C& 569138-22708379CV10PDD 820A12A202Pile 740729/192978 3	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: /p /o// o
LINDA A. LACEWELL, in her official capacity as Superintendent of the New York State Department of Financial Services,	-X DATE FILED: /*/24//9
Plaintiff,	: · 18 Civ. 8377 (VM)
- against -	DECISION AND ORDER
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY, and JOSEPH M. OTTING, in his official capacity as U.S. Comptroller of the Currency,	
Defendants.	: - Y
VICTOR MARRERO, United States Dist	rict Judge.

By order dated May 2, 2019, the Court denied the motion of defendants Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and Joseph M. Otting, in his official capacity as United States Comptroller of the Currency (together, "OCC"), to dismiss the Administrative Procedure Act ("APA") challenge to 5 C.F.R. Section 5.20(e)(1)(i) (the "Regulation") brought by plaintiff Maria T. Vullo, in her official capacity as Superintendent of the New York State Department of Financial Services ("DFS").1 See Vullo v. Office of Comptroller of Currency, 378 F. Supp. 3d 271, 300 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).² In response to the Court's

¹ Maria T. Vullo has since been succeeded as Superintendent by Linda A. Lacewell, and the case caption has changed accordingly pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d). (See Dkt. Nos. 32; 35.) ² The Court granted OCC's motion to dismiss with respect to DFS's claim alleging a violation of the Tenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. See Vullo, 378 F. Supp. 3d at 300.

C6389:19-42708379CVMenb12uA12/A202Pil2740123/19age73eo2783

directive to confer and submit a case management plan, the parties negotiated a stipulated final judgment in DFS's favor, submitted competing versions on October 7, 2019, and now ask the Court to decide which to endorse. (See "DFS Proposal," Dkt. No. 40; "OCC Proposal," Dkt. No. 41.)

The two proposals are nearly identical. Both (1) direct the Clerk of Court to enter final judgment in favor of plaintiff DFS and close the case, and (2) provide that each party shall bear its own fees and costs. (See OCC Proposal at 7; DFS Proposal at 5.) However, where DFS proposes that the Regulation be "set aside with respect to all fintech applicants seeking a national bank charter that do not accept deposits" (DFS Proposal at 5), OCC proposes that the Regulation be set aside more narrowly: only "with respect to all fintech applicants seeking a national bank charter that do not accept deposits, and that have a nexus to New York State, i.e., applicants that are chartered in New York or that intend to do business in New York (including through the Internet) in a manner that would subject them to regulation by DFS." (OCC Proposal at 7.) OCC justifies this proposed limitation with a lengthy argument about the propriety of nationwide injunctions. (See id. at 2-5.)

Here, however, the Court is not providing injunctive relief of any kind, nationwide or otherwise. Rather, having

2

$C_{6}=12-42708379$ CVIMento $12^{1}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}/12^{2}$

previously held that DFS (1) has standing and (2) states an APA claim, <u>see Vullo</u>, 378 F. Supp. 3d at 289, 298, the Court now grants judgment -- at the parties' request -- on that claim in DFS's favor. Hence vacatur of the Regulation with respect to non-depository institutions is the corresponding remedy the APA prescribes. The Court finds that OCC has failed to identify a persuasive reason to deviate from ordinary administrative law procedure on this score. <u>See, e.g., Am.</u> <u>Biosci., Inc. v. Thompson</u>, 269 F.3d 1077, 1084 (D.C. Cir. 2001) ("If an appellant has standing . . . and prevails on its APA claim, it is entitled to relief under that statute, which normally will be a vacatur of the agency's order.").

For the foregoing reasons, it is hereby

ORDERED that the proposed final judgment (Dkt. No. 40) submitted by Linda A. Lacewell, in her official capacity as Superintendent of the New York State Department of Financial Services, is **ADOPTED**. A final judgment will be endorsed and docketed separately.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York 21 October 2019

Victor Marrero

U.S.D.J.

Case 1.18-22708379cvmenb 124812622020112740128/162927601782

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

LINDA A. LACEWELL, in her official capacity as Acting Superintendent of the New York State Department of Financial Services,

> Plaintiff, v.

OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY and JOSEPH M. OTTING, in his official capacity as U.S. Comptroller of the Currency,

18-cv-8377

ĴĘ

Hon. Victor Marrero

Defendants.

