

# The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt™ PUBLICATION

MAY 2023

**Editor's Note: The Rules Are Getting Tighter and Tighter**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**A New "Operation Choke Point"? The Quickly Constricting Rules on Crypto Activities for Banks**

Douglas Landy, Glen R. Cuccinello, Leel Sinai and Chante Eliaszadeh

**Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Continues Rulemakings Related to Misrepresentation in Advertising: Digital Asset Businesses Still in the Crosshairs**

Hugh C. Conroy Jr., Brandon Hammer, Megan Lindgren and Richard Bae Gong

**Financial Crimes Enforcement Network Proposes Rule on Access to Beneficial Ownership Information**

Richard M. Alexander, Marcus A. Asner, James W. Cooper, David F. Freeman, Jr., Michael A. Mancusi, Kevin M. Toomey, Christopher L. Allen, Erik Walsh and Rebecca A. Caruso

**New Legislation to Expand Privacy Obligations of Financial Institutions Introduced in Congress**

Kirk J. Nahra, Peter G. Machtiger and Ali A. Jessani

**Core Considerations for Out-of-Network Buy Now, Pay Later Payments**

Evan R. Minsberg and Maria B. Earley

**Foreclosure Abuse Prevention Act – Due Process Considerations**

Morgan R. McCord

**How the U.S. Supreme Court's Upcoming Decision in *Slack v. Pirani* May Tilt the Legal Playing Field Between Investors and Issuers**

Douglas Baumstein, John Condon, Patrick McDonough and Aaron Megar



LexisNexis

# THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

---

VOLUME 140

NUMBER 5

May 2023

---

<b>Editor’s Note: The Rules Are Getting Tighter and Tighter</b> Victoria Prussen Spears	219
<b>A New “Operation Choke Point”? The Quickly Constricting Rules on Crypto Activities for Banks</b> Douglas Landy, Glen R. Cuccinello, Leel Sinai and Chante Eliaszadeh	222
<b>Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Continues Rulemakings Related to Misrepresentation in Advertising: Digital Asset Businesses Still in the Crosshairs</b> Hugh C. Conroy Jr., Brandon Hammer, Megan Lindgren and Richard Bae Gong	236
<b>Financial Crimes Enforcement Network Proposes Rule on Access to Beneficial Ownership Information</b> Richard M. Alexander, Marcus A. Asner, James W. Cooper, David F. Freeman, Jr., Michael A. Mancusi, Kevin M. Toomey, Christopher L. Allen, Erik Walsh and Rebecca A. Caruso	245
<b>New Legislation to Expand Privacy Obligations of Financial Institutions Introduced in Congress</b> Kirk J. Nahra, Peter G. Machtiger and Ali A. Jessani	250
<b>Core Considerations for Out-of-Network Buy Now, Pay Later Payments</b> Evan R. Minsberg and Maria B. Earley	255
<b>Foreclosure Abuse Prevention Act – Due Process Considerations</b> Morgan R. McCord	259
<b>How the U.S. Supreme Court’s Upcoming Decision in <i>Slack v. Pirani</i> May Tilt the Legal Playing Field Between Investors and Issuers</b> Douglas Baumstein, John Condon, Patrick McDonough and Aaron Megar	263

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

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

Matthew T. Burke at ..... (800) 252-9257  
Email: ..... matthew.t.burke@lexisnexis.com

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (973) 820-2000  
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) 487-3385  
Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341

Customer Service Website ..... <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 ..... (937) 247-0293

---

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7878-2 (print)

ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)

Cite this publication as:

The Banking Law Journal (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 designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It 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 RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2023 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., 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.

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://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**

**BARKLEY CLARK**

*Partner, Stinson Leonard Street LLP*

**CARLETON GOSS**

*Partner, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP*

**MICHAEL J. HELLER**

*Partner, Rivkin Radler LLP*

**SATISH M. KINI**

*Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP*

**DOUGLAS LANDY**

*Partner, White & Case LLP*

**PAUL L. LEE**

*Of Counsel, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP*

**TIMOTHY D. NAEGELE**

*Partner, Timothy D. Naegele & Associates*

**STEPHEN J. NEWMAN**

*Partner, Stroock & Stroock & Lavan LLP*

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL (ISBN 978-0-76987-878-2) (USPS 003-160) is published ten times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2023 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. 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 customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail [Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com](mailto:Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com). Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. 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 THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW, Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207.

# Foreclosure Abuse Prevention Act – Due Process Considerations

*By Morgan R. McCord\**

*In this article, the author considers whether a law now in effect in New York may be applied retroactively.*

New York Governor Kathy Hochul has signed the so-called “Foreclosure Abuse Prevention Act” (S.5473)(A.7737) (FAPA) into law. FAPA, which took effect immediately, was introduced by the legislature to address purported abuses of the judicial foreclosure process by foreclosing plaintiffs. According to the legislature, these abuses were exacerbated by the courts, warranting legislative abrogation of several appellate court decisions and, most notably, the New York Court of Appeals’ November 21, 2021 decision in *Freedom Mtge. Corp. v. Engel*.<sup>1</sup>

Among the critical changes, the law alters the impact of voluntary discontinuances, sets out new rules for successive foreclosure actions, changes how the statute of limitation is applied, and creates a new and significantly narrower version of the savings statute applicable to mortgage foreclosure cases.

