

President

Michelle M. Proia
Mettler-Toledo, Inc.
614.438.4870
michelle.proia@mt.com

Vice President and President Elect

Jonathan Dean
Eaton Corporation
216.523.4129
JonathanDean@Eaton.com

Secretary

William Davis
National City Corporation
216.222.3974
william.davis@nationalcity.com

Treasurer

John Moran
GrafTech International Ltd.
216.676.2397
john.moran@graftech.com

Program Chair

David G. Slezak
DentalCare Partners, Inc.
440.684.6966
dslezak@dcpartners.com

Pro Bono Co-chairs

Cynthia A. Binns
GrafTech International Ltd.
216.676.2288
cynthia.binns@graftech.com
John D. Moran
216.676.2397
john.moran@graftech.com

Sponsorship Co-chairs

Gail L. Cudak
Eaton Corporation
216.523.4077
gailcudak@eaton.com
Rhonda S. Ferguson
FirstEnergy Corporation
330.384.5620
rferguson@firstenergycorp.com

Immediate Past President and Communications Chair

D. Russell Hood
TravelCenters of America
440.808.7397
hood.russell@tatravelcenters.com

Board of Directors

Joseph Daprile
Steven Lee
Richard Legenza
Mark McClendon
John Ritchey
Michael Yaksic
J. Adam Zangerle

Chapter Administrator

Nancy Schneider
440.988.3213
neoacca@centurytel.net

Upcoming Events and Programs

- September 8** West side Brief Advice and Referral Clinic at the Spanish American Center, 4407 Lorain Road in Cleveland
- September 20** CLE Seminar: Securities Issues, Thompson Hine
- September 28** NEOACCA National Community Service Day with City Year
- October 18** CLE Seminar: Labor and Employment Law 101, Duvin, Cahn & Hutton
- November 15** CLE Seminar: Ethics, Professionalism and Substance Abuse, Porter Wright
- November 29** 5:00–8:00 PM, Social at The House of Blues

For more information on upcoming chapter programs and events, go to www.acc.com/chapters/neoacc.php.

NEOACCA extends sincere thanks to Special Counsel and JurInnov for underwriting the publication costs of this newsletter.



Nancy A. Schneider
Chapter Administrator
413 Oaknoll Dr.
Amherst, OH 44001

Michelle Proia President's Message

Many of you probably have received the invitation to ACC's 2007 Annual Meeting in Chicago scheduled for October 29 through October 31. If your schedule has been anything like mine, chances are that you have not thoroughly read the entire program brochure entitled, "Enjoying the Ride on the Track to Success." The opening lines of the brochure did, however, catch my eye as I was unpacking boxes shortly after I arrived to work for my new employer several weeks ago:

"We work hard to get our jobs done, and to advance in our careers, but in-house life is always full of twists and turns. Sometimes it feels like a roller coaster – no matter how well we map out our plans You can't control the issues that come up each day, and you may not know what is around the corner or where you will end up . . . with the right skills, you can actually enjoy the ride!"

The roller coaster analogy is a good one to describe the last couple of months for me. Most of my NEOACCA colleagues know that I recently relocated to Columbus after accepting a position as Assistant General Counsel, North America for Mettler-Toledo, Inc. This new opportunity will expand my international experience, while providing me with securities and corporate governance

responsibilities. I will report to General Counsel James Bellerjeau in our Switzerland headquarters. James serves on the board of ACC Europe as the representative for Switzerland and also is Chapter Treasurer.

During my transition, Chapter Administrator Nancy Schneider has been the glue to help me hold everything together. Her unwavering support and incredible energy level have actually made me learn to kind of like roller coasters. Our board has also been critical to me, and I deeply thank each member for the unrelenting efforts, which continue to elevate our chapter. Our generous and loyal law firm and vendor sponsors also deserve a huge thank you.

