

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS**

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
FINANCIAL SERVICES INSTITUTE, INC.,
FINANCIAL SERVICES ROUNDTABLE,
GREATER IRVING-LAS COLINAS
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, HUMBLE
AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE DBA
LAKE HOUSTON AREA CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE, INSURED RETIREMENT
INSTITUTE, LUBBOCK CHAMBER OF
COMMERCE, SECURITIES INDUSTRY
AND FINANCIAL MARKETS
ASSOCIATION, and
TEXAS ASSOCIATION OF BUSINESS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

THOMAS E. PEREZ, SECRETARY OF
LABOR,
and
UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 3:16-cv-1476-M
Consolidated with:

3:16-cv-1530-C

3:16-cv-1537-N

**PLAINTIFFS' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S
NOTICE OF FACTUAL DEVELOPMENTS**

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this response to the Notice of the Defendant Department of Labor (the “Department,” or “DOL”) regarding purported “factual developments relevant to the parties’ cross-motions for summary judgment.” Dkt. 129.

1. DOL’s new IMO proposal is merely that—a proposal—and may never become law. In any event, the proposal crystallizes two points. *First*, it confirms that the Rule will upend the distribution system for fixed-indexed annuities, including the role played by independent marketing organizations (“IMOs”). As explained by Plaintiffs, the Department failed to consider these deleterious effects or account for the resulting costs in its cost-benefit analysis. Dkt. 59 at 24-28; Dkt. 61 at 38-40; Dkt. 62 at 29-32; Dkt. 107 at 17-18; Dkt. 108 at 15-18; Dkt. 109 at 29. Instead, the Department played down these problems, speculating that they could be addressed on an *ad hoc* basis if every IMO separately sought (and succeeded in receiving) an individual exemption from the prohibited transaction rules. *See* Dkt. 72-1 at 86-87; *see also* Proposed Best Interest Contract Exemption for Insurance Intermediaries, 82 Fed. Reg. 7,366, 7,341 (Jan. 19, 2017). After receiving nearly two-dozen applications for these *ad hoc* exemptions, the Department now tacitly acknowledges that the fix the Department advocated in litigation is not feasible and that the Rule’s impact on IMOs requires promulgation of a new rule.

In any event, this new proposal can do nothing to repair the flaws in DOL’s case before this Court. It is a “foundational principal of administrative law that a court may uphold agency action”—here, the Rule currently before the Court—“only on the grounds that the agency invoked when it took the action.” *Michigan v. EPA*, 135 S. Ct. 2699, 2710 (2015).

Second, the Department’s belated attempt to fix one of the Rule’s many defects highlights the regulatory overreach that afflicts the Rule as a whole. The Department erred regarding fixed-indexed annuities because they are outside its regulatory authority and expertise. So too, the

disclosure requirements of the securities laws; the appropriateness of proprietary financial products; the efficacy of class action litigation; and regulation and enforcement with respect to IRAs are matters that Congress never entrusted or delegated to DOL. DOL's complex new proposal—which occupies nearly 40 pages in the Federal Register—is the latest illustration of how DOL overextended itself into matters that are the province of other regulators and Congress.

2. The Notice asserts that the Department's FAQs show that its "explanations of the rulemaking" in its briefs and at oral argument were not "mere[] litigation posturing." In fact, the documents do nothing to allay Plaintiffs' concerns with the Rule, and at points merely illustrate the flaws Plaintiffs emphasized in their briefs and at the hearing. For instance, the January 13 FAQs further confirm that the Rule impermissibly transforms virtually all sales activity into fiduciary advice, in violation of the statute as well as the First Amendment. *See, e.g.*, FAQs on Your Rights and Financial Advisers 6 (Jan. 13, 2017) (including within the strictures of the Rule a "suggestion" that a person should "buy[] a particular security"). Even offering a *free* seminar to advertise services to potential customers could result in an agent or broker being slapped with the "fiduciary" label—if the agent or broker says anything during the seminar that might be interpreted as "a suggestion" that an attendee purchase or not purchase a security, she risks becoming a fiduciary "to all the attendees" at the seminar. Conflict of Interest FAQs (Part II - Rule) 9-10 (Jan. 13, 2017).

