

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**Office of the Comptroller of the Currency****12 CFR Part 19**

[Docket No. 96-10]

RIN 1557-AB43

Uniform Rules of Practice and Procedure**AGENCY:** Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury.**ACTION:** Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC) is amending its regulatory provisions implementing the Uniform Rules of Practice and Procedure (Uniform Rules) and the OCC's agency-specific rules of administrative practice and procedure (Local Rules).

The final rule is intended to clarify certain provisions and to increase the efficiency and fairness of administrative hearings. The final rule is another component of the OCC's Regulation Review Program.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 5, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Daniel Stipano, Director, Enforcement and Compliance Division, 202-874-4800, or Daniel Cooke, Attorney, Legislative and Regulatory Activities, Division, 202-874-5090, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 250 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20219.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**Background**

Section 916 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA), Pub. L. 101-73, 103 Stat. 183 (1989), required the OCC, The Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS), the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board), and the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA) (agencies) to develop uniform rules and procedures for administrative hearings. The agencies each adopted final Uniform Rules in August, 1991.¹ Based on their experience in using the rules since then, the agencies have identified sections of the Uniform Rules that should be modified. Accordingly, the

agencies proposed amendments to the Uniform Rules on June 23, 1995 (60 FR 32882). The OCC also proposed amendments to its Local Rules.

The OCC received two comments on the proposal. Both commenters generally supported the proposal, but each suggested improvements.

The final rule implements the proposal with certain changes, including revisions responsive to some of the concerns expressed by the commenters. The following section-by-section analysis summarizes the final rule and highlights the changes from the proposal that the OCC made in response to the commenters' suggestions.

The OTS, FDIC, Board, and NCUA are publishing separate final rules that are substantively identical to the OCC's final rule.

Section-by-Section Summary and Discussion of Amendments to the Uniform Rules**Section 19.1 Scope**

The proposal added two statutory provisions to the list of civil money penalty provisions to which the Uniform Rules apply. The two provisions were enacted by the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994 (CDRI), Pub. L. 103-325, 108 Stat. 2160.

The first provision, CDRI section 406, amended the Bank Secrecy Act (BSA) (31 U.S.C. 5321) to require the Secretary of the Treasury to delegate authority to the Federal banking agencies (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813)) to impose civil money penalties for BSA violations.

The second, CDRI section 525, amended section 102 the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (FDPA) (42 U.S.C. 4012a). Section 102 now gives each "Federal entity for lending regulation" authority to assess civil money penalties against a regulated lending institution if the institution has a pattern or practice of committing violations under the FDPA or the notice requirements of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 (NFIA) (42 U.S.C. 4104a). Under the FDPA, the term "Federal entity for lending regulation" includes the agencies and the Farm Credit Administration.

CDRI section 525 also gave the agencies authority to require a regulated lending institution to take remedial actions that are necessary to ensure that the institution complies with the requirements of the national flood insurance program if: (1) the institution has engaged in a pattern and practice of noncompliance with regulations issued

pursuant to the FDPA and NFIA; and (2) has not demonstrated measurable improvement in compliance despite the assessment of civil money penalties. The final rule adds a new paragraph to the scope section that reflects this additional authority.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed.

Section 19.6 Appearance and Practice in Adjudicatory Proceedings

The proposal permitted the administrative law judge (ALJ) to require counsel who withdraws from representing a party to accept service of papers for that party until either: (1) a new counsel has filed a notice of appearance; or (2) the party indicates that he or she will proceed on a *pro se* basis.

The OCC received one comment on this section. The commenter suggested that the proposal did not adequately address certain situations: for example, when counsel withdraws because of a lack of payment of legal fees that is caused by an agency asset freeze, or withdraws because the client discharged him or her. The commenter's implication is that it is unfair to require counsel to continue to accept service in these situations. Moreover, the commenter expressed concern that the administrative proceeding may become involved in a dispute between the client and counsel when the ALJ requires counsel to continue to accept service after a client discharges counsel. The commenter suggested that the rule should require that service be given to both the unrepresented counsel and the party.

The proposal was intended to ensure that a lawyer is always available to receive service in order to prevent a party from halting the administrative proceedings simply by evading service. The regulatory text is clear, however, that the ALJ has the discretion whether to require former counsel to continue to accept service. Fairness to counsel is among the factors the ALJ would consider in exercising this discretion, and the OCC therefore believes that the provision as proposed is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the concerns raised by the commenter.

The final rule changes the proposal's reference from "service of process" to "service" to clarify that this section applies to all papers that the party is entitled to receive. This section is otherwise adopted as proposed.

Section 19.8 Conflicts of Interest

The proposal sought to improve in two ways the provisions governing the

¹ The agencies issued a joint notice of proposed rulemaking on, June 17, 1991 (56 FR 27790). The agencies issued their final rules on the following dates: OCC on August 9, 1991 (56 FR 38024); Board on August 9, 1991 (56 FR 38052); FDIC on August 9, 1991 (56 FR 37975); OTS on August 12, 1991 (56 FR 38317); and NCUA on August 8, 1991 (56 FR 37767).

conflicts of interest that may arise when counsel represents multiple persons connected with a proceeding.

First, the proposal sought to protect the interests of individuals and financial institutions by expanding the circumstances under which counsel must certify that he or she has obtained a waiver from each non-party of any potential conflict of interest. The former rule required counsel to obtain waivers only from non-party institutions "to which notice of the proceedings must be given." The proposal required counsel to obtain waivers from all parties and non-parties that counsel represents on a matter relevant to an issue in the proceeding. It thus ensured that all appropriate party and non-party individuals and institutions are informed of potential conflicts.

Second, the proposal simplified this provision by eliminating the requirement for counsel to certify that each client has asserted that there are no conflicts of interest. The OCC believes that the former provision was superfluous because the responsibility for identifying potential conflicts resides with counsel.