Officially, my last day as NEOACCA president is August 31, 2007, right around the time when you receive this newsletter. On September 1, 2007, Jonathan Dean, Chief Counsel—Truck Group for Eaton Corporation, will become president; and Bill Davis, fiduciary officer for National City Bank's Private Client Group, will become president-elect. Both Jonathan and Bill have



2007 State Finalists, Shaw High School Mock Trial Team
Front row: Jonathan Lykes, Nátasha Webb-Prather, Shalah Turner, Jessica Perkins and Alana Garrett. Second row: Michelle Proia (Legal Advisor); Greg Winston II, Jeannette Moore (Teacher); Terrell Blake, Lachauna Burton, Dominique Kizer and Jim Lawniczak (Legal Advisor/Calfee, Halter & Griswold).

graciously agreed to stand for election in November, in order to then serve complete terms in those positions throughout 2008. The board will fill the secretary position, and John Moran will continue as our hard-working treasurer.

Following this transition, our board, committee chairs, and members will

continued on page 4

All in the Corporate Family: Privilege and Co-representation Issues for In-house Lawyers2, 3

Don't Overlook Insurance in M&A Transactions5

Welcome New Members6

ACC News Briefs6

Upcoming Events and Programs8

All in the Corporate Family: Privilege and Co-representation Issues for In-house Lawyers

By Susan Hackett
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
Association of Corporate Counsel (ACC)

Martine Turcotte is a very happy lady—at least for a while. She recently won a decision for her client, BCE—the Canadian telecommunications giant—in a US federal court in a case that raised questions (and the specter of unpleasant results) about what many of us do on a daily basis without a lot of thought. Martine’s experience provides a caution to us all—don’t provide legal advice to subsidiaries without safeguards in place.

Many ACC members work in companies that have partially or wholly-owned parents, subsidiaries or affiliates—call them corporate family members. Many times, and certainly when the entities fully share the same ultimate ownership, in-house counsel provide advice for entities across the family (and their employer client’s “borders”), in order to ensure that appropriate policies and practices are adopted and followed by each of the entities. It’s in each of the entire family’s interests for other members of the family to stay out of trouble (avoiding reputational run-off) at least, and at best to be properly coordinated when they share a variety of common interests: the same regulators, suppliers, customers, industry partners, investors, and so on. And for the most part, this approach works very well. Indeed, we all know the repercussions that would follow a failure in a related entity that the parent or other corporate family members knew about but “ignored”: the entire family of brands would be tarnished and the entire entity group pilloried.

But even cross-counseling that works well “for the most part” still has room for the exceptions. Martine’s company, BCE, has been engaged in a grueling battle before the Delaware courts for more than five years litigating with former US subsidiaries and their creditors regarding BCE’s decision to stop financing the operations of one of its struggling former subs, Teleglobe. The two sides haven’t gotten to the meat of the underlying matter yet. They’re still arguing over privilege claims stemming from whether client services provided by BCE in-house lawyers to Teleglobe (when it was a sub) entitle Teleglobe to see BCE privileged communications and work product that would otherwise be protected from a hostile party’s discovery demands.

The disputed material pertains to BCE’s inside and outside legal advice to the client regarding its decision to pull their financing, including presentations by BCE’s chief legal officer—Martine Turcotte—to the board and opinions from outside law firms, all discussing ramifications of the company’s decisions on the defensibility of the kind of litigation it now faces. BCE claims that these events occurred after they severed joint representation of the sub; Teleglobe claims otherwise, arguing it has the right to see everything that passed through BCE’s in-house law department because in-house lawyers, at one time, had provided Teleglobe with legal advice on the financial commitments, meaning the subsidiaries share the legal privilege.

When Martine approached ACC and asked for our opinion and support, we thought the issue was one that deserved attention; after reviewing the facts and the rules, we decided to file amicus rather than risk allowing the lower court’s decisions in favor of Teleglobe’s discovery demands to become precedent. Our brief is online at www.acc.com/public/amicus/teleglobe.pdf.