Dated: January 25, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Eugene Scalia

Eugene Scalia*
Jason J. Mendro*
Paul Blankenstein*
**GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER
LLP**
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 955-8500
Facsimile: (202) 467-0539
escalia@gibsondunn.com
jmendro@gibsondunn.com
pblankenstein@gibsondunn.com

James C. Ho, Texas Bar No.
24052766
Russell H. Falconer, Texas Bar
No. 24069695
**GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER
LLP**
2100 McKinney Avenue
Suite 110
Dallas, TX 75291
Telephone: (214) 698-3264
Facsimile: (214) 571-2917
jho@gibsondunn.com
rfalconer@gibsondunn.com

*Counsel for Plaintiffs Chamber of
Commerce of the United States of
America, Financial Services
Institute, Inc., Financial Services
Roundtable, Greater Irving-Las
Colinas Chamber of Commerce,
Humble Area Chamber of
Commerce DBA Lake Houston
Area Chamber of Commerce,
Insured Retirement Institute,
Lubbock Chamber of Commerce,
Securities Industry and Financial
Markets Association, and Texas
Association of Business*

s/ Joseph R. Guerra

Joseph R. Guerra*
Peter D. Keisler*
Eric D. McArthur*
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
1501 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 736-8000
Facsimile: (202) 736-8711
pkeisler@sidley.com
jguerra@sidley.com
emcarthur@sidley.com

Yvette Ostolaza (Bar No.
00784703)
SIDLEY AUSTIN LLP
2001 Ross Avenue
Suite 3600
Dallas, TX 75201
Telephone: (214) 981-3401
Facsimile: (214) 981-3400
yvette.ostolaza@sidley.com

Counsel for IALC Plaintiffs

s/ David W. Ogden

David W. Ogden*
Kelly P. Dunbar*
Jessica B. Leinwand*
Ari Holtzblatt*
Kevin M. Lamb*
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 663-6000
Facsimile: (202) 663-6363
david.ogden@wilmerhale.com
kelly.dunbar@wilmerhale.com
jessica.leinwand@wilmerhale.com
ari.holtzblatt@wilmerhale.com
kevin.lamb@wilmerhale.com

Andrea J. Robinson*
**WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP**
60 State Street
Boston, MA 02109
Telephone: (617) 526-6000
Facsimile: (617) 526-5000
andrea.robinson@wilmerhale.com

Michael A. Yanof, Texas Bar No.
24003215
**THOMPSON COE COUSINS &
IRONS, LLP**
700 North Pearl Street
Twenty-Fifth Floor – Plaza of the
Americas
Dallas, Texas 75201
Tel.: (214) 871-8270
Fax: (214) 871-8209
myanof@thompsoncoe.com

Counsel for ACLI Plaintiffs

(continued on next page)

Steven P. Lehotsky*
U.S. CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER
1615 H Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20062
Telephone: (202) 463-5337
Facsimile: (202) 463-5346
slehotsky@uschamber.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff Chamber of Commerce
of the United States of America*

J. Lee Covington II*
INSURED RETIREMENT INSTITUTE
1100 Vermont Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 469-3000
Facsimile: (202) 469-3030
lcovington@irionline.org

*Counsel for Plaintiff Insured Retirement
Institute*

David T. Bellaire*
Robin Traxler*
FINANCIAL SERVICES INSTITUTE, INC.
607 14th Street, N.W.
Suite 750
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (888) 373-1840
Facsimile: (770) 980-8481
david.bellaire@financialservices.org
robin.traxler@financialservices.org

*Counsel for Plaintiff Financial Services
Institute, Inc.*

Kevin Carroll*
Ira D. Hammerman*
SECURITIES INDUSTRY AND
FINANCIAL MARKETS ASSOCIATION
1101 New York Avenue, N.W.
8th Floor
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 962-7300
Facsimile: (202) 962-7305
kcarroll@sifma.org
ihammerman@sifma.org

*Counsel for Plaintiff Securities Industry and
Financial Markets Association*

Kevin Richard Foster*
Felicia Smith*
FINANCIAL SERVICES ROUNDTABLE
600 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 289-4322
Facsimile: (202) 589-2526
richard.foster@FSRoundtable.org
felicia.smith@FSRoundtable.org

Counsel for Plaintiff Financial Services Roundtable

* Admitted *pro hac vice*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on January 25, 2017, the foregoing document was electronically submitted with the clerk of the court for the United States District Court, Northern District of Texas, using the electronic case file system of the court. I hereby certify that I have served all counsel of record electronically or by another manner authorized by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5(b)(2).

s/ Eugene Scalia