The OCC received one comment on this section. The commenter noted that the proposal may inhibit multiple representation that otherwise complies with applicable ethics rules. The commenter suggested that the proposal could inappropriately tilt the proceeding in favor of the agencies.

The provision does not limit the right of any party to representation by counsel of the party's choice. Rather, it ensures that all interested persons are informed of potential conflicts so that they may avoid the conflict if they choose. In the OCC's view, it is reasonable to establish a baseline standard requiring the affirmative waiver of conflicts by all affected persons or entities in order to ensure the integrity of the administrative adjudication process. State rules of professional responsibility that impose more stringent ethical standards are unaffected by this requirement.

In addition, the OCC is unpersuaded by the argument that the conflicts provision grants the agencies significant advantage in a proceeding. Persons and entities may be well and vigorously represented even if they are not all represented by the same counsel.

Therefore, the OCC adopts this section as proposed.

Section 19.11 Service of Papers

The proposal changed this section by permitting parties, the Comptroller, and ALJs to serve a subpoena on a party by

delivering it to a person of suitable age and discretion at a party's place of work.

The OCC received one comment on this section. The commenter supported the intent of the proposal, but asserted that the provision permitting service at a person's place of work was too broad to be effective, particularly where a bank has numerous branches.

The OCC interpreted the phrase "person's place of work" as used in the proposal to mean the physical location at which an individual works and not as any office of the corporation or association that employs the person. To avoid confusion, the OCC has added specific reference to physical location to the regulatory text. In addition, the final rule states expressly that only an individual, not a corporation or association, may be served at a residence or place of work.

The same comment points out, however, that the former Uniform Rules did not expressly permit certain methods of service that are useful for serving a corporation or other association. The final rule, therefore, permits service on a party corporation or other association by delivery of a copy of a notice to an officer, managing or general agent, or to any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process. The final rule also provides that, if the agent is one authorized by a statute to receive service and the statute so requires, the serving party must also mail a copy to the party. The final rule also restructures this provision for clarity.

Section 19.12 Construction of Time Limits

The proposal clarified that the additional time allotted for responding to papers served by mail, delivery service, or electronic media transmission under § 19.12(c) is not included in determining whether an act is required to be performed within ten days. The proposal also clarified that additional time allotted for responding to papers served by mail, delivery, or electronic media transmission is counted by calendar days and, therefore, a party must count Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays when calculating a time deadline.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed.

Section 19.20 Amended Pleadings

The proposal changed this section to permit a party to amend its pleadings without leave of the ALJ and to permit the ALJ to admit evidence over the objection that the evidence does not fall

directly within the scope of the issues raised by a notice or answer.

The OCC received one comment on this section. The commenter asserted that the change could unduly prejudice a party if a notice were amended to add or delete allegations immediately prior to the hearing. The commenter expressed concern that the amendment would give a party insufficient time to seek additional discovery or file for summary judgment.

The regulatory text gives the ALJ discretion to revise the hearing schedule to ensure that no prejudice results from last minute amendments to a notice. The OCC believes this approach is adequate to avoid prejudice to a party and, therefore, the OCC adopts this section as proposed.

Section 19.24 Scope of Document Discovery

The former Uniform Rules were silent on the use of interrogatories. The proposal expressly prohibited parties from using interrogatories on grounds that other discovery tools are more efficient and less burdensome and therefore more appropriate to administrative adjudications.

The proposal also sought to focus document discovery requests so that they are not unreasonable, oppressive, excessive in scope, or unduly burdensome to any of the parties.

Accordingly, the proposal preserved the former rule's limitation on document discovery by permitting discovery only of documents that have material relevance. However, the proposal specifically provided that a request should be considered unreasonable, oppressive, excessive in scope, or unduly burdensome if, among other things: (1) it fails to include justifiable limitations on the time period covered and the geographic locations to be searched; (2) the time provided to respond in the request is inadequate; or (3) the request calls for copies of documents to be delivered to the requesting party and fails to include the requestor's written agreement to pay in advance for the copying, in accordance with § 19.25.

Under the proposal, the scope of permissible document discovery is not as broad as that allowed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b) (28 U.S.C. app.). Historically, given the specialized nature of enforcement proceedings in regulated industries, discovery in administrative proceedings has not been as expansive as it is in civil litigation.

The OCC received no significant comments on this section and, therefore, adopts it as proposed.

Section 19.25 Request for Document Discovery From Parties

The OCC proposed several changes to § 19.25. First, the proposal sought to reduce unnecessary burden by permitting a party to: (1) respond to document discovery either by producing documents as they are kept in the ordinary course of business or by organizing them to correspond to the categories in a document request; and (2) identify similar documents by category when they are voluminous and are protected by the deliberative process, attorney-client, or attorney work-product privilege.

The proposal also amended § 19.25 to permit a party to require payment in advance for the costs of copying and shipping requested documents; and clarified that, if a party has stated its intention to file a timely motion for interlocutory review, the ALJ may not release, or order a party to produce, documents withheld on grounds of privilege until the motion for interlocutory review has been decided.

The OCC received two comments on this section. One commenter sought guidance on when, how, and to whom a party must express an "intention" to file a timely motion for interlocutory review.

Because it is the ALJ who may not release or order a party to produce documents, it was implicit in the proposed regulatory text that a party must make the intention to seek interlocutory review known to the ALJ. For clarity, the final rule adds language to this effect.

Another commenter suggested that a request for interlocutory review should automatically stay the proceeding.

Under § 19.28(d) of the Uniform Rules, a party may request that a proceeding be stayed during the pendency of an interlocutory review, and the ALJ has the discretion to decide whether a stay is appropriate. The OCC believes that this procedure adequately protects the parties. For this reason and to avoid adding unnecessary delays in the administrative proceedings, the OCC declines to provide for an automatic stay whenever a party requests interlocutory review.

