Portfolio Media. Inc. | 860 Broadway, 6th Floor | New York, NY 10003 | www.law360.com
Phone: +1 646 783 7100 | Fax: +1 646 783 7161 | customerservice@law360.com

2nd Circ.'s Broad View Of Insider Trader's Civil Liability

Law360, New York (February 27, 2014, 6:40 PM ET) -- On Feb. 18, 2014, in U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission v. Contorinis,[1] the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit affirmed an order requiring Joseph Contorinis to personally disgorge more than $7 million in insider trading profits realized by a fund he co-managed, even though he did not personally receive those profits. In doing so, the court continued its expansive reading of civil liability for insider trading.

The Second Circuit's broad view of civil disgorgement follows an earlier opinion in which the court adopted a similarly expansive view of what is required to establish civil liability for insider trading. In 2012, in SEC v. Obus,[2] the Second Circuit held that actual knowledge of a breach of a duty was not required to establish civil liability for either a tipper or a tippee. Rather, a tipper's liability could flow from recklessly disregarding the nature of the confidential or nonpublic information, and a tippee's liability could arise if he had "reason to know"[3] that the information may have been disclosed in violation of a duty of confidentiality.

Contorinis will facilitate the SEC's pursuit of large civil recoveries beyond the tippee's personal benefit from any insider trading.

Background

Joseph Contorinis was a managing director at Jeffries & Company Inc. who executed several trades involving the stock of the supermarket chain Albertson's Inc. ahead of its 2006 buyout.[4] In 2010, Contorinis was convicted of making several trades based on tips from a former banker at UBS AG who was privy to confidential information concerning the buyout.[5] These trades were made not for Contorinis' personal account, but only on behalf of the Jeffries Paragon Fund that he co-managed.[6] The court, in his criminal case, found Contorinis' "personal profit" to be $427,875 of "linked compensation from the trades" and ordered forfeiture of that amount.[7]

The recent Second Circuit opinion arose out of a subsequent civil case brought by the SEC seeking disgorgement from Contorinis of the profits obtained by the Paragon Fund.[8] The district court granted summary judgment for the SEC and ordered disgorgement of $7,260,604, reflecting the fund's profits, prejudgment interest of $2,485,205 on the entire disgorgement amount, and a civil penalty of $1 million.[9] Contorinis appealed the judgment insofar as it required him to disgorge the amount obtained by the Paragon Fund and related prejudgment interest, arguing that it was a misapplication of the principle of disgorgement.[10]

"The question is thus posed whether an insider trader can be required to disgorge not only the profit that he personally enjoyed from his exploitation of inside information, but also the profits of such

exploitation that he channeled to friends, family, or clients."[11]

The Court's Decision

The court began its analysis by noting that it had "long applied" the principle of disgorgement in the tipper-tippee context to require disgorgement of "the benefit that accrues to third parties whose gains can be attributed to the wrongdoer's conduct."[12] The court explained that this must be so because a tipper could achieve the same result by either trading on inside information and passing on the profit to a third party, trading directly for their account, or by passing the information to the third party "who he knows will spin the information into gold by trading on it themselves."[13] In each instance, the wrong committed and the economic result would be the same.

"Whether the defendant's motive is direct economic profit, self-aggrandizement, psychic satisfaction from benefiting a loved one, or future profits by enhancing one's reputation as a successful fund manager, the insider trader who trades for another's account has engaged in a fraud, secured a benefit thereby, and directed the profits of the fraud where he has chosen them to go."[14]

The court opined that the case for disgorgement under the facts before it, of a tippee trading for the benefit of others, was even stronger than the case for disgorgement against a tipper. A tipper may not know the extent to which the tippee will trade, and thus would have no idea of the potential exposure to disgorgement. In contrast, Contorinis "controlled the size and timing of the trades" and received financial and other reputational benefits from the trades.[15]

Notably, the court made clear that disgorgement of gains that accrue to innocent third parties was not mandatory, but rather within the discretion of the district court.[16] The court remarked on disgorgement's remedial purpose—"disgorgement is imposed not to punish, but to ensure illegal actions do not yield unwarranted enrichment" — and held that "[d]istrict courts possess the equitable discretion to determine whether disgorgement liability should fall upon third parties or violators."[17]

Contorinis argued that ordering him to disgorge the Paragon Fund's profits in the SEC's civil case would be inconsistent with the holding in his criminal case, in which criminal forfeiture was limited to his personal gain.[18]

