

Milbank

January 9, 2009

Corporate Governance Group

Client Alert

BEIJING FRANKFURT HONG KONG LONDON LOS ANGELES MUNICH NEW YORK SINGAPORE TOKYO WASHINGTON, DC

FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT FINDS THAT MATERIAL ERRORS IN FINANCIAL STATEMENTS — IN THE ABSENCE OF AN ACTUAL RESTATEMENT — NOT SUFFICIENT TO SUPPORT A CLAIM UNDER SECTION 304 OF SARBANES-OXLEY

Actual Filing of Restated Financial Statements Required Before SEC May Bring Action

In a recent Client Alert, we discussed the ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in *In re Digimarc Corporation Derivative Litigation*¹ that section 304 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (“SOX”)² does not create a private right of action on the part of shareholders of affected corporations. On December 12, 2008, in *U.S. v. Shanahan*,³ decided just one day after *Digimarc*, the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Missouri similarly adopted a strict constructionist approach in interpreting section 304. In a case of first impression in the Eighth Circuit, the Court determined that section 304, which provides for disgorgement of certain executive officer bonuses and profits in the event “an issuer is required to prepare an accounting restatement due to the material noncompliance of the issuer, as a result of misconduct, with any financial reporting requirement under the securities laws,” requires the “actual filing of restated accounting reports” before its provisions apply.

Background

Under section 304 of SOX:

“If an issuer is required to prepare an accounting restatement due to the material noncompliance of the issuer, as a result of misconduct, with any financial reporting requirement under the securities laws, the chief executive officer and chief financial officer of the issuer shall reimburse the issuer for –

Please feel free to discuss any aspect of this Client Alert with your regular Milbank contacts or with any of the members of our Corporate Governance Group, whose names and contact information are provided herein.

In addition, if you would like copies of our other Client Alerts, please contact any of the attorneys listed. You can also obtain this and our other Client Alerts by visiting our website at <http://www.milbank.com> and choosing the “Client Alerts & Newsletters” link under “Newsroom/Events”.

This Client Alert is a source of general information for clients and friends of Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP. Its content should not be construed as legal advice, and readers should not act upon the information in this Client Alert without consulting counsel.
© 2009 Milbank, Tweed, Hadley & McCloy LLP. All rights reserved.
Attorney Advertising, prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

¹ 2008 WL 5171347 (9th Cir. 2008). This case was described in our Client Alert entitled “Ninth Circuit Finds No Private Right Of Action Under Section 304 Of Sarbanes-Oxley”, dated January 5, 2009.

² 15 U.S.C. § 7243.

³ 2008 WL 5211909 (E.D. Mo.).

(1) any bonus or other incentive-based or equity-based compensation received by that person from the issuer during the 12-month period following the first public issuance or filing with the Commission (whichever first occurs) of the financial document embodying such financial reporting requirement; and

(2) any profits realized from the sale of securities of the issuer during that 12-month period.”

The SEC has not adopted rules specifically implementing section 304, instead leaving interpretation to the courts.

Michael Shanahan, Sr. served as CEO and Chairman of the Board of Directors of Engineered Support Systems, Inc., a “holding company for a number of wholly-owned subsidiaries that design and manufacture military support equipment and electronics,” from its inception until April 2003 and as Chairman until May 2005. According to a complaint filed by the SEC, Engineered Support, with Shanahan’s “participation, knowledge and consent,” issued backdated stock options having an exercise price lower than the price of the Company’s common stock on the actual award date, in violation of the company’s shareholder-approved stock option plans. The SEC further contended that this backdating improperly increased the compensation of Engineered Support’s officers, employees and directors, which in turn “caused Engineered Support to file official documents with the Commission that [the company’s officers] knew, or were reckless in not knowing, contained materially false and misleading statements and omissions of material facts relating to the Company’s stock option program.” These “official documents” included the company’s financial statements. In addition to other relief, the SEC sought disgorgement by Shanahan of bonuses and profits under SOX section 304. In response, Shanahan filed a Motion for Partial Summary Judgment, asserting that the SEC “cannot prove a necessary element of” section 304.