One commenter asserted that permitting the OCC to require payment in advance for document copying and shipping costs would give the OCC an advantage over other creditors if the party is bankrupt following the administrative hearing. The commenter does not assert that it is a violation of the bankruptcy laws for the OCC or any other creditor to require prepayment for products or services. Moreover, the OCC

believes that the situations causing the commenter's concern would be very rare. Accordingly, the OCC adopts this section as proposed.

Section 19.27 Deposition of Witness Unavailable for Hearing

The proposal clarified that a party may serve a deposition subpoena on a witness who is unavailable by serving the subpoena on the witness's authorized representative. The final rule does not include this proposed change because, in § 19.11(d), the final rule expressly permits a party to serve a subpoena by delivering the subpoena to an agent, which includes delivery to an authorized representative. The proposed change to § 19.27 would be redundant. The OCC received no comments on this section. The final rule does not, therefore, change this provision.

Section 19.33 Public Hearings

The proposal changed this section to specify that a party must file a motion for a private hearing with the Comptroller, and not the ALJ, but must serve the ALJ with a copy of the motion.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed.

Section 19.34 Hearing Subpoenas

The former Uniform Rules did not specifically require that a party inform all other parties when a subpoena is issued to a non-party. The proposal required that, after a hearing subpoena is issued by the ALJ, the party that applied for the subpoena must serve a copy of it on each party. Under the proposal, any party may move to quash any hearing subpoena and must serve the motion on each other party.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed.

Section 19.35 Conduct of Hearings

The proposal limited the number of counsel permitted to examine a witness and clarified that hearing transcripts may be obtained only from the court reporter. The former Uniform Rules were silent on these issues.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed.

Section 19.37 Post-Hearing Filings

The proposal changed the title of this section from "Proposed findings and conclusions" to "Post-hearing filings" to describe more accurately the content of the section.

The proposal also moved, from § 19.35(b) to § 19.37(a), the provision that requires the ALJ to serve each party

with notice of the filing of the certified transcript of the hearing (including hearing exhibits). The proposal added a requirement that the ALJ must use the same method of service for this notice for each recipient.

Finally, the proposal clarified that the ALJ may, when appropriate, permit parties more than the allotted 30 days to file proposed findings of fact, proposed conclusions of law, and a proposed order.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted with a minor technical change.

Section 19.38 Recommended Decision and Filing of Record

Under the former Uniform Rules, the ALJ was not required to file an index of the record when he filed the record with the Comptroller. The proposal added this requirement and reorganized this section to improve its clarity.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed.

Section-by-Section Summary and Discussion of Proposed Amendments to the OCC's Local Rules

Section 19.112 Informal Hearing

Section 19.112 governs the conduct of informal hearings requested by a party who is the subject of a removal, suspension, or prohibition when a crime is charged or a conviction obtained.

The proposal amended § 19.112(b) so that the District Deputy Comptroller or Administrator, the Deputy Comptroller for Multinational Banking, or the Deputy Comptroller or Director for Special Supervision, whoever is appropriate, fixes the date, time, and place for an informal hearing and chooses the presiding officer.

The proposal amended § 19.112(c): (1) to clarify that, if a petitioner waives the opportunity to present an oral argument at a hearing, the OCC may file written submissions with the presiding officer no later than the date on which the hearing was to be held; and (2) to require a petitioner who chooses to waive the opportunity to present oral argument to submit that waiver at the same time that the petitioner requests a hearing.

Former § 19.112(d)(3) required that copies of all affidavits, memoranda, and other written material to be presented at the hearing be provided to the presiding officer and other parties ten days prior to the hearing. The final rule conforms § 19.112(d)(3) to the change made to § 19.112(c), which permits the OCC to file papers on the day of the hearing. Therefore, as amended, § 19.112(d)

allows the OCC an additional ten days to file its submissions when a petitioner chooses to waive its right to an oral hearing. The OCC will need the additional ten days to prepare its submissions as a response to the petitioner's submissions because the OCC will not have an opportunity to present an oral argument.

The OCC received one comment on this section. The commenter sought clarification of whether waiver of oral argument results in a waiver of the hearing.

The former rule and the proposal used the term "hearing" to refer to both an oral hearing and a hearing based solely on documents. A waiver of an oral argument does not result in a waiver of the hearing itself. Therefore, the OCC believes no further clarification is necessary and adopts this section with a minor technical change.

Section 19.113 Recommended and Final Decisions

The former Local Rules stated that the Comptroller must issue a final decision in a removal, suspension, or prohibition case within 60 days of the hearing or within 60 days of receiving the petitioner's written submission. Section 8(g)(3) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(g)(3)) requires the Comptroller to notify a petitioner of the Comptroller's final decision within 60 days of the hearing. Section 8(g)(3) does not state that the Comptroller may use the date of receipt of the petitioner's written submission as the start date of the 60-day time limitation.

The proposal clarified that the Local Rules conform to section 8(g)(3) by requiring the Comptroller to issue a final decision on a removal, suspension, or prohibition case within 60 days of the hearing, regardless of when the Comptroller received the petitioner's written submission.

To ensure that the Comptroller can meet this 60-day deadline, the proposal imposed a clear time deadline on the presiding officer to issue a recommended decision. The proposal required the presiding officer to issue a recommended decision within 20 days from the hearing.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed.

Section 19.160 Scope

The proposal clarified the provision regarding the time permitted the OCC to communicate to the proposed acquiring party (filer) the OCC's disapproval of a change-in-control notice.

Former § 19.160 suggests that the OCC must give written notice to a filer of the

OCC's disapproval within three days of the decision. Because first class mail can take three days, the proposal stated that the OCC must mail the written notice within three days of making a disapproval decision.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed.

Section 19.161 Notice of Disapproval and Hearing Initiation

The proposal changed the title of this section from "Hearing request and answer" to "Notice of disapproval and hearing initiation" in order to describe more accurately the content of the section.

The proposal changed the initiation procedures for change-in-control proceedings. Under the former OCC Local Rule, the OCC's notice of disapproval was both a licensing communication and the initial pleading in the action.

