

EDITORS' NOTE: WELCOME TO PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT!

Steven A. Meyerowitz and Victoria Prussen Spears

DAY ONE: THE ORIGIN STORY OF COMPUTER FORENSICS

David Kalat

THE SEC'S NEW GUIDANCE ON CYBERSECURITY: CODING BEST PRACTICES

Gregg S. Buksbaum, Skye W. Smith, Matt P. Cohen, Sunitha Malepati, and Brooke P. LoCoco

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ISSUES GUIDANCE ON BEST PRACTICES FOR CYBERSECURITY PREPAREDNESS

A.J. Kess, Yafit Cohn, and Linda M. Nyberg

FCC BECOMES LATEST AGENCY TO INCREASE CONSUMER PRIVACY AND DATA SECURITY ENFORCEMENT

Paul C. Besozzi, Monica S. Desai, and Koyulyn K. Miller

SECOND CIRCUIT RULES PATRIOT ACT DOES NOT AUTHORIZE GOVERNMENT'S BULK TELEPHONE METADATA COLLECTION PROGRAM Angelo A. Stio III and Eli Segal

ARE PRIVATE INSTITUTION SECURITY DEPARTMENT RECORDS SUBJECT TO DISCLOSURE UNDER PUBLIC RECORDS ACTS?

Michael J. Cooney, Christopher D. Thomas, Steven M. Richard, and Kacey Houston Walker

COOK COUNTY "PIGGYBACKS" ON STATE OF ILLINOIS AND CITY OF CHICAGO EMPLOYEE CREDIT PRIVACY LAWS

Howard L. Mocerf

IN THE COURTS
Steven A. Meyerowitz

LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY DEVELOPMENTS

Steven A. Meyerowitz

INDUSTRY NEWS

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME I	NUMBER 1	AUGUST/SEPTEMBER 2015
Editors' Note—Welcome to <i>Prat</i> Steven A. Meyerowitz and Victoria		ecurity Law Report!
Day One: The Origin Story of C David Kalat	omputer Forensics	4
The SEC's New Guidance on Cy Gregg S. Buksbaum, Skye W. Smith Brooke P. LoCoco	,	
Department of Justice Issues Gui A.J. Kess, Yafit Cohn, and Linda M		ces for Cybersecurity Preparedness
FCC Becomes Latest Agency to I Enforcement Paul C. Besozzi, Monica S. Desai,		•
Second Circuit Rules Patriot Act Metadata Collection Program Angelo A. Stio III and Eli Segal	Does Not Authorize	Government's Bulk Telephone
Are Private Institution Security I Records Acts? Michael J. Cooney, Christopher D	-	Subject to Disclosure under Public Richard, and Kacey
Houston Walker Cook County "Piggybacks" on S Credit Privacy Laws	tate of Illinois and Ci	
Howard L. Mocerf In the Courts Steven A. Meyerowitz		30
Legislative and Regulatory Devel Steven A. Meyerowitz	opments	37
Industry News Victoria Prussen Spears		40



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact: Deneil C. Targowski at
Customer Services Department at
Your account manager or

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3362-4 (print) ISBN: 978-1-6328-3363-1 (eBook)

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print) ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online) Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

David Kalat, *Day One: The Origin Story of Computer Forensics*, [1] Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report [4] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2015 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. $Pratt^{TM}$ Publication Editorial

Editorial Offices 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800 201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW BENDER

(2015-Pub. 4939)

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

EMILIO W. CIVIDANES

Partner, Venable LLP

RICHARD COHEN

Special Counsel, Kelley Drye & Warren LLP

CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

RICHARD D. HARRIS

Partner, Day Pitney LLP

DAVID C. LASHWAY

Partner, Baker & McKenzie LLP

CRAIG A. NEWMAN

Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP

ALAN CHARLES RAUL

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

AARON P. SIMPSON

Partner, Hunton & Williams LLP

RANDI SINGER

Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI

Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP

TODD G. VARE

Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP

THOMAS F. ZYCH

Partner, Thompson Hine

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2015 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 718.224.2258. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

Cook County "Piggybacks" on State of Illinois and City of Chicago Employee Credit Privacy Laws

By Howard L. Mocerf*

This article summarizes the similarities and the few differences between three Illinois laws restricting the use of credit history or credit reports in making employment decisions.

Joining a growing trend among states and local governments, the Cook County, Illinois Human Rights Ordinance was amended effective as of June 1, 2015 to add an employee or applicant's credit history or credit report as a prohibited type of employment discrimination. The amendments¹ are substantially the same as the provisions of the Illinois Employee Credit Privacy Act,² and those restricting the use of credit history or credit reports in making employment decisions under counterpart provisions of City of Chicago Human Rights Ordinance of the Chicago Municipal Code.³ This article summarizes the similarities and the few differences between these laws.

