

# The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt™ PUBLICATION

JUNE 2023

**Editor's Note: Yes, the Law Is Still Continuing to Develop**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**U.S. Supreme Court Clarifies Scope of Nondischargeable Debt in Favor of Victims of Fraud**

Lawrence J. Kotler and Drew S. McGehrin

**U.S. Supreme Court Rules that FBAR Penalties Are Per-FBAR Form, Rejecting IRS's Per-Account Position**

Susan Combs

**U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Rules That the Funding Structure for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Is Constitutional**

Diana M. Eng, Louise Bowes Marencik and Jonathan K. Moore

**Decision by New York's Highest Court Results in Account Debtor Owing Its Counterparty's Debts**

Deborah J. Enea and Steven Soffer

**Royalty Rights as Unsecured Claims: The Relevance of *Mallinckrodt* to M&A, Revenue or Royalty Interest Financings, and Other Transactions Involving Future Payment Streams**

Martin E. Beeler, Dianne F. Coffino and Peter A. Schwartz

**Denial of Assumption of Pre-Bankruptcy Workout Agreement Demonstrates How Settlement Value Can Change with Time and Circumstances**

Patrick E. Fitzmaurice and Claire K. Wu

**New York's "Small Business" Commercial Financing Disclosure Law**

Leonard A. Bernstein, Bob Jaworski and Richard Smith

**Subscription Credit Facilities: Continuation Funds**

Kiel A. Bowen and McKay S. Harline

**Lenders May Be the Next Government Focus for PPP Fraud**

Christopher L. Nasson, Hayley Trahan-Liptak, Robert M. Tammero, Jr and Christopher F. Warner



LexisNexis

# THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

---

VOLUME 140

NUMBER 6

June 2023

---

<b>Editor’s Note: Yes, the Law Is Still Continuing to Develop</b> Victoria Prussen Spears	275
<b>U.S. Supreme Court Clarifies Scope of Nondischargeable Debt in Favor of Victims of Fraud</b> Lawrence J. Kotler and Drew S. McGehrin	278
<b>U.S. Supreme Court Rules that FBAR Penalties Are Per-FBAR Form, Rejecting IRS’s Per-Account Position</b> Susan Combs	281
<b>U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Rules That the Funding Structure for the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau Is Constitutional</b> Diana M. Eng, Louise Bowes Marencik and Jonathan K. Moore	284
<b>Decision by New York’s Highest Court Results in Account Debtor Owing Its Counterparty’s Debts</b> Deborah J. Enea and Steven Soffer	289
<b>Royalty Rights as Unsecured Claims: The Relevance of <i>Mallinckrodt</i> to M&amp;A, Revenue or Royalty Interest Financings, and Other Transactions Involving Future Payment Streams</b> Martin E. Beeler, Dianne F. Coffino and Peter A. Schwartz	292
<b>Denial of Assumption of Pre-Bankruptcy Workout Agreement Demonstrates How Settlement Value Can Change with Time and Circumstances</b> Patrick E. Fitzmaurice and Claire K. Wu	298
<b>New York’s “Small Business” Commercial Financing Disclosure Law</b> Leonard A. Bernstein, Bob Jaworski and Richard Smith	302
<b>Subscription Credit Facilities: Continuation Funds</b> Kiel A. Bowen and McKay S. Harline	316
<b>Lenders May Be the Next Government Focus for PPP Fraud</b> Christopher L. Nasson, Hayley Trahan-Liptak, Robert M. Tammero, Jr and Christopher F. Warner	321

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

---

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

Matthew T. Burke at ..... (800) 252-9257  
Email: ..... matthew.t.burke@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) 487-3385  
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**

*Counsel, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP*

**MICHAEL J. HELLER**

*Partner, Rivkin Radler LLP*

**SATISH M. KINI**

*Partner, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP*

**DOUGLAS LANDY**

*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.

# Decision by New York’s Highest Court Results in Account Debtor Owing Its Counterparty’s Debts

*By Deborah J. Enea and Steven Soffer\**

*In this article, the authors discuss the implications of a decision by the highest court in New York causing an account debtor to ultimately pay double the amount that the account debtor owed.*

In *Worthy Lending LLC v. New Style Contractors, Inc.*,<sup>1</sup> New York’s highest court, the New York Court of Appeals, has ruled that a security interest includes a lender’s right to force the borrower’s account debtors to remit payments directly to the lender, regardless of whether an event of default exists.

Further, the court clarified that the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC) does not provide a distinction between a security interest and an assignment.

As a practical result, the account debtor in this case was obligated to pay the lender an amount equal to the amount of payments paid to the borrower instead of the lender, causing the account debtor to ultimately pay double the amount that the account debtor owed.

## **BACKGROUND**

In 2019, Worthy Lending LLC and Checkmate Communications LLC entered into a promissory note and security agreement (the agreement) whereby Checkmate could borrow up to \$3,000,000 (subject to increase) from Worthy. To secure the loan, Checkmate granted Worthy a continuing security interest in, and a lien on, all of Checkmate’s assets. Checkmate’s assets included all right, title, and interest in its accounts receivable. Worthy perfected its security interest by filing a UCC-1 financing statement with the New Jersey secretary of state upon the closing of the loan facility.