As proposed, the notice of disapproval would not serve as the OCC's initial pleading. Under the proposal, the Comptroller issues a hearing order after receiving a request for a hearing in response to a notice of disapproval. The hearing order serves as the OCC's pleading document and states the legal authority for the proceeding, the OCC's jurisdiction over the proceeding, and the matters of fact or law upon which the disapproval is based. The hearing order also states that a filer who seeks a hearing must file an answer to the hearing order with the Office of Financial Institution Adjudication (OFIA) within 20 days after service of the order on the filer.

The proposal also made a technical correction by removing the phrase "in civil money penalty proceedings" from the heading of former paragraph (c)(2).

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted as proposed with minor technical changes.

Section 19.170 Discovery Depositions

The proposal clarified that a party may have the court reporter record deposition testimony with a stenotype machine or an electronic sound recording device. The proposal modified the former rule to state expressly that, for good cause and with leave of the ALJ or upon agreement of the parties, a party may have the court reporter use any other method to record the deposition testimony.

The proposal specified that a written record of the witness's testimony must be made unless the parties agree otherwise, that all parties are entitled to receive a transcript of the witness's testimony, and that the party taking the

deposition bears the cost of the recording and the transcription of that recording.

The OCC received no comments on this section, which is adopted with one clarifying change. The final rule specifies that each party is responsible for the cost of the copy of the transcript that the party receives and that the cost of these additional transcript copies does not fall on the party that requests the deposition.

Section 19.171 Deposition Subpoenas

The proposal added to the permissible methods of serving a deposition subpoena under § 19.171 the methods allowed in the Uniform Rules, § 19.11(d). As amended by this final rule, the Uniform Rules permit the following methods of service: by delivery to an agent, by delivery to a person of suitable age and discretion at the subpoenaed person's residence or place of work, by registered or certified mail to the person's last known address, or in such other manner as is reasonably calculated to give actual notice.

The OCC received no comments on this section. The final rule conforms § 19.184 with § 19.11(d), as adopted in the final rule, by cross-referencing § 19.11(d).

Section 19.184 Service of Subpoena and Payment of Witness Fees

As in § 19.171, the proposal adopted the methods of service used in § 19.11(d). The OCC also received no comments on this section.

The final rule conforms this section, as it does § 19.171, to § 19.11(d) by cross-referencing § 19.11(d).

Technical Changes

The final rule makes several technical changes to the proposal that make the final rule specific to the OCC. These changes appear throughout the rule text. For example, bracketed references to the "agency head" have been replaced with "the Comptroller" and the blank part designation before each section number has been filled in with "19."

Regulatory Flexibility Act

Pursuant to section 605(b) of the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the OCC hereby certifies that this final rule will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. Accordingly, a regulatory flexibility analysis is not required.

This final rule imposes only procedural requirements in administrative adjudications. It contains no substantive requirements. It improves the Uniform Rules of Practice and Procedure and facilitates the

orderly determination of administrative proceedings. The changes in this final rule are primarily clarifications and impose no significant additional burdens on regulated institutions, parties to administrative actions, or counsel.

Executive Order 12866 Statement

The OCC has determined that this final rule is not a significant regulatory action as defined in Executive Order 12866.

Unfunded Mandates Act

Section 202 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995, Pub. L. 104-4 (Unfunded Mandates Act) requires that an agency prepare a budgetary impact statement before promulgating a rule that includes a Federal mandate that may result in expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, or by the private sector, of \$100 million or more in any one year. If a budgetary impact statement is required, section 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Act also requires an agency to identify and consider a reasonable number of regulatory alternatives before promulgating a rule. As discussed in the preamble, this final rule is limited in application to procedural amendments to the rules of administrative practice before the OCC. The OCC has therefore determined that the final rule will not result in expenditures by State, local, or tribal governments or by the private sector of more than \$100 million. Accordingly, the OCC has not prepared a budgetary impact statement or specifically addressed the regulatory alternatives considered.

Effective Date

Section 302 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act 1994 delays the effective date of regulations promulgated by the Federal banking agencies that impose additional reporting, disclosure, or other new requirements to the first date of the first calendar quarter following publication of the final rule. The OCC believes that section 302 is not applicable to this final rule, because the regulation does not impose any additional reporting or other requirements not already contained in the current version of the Uniform Rules or the Local Rules.

List of Subjects in 12 CFR Part 19

Administrative practice and procedure, Crime, Investigations, National banks, Penalties, Securities.

Authority and Issuance

For the reasons set out in the preamble, part 19 of chapter I of title 12 of the Code of Federal Regulations is amended as set forth below:

PART 19—RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE

1. The authority citation for part 19 is revised to read as follows:

Authority: 5 U.S.C. 504, 554-557; 12 U.S.C. 93(b), 164, 505, 1817, 1818, 1820, 1831o, 1972, 3102, 3108(a), 3909, and 4717; 15 U.S.C. 78 (h) and (i), 78o-4(c), 78o-5, 78q-1, 78u, 78u-2, 78u-3, and 78w; 31 U.S.C. 330 and 5321; and 42 U.S.C. 4012a.

Subpart A—[Amended]

2. In § 19.1, paragraph (e)(9) is amended by removing “and” after the semicolon, new paragraphs (e)(11) and (e)(12) are added, paragraph (f) is redesignated as paragraph (g), and new paragraph (f) is added to read as follows:

§ 19.1 Scope.

* * * * *

(e) * * *

(11) Any provision of law referenced in section 102(f) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(f)) or any order or regulation issued thereunder; and

(12) Any provision of law referenced in 31 U.S.C. 5321 or any order or regulation issued thereunder;

(f) Remedial action under section 102(g) of the Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 (42 U.S.C. 4012a(g)); and

* * * * *

3. In § 19.6, paragraph (a)(3) is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.6 Appearance and practice in adjudicatory proceedings.