Importantly, the law also expressly states that it applies retroactively, even though mortgagees have reasonably relied on settled appellate and New York Court of Appeals case law in extending assistance to distressed mortgagors, advancing monies on their behalf for real estate taxes, insurance and other things. The law’s express claim to apply retroactively while ignoring mortgagees’ substantive due process rights is concerning.

In short, under the new law, vested property rights conferred by final judgments of foreclosure and sale are in jeopardy. For example, the retroactive application of FAPA could result in dismissal of a complaint on statute of limitations grounds, thereby voiding a judgment and rendering a previously enforceable mortgage unenforceable.

## **CASE LAW**

New York Court of Appeals case law is instructive in analyzing whether the retroactive application of FAPA can survive a constitutional challenge. In 2020, the court reviewed and ultimately struck down retroactive application of

---

\* Morgan R. McCord, a member of Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott, LLC, focuses his practice on banking, financial services, consumer and commercial collections, and bankruptcy litigation. He may be contacted at [mmccord@eckertseamans.com](mailto:mmccord@eckertseamans.com).

<sup>1</sup> *Freedom Mtge. Corp. v. Engel*, 37 N.Y.3d 1 (2021).

another housing-related statute in *Matter of Regina Metro. Co., LLC v. New York State Div. of Hous. & Community Renewal*.<sup>2</sup>

In *Regina*, the court evaluated the constitutionality of applying certain amendments to the Rent Stabilization Law (RSL) included in the Housing Stability and Tenant Protection Act (HSTPA) retroactively. Specifically, the court addressed the retroactive application of part F of the HSTPA, which extended the statute of limitations for certain violations of the RSL; altered the method for determining legally regulated rent for overcharge purposes; and expanded the nature and scope of a landlord's liability in rent overcharge cases.

The court reasoned that if applied retroactively these amendments would impair substantive rights possessed by landlords, increase their liability for past conduct, and impose new duties with respect to transactions already completed. The court noted that it is precisely because retroactive legislation has the potential to undermine substantive rights and triggers fundamental concerns about fairness that it is viewed with "great suspicion," and a presumption against retroactivity is "deeply rooted" in U.S. Supreme Court jurisprudence.

With these considerations in mind, the New York Court of Appeals articulated a framework for evaluating whether retroactive application of a newly enacted statute comports with due process protections in the state and federal constitutions. To comport with due process, all legislation, whether prospective or retroactive, must be supported by "a legitimate legislative purpose furthered by rational means." Furthermore, because retroactive legislation presents problems of unfairness more serious than those posed by prospective legislation, there must be a persuasive reason for the potentially harsh impacts of retroactivity commensurate with the degree of the retroactive effect.

In short, the court articulated a balancing test, pitting the public policy purpose of the retroactive application of the statute against the substantive rights and reliance interests of the impacted parties. In cases where retroactive application cannot be justified given the scope and extent of settled interests, retroactive application will be struck down.

In reviewing prior precedent, the court in *Matter of Regina* found that there are two types of retroactive statutes that are constitutional under this test: those employing brief, defined periods that function in an administrative manner to assist in effectuating the legislation, and those where the retroactive application is integral to the fundamental aim of the legislation.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Matter of Regina Metro. Co., LLC v. New York State Div. of Hous. & Community Renewal*, 35 N.Y.3d 332 (2020).

In the case before it, the court found the retroactive period in part F was not rationally related to a legitimate governmental purpose. The retroactive period was neither brief nor defined, but rather bounded only by the length of the subject apartment's rental history.

Similarly, the court found that extending the statute of limitations for overpayment claims retroactively upended landlords' reasonable expectations of repose relating to conduct that may have occurred years prior to the recovery period. Likewise, by extending treble damages retroactively, landlords faced increased penalties for past conduct and/or new penalties for damages that were not previously trebled. The court further noted that these concerns are heightened when, as here, retroactive legislation "affect[s] contractual or property rights, matters in which predictability and stability are of prime importance."

Finally, the court evaluated specifically whether retroactive application of part F was rationally related to the statute's stated legislative purpose – increasing access to affordable housing. On this front, although the court acknowledged that increasing a landlord's liability for overpayments prospectively could potentially increase access to affordable housing, increasing such liability retroactively does not. Rather, to apply part F retroactively to punish landlords for past conduct, the court determined the statute impaired a landlord's real property rights by diminishing or possibly eliminating their constitutionally protected return on investment.

In weighing these factors, the court ultimately determined retroactive application of part F was not rationally related to a legitimate legislative purpose and thus violated landlords' due process rights under both the state and federal constitutions. The court noted that there was "no indication that the legislature considered the harsh and destabilizing effect on [landlords'] settled expectations, much less had a rational justification for that result."

Here, the retroactive application of FAPA suffers from the very same due process concerns. As in *Regina*, FAPA's retroactive period is neither brief nor defined, and only bounded in practice by the length of the mortgage – typically 30 years. Similarly, the retroactive application of FAPA expressly applies to cases in which final judgments of foreclosure and sale have been entered but a sale has not yet occurred, thereby upending the finality of judgments and impairing or eliminating mortgagees' vested property rights.

## CONCLUSION

Given the serious impact on mortgagees' property rights, including their reasonable reliance on the law in effect at the time in advancing monies for property taxes, insurance, property upkeep, and repairs – to name but a few –



it is noteworthy that the legislature does not appear to have articulated a rational justification for upsetting these rights.

As in *Regina*, retroactive application of FAPA may very well be determined to be not rationally related to a legitimate governmental purpose and not survive a constitutional challenge.