Checkmate’s accounts receivable included receivables from Checkmate’s invoices issued to its customers, including New Style Contractors, Inc., that had previously engaged Checkmate as a subcontractor. The agreement allowed Worthy the right to “notify and instruct account debtors . . . to remit payment of Accounts and other Collateral directly to Lender (Worthy)” before any default under the agreement by Checkmate.

---

\* The authors, attorneys with Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP, may be contacted at [deborah.enea@troutman.com](mailto:deborah.enea@troutman.com) and [steven.soffer@troutman.com](mailto:steven.soffer@troutman.com), respectively.

<sup>1</sup> *Worthy Lending LLC v. New Style Contractors, Inc.*, 39 N.Y.3d 99 (2022).

Shortly following the closing of the loan facility, Worthy sent a notice and collateral assignment to New Style, directing New Style to remit all payments due under the accounts receivable directly to Worthy instead of Checkmate. Worthy's notice also referred to UCC Section 9-406 in boldface type to inform New Style that any payments New Style made to Checkmate would not relieve New Style of its obligations to Worthy:

**Pursuant to Section 9-406 of the Uniform Commercial Code, payments of accounts made by New Style to Checkmate or to anyone other than Worthy Lending will not discharge any of New Style's obligations with respect to such Accounts, and notwithstanding any such payments, New Style shall remain liable to Worthy Lending for the full amount of such Accounts.**

Despite receiving this notification, New Style continued to remit payments to Checkmate. Subsequently, Checkmate defaulted on the loan, and Worthy demanded immediate repayment. Checkmate was unable to pay the principal and accrued interest under the loan and filed for bankruptcy.

Following Checkmate's bankruptcy declaration, Worthy sued New Style. Worthy alleged that New Style, which ignored Worthy's payment notice, was obligated to pay Worthy an amount equal to all amounts payable to Checkmate after New Style's receipt of Worthy's notice, regardless of whether those amounts were previously paid to Checkmate.

A trial court in New York held that New Style did not owe a duty to Worthy under the UCC on the basis that the rules cited by Worthy only applied to assignments and not security interests. An intermediate appellate court affirmed on similar grounds. Worthy "did not have an independent cause of action against [New Style] pursuant to UCC 9-607"<sup>2</sup> because Section 9-607(e) does not authorize a secured creditor, as distinct from an assignee, to recover from a nonparty debtor like New Style even though Worthy had directed New Style to pay Worthy instead of Checkmate."

## OUTCOME

The New York Court of Appeals reversed the decisions of both lower courts. The Court of Appeals held that (1) a secured creditor may, regardless of whether

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 9-607 of the UCC states:

If so agreed, and in any event after default, a secured party . . . may enforce the obligations of an account debtor or other person obligated on collateral and exercise the rights of the debtor with respect to the obligation of the account debtor or other person obligated on collateral to make payment or otherwise render performance to the debtor, and with respect to any property that secures the obligations of the account debtor or other person obligated on the collateral.

an event of default exists, assert its rights to receive payments due under any secured collateral directly from a borrower's account debtor if permitted under the loan documentation, and (2) the UCC does not provide a distinction between a security interest and an assignment.

The court interpreted the phrase "If so agreed" in Section 9-607 as a mechanism that allows parties to contractually determine the extent of a creditor's rights in the borrower's accounts receivable prior to a default. Any prohibition of this right would render Section 9-607 meaningless because the secured creditor already has statutory rights to step into the shoes of the borrower and collect on any obligations owed to the borrower by an account debtor after a default.

The court then analyzed whether the definition of "security interest" in the UCC distinguishes between a security interest and an assignment. The court referred to the language of the statute and the UCC Permanent Editorial Board (PEB) Commentary No. 21 issued in 2020 on the use of the term "assignment" in Article 9 of the UCC. The court found that under Sections 9-406 and 9-607, "an account debtor who receives a secured creditor's notice asserting its right to receive payment directly can pay the secured creditor and receive a complete discharge (UCC § 9-406(a)) or, if in doubt, can seek proof from the secured creditor that it possesses a valid assignment and withhold payment in the interim (UCC § 9-406(c))." In pointing to this language, the court concluded that there was no distinction between the two concepts. Further, the lack of distinction was a useful tool, the court argued, to promote efficiency in contracting.

While New Style may now be forced to pay double, the court strongly stated that this outcome is "the statutory consequence of failing to pay a secured party who has notified the account debtor to pay the secured party directly."

## **SIGNIFICANCE FOR BORROWERS AND DEBTORS OF BORROWERS**

For borrowers, this case highlights the significance of understanding the breadth of rights that can be granted to a secured lender and negotiating provisions that are problematic. Borrowers seeking to maintain good relations with key customers should alert their customers about provisions that grant borrowers' lenders broad collection rights in the borrowers' receivables.

Even more importantly, the case presents a clear shot across the bow to account debtors of borrowers to take notices from their counterparty's lenders seriously or else risk being on the hook for all, or part of, the debt owed by their counterparty. Any entity that receives a notice from their counterparty's lenders should consult counsel immediately or else risk double payment.