(a) * * *

(3) *Notice of appearance.* Any individual acting as counsel on behalf of a party, including the Comptroller, shall file a notice of appearance with OFIA at or before the time that the individual submits papers or otherwise appears on behalf of a party in the adjudicatory proceeding. The notice of appearance must include a written declaration that the individual is currently qualified as provided in paragraph (a)(1) or (a)(2) of this section and is authorized to represent the particular party. By filing a notice of appearance on behalf of a party in an adjudicatory proceeding, the counsel agrees and represents that he or she is authorized to accept service on behalf of the represented party and that, in the event of withdrawal from representation, he or she will, if required by the administrative law judge, continue to accept service until

new counsel has filed a notice of appearance or until the represented party indicates that he or she will proceed on a *pro se* basis.

* * * * *

4. In § 19.8, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.8 Conflicts of interest.

* * * * *

(b) *Certification and waiver.* If any person appearing as counsel represents two or more parties to an adjudicatory proceeding or also represents a non-party on a matter relevant to an issue in the proceeding, counsel must certify in writing at the time of filing the notice of appearance required by § 19.6(a):

(1) That the counsel has personally and fully discussed the possibility of conflicts of interest with each such party and non-party; and

(2) That each such party and non-party waives any right it might otherwise have had to assert any known conflicts of interest or to assert any non-material conflicts of interest during the course of the proceeding.

5. In § 19.11, paragraphs (c)(2) and (d) are revised to read as follows:

§ 19.11 Service of papers.

* * * * *

(c) * * *

(2) If a party has not appeared in the proceeding in accordance with § 19.6, the Comptroller or the administrative law judge shall make service by any of the following methods:

(i) By personal service;

(ii) If the person to be served is an individual, by delivery to a person of suitable age and discretion at the physical location where the individual resides or works;

(iii) If the person to be served is a corporation or other association, by delivery to an officer, managing or general agent, or to any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service and, if the agent is one authorized by statute to receive service and the statute so requires, by also mailing a copy to the party;

(iv) By registered or certified mail addressed to the person's last known address; or

(v) By any other method reasonably calculated to give actual notice.

(d) *Subpoenas.* Service of a subpoena may be made:

(1) By personal service;

(2) If the person to be served is an individual, by delivery to a person of suitable age and discretion at the physical location where the individual resides or works;

(3) By delivery to an agent, which, in the case of a corporation or other

association, is delivery to an officer, managing or general agent, or to any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service and, if the agent is one authorized by statute to receive service and the statute so requires, by also mailing a copy to the party;

(4) By registered or certified mail addressed to the person's last known address; or

(5) By any other method reasonably calculated to give actual notice.

* * * *

6. In § 19.12, paragraphs (a), (c)(1), (c)(2), and (c)(3) are revised to read as follows:

§ 19.12 Construction of time limits.

(a) *General rule.* In computing any period of time prescribed by this subpart, the date of the act or event that commences the designated period of time is not included. The last day so computed is included unless it is a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday. When the last day is a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday, the period runs until the end of the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday. Intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays are included in the computation of time. However, when the time period within which an act is to be performed is ten days or less, not including any additional time allowed for in paragraph (c) of this section, intermediate Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays are not included.

* * * *

(c) If service is made by first class, registered, or certified mail, add three calendar days to the prescribed period;

(2) If service is made by express mail or overnight delivery service, add one calendar day to the prescribed period; or

(3) If service is made by electronic media transmission, add one calendar day to the prescribed period, unless otherwise determined by the Comptroller or the administrative law judge in the case of filing, or by agreement among the parties in the case of service.

7. Section 19.20 is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.20 Amended pleadings.

(a) *Amendments.* The notice or answer may be amended or supplemented at any stage of the proceeding. The respondent must answer an amended notice within the time remaining for the respondent's answer to the original notice, or within ten days after service of the amended notice, whichever period is longer,

unless the Comptroller or administrative law judge orders otherwise for good cause.

(b) *Amendments to conform to the evidence.* When issues not raised in the notice or answer are tried at the hearing by express or implied consent of the parties, they will be treated in all respects as if they had been raised in the notice or answer, and no formal amendments are required. If evidence is objected to at the hearing on the ground that it is not within the issues raised by the notice or answer, the administrative law judge may admit the evidence when admission is likely to assist in adjudicating the merits of the action and the objecting party fails to satisfy the administrative law judge that the admission of such evidence would unfairly prejudice that party's action or defense upon the merits. The administrative law judge may grant a continuance to enable the objecting party to meet such evidence.

8. In § 19.24, paragraphs (a) and (b) are revised to read as follows:

§ 19.24 Scope of document discovery.

(a) *Limits on discovery.* (1) Subject to the limitations set out in paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of this section, a party to a proceeding under this subpart may obtain document discovery by serving a written request to produce documents. For purposes of a request to produce documents, the term "documents" may be defined to include drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, recordings, data stored in electronic form, and other data compilations from which information can be obtained, or translated, if necessary, by the parties through detection devices into reasonably usable form, as well as written material of all kinds.

(2) Discovery by use of deposition is governed by subpart I of this part.

(3) Discovery by use of interrogatories is not permitted.

(b) *Relevance.* A party may obtain document discovery regarding any matter, not privileged, that has material relevance to the merits of the pending action. Any request to produce documents that calls for irrelevant material, that is unreasonable, oppressive, excessive in scope, unduly burdensome, or repetitive of previous requests, or that seeks to obtain privileged documents will be denied or modified. A request is unreasonable, oppressive, excessive in scope, or unduly burdensome if, among other things, it fails to include justifiable limitations on the time period covered and the geographic locations to be searched, the time provided to respond in the request is inadequate, or the

request calls for copies of documents to be delivered to the requesting party and fails to include the requestor's written agreement to pay in advance for the copying, in accordance with § 19.25.

* * * *

9. In § 19.25, paragraphs (a), (b), (e), and (g) are revised to read as follows:

§ 19.25 Request for document discovery from parties.

