

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

DECEMBER 2015

VOL. 1 • NO. 9

PRATT'S
**GOVERNMENT
CONTRACTING
LAW**
REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: FOREIGN INVESTMENTS

Victoria Prussen Spears

FIVE QUESTIONS INVESTORS AND GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS MUST ANSWER REGARDING FOREIGN INVESTMENTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Damien C. Specht and Charles L. Capito

THE NEW DFARS INTERIM RULE ON NETWORK PENETRATION REPORTING AND CONTRACTING FOR CLOUD SERVICES: FIVE IMMEDIATE STEPS CONTRACTORS CAN TAKE TO COMPLY

Keir X. Bancroft

CHANGING COMPENSATION LANDSCAPE FOR GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS: NEW EXECUTIVE ORDER MANDATES PAID SICK LEAVE FOR EMPLOYEES OF GOVERNMENT CONTRACTORS, AND DEPARTMENT OF LABOR ISSUES FINAL RULE ON CONTRACTOR PAY TRANSPARENCY

Julia E. Judish and Rebecca C. Rizzo

THE YATES MEMO AND THE DOJ'S FOCUS ON INDIVIDUALS

Mark T. Calloway and Emily C. McGowan

IN THE COURTS

Steven A. Meyerowitz

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

VOLUME 1

NUMBER 9

December 2015

Editor's Note: Foreign Investments

Victoria Prussen Spears

281

Five Questions Investors and Government Contractors Must Answer Regarding Foreign Investments in the United States

Damien C. Specht and Charles L. Capito

283

The New DFARS Interim Rule on Network Penetration Reporting and Contracting for Cloud Services: Five Immediate Steps Contractors Can Take to Comply

Keir X. Bancroft

291

Changing Compensation Landscape for Government Contractors: New Executive Order Mandates Paid Sick Leave for Employees of Government Contractors, and Department of Labor Issues Final Rule on Contractor Pay Transparency

Julia E. Judish and Rebecca C. Rizzo

300

The Yates Memo and the DOJ's Focus on Individuals

Mark T. Calloway and Emily C. McGowan

308

In the Courts

Steven. A. Meyerowitz

313

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call:

Heidi A. Litman at 516-771-2169

Email: heidi.a.litman@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3000

Fax Number (518) 487-3584

Customer Service Web site <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3000

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT’S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT’S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2015 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt® Publication

Editorial Offices

630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800

201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200

www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

MARY BETH BOSCO

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

DARWIN A. HINDMAN III

Shareholder, Baker, Donelson, Bearman, Caldwell & Berkowitz, PC

J. ANDREW HOWARD

Partner, Alston & Bird LLP

KYLE R. JEFCOAT

Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP

JOHN E. JENSEN

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

DISMAS LOCARIA

Partner, Venable LLP

MARCIA G. MADSEN

Partner, Mayer Brown LLP

KEVIN P. MULLEN

Partner, Jenner & Block

VINCENT J. NAPOLEON

Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP

STUART W. TURNER

Counsel, Arnold & Porter LLP

WALTER A.I. WILSON

Senior Partner, Polsinelli PC

PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT is published twelve times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright 2015 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or

incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For permission to photocopy or use material electronically from *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, please access www.copyright.com or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 718.224.2258. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to government contractors, attorneys and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, and senior business executives. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher. POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Avenue, New Providence, NJ 07974.

The Yates Memo and the DOJ's Focus on Individuals

*By Mark T. Calloway and Emily C. McGowan**

The Department of Justice recently issued a memo to federal prosecutors implementing new policies that prioritize the prosecution of individual corporate employees' wrongdoing. The authors of this article explain the memo and its implications.