THE PROHIBITIONS

Each of the three laws prohibits employers that are subject to them from:

- Inquiring about an applicant's or employee's credit history;
- Ordering or obtaining an applicant's or employee's credit report from a consumer reporting agency; or
- Failing or refusing to hire or recruit, fire or otherwise discriminate against any
 individual with respect to employment, compensation or any term, privilege or
 condition of employment because of the individual's credit history or credit
 report.

None of these prohibitions, however, apply to jobs that:

- Require bonding or other security under federal or state law;
- Include having custody of or unsupervised access to cash or marketable assets, as defined by the laws, valued at \$2,500 or more;
- Give the individual signatory power over business assets of \$100 or more per transaction;

^{*} Howard L. Mocerf is a practice group attorney at Greenberg Traurig, LLP, where he focuses his practice on labor law and management employment matters. He may be contacted at mocerfh@gtlaw.com.

¹ Bill No. 3088.

² 820 ILCS 70/1, et seq.

³ § 1-160-010, et seq.

- Are managerial jobs that involving setting the direction and control of the business;
- Involve access to personal or confidential information, financial information, trade secrets or state or national security information, as defined by the laws;
- Meet criteria set forth in any administrative rules of the U.S. Department of Labor or Illinois Department of Labor that define the circumstances in which a credit history is a bona fide occupational qualification; or
- An applicant's or employee's credit history is otherwise required by or exempt under any other applicable law.

WHO DO THE LAWS APPLY TO?

All three laws apply to any individual or entity that employs at least one employee or accepts applications for employment within the State of Illinois, Cook County, and the City of Chicago, respectively, with the following exceptions:

- Bank holding companies, financial holding companies, banks, savings banks, savings and loan associations, credit unions or trust companies, or any subsidiary or affiliate thereof, that is authorized to do business under Illinois or U.S. law; or
- Companies authorized to engage in any kind of insurance or surety business pursuant to the Illinois Insurance Code.

HOW DO THE LAWS DIFFER?

The Illinois, Cook County, and City of Chicago laws differ in the following ways:

- The Illinois law exempts from the definition of employer covered by the state law any Illinois state law enforcement agency or investigative unit, but does not exempt similar county or municipal agencies. However, the Illinois state law also exempts from the definition of employer, any Illinois state or local government agency that otherwise requires the use of an employee's or applicant's credit history or report. Pursuant to the latter exemption, the City of Chicago law exempts the City's law enforcement and investigative units. The Cook County law, somewhat differently, exempts any county law enforcement, investigative unit or agency that requires the use of an employee's credit history or credit report.
- The Illinois law exempts from the definition of employer covered by the state law any entity that is defined as a debt collector under federal or state statute, but does not exempt a debt collector as defined under local law. The Cook County law extends this exemption to debt collectors as defined in the County ordinance. The City of Chicago law does not similarly extend the exemption.

- The enforcement mechanisms under the three laws are different. Actions for violation of the Illinois law must be brought in the state circuit courts. Complaints for alleged violations of Cook County and City of Chicago Human Rights Ordinances must be filed before the Cook County Human Rights Commission and City of Chicago Human Relations Commission, respectively, and are subject to the exclusive administrative investigatory and adjudicatory provisions of those ordinances and the agencies' regulations. However, the Cook County Human Rights Ordinance contains provisions that allow a complainant to obtain a right to sue in the Circuit Court of Cook County under certain circumstances and, thereby, terminate the administrative proceeding. No such right exists under the City of Chicago Human Rights Ordinance.
- The remedial provisions under these laws are similar but somewhat different. The Illinois law provides for injunctive relief, damages, costs and reasonable attorney's fees to a prevailing employee or applicant. The Cook County Human Rights Ordinance and the City of Chicago Human Relations Enabling Ordinance specify the full panoply of the types of relief typically allowed a prevailing employee or applicant in an employment discrimination case. These include damages, reinstatement or order to hire, back pay, attorney's fees, costs, witness fees, expert witness fees, and copying fees.

CONCLUSION

While Cook County's enactment of employee credit privacy protections should have little impact on most employers who employ workers in the county or the City of Chicago in view of the existing Illinois and City of Chicago laws, it serves as a reminder to such employers to review their existing policies concerning the use of credit histories and credit reports to evaluate whether it is obtaining and using such information in a lawful manner. Further, since nine other states and some local governments have enacted similar laws, employers who obtain and use such information in making employment decisions affecting applicants or employees in other jurisdictions should be aware of any laws in those other jurisdictions that impact their practices.