(a) *General rule.* Any party may serve on any other party a request to produce for inspection any discoverable documents that are in the possession, custody, or control of the party upon whom the request is served. The request must identify the documents to be produced either by individual item or by category, and must describe each item and category with reasonable particularity. Documents must be produced as they are kept in the usual course of business or must be organized to correspond with the categories in the request.

(b) *Production or copying.* The request must specify a reasonable time, place, and manner for production and performing any related acts. In lieu of inspecting the documents, the requesting party may specify that all or some of the responsive documents be copied and the copies delivered to the requesting party. If copying of fewer than 250 pages is requested, the party to whom the request is addressed shall bear the cost of copying and shipping charges. If a party requests 250 pages or more of copying, the requesting party shall pay for the copying and shipping charges. Copying charges are the current per-page copying rate imposed by 12 CFR part 4 implementing the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552). The party to whom the request is addressed may require payment in advance before producing the documents.

* * * *

(e) *Privilege.* At the time other documents are produced, the producing party must reasonably identify all documents withheld on the grounds of privilege and must produce a statement of the basis for the assertion of privilege. When similar documents that are protected by deliberative process, attorney work-product, or attorney-client privilege are voluminous, these documents may be identified by category instead of by individual document. The administrative law judge retains discretion to determine when the identification by category is insufficient.

* * * *

(g) *Ruling on motions.* After the time for filing responses pursuant to this section has expired, the administrative

law judge shall rule promptly on all motions filed pursuant to this section. If the administrative law judge determines that a discovery request, or any of its terms, calls for irrelevant material, is unreasonable, oppressive, excessive in scope, unduly burdensome, or repetitive of previous requests, or seeks to obtain privileged documents, he or she may deny or modify the request, and may issue appropriate protective orders, upon such conditions as justice may require. The pendency of a motion to strike or limit discovery or to compel production is not a basis for staying or continuing the proceeding, unless otherwise ordered by the administrative law judge. Notwithstanding any other provision in this part, the administrative law judge may not release, or order a party to produce, documents withheld on grounds of privilege if the party has stated to the administrative law judge its intention to file a timely motion for interlocutory review of the administrative law judge's order to produce the documents, and until the motion for interlocutory review has been decided.

* * * *

10. In § 19.33, paragraph (a) is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.33 Public hearings.

(a) *General rule.* All hearings shall be open to the public, unless the Comptroller, in the Comptroller's discretion, determines that holding an open hearing would be contrary to the public interest. Within 20 days of service of the notice or, in the case of change-in-control proceedings under section 7(j)(4) of the FDIA (12 U.S.C. 1817(j)(4)), within 20 days from service of the hearing order, any respondent may file with the Comptroller a request for a private hearing, and any party may file a reply to such a request. A party must serve on the administrative law judge a copy of any request or reply the party files with the Comptroller. The form of, and procedure for, these requests and replies are governed by § 19.23. A party's failure to file a request or a reply constitutes a waiver of any objections regarding whether the hearing will be public or private.

* * * *

11. In § 19.34, paragraphs (a) and (b)(1) are revised to read as follows:

§ 19.34 Hearing subpoenas.

(a) *Issuance.* (1) Upon application of a party showing general relevance and reasonableness of scope of the testimony or other evidence sought, the administrative law judge may issue a subpoena or a subpoena *duces tecum* requiring the attendance of a witness at

the hearing or the production of documentary or physical evidence at the hearing. The application for a hearing subpoena must also contain a proposed subpoena specifying the attendance of a witness or the production of evidence from any state, territory, or possession of the United States, the District of Columbia, or as otherwise provided by law at any designated place where the hearing is being conducted. The party making the application shall serve a copy of the application and the proposed subpoena on every other party.

(2) A party may apply for a hearing subpoena at any time before the commencement of a hearing. During a hearing, a party may make an application for a subpoena orally on the record before the administrative law judge.

(3) The administrative law judge shall promptly issue any hearing subpoena requested pursuant to this section. If the administrative law judge determines that the application does not set forth a valid basis for the issuance of the subpoena, or that any of its terms are unreasonable, oppressive, excessive in scope, or unduly burdensome, he or she may refuse to issue the subpoena or may issue it in a modified form upon any conditions consistent with this subpart. Upon issuance by the administrative law judge, the party making the application shall serve the subpoena on the person named in the subpoena and on each party.

(b) *Motion to quash or modify.* (1) Any person to whom a hearing subpoena is directed or any party may file a motion to quash or modify the subpoena, accompanied by a statement of the basis for quashing or modifying the subpoena. The movant must serve the motion on each party and on the person named in the subpoena. Any party may respond to the motion within ten days of service of the motion.

* * * *

12. In § 19.35, paragraph (a)(3) is redesignated as paragraph (a)(4), a new paragraph (a)(3) is added, and paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.35 Conduct of hearings.

(a) * * *

(3) *Examination of witnesses.* Only one counsel for each party may conduct an examination of a witness, except that in the case of extensive direct examination, the administrative law judge may permit more than one counsel for the party presenting the witness to conduct the examination. A party may have one counsel conduct the direct examination and another counsel conduct re-direct examination of a

witness, or may have one counsel conduct the cross examination of a witness and another counsel conduct the re-cross examination of a witness.

* * * *

(b) *Transcript.* The hearing must be recorded and transcribed. The reporter will make the transcript available to any party upon payment by that party to the reporter of the cost of the transcript. The administrative law judge may order the record corrected, either upon motion to correct, upon stipulation of the parties, or following notice to the parties upon the administrative law judge's own motion.

13. In § 19.37, the section heading and paragraph (a)(1) are revised to read as follows:

§ 19.37 Post-hearing filings.

(a) *Proposed findings and conclusions and supporting briefs.* (1) Using the same method of service for each party, the administrative law judge shall serve notice upon each party that the certified transcript, together with all hearing exhibits and exhibits introduced but not admitted into evidence at the hearing, has been filed. Any party may file with the administrative law judge proposed findings of fact, proposed conclusions of law, and a proposed order within 30 days following service of this notice by the administrative law judge or within such longer period as may be ordered by the administrative law judge.