The majority disagreed based on the different purposes of criminal forfeiture and civil disgorgement: "[D]isgorgement is an equitable remedy that prevents unjust enrichment, and criminal forfeiture a statutory legal penalty imposed as punishment."[19] The court also noted that criminal forfeiture is mandatory and imposed by statute, whereas disgorgement is an equitable remedy within the court's discretion. [20]

The court found that failure to order civil disgorgement for defendants such as Contorinis "would allow them to unjustly enrich their affiliates," and thus the district court's order here "serves disgorgement's core remedial function."[21]

Implications

Contorinis provides discretion in the Second Circuit for the SEC to seek disgorgement from fund managers personally or from the investment funds they manage.[22] When considering the implications of this discretion, it is also important to bear in mind the range of potential civil penalties.

Before the district court, the SEC sought not only disgorgement from Contorinis, but also a civil penalty of three times the disgorged amount, or more than $21 million dollars. Judge Richard Sullivan exercised his discretion to award the full disgorgement of $7 million, together with a $1 million penalty.[23] The Second Circuit's affirmance of the disgorgement order leaves open the possibility that civil penalties in future cases could be calculated with those total profits as a reference, and therefore a fund manager could be subject to a civil judgment of up to four times the fund's profits, plus interest.

Going forward, as was the case in Contorinis, the SEC may seek the maximum disgorgement and civil penalty, leaving district courts with broad discretion.

The implications of Contorinis may also be informed by Rajat Gupta's appeal of the $13.9 million civil penalty assessed against him for providing information to Raj Rajaratnam, which is presently before the Second Circuit.[24] There, the court assessed no disgorgement, but rather a civil penalty of three times the relevant trading profits gained by Rajaratnam, even though Gupta received no profits himself. If the lower courts read Contorinis to mean that insider traders may liable for profits they did not personally receive, Gupta may soon inform whether and when they can also be held liable for multiples of that amount.

Conclusion

Contorinis is the most recent reflection of the Second Circuit's broad view of civil liability for insider trading. As such, it may embolden the SEC's pursuit of insider trading cases and of civil recoveries beyond the reach of criminal forfeiture of personal profits, and extending to any profits channeled to others. And with another high-profile civil insider trading case on its docket, we can expect to hear more from the Second Circuit in the near future.

—By Joel C. Haims and Kayvan B. Sadeghi, Morrison & Foerster LLP

Joel Haims is a partner and Kayvan Sadeghi is of counsel in Morrison & Foerster's New York office.

The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the firm, its clients, or Portfolio Media Inc., or any of its or their respective affiliates. This article is for general information purposes and is not intended to be and should not be taken as legal advice.

[1] Slip Op., No. 12-1723-cv (Feb. 18, 2014).

[2] 693 F.3d 276 (2d Cir. 2012). In Obus, the SEC alleged that a tipper revealed information to his friend who worked for a hedge fund, who in turn relayed that information to his boss, who traded based on the information.

[3] Obus, 693 F.3d at 289.

[4] Contorinis, Slip Op. at 4.

[5] Id. at 4-5.

[6] Id. at 5.

[7] Id. at 6.

[8] Id. at 6.

[9] Id. at 7.

[10] Id. at 7, 9.

[11] Id. at 10.

[12] Id. at 10-11 (citing SEC v. Warde, 151 F.3d 42, 49 (2d Cir. 1998)).

[13] Id. at 12-13.

[14] Id. at 13.

[15] Id. at 14.

[16] Id. at 16.

[17] Id. at 22-23.

[18] Id. at 21.

[19] Id.

[20] See id. at 23. In dissent, Judge Chin noted that disgorgement is intended to return the defendant to the "status quo prior to the wrongdoing" and that the order here went beyond that by requiring Contorinis "to disgorge funds he never had and to pay back profits he never received." Id., Chin, J. dissenting, at 2.

[21] Id. at 22-23.

[22] The Second Circuit previously made clear that cumulative orders of disgorgement cannot be made against separate persons or entities with respect to the same profits. See SEC v. Hirshberg, Nos. 97-6171, 97-6259, 1999 U.S. App. LEXIS 4764 (2d Cir. N.Y. Mar. 18, 1999) (remanding for clarification that disgorgement orders did not impose cumulative liabilities).

[23] See SEC v. Contorinis, No. 09 Civ. 1043 (RJS), 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS, at *16 (S.D.N.Y. Feb. 3, 2012).

[24] See SEC v. Gupta, No. 13-3062 (2d Cir.). Briefing in that matter will continue through most of Spring 2014.