The Department of Justice (“DOJ”) recently issued a memo¹ (“Individual Accountability for Corporate Wrongdoing”) to federal prosecutors nationwide implementing new policies that—for the first time—prioritize the prosecution of individual corporate employees in “any investigation of corporate misconduct.” The clamor for individual prosecutions has intensified since the 2008 financial crisis, but holding individuals accountable has occasionally proven difficult. (The DOJ’s dismissal of the criminal investigation of Countrywide CEO Angelo Mozilo comes to mind.) The new policies are intended to increase scrutiny of high-level executives and pressure corporations to turn over evidence against their employees, in both criminal and civil proceedings. The memo is Attorney General Loretta E. Lynch’s first major policy announcement since taking office in April.

THE YATES MEMO

The so-called “Yates Memo”—named for Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, a career prosecutor and former U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Georgia—reaffirms the principle that corporations can commit crimes only through “flesh-and-blood people.” It asserts that individual corporate wrongdoers must be held personally accountable for the actions that they cause corporations to take.² The memo instructs DOJ attorneys not to give corporations credit for cooperation unless they first identify all people

* Mark T. Calloway, a partner at Alston & Bird LLP, is the former United States Attorney for the Western District of North Carolina. He concentrates his practice on white collar criminal defense and the defense of civil False Claims Act matters. Emily C. McGowan is an associate at the firm and a member of the Litigation & Trial Practice Group. The authors may be contacted at mark.calloway@alston.com and emily.mcgowan@alston.com, respectively.

¹ <http://www.justice.gov/dag/file/769036/download>.

² Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates, Remarks at New York University School of Law Announcing New Policy on Individual Liability in Matters of Corporate Wrongdoing (Sept. 10, 2015), <http://www.justice.gov/opa/speech/deputy-attorney-general-sally-quillian-yates-delivers-remarks-new-york-university-school>.

responsible for the corporate actions under investigation, regardless of position, status, or seniority, and to produce all facts relating to the alleged misconduct.

Specifically, the memo outlines “six key steps” prosecutors will adopt to strengthen the DOJ’s pursuit of individual corporate wrongdoing.

1. *To be eligible for any cooperation credit, corporations must provide to the Department all relevant facts about the individuals involved in corporate misconduct.* The DOJ will now demand identification of all involved individuals in criminal *and* civil investigations; companies that refuse or fail to do so will not be considered for cooperation credit. The DOJ may also require a company’s continued cooperation against relevant individuals even after the company has resolved the matter. Deputy Attorney General Yates told *The New York Times* that the DOJ won’t “be accepting a company’s cooperation when they just offer up the vice president in charge of going to jail.”³ Nor is corporate ignorance an excuse. As Deputy Attorney General Yates explained in a September 10, 2015, speech at NYU Law School about the new policies: “If [companies] want any cooperation credit, they will need to investigate and identify the responsible parties, then provide all non-privileged evidence implicating those individuals.”
2. *Both criminal and civil corporate investigations should focus on individuals from the inception of the investigation.* An early focus on individuals allows the DOJ to seek cooperation from individuals who will “provide information against individuals higher up the corporate hierarchy” and to coordinate charges against individuals and companies.
3. *Criminal and civil attorneys handling corporate investigations should be in routine communication with one another.* Improving communication between criminal and civil teams facilitates parallel investigations, a recent DOJ focus. For example, every civil qui tam whistleblower complaint is now sent to the Criminal Division to determine whether a criminal investigation should also be opened.
4. *Absent extraordinary circumstances, no corporate resolution will provide protection from criminal or civil liability for any individuals.* Unless a preexisting DOJ leniency policy (the Antitrust Division’s Corporate Leniency Policy, for example) applies, corporate resolutions won’t exempt individuals.

³ *The New York Times*’ report on the Yates Memo is available at <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/09/10/us/politics/new-justice-dept-rules-aimed-at-prosecuting-corporate-executives.html>.