* * * *

14. Section 19.38 is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.38 Recommended decision and filing of record.

(a) *Filing of recommended decision and record.* Within 45 days after expiration of the time allowed for filing reply briefs under § 19.37(b), the administrative law judge shall file with and certify to the Comptroller, for decision, the record of the proceeding. The record must include the administrative law judge's recommended decision, recommended findings of fact, recommended conclusions of law, and proposed order; all prehearing and hearing transcripts, exhibits, and rulings; and the motions, briefs, memoranda, and other supporting papers filed in connection with the hearing. The administrative law judge shall serve upon each party the recommended decision, findings, conclusions, and proposed order.

(b) *Filing of index.* At the same time the administrative law judge files with and certifies to the Comptroller for final determination the record of the proceeding, the administrative law judge shall furnish to the Comptroller a

certified index of the entire record of the proceeding. The certified index shall include, at a minimum, an entry for each paper, document or motion filed with the administrative law judge in the proceeding, the date of the filing, and the identity of the filer. The certified index shall also include an exhibit index containing, at a minimum, an entry consisting of exhibit number and title or description for: Each exhibit introduced and admitted into evidence at the hearing; each exhibit introduced but not admitted into evidence at the hearing; each exhibit introduced and admitted into evidence after the completion of the hearing; and each exhibit introduced but not admitted into evidence after the completion of the hearing.

Subpart B—[Amended]

15. Section 19.100 is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.100 Filing documents.

All materials required to be filed with or referred to the Comptroller or the administrative law judge in any proceeding under this part must be filed with the Hearing Clerk, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, 250 E Street, SW, Washington, DC 20219. Filings to be made with the Hearing Clerk include the notice and answer; motions and responses to motions; briefs; the record filed by the administrative law judge after the issuance of a recommended decision; the recommended decision filed by the administrative law judge following a motion for summary disposition (except that in removal and prohibition cases the administrative law judge will file the record and the recommended decision with the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System); referrals by the administrative law judge of motions for interlocutory review; exceptions and requests for oral argument; and any other papers required to be filed with the Comptroller or the administrative law judge under this part.

Subpart C—[Amended]

16. In § 19.112, paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d)(3)(i) are revised to read as follows:

§ 19.112 Informal hearing.

(a) *Issuance of hearing order.* After receipt of a request for hearing, the District Deputy Comptroller or Administrator, the Deputy Comptroller for Multinational Banking, or the Deputy Comptroller or Director for Special Supervision, as appropriate, must notify the petitioner requesting the

hearing, the OCC's Enforcement and Compliance Division, and the appropriate OCC District Counsel of the date, time, and place fixed for the hearing. The hearing must be scheduled to be held not later than 30 days from the date when a request for hearing is received unless the time is extended in response to a written request of the petitioner. The District Deputy Comptroller or Administrator, the Deputy Comptroller for Multinational Banking, or the Deputy Comptroller or Director for Special Supervision, as appropriate, may extend the hearing date only for a specific period of time and must take appropriate action to ensure that the hearing is not unduly delayed.

(b) *Appointment of presiding officer.* The District Deputy Comptroller or Administrator, the Deputy Comptroller for Multinational Banking, or the Deputy Comptroller or Director for Special Supervision, as appropriate, must appoint one or more OCC employees as the presiding officer to conduct the hearing. The presiding officer(s) may not have been involved in the proceeding, a factually related proceeding, or the underlying enforcement action in a prosecutorial or investigative role.

(c) *Waiver of oral hearing—(1) Petitioner.* When the petitioner requests a hearing, the petitioner may elect to have the matter determined by the presiding officer solely on the basis of written submissions by serving on the District Deputy Comptroller or Administrator, the Deputy Comptroller for Multinational Banking, or the Deputy Comptroller or Director for Special Supervision, as appropriate, and all parties, a signed document waiving the statutory right to appear and make oral argument. The petitioner must present the written submissions to the presiding officer, and serve the other parties, not later than ten days prior to the date fixed for the hearing, or within such shorter time period as the presiding officer may permit.

(2) *OCC.* The OCC may respond to the petitioner's submissions by presenting the presiding officer with a written response, and by serving the other parties, not later than the date fixed for the hearing, or within such other time period as the presiding officer may require.

(d) * * *

(3) *Presentation.* (i) The OCC may appear and the petitioner may appear personally or through counsel at the hearing to present relevant written materials and oral argument. Except as permitted in paragraph (c) of this section, each party, including the OCC,

must file a copy of any affidavit, memorandum, or other written material to be presented at the hearing with the presiding officer and must serve the other parties not later than ten days prior to the hearing or within such shorter time period as permitted by the presiding officer.

* * * * *

17. In § 19.113, paragraphs (a) and (b) are revised, paragraph (c), (d), and (e) are redesignated as paragraphs (d), (e), and (f), respectively, and new paragraph (c) is added, to read as follows:

§ 19.113 Recommended and final decisions.

(a) The presiding officer must issue a recommended decision to the Comptroller within 20 days of the conclusion of the hearing or, when the petitioner has waived an oral hearing, within 20 days of the date fixed for the hearing. The presiding officer must serve promptly a copy of the recommended decision on the parties to the proceeding. The decision must include a summary of the facts and arguments of the parties.

(b) Each party may, within ten days of being served with the presiding officer's recommended decision, submit to the Comptroller comments on the recommended decision.

(c) Within 60 days of the conclusion of the hearing or, when the petitioner has waived an oral hearing, within 60 days from the date fixed for the hearing, the Comptroller must notify the petitioner by registered mail whether the suspension or removal from office, and prohibition from participation in any manner in the affairs of the bank, will be affirmed, terminated, or modified. The Comptroller's decision must include a statement of reasons supporting the decision. The Comptroller's decision is a final and unappealable order.