The Court of Appeals agreed with BCE’s and ACC’s arguments, citing our amicus in a 93-page decision written by Judge Ambrose and handed down July 17, 2007 (www.acc.com/public/amicus/teleglobeopinion.pdf). The court vacated an order from the US District Court in Delaware that would have forced BCE to produce 900 privileged documents, remanding it back for further examination. But they didn’t stop there. They all but wrote a handbook on how parents and subsidiaries can steer through the tricky shoals of shared legal advice and keep the parent’s privilege intact. Along the way, the court discusses a number of major issues and doctrines, including (1) the attorney-client privilege, (2) the disclosure rule and the requirement that communications be in confidence, (3) privileged information sharing under (a) the co-client or joint-client privilege and (b) the community-of interest or common-interest privilege, (4) the exception for adverse litigation, and (5) the problems that arise when the interests of the clients in the joint representation begin to diverge.

What I’ll discuss further below and what the court held is this: There’s nothing wrong and a lot right with the concept of in-house counsel providing legal services across corporate family lines. But there are risks and they can be addressed with forethought. Indeed, it is advisable for in-house counsel to have paperwork in place so that the moment parent and subsidiary realize their interests might diverge through spin-off, insolvency or sale, the parent can sever its legal ties and counsel arrangement, and get the subsidiary separate legal counsel. But, as these deals can take months to play out, there’s no reason the parent can’t then continue to provide the subsidiary with legal advice on other non-related matters without putting its privilege at risk.

Good advice, but of course, when is “the moment” of realization, how can the shared legal services relationship be effectively severed, and what is now to be avoided as conflicted representation, and more?

ACC has created an important article (www.acc.com/public/attyclientpriv/parentsbcprprntethics.pdf) that reviews the following issues for your consideration to avoid learning BCE’s lesson the hard way:

- When, and to what extent, the representation of wholly or less than wholly-owned entities by a single in-house legal department raises conflicts issues for in-house counsel.
- An overview of attorney-client and work product privilege in the context of multi-entity enterprises.
- Conflicts and privilege issues that can arise once the decision has been made to sell an entity or its assets, or once the sale has been completed.

* Please note that this article was written before the BCE case was decided, and while we’re amending it to reflect the impact of this recent decision, it may not be finished with those revisions by the time you read it!

Further, we suggest that you may wish to consider executing a form of a joint defense agreement if you/your legal team provides services to multiple entities in the corporate family. A joint defense agreement allows a counsel for one client to work with another client on matters in which they share common interests, and which they agree do not present conflicts. A joint defense agreement asks the parties to recognize that the lawyer represents one of the clients and the lawyer’s loyalties will remain with that

client should common interests at some point diverge. Thus, if a conflict arises in the future, the joint defense relationship is automatically severed. It’s a neat little tool that’s simple to execute and helps protect both you (professionally), and your client (in case business interests diverge in the future) resulting from your services provided across the corporate family. (www.acc.com/vl/index.php?action=search&full=yes&anytext=Joint+Defens.)

I’ve borrowed and consolidated some of the themes from our overview of joint representation in a multi-entity environment for your consideration below. Thanks and cudos go to Peter Jarvis of Hinshaw & Culbertson, one of ACC’s ethics specialists.

Current-Client Conflicts of Interest in a Multi-Entity Setting

There is no general black letter rule of professional conduct that defines the term “client,” and a favorite on the in-house counsel ethics hit parade is always the topic of identifying the client in thorny situations. On the other hand, ABA Model Rule 1.13, Organization as Client, provides a starting point: I’ve included some of the pertinent sections below:

- (a) A lawyer employed or retained by an organization represents the organization acting through its duly authorized constituents.
- (f) In dealing with an organization’s directors, officers, employees, members, shareholders or other constituents, a lawyer shall explain the identity of the client when the lawyer knows, or reasonably should know, that the organization’s interests are adverse to those of the constituents with whom the lawyer is dealing.
- (g) A lawyer representing an organization may also represent any of its directors, officers, employees, members, shareholders or other constituents, subject to the provisions of Rule 1.7 [regarding certain conflicts of interest]. If the organization’s consent to the dual representation is required by Rule 1.7, the consent shall be given by an appropriate official of the organization other than the individual who is to be represented, or by the shareholders.

