexis®

LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

tance. The meet-and-confer session is an opportunity to narrow the scope of the requests and close the information gap between the CFPB and the subject of its investigation. As a prerequisite to filing a petition, CID recipients are obligated to confer with the Bureau in a good-faith and productive effort to resolve issues. In fact, the Final Rules provide that “[t]he Bureau will not consider petitions to set aside or modify civil investigative demands *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.*”⁵⁰ The CFPB’s emphasis on cooperation was illustrated by its hardline approach to Next Generation’s unresponsiveness and lack of effort to work with CFPB enforcement attorneys. Indeed, the Bureau noted in its first opinion that it already had made substantial modifications to the CID through the meet-and-confer process, suggesting that recipients are more likely to succeed with requests to modify a CID when they cooperate fully with Bureau attorneys from the onset, rather than take their chances with the Director.

50. [12 C.F.R. part 1080.6\(c\)\(3\)](#) (emphasis added).

[Click here for more Emerging Issues Analyses related to this Area of Law.](#)

About the Authors. Amanda M. Raines represents financial services industry clients in federal and state enforcement agency investigations and litigation, as well as in private civil and class action litigation. She has represented clients in investigations by the Department of Justice, the SEC, the FDIC, and state attorneys general, as well as in private class action litigation involving securities fraud, tax fraud, the Fair Housing Act, the Equal Credit Opportunity Act, the Civil Rights Act, and unfair and deceptive trade practices statutes. Ms. Raines received her J.D. from Case Western Reserve University School of Law, where she was the managing editor of the *Case Western Law Review*.

Amanjot (“A.J.”) Singh Dhaliwal is an associate in the Washington DC, office of BuckleySandler LLP. He assists financial services clients in litigation, regulatory and

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)



LexisNexis® Emerging Issues Analysis

Amanda M. Raines and A.J. Dhaliwal on

Petitions To Modify or Set Aside CFPB Civil Investigative Demands: Analysis of Recent Decisions

compliance matters, and counsels clients on federal laws including the Fair Credit Reporting Act, the Fair Debt Collections Practices Act, the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, and the Truth in Lending Act. He is the Immediate Past-President of the South Asian Bar Association of Washington DC (SABA-DC). He received his LL.M. from The George Washington University Law School, where he focused on international business transactions and trade law.

Emerging Issues Analysis is the title of this LexisNexis® publication. All information provided in this publication is provided for educational purposes. For legal advice applicable to the facts of your particular situation, you should obtain the services of a qualified attorney licensed to practice law in your state.

TOTAL SOLUTIONS

[Legal](#) [Academic](#) [Risk & Information Analytics](#) [Corporate & Professional](#) [Government](#)