The Court’s Analysis

Shanahan argued that since Engineered Support never actually filed restated financial statements, section 304 did not apply. The SEC countered that since an accounting restatement was required under general accounting principles to correct the material errors in the company’s financial statements, the fact that such a restatement was not actually prepared and filed did not detract from the Commission’s ability to seek disgorgement under section 304. In addressing this dispute, the Court noted that “[i]n interpreting the statute, this Court must be guided by the rule that, [c]ourts properly assume, absent sufficient indication to the contrary, that Congress intends the words in its enactments to carry their ‘ordinary, contemporary, common meaning’.”⁴

The Court disagreed with the SEC’s interpretation of the statute, ruling that “the ordinary, contemporary, common meaning of Section 304 is that, before penalties may be imposed, an issuer must be compelled or ordered to prepare a financial restatement, and must actually file the restatement.” The Court also determined that its reading of the statute was consistent with the legislative intent. Accordingly, because Engineered Support had not actually filed restated financial statements, the Court granted Shanahan’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and dismissed the SEC’s section 304 claim.

Conclusion

As with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals’ decision in *Digimarc*, the *Shanahan* Court narrowly construed the reach of section 304. This decision creates yet another barrier to penalizing corporate officers for wrongdoing under this section. Perhaps partially in response to continued criticism that the SOX legislation, and the SEC’s rule-making thereunder, reflect an over-reaction to the problems they were intended to address, these two recent decisions suggest that courts will continue to narrowly construe, and thereby limit the reach of, this and other provisions of SOX.

⁴ *Pioneer Inv. Servs. Co. V. Brunswick Assoc. Ltd. Partnership*, 507 U.S. 380, 388 (1993) (quoting *Perrin v. United States*, 444 U.S. 37, 42 (1979)).

Please feel free to discuss any aspect of this Client Alert with your regular Milbank contacts or with any of the members of our Corporate Governance Group, whose names and contact information are provided below.

Beijing

Units 05-06, 15th Floor, Tower 2
China Central Place, 79 Jianguo Road, Chaoyang District
Beijing 100025, China

Anthony Root +86-10-5969-2777 aroot@milbank.com
Edward Sun +86-10-5969-2772 esun@milbank.com

Frankfurt

Taunusanlage 15
60325 Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Norbert Rieger +49-69-71914-3453

nrieger@milbank.com

Hong Kong

3007 Alexandra House, 18 Chater Road
Central, Hong Kong

Anthony Root +852-2971-4842 aroot@milbank.com
Joshua Zimmerman +852-2971-4811 jzimmerman@milbank.com

London

10 Gresham Street
London EC2V 7JD, England

Stuart Harray +44-20-7615-3083 sharray@milbank.com
Thomas Siebens +44-20-7615-3034 tsiebens@milbank.com

Los Angeles

601 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Ken Baronsky +1-213-892-4333 kbaronsky@milbank.com
Neil Wertlieb +1-213-892-4410 nwertlieb@milbank.com

Munich

Maximilianstrasse 15 (Maximilianhoefer)
80539 Munich, Germany

Peter Nussbaum +49-89-25559-3636 pnussbaum@milbank.com

New York

One Chase Manhattan Plaza
New York, NY 10005

Scott Edelman +1-212-530-5149 sedelman@milbank.com
Roland Hlawaty +1-212-530-5735 rhlawaty@milbank.com
Thomas Janson +1-212-530-5921 tjanson@milbank.com
Robert Reder +1-212-530-5680 rreder@milbank.com
Alan Stone +1-212-530-5285 astone@milbank.com
Douglas Tanner +1-212-530-5505 dtanner@milbank.com

Singapore

30 Raffles Place, #14-00 Chevron House
Singapore 048622

David Zemans +65-6428-2555 dzemans@milbank.com
Naomi Ishikawa +65-6428-2525 nishikawa@milbank.com

Tokyo

21F Midtown Tower, 9-7-1 Akasaka, Minato-ku
Tokyo 107-6221 Japan

Darrel Holstein +813-5410-2841 dholstein@milbank.com
Bradley Edmister +813-5410-2843 edmister@milbank.com

Washington, DC

International Square Building, 1850 K Street
Washington, DC 20006

Glenn Gerstell +202-835-7585 gerstell@milbank.com