According to Comment [1] to this rule, the words “Other constituents” refers to “the positions equivalent to officers, directors, employees and shareholders held by persons acting for organizational clients that are not corporations.” Thus, it does not expressly include all ostensibly related entities. On the other hand, “constituents” can certainly include entities that are stockholders in other entities, and the rule more broadly acknowledges that representations may cross single organizational lines.

If, in fact, any non-clients appear to be in doubt about whether the lawyer represents them, the lawyer must explain that she does not. See *id.*; ABA Model Rule 4.3. Whether in a context of entity or individual clients, the test developed in caselaw and in ethics opinions to determine who is and is not a client, depends upon the subjective belief of the putative client and secondarily on proof of facts that it was, at least to some degree, reasonable for the client to hold such a belief.

Stated another way, in-house counsel who actually provides legal advice to multiple entities, or who allows those entities to form the reasonable belief that they are clients, will be held to have multiple clients. Once this conclusion is reached, the attendant duties of loyalty and confiden-

tiality that are part of the representation of any client apply to these intended or unintended entity clients. As a practical matter, the only way for counsel to seek to limit these duties once they attach is first expressly to disclaim them (in writing, if at all possible) and then to make sure that her conduct is consistent with any disclaimers. And the only way to be certain that an attorney-client relationship is at an end is to end it clearly and unambiguously. When a client has reasonable, ongoing expectations of a relationship based on a history of past work, a court may view the relationship as a current-client relationship even though, as of a particular date, the lawyer is not actually doing work for that client.

The Current-Client Conflicts Rule

ABA Model Rule 1.7 is typical of current-client conflicts rules throughout the US and, in fact, has directly been adopted in some form by most United States jurisdictions. It provides in pertinent part that:

(a) Except as provided in paragraph (b), a lawyer shall not represent a client if the representation involves a concurrent conflict of interest. A concurrent conflict of interest exists if:

- (1) The representation of one client will be directly adverse to another client; or
 - (2) There is a significant risk that the representation of one or more clients will be materially limited by the lawyer’s responsibilities to another client, a former client or a third person, or by a personal interest of the lawyer.
- (b) Notwithstanding the existence of a concurrent conflict of interest under paragraph (a), a lawyer may represent a client if:
- (1) The lawyer reasonably believes that the lawyer will be able to provide competent and diligent representation to each affected client;
 - (2) The representation is not prohibited by law;
 - (3) The representation does not involve the assertion of a claim by one client against another client represented by the lawyer in the same litigation or other proceeding before a tribunal; and
 - (4) Each affected client gives informed consent, confirmed in writing.

The current-client conflicts rules can briefly be summarized in terms of veto power. Although Texas takes a different approach as a matter of state law,¹ the current client always has veto power to prevent the lawyer from acting adversely to that client in all other United States jurisdictions. Indeed, in some situations (which vary from state to state) a lawyer cannot proceed adversely to a current client even with consent. See, e.g., *In re Johnson*, 300 Or. 52, 707 P.2d 573 (1985); Restatement (Third) of the Law: Law Governing Lawyers §128, reporters’ note cmt. c (2000) (“Restatement”).

It also bears mention that over time, a situation that did not initially present a conflict or require a waiver can develop into one that does. Similarly, a previously valid waiver may have to be repeated if the facts change in material and unanticipated manners. In fact, it is also possible that a situation that began as one in which no conflict existed, or in which only a waiveable conflict existed, can turn into one in which (depending upon the rules of the jurisdiction) continuing representation, even with a waiver, is not permissible. See, e.g., *In re Stauffer*, 327 Or. 44, 956 P.2d 967 (1998); Oregon Formal Op. Nos. 2005-122, 2005-40.

One final point. Legal departments are “firms” within the meaning of the conflicts rules. See, e.g., ABA Model Rule 1.0(c). Unless the situation is one in which screening to

avoid conflicts is permitted by applicable law, a current-client conflict that is attributable to one in-house lawyer will be attributed to all members of the legal department—the same rule that applies to outside firms. See, e.g., ABA Model Rule 1.10; Restatement §123, cmt. d(i) (2000).

