



AML Developments – FDIC Announces That It Will End Its Supervisory Trend of Expecting Regulated Institutions to ‘De-Risk’ Entire Categories of Customers

On Jan. 28, 2015, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) in a Financial Institutions Letter (FIL) announced that it would, in effect, do an about-face on its supervisory expectation that banks strongly consider discontinuing the provision of financial services to entire categories of certain purportedly high-risk customers. These categories of customers included, to name a few, non-U.S. companies, online gambling-related operations, online lenders, pharmaceutical sales, telemarketing entities, coin dealers, firearm and ammunition sellers, and even dating services.

The Letter now makes clear that banks regulated by the FDIC, in determining whether to continue – or discontinue – a specific customer relationship, may make that determination based on an individualized case-by-case risk analysis (something bankers have long advocated), as opposed to kicking out an otherwise profitable and risk management-sound customer from the bank simply because that customer happens to be in an industry that a regulator had deemed to be high-risk. But for the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Oversight Report from Dec. 8, 2014 investigating the FDIC’s handling of “Operation Choke Point,” the FDIC’s FIL might very well never have seen the light of day.

According to that Report, “FDIC, in cooperation with the Justice Department, made sure banks understood – or in their own language, ‘got the message’ – that maintaining relationships with certain disfavored business lines would incur enormous regulatory risk.” The FDIC has now reversed course, recognizing that it “is aware that some institutions may be hesitant to provide certain types of banking services due to concerns that they will be unable to comply with the associated requirements of the Bank Secrecy Act (BSA).” Under the new FDIC approach, FDIC-regulated banks are encouraged to “take a risk-based approach in assessing individual customer relationships rather than declining to provide banking services to entire categories of customers”

Financial firms – not just those examined by the FDIC – should be hopeful that the supervisory position of the FDIC expressed in the FIL might spill over to the other federal functional regulators, marking the start of a shift away from industry “de-risking” (and closing the accounts of) entire customer classes and, in its place, restoring reliance on robust know-your-customer or KYC practices, where bankers’ reasoned judgments regarding whether they know a specific customer should be entitled to supervisory deference.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by **Carl A. Fornaris** and **Jennifer H. Weddle**. Questions can be directed to:

- > [Carl A. Fornaris](mailto:fornarisc@gtlaw.com) | +1 305.579.0626 | fornarisc@gtlaw.com
- > [Jennifer H. Weddle](mailto:weddlej@gtlaw.com) | +1 303.572.6565 | weddlej@gtlaw.com
- > Or your [Greenberg Traurig](#) attorney

Albany +1 518.689.1400	Denver +1 303.572.6500	New York +1 212.801.9200	Shanghai +86 (21) 6391.6633
Amsterdam +31 (0) 20 301 7300	Fort Lauderdale +1 954.765.0500	Northern Virginia +1 703.749.1300	Silicon Valley +1 650.328.8500
Atlanta +1 678.553.2100	Houston +1 713.374.3500	Orange County +1 949.732.6500	Tallahassee +1 850.222.6891
Austin +1 512.320.7200	Las Vegas +1 702.792.3773	Orlando +1 407.420.1000	Tampa +1 813.318.5700
Boca Raton +1 561.955.7600	London* +44 (0) 203 349 8700	Philadelphia +1 215.988.7800	Tel Aviv^ +972 (0) 3 636 6000
Boston +1 617.310.6000	Los Angeles +1 310.586.7700	Phoenix +1 602.445.8000	Tokyo[‡] +81 (0)3 3216 7211
Chicago +1 312.456.8400	Mexico City+ +52 (1) 55 5029 0000	Sacramento +1 916.442.1111	Warsaw[~] +48 22 690 6100
Dallas +1 214.665.3600	Miami +1 305.579.0500	San Francisco +1 415.655.1300	Washington, D.C. +1 202.331.3100
Delaware +1 302.661.7000	New Jersey +1 973.360.7900	Seoul[∞] +82 (0) 2 369 1000	Westchester County +1 914.286.2900
			Palm Beach +1 561.650.7900

*This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer’s legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. *Operates as Greenberg Traurig Maher LLP. **Greenberg Traurig is not responsible for any legal or other services rendered by attorneys employed by the strategic alliance firms. +Greenberg Traurig’s Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ∞Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. ^Greenberg Traurig’s Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. ‡Greenberg Traurig Tokyo Law Offices are operated by Greenberg Traurig Horitsu Jimusho, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ~Greenberg Traurig’s Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2015 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*