FINAL JUDGMENT

WHEREAS, on September 14, 2018, plaintiff the Superintendent of the New York State Department of Financial Services ("DFS")¹ commenced this action against defendants the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency and Comptroller Joseph M. Otting (together, "OCC"), challenging OCC's decision to accept applications for special-purpose national bank charters from financial technology (or "fintech") companies, including fintech companies that do not accept deposits;

WHEREAS, on February 26, 2019, OCC moved to dismiss DFS's Complaint (ECF Nos. 20-22); on March 19, 2019, DFS opposed the motion to dismiss (ECF No. 25); and on March 26, 2019, OCC filed a reply brief in support of its motion (ECF No. 26);

¹ On May 31, 2019, in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), Superintendent of DFS Linda A. Lacewell was substituted as the plaintiff in this matter. (ECF No. 31).

Case 1 18-42708 379 cvimeno 8 2 4 12 A 2 4 10 28 10 29 20 28 2

WHEREAS, in a decision and order dated May 2, 2019 (ECF No. 28), this Court denied OCC's motion to dismiss in part, holding that the National Bank Act's "business of banking' clause, read in the light of its plain language, history, and legislative context, unambiguously requires that, absent a statutory provision to the contrary, only depository institutions are eligible to receive national bank charters from OCC";

WHEREAS, the parties have conferred and agree that the Court's May 2, 2019, order resolves the substantive legal issues in this matter and renders the entry of final judgment appropriate; and

WHEREAS, notwithstanding its agreement that entry of final judgment is appropriate at this time, OCC expressly reserves its appellate rights in this matter;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. For the reasons set forth in the Court's May 2, 2019, order, the Clerk of the Court is directed to enter final judgment in favor of plaintiff DFS, and to close this case;

2. OCC's regulation, 5 C.F.R. § 5.20(e)(1)(i), is set aside with respect to all fintech applicants seeking a national bank charter that do not accept deposits;

3. Each party shall bear its own fees and costs in this action.

Dated: New York, New York 2/October, 2019

SO ORDERED.

HON. VICTOR MARRERO United States District Judge

C& 369 1:18-22708379 CVINEND 12 UR1 2 PC	4502pined 40123/19aged geo1 68 2
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YOR	USDC SDNY DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #:
LINDA A. LACEWELL, in her official capacity as Superintendent of the New York State Department of Financial Services,	$\frac{\text{DATE FILED:}}{2}$
Plaintiff,	18 Civ. 8377
- against -	
OFFICE OF THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY and JOSEPH M. OTTING, in his official capacity as U.S. Comptroller of the Currency,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Defendants.	: : -X

AMENDED FINAL JUDGMENT

WHEREAS, on September 14, 2018, plaintiff the Superintendent of the New York State

Department of Financial Services ("DFS")' commenced this action against defendants the Office

of the Comptroller of the Currency and Comptroller Joseph M. Otting (together, "OCC"),

.

challenging OCC's decision to accept applications for special-purpose national bank charters

from financial technology (or "fintech") companies, including fintech companies that do not

accept deposits;

WHEREAS, on February 26, 2019, OCC moved to dismiss DFS' s Complaint (ECF Nos. 20-22); on March 19, 2019, DFS opposed the motion to dismiss (ECF No. 25); and on March 26, 2019, OCC filed a reply brief in support of its motion (ECF No. 26);

¹ On May 31, 2019, in accordance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 25(d), Superintendent of DFS Linda A. Lacewell was substituted as the plaintiff in this matter. (ECF No. 31).

C&389:18-42708379CVMPenb12uA12/A202Pi12740123/1Bage28e02782

WHEREAS, in a decision and order dated May 2, 2019 (ECF No. 28), this Court denied OCC's motion to dismiss in part, holding that the National Bank Act's "'business of banking' clause, read in the light of its plain language, history, and legislative context, unambiguously requires that, absent a statutory provision to the contrary, only depository institutions are eligible to receive national bank charters from OCC";

WHEREAS, the parties have conferred and agree that the Court's May 2, 2019, order resolves the substantive legal issues in this matter and renders the entry of final judgment appropriate; and

WHEREAS, notwithstanding its agreement that entry of final judgment is appropriate at this time, OCC expressly reserves its appellate rights in this matter;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that:

1. For the reasons set forth in the Court's May 2, 2019, order, the Clerk of the Court is directed to enter final judgment in favor of plaintiff DFS, and to close this case;

2. OCC's regulation, 5 C.F.R. § 5.20(e)(l)(i), is set aside with respect to all fintech applicants seeking a national bank charter that do not accept deposits;

3. Each party shall bear its own fees and costs in this action.

Dated: New York, New York L3 October 2019

SO ORDERED. HON. VICTOR MARRERO

United States District Judge