As a general proposition, all representations of multiple “current” clients create at least a theoretical potential for conflicts, but again generally, simultaneous presentation of wholly commonly owned and solvent entities will not usually lead to conflicts problems. When common ownership is less than complete, the potential for current-client conflicts becomes greater—even if one of the entities has a sufficient ownership interest in the other to exercise effective control. When the interests of multiple but related clients are in conflict, conflict waivers must be obtained from disinterested parties in order for the joint legal representation to continue since the in-house lawyer is professionally obligated to its employer-client under the rules previously discussed.

In the situation of an insolvent related entity, it is a matter of black letter law that management and the board of the entity owe their duties to continue to run the entity for the benefit of its creditors, and not for the benefit of its equity owners (as would be the case if the business were solvent). In what are called “deepening insolvency” situations, lawyers and other advisers whose actions increase the degree of insolvency (and therefore of creditor debt) in an attempt to assist the equity owners are at risk of being sued. While there are many unknowns in these situations, it seems relatively clear that in-house counsel of a multi-entity enterprise who wish to act for the benefit of a solvent entity and to the detriment of an insolvent entity, and who appreciate that’s what they are doing, act at their potential peril.

So what about the attorney-client privilege—how is it applied in a multi-entity joint relationship? In general, if there is co-representation on an issue, then there is co-attorney-client privilege, which can be enforced against third parties, as well as now-feeding entity family members. (There can be privilege between co-entities sharing a lawyer, as well as separate privilege that is not shared if the entities have their own counsel on non-shared matters, too. They are not mutually exclusive.)

Thus, in Martine’s case, the court held that documents created by the in-house lawyers during the joint representation were discoverable to both parties. The dispute arose over documents and communications that took place after BCE claimed it had severed its joint legal relationship on all relevant counseling to its sub. And the court agreed that it is possible to not only sever the joint defense relationship in its entirety on a going-forward basis, but also possible to continue representation on non-disputed matters (say, IP management or environmental compliance) and sever it on disputed matters (relating to financial business decisions, for instance).

Of course, all of the rules pertaining to privilege still apply: it can be waived if confidentiality is broken by any party to the privilege (include the related entity which has received legal services from another family members’ lawyer and then divulges the confidential information to a third party), it does not survive the crime fraud rule exceptions, and it does not prevent anyone from investigating facts (since privilege doesn’t cover facts, it covers communications and related work product of lawyers). See ACC’s resources defining in-house privilege application, waiver, and best practices to ensure that privilege is properly protected: www.acc.com/php/cms/index.php?id=84.

The trickiest part of the equation is figuring out at what point the relationship must be severed in order to be able to claim privilege with lawyers who formerly advised from now-hostile subs: Is the point prior to any “negative” assessments or actions, or upon some form of notice? Or is there some kind of material conflict standard? The answer is not clear, and thus, ACC recommends considering adoption of joint defense agreements between entities sharing legal counsel. This enables the company to notice the affiliates, with whom it’s sharing counsel, of what the terms of the sharing are, and also to sever the relationship formally when there is concern that a notice that can be pointed to must be given.

Other Practical Considerations:

- Consider non-representation of some entities: just because you can, doesn’t mean you should. Some entities may not be well suited to share your services because of the potential for conflicts or waivers or other issues. It’s okay to just say “no” and encourage them to get their own counsel.
- Clearly limit the scope of representation (and do it in writing): don’t try to be everybody’s lawyer for everything, or you may end up being barred from being anybody’s lawyer for anything. If their needs are many, then other family members may need to hire their own in-house counsel or the family may wish to pay for outside representation where it’s needed. This is especially important if the affiliate might at some time be sold: where documents are requested by the buyer, it will be easier to limit them to those covered in the scope of representation.
- If you do need to sever the relationship, ABA Model Rules 1.9 and 1.10 allow you to do so, only if you end it prior to any material legal work impacting the severed party’s representation has begun. So don’t wait to sever a relationship until the matter raising a conflict is too ripe.
- Confirm in writing what will or will not be shared before the representation begins to help ensure that if and when it ends, the files that may be open to both parties are limited to those agreed upon in advance.
- Beware the “sale” of privilege before the sale of assets is considered in a related entity that has shared legal services and is now to be sold. See John Villa’s excellent article on this subject at www.acc.com/protected/pubs/docket/nd01/ethics1.php and www.acc.com/vl/index.php?action=search&full=yes&anytext=Villa.
- Watch what goes out the door and act promptly if a mistake is made and something is inadvertently disclosed. Generally, if inadvertently disclosed and quickly remedied, the rules and courts will allow you to put something that shouldn’t have been shared back into the privileged “box.”