* * * * *

Subpart H—[Amended]

§ 19.160 [Amended]

18. In § 19.160, paragraph (a) is amended in the second sentence by revising the phrase "notify the acquiring party in writing" to read "mail a written notification to the proposed acquiring person".

19. Section 19.161 is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.161 Notice of disapproval and hearing initiation.

(a) *Notice of disapproval.* The OCC's written disapproval of a proposed acquisition of control of a national bank must:

(1) Contain a statement of the basis for the disapproval; and

(2) Indicate that the filer may request a hearing.

(b) *Hearing request.* Following receipt of a notice of disapproval, a filer may request a hearing on the proposed acquisition. A hearing request must:

(1) Be in writing; and

(2) Be filed with the Hearing Clerk of the OCC within ten days after service on the filer of the notice of disapproval. If a filer fails to request a hearing with a timely written request, the notice of disapproval constitutes a final and unappealable order.

(c) *Hearing order.* Following receipt of a hearing request, the Comptroller shall issue, within 20 days, an order that sets forth:

(1) The legal authority for the proceeding and for the OCC's jurisdiction over the proceeding;

(2) The matters of fact or law upon which the disapproval is based; and

(3) The requirement for filing an answer to the hearing order with OFIA within 20 days after service of the hearing order.

(d) *Answer.* An answer to a hearing order must specifically deny those portions of the order that are disputed. Those portions of the order that the filer does not specifically deny are deemed admitted by the filer. Any hearing under this subpart is limited to those portions of the order that are specifically denied.

(e) *Effect of failure to answer.* Failure of a filer to file an answer within 20 days after service of the hearing order constitutes a waiver of the filer's right to appear and contest the allegations in the hearing order. If a filer does not file a timely answer, enforcement counsel may file a motion for entry of an order of default. Upon a finding that no good cause has been shown for the failure to file a timely answer, the administrative law judge shall file with the Comptroller a recommended decision containing the findings and the relief sought in the hearing order. Any final order issued by the Comptroller based upon a filer's failure to answer is deemed to be an order issued upon consent and is a final and unappealable order.

§ 19.162 [Removed]

20. Section 19.162 is removed.

Subpart I—[Amended]

21. In § 19.170, paragraph (d) is revised, paragraphs (e) and (f) are redesignated as paragraphs (f) and (g), respectively, and a new paragraph (e) is added to read as follows:

§ 19.170 Discovery depositions.

* * * * *

(d) *Conduct of the deposition.* The witness must be duly sworn, and each party will have the right to examine the witness with respect to all non-privileged, relevant, and material matters of which the witness has factual, direct, and personal knowledge. Objections to questions or exhibits must be in short form and must state the grounds for the objection. Failure to object to questions or exhibits is not a waiver except where the grounds for the objection might have been avoided if the objection had been timely presented.

(e) *Recording the testimony.*—(1)

Generally. The party taking the deposition must have a certified court reporter record the witness's testimony:

(i) By stenotype machine or electronic sound recording device;

(ii) Upon agreement of the parties, by any other method; or

(iii) For good cause and with leave of the administrative law judge, by any other method.

(2) *Cost.* The party taking the deposition must bear the cost of the recording and transcribing the witness's testimony.

(3) *Transcript.* Unless the parties agree that a transcription is not necessary, the court reporter must provide a transcript of the witness's testimony to the party taking the deposition and must make a copy of the transcript available to each party upon payment by that party of the cost of the copy.

* * * * *

22. In § 19.171, paragraph (b) is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.171 Deposition subpoenas.

* * * * *

(b) *Service.*—(1) *Methods of service.*

The party requesting the subpoena must serve it on the person named therein, or on that person's counsel, by any of the methods identified in § 19.11(d).

(2) *Proof of service.* The party serving the subpoena must file proof of service with the administrative law judge.

* * * * *

Subpart J—[Amended]

23. Section 19.184 is revised to read as follows:

§ 19.184 Service of subpoena and payment of witness expenses.

(a) *Methods of service.* Service of a subpoena may be made by any of the methods identified in § 19.11(d).

(b) *Expenses.* A witness who is subpoenaed will be paid the same expenses in the same manner as witnesses in the district courts of the United States. The expenses need not be

tendered at the time a subpoena is served.

Dated: April 2, 1996.

Eugene A. Ludwig,

Comptroller of the Currency.

[FR Doc. 96-10331 Filed 5-3-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4810-33-P

FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

12 CFR Part 263

[Docket No. R-0878]

Uniform Rules of Practice and Procedure

AGENCY: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

ACTION: Final rule.

SUMMARY: The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (Board), as a result of an interagency review conducted by the Board, the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC), the Office of Thrift Supervision (OTS), the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC), and the National Credit Union Administration (NCUA), is amending its implementation of the Uniform Rules of Practice and Procedure for Administrative Hearings (Uniform Rules). The Board's review of the Uniform Rules was conducted in accordance with section 303 of the Riegle Community Development and Regulatory Improvement Act of 1994.

The final rule is intended to clarify certain provisions and to increase the efficiency and fairness of administrative hearings.

EFFECTIVE DATE: June 5, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Katherine H. Wheatley, Assistant General Counsel, Legal Division (202 452-3779), Douglas B. Jordan, Senior Attorney, Legal Division, (202 452-3787), or Ann Marie Kohlligan, Senior Counsel, Division of Banking Supervision and Regulation, (202/452-3528).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

A. Background

Section 916 of the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 (FIRREA), Pub. L. 101-73, 103 Stat. 183 (1989), required the Board, OCC, FDIC, OTS, and NCUA (agencies) to develop uniform rules and procedures for administrative hearings. The agencies each adopted final Uniform Rules in August, 1991.¹ Based

¹ The agencies issued a joint notice of proposed rulemaking on Monday, June 17, 1991 (56 FR 27790). The agencies promulgated their final rules