5. *Corporate cases should not be resolved without a clear plan to resolve related individual cases before the statute of limitations expires and declinations as to individuals in such cases must be memorialized.* The corporate authorization memorandum seeking corporate resolution must discuss the potentially liable individuals and describe the status of their investigations. Decisions not to prosecute or bring civil claims must be memorialized in writing and approved by the U.S. attorney or assistant attorney general (or their designees).
6. *Civil attorneys should consistently focus on individuals as well as the company and evaluate whether to bring suit against an individual based on considerations beyond that individual's ability to pay.* The memo emphasizes that “accountability for and deterrence of individual misconduct” is just as important as “recovering as much money as possible.” Therefore, decisions to pursue civil actions against individual wrongdoers should not turn on whether the individual can pay a significant judgment; rather, DOJ attorneys should consider whether the conduct was serious, actionable, and sufficient to obtain and sustain judgment, as well as whether pursuing the action would reflect an important federal interest. The goal is “long-term deterrence” that will impact corporate culture.

The DOJ recognizes that the policies may result in “[l]ess corporate cooperation,” “fewer settlements” and “potentially smaller overall recoveries by the government.” The changes could also mean “fewer guilty pleas” as more individuals facing potential prison sentences “roll the dice before a jury.” The DOJ’s response? “[S]o be it.”

WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS? MANY.

The implications for this policy shift are fairly staggering for companies, not to mention executives. Aside from calling for increased vigilance and corporate reinforcement of compliance programs, the Yates Memo raises many questions that will need clarification.

- What happens if a company does not agree with the DOJ’s assessment that wrongdoing has occurred? Under the new policy, will the company not be viewed as “cooperating” even when it has provided full and complete information to the DOJ as part of its investigation? In other words, if the company does not agree with the DOJ’s view of the facts and the culpability of the individuals involved, is it not cooperating? If so, cooperation with a DOJ investigation does not mean “cooperating” in any normal sense of the term. Rather, it would mean that—in addition to providing full and complete factual information to the

government about the conduct at issue—the company must agree with the DOJ's view of the facts and theory of prosecution and not attempt to offer a factual defense on behalf of the individuals the DOJ views as culpable.

- What changes must occur to internal investigations by in-house or outside counsel when investigating compliance issues and responding to subpoenas? For example, in addition to standard “Upjohn” warnings in investigations, must there now also be a warning to individuals that a company is “cooperating” and anything the individual says will be turned over to the government because this is what the government requires? When will individuals’ right to counsel now kick in during interviews?
- What will be the impact on Deferred Prosecution and Non-Prosecution Agreements, which the DOJ frequently uses to resolve investigations of corporate wrongdoing? The policy is silent on these tools and how they will be affected.
- Whither the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine? Although facts are never privileged, the memo once again raises the issue of how companies can turn over the results of their internal investigations and a conclusion that certain individuals have committed wrongdoing without running the risk of waiving the attorney-client privilege. Indeed, the policy seems to be a return to the days when cooperation required a privilege waiver, or at least a waiver related to the company’s attorney work product related to an investigation.
- What are the collateral consequences? The policy says that there will no longer be individual releases as a matter of course, even in civil fraud cases. Thus, a company settling a civil case may still face collateral consequences for it and for its executives in civil litigation (for which indemnification may very well be required by statute or the company’s bylaws). There could also be collateral consequences in civil or regulatory matters related to any of the information that is turned over to the government as a part of the company’s attempt to “cooperate.”

CONCLUSION

The new policies are effective immediately (DOJ attorneys were to begin training on the new policies as early as September 16). And while the policies are unlikely to apply to open investigations that are already well underway, the memo “will . . . apply to those matters pending” as of September 9 “to the extent it is practicable to do so.” Updates to the United States Attorneys’

Manual (specifically, the Principles of Federal Prosecution of Business Organizations)⁴ and the commercial litigation provisions in Title 4⁵ are forthcoming.

There are many more questions than answers in the policy. And it will require a fundamental shift in how some aspects of a company's compliance program and internal investigations procedures operate.

⁴ USAM 9-28.000 et seq.

⁵ USAM 4-4.000 et seq.