The only thing that’s clear is that there is still much that is unclear for the counsel who navigates this twisting path. But the need for, and practicality of co-counseling related entities is so apparent, and the risks attendant to ignoring ill-advised behaviors in related entities is so high, that today’s in-house lawyer (and her client) has little choice but to venture forth and provide co-counsel. But, forewarned is forearmed: Exercise caution!

If you have questions or if I can be of service, please feel free to call me at 202.293.4103, x318, or email me at hackett@acc.com. ACC’s advocacy and ethics team is waiting to serve you!

1 See Texas RPC 1.6.

continued from page 1

continue to steer our chapter towards the goals of helping our less-fortunate neighbors, providing value to the membership through articles and educational seminars, and reminding each of you to “enjoy the ride” through networking opportunities and social programming.

Several of our members participated in the 3Rs program and the Ohio Center for Law Related Education’s High School Mock Trial Competition during the 2006/2007 school year. Through our volunteers, Northeast Ohio teens learned that while they might not be able to control all of the issues that come up each day, being equipped with the right skills might make all the difference. Our volunteers recognize that the job of a leader is not to find followers, but to instead develop future leaders. I have no doubt that President Jonathan Dean will lead the way, as the 3Rs and Mock Trial initiatives for the 2007/2008 school year begin.

Please join us on Saturday, September 8, at the Spanish American Center, 4407 Lorain Road in Cleveland, for a Brief Advice and Referral Clinic. You’ll have fun while helping

other people, and we’ll even buy you lunch afterwards at a local restaurant. Also, mark your calendar for our National Community Service Day project with City Year on Friday afternoon, September 28. Maybe your whole legal department will want to help us out that afternoon too.

And speaking of enjoying the ride, start shopping for your party outfits now. Our holiday bash is scheduled for Thursday, November 29, 2007, from 5:00–8:00 PM at the House of Blues, for you and a guest.

I personally look forward to seeing many of you again soon at one of our September community events, at the ACC Annual Meeting in the Windy City in October, at the House of Blues in late November...or whenever your travels may lead you down 71 South into the heart of Buckeye Country!

Thank you to all of you for your dedication to our chapter. Thank you for your friendships, though, most of all.

NEOACCA SINCERELY THANKS the following members for their hard work and dedication in making the 3Rs program a success, and for positively influencing the lives of students in Northeast Ohio’s schools. If you volunteered and your name does not appear, please advise us of your participation at neoacca@centurytel.net.

Cynthia A. Binns, GrafTech International Ltd.

Matthew T. Brady, Eaton Corporation

Allison E. Cole, The Sherwin-Williams

Company

Jeffrey A. Crossman, U-Store-It

Jonathan Dean, Eaton Corporation

David H. Fogarty, Medical Mutual of Ohio

Julie A. Harris, Novelis Corporation

William F. Hogsett, Eaton Corporation

Helen S. Jarem, The Sherwin-Williams

Company

Charles E. Jarrett, The Progressive Corporation

Richard A. Legenza, The Sherwin-Williams

Company

Victor J. Leo, Eaton Corporation

Ray Ling, Progressive Casualty Insurance

Company

Mark A. McClendon, Avery-Dennison

John D. Moran, GrafTech International Ltd.

Sharon L. O’Flaherty, Eaton Corporation

Natalie L. Peterson, STERIS Corporation

Michelle M. Proia, Mettler-Toledo, Inc.

Gregory A. Smith, Eaton Corporation

Taras G. Szmagala, Eaton Corporation

Don’t Overlook Insurance in M&A Transactions

By Michael Brittain and Shelly K. Hillyer*

According to Thompson Financial, the value of global mergers and acquisitions in 2006 increased to a record-setting \$3.8 trillion. Faced with this rapid expansion of M&A activity, it is now more important than ever for corporate counsel to understand how historical insurance policies can protect their corporate treasuries from unexpected product liability, environmental liability, and mass tort claims.

Unfortunately, many companies enter into M&A transactions without fully understanding and planning for how insurance will respond to post-closing claims arising out of a predecessor’s business. These claims are frequently referred to as “long-tail” claims because the manifestation of injury is separated by a long period of time from the cause of the injury. By taking proactive steps before closing, corporate counsel and the acquisition team can avoid potential disaster from long-tail claims and, hopefully, make a substantial contribution to their company’s bottom line.

To maximize coverage for post-closing claims, corporate counsel must seize the opportunity to investigate, evaluate, and structure the insurance aspects of the transaction while both the seller and the buyer are cooperating. While an individual strategy should be developed for each transaction, the following steps should be considered each time your company is involved in the due diligence process.

- Establish a complete corporate history of the target including prior owners, and prior acquisitions by the target.
- Obtain copies of all current and historical policies for the target and its predecessors. Secondary evidence of “lost policies”, such as insurance schedules, premium statements, certificates of insurance and additional insured endorsements, should also be secured.
- Once located, organize and protect all historical policies and secondary evidence of the target’s coverage.

- Identify existing and potential liabilities of the target through review of litigation schedules, insurance loss runs, litigation files and other records. Interview the target’s risk manager, in-house counsel, outside counsel, insurance broker and others who may have knowledge of potential claims.
- Analyze how the target’s policies will respond to known and potential liabilities. Develop a clear understanding of the scope of the target’s coverage and be alert for unusual restrictions on coverage.
- Determine whether or not the target’s policies have aggregate limits for all claims or certain types of claims. Verify the amount of remaining aggregate limits.
- Evaluate whether or not the target’s coverage is illusory because of high deductibles, retrospective premium programs, fronting policies, insolvent insurers, or policy buyouts.

Traditionally, buyers have looked to their target’s insurance policies to pay post-closing claims that arise out of the pre-closing activities of the target or its predecessors. Generally, the target’s insurance will apply to post-closing claims which follow a stock purchase or merger transaction. The coverage issues become much more complicated in an asset purchase or where the target has a prior history of acquisitions and restructurings. In order to minimize problems with collecting under the target’s historical policies, the following points should be considered in structuring the deal.

- Identify and resolve problems where the target will “share” coverage with the target’s former parent. A shared coverage problem arises when a subsidiary is sold because the subsidiary retains its status as a named insured under the parent’s policies. The problem of shared coverage becomes serious when available limits of liability are inadequate to cover claims against the parent and the target, or where deductibles and retrospective premiums are involved.

continued on page 6

Thank You

continued from page 5

- Understand the impact of governing law on the assignability of insurance coverage to successors. Some states strictly limit the assignability of rights under liability policies. Ohio and many other states permit the assignment of rights under liability policies when a covered occurrence takes place before the coverage is transferred to a successor corporation.
- Carefully document the insurance-related terms of the transaction, including the assignment of rights to claim coverage under historical policies and the responsibilities of the parties to pay deductibles and retrospective premiums.

- Document the seller's obligation to cooperate with the buyer in attempts to pursue rights against the seller's insurers.

When claims arise after a deal closes, they often become the responsibility of the corporate legal department. Corporate counsel can protect their legal budget from such claims by placing a high priority on the insurance aspects of M&A transactions.

** Michael Brittain is a partner at Calfee, Halter & Griswold LLP in Cleveland and chair of the Insurance Recovery Group. He can be reached at mbrittain@calfee.com. Shelly K. Hillyer is a partner at Calfee and vice chair of the Insurance Recovery Group. She can be reached at shillyer@calfee.com.*

Welcome New Members

Karin Bergener, Limeridge Farm
Jeffrey Crossman, U-Store-It
William Dunn, YRC Worldwide, Inc.
Kristin French, YRC Worldwide, Inc.
Julie Harris, Novelis Corporation
Tim Krogh, GrafTech International, Inc.
Matthew J. Morelli, CBIZ Inc.
Teresa Purtiman, YRC Worldwide, Inc.
Susan O. Scheutzow, Southwest General Health Center
Varhesh Sritharan, DATATRAK International Inc.
Deborah A. Zahar, DeBartolo Property Group

ACC News Briefs

New and Updated InfoPAKsSM Add Value to Your Practice

Role of the General Counsel

This updated InfoPAK provides some definition of the role, scope, and nature of the duties of a general counsel in a post-enron/Sarbanes-oxley world. By noting some of the issues that arise in the ordinary course of an in-house counsel's practice, this InfoPAK will help general counsel provide high-quality representation for their corporate client. Access it at www.acc.com/resource/v6685.

Hiring Foreign Nationals in the United States

This updated InfoPAK provides visa specific suggestive strategies for hiring and maintaining uninterrupted employment of foreign nationals. Access it at www.acc.com/resource/v4704.

Employee Benefits for Domestic Partners and Same Sex Spouses

A company's decision to offer domestic partner or same sex spouse benefits can be fraught with complications. The legal landscape that governs such benefits is constantly changing due to on-going political battles that result in changes to statutes and state constitutions. This new InfoPAK, compiled by Hogan & Hartson, LLP, addresses both the types of benefits that companies may provide to domestic partners and same sex spouses, and the impact of both federal and state laws on those benefits. Access it at www.acc.com/resource/v8437.

Small Law Department Human Resources Manual—Mexico

The Small law Department Committee, together with its sponsor Meritas, has developed this InfoPAK to help ACC members become more aware of the differences in employment law found in the provinces in Canada (www.acc.com/infopaks/getfile.php?path=/protected/infopaks/employment/canadasldmanual.pdf) and in Mexico (www.acc.com/infopaks/getfile.php?path=/protected/infopaks/employment/mexicohrmanual.pdf).

Get A Year's Worth Of CLE at ACC's 2007 Annual Meeting

ACC offers the best continuing legal education for in-house counsel. Our 2007 Annual Meeting (October 29–31 in Chicago, IL) provides corporate practitioners with over 100 CLE-approved sessions from which to choose. Various tracks of programming developed by in-house counsel for in-house counsel cover a wide range of legal and management topics including intellectual property, litigation, labor & employment, corporate & securities, international, and financial services. Plus, you'll get a year's worth of CLE in one shot. Don't miss out! Go to am.acc.com and register today.

Advance Your Career; Find Your Next Hire

If you are looking for a new lawyer for your in-house department or looking for your next career move, check out ACC's In-house JoblineSM, the premier career website for the in-house community. Here are a few reasons why:

For job seekers:

- Find positions that match your specific criteria, including practice area, geographic location, and job title.
- Browse more than 1,100 current job postings.
- Post your resume for free.
- Explore the online career center, featuring compensation data, and career advancement advice.

For employers:

- Find the right match for your department from the thousands of qualified candidates registered on the website.
- Receive automatic notification when candidates who meet your criteria add their resume to the website.
- Take advantage of a discount on job postings, only for ACC members. Move to the next level with ACC's In-house Jobline: www.jobline.acc.com.

Learn the Basics to a Successful In-house Career at Canadian CCU

Whether you practice in Canada, the United States or are involved in work that crosses the border, in-house counsel face a number of similar challenges. Open only to in-house counsel, Canadian CCU (November 18–20, The Metropolitan Hotel, Toronto, ON) teaches attendees how to excel in their new role with a focus on the basics you need to succeed. Registrants will learn first-hand from in-house colleagues the tools and best practices necessary to foster a successful in-house career. Network with the best and brightest in the in-house legal profession! Register for only \$575 US at ccucanada.acc.com.