

## securities lawflash

June 23, 2014

## Halliburton II Upholds Basic Presumption

*The Supreme Court upholds the fraud-on-the-market presumption but allows defendants to rebut the presumption at the class certification stage.*

On June 23, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its long-anticipated decision in *Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc. (Halliburton II)*.<sup>1</sup> Chief Justice Roberts delivered the opinion of the Court, in which Justices Kennedy, Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan joined. Justice Ginsburg filed a concurring opinion, in which Justices Breyer and Sotomayor joined. Justice Thomas filed an opinion concurring in the judgment, in which Justices Scalia and Alito joined.

The *Halliburton II* case generated significant publicity because it presented the Supreme Court with the opportunity to reexamine the fraud-on-the-market presumption created in *Basic v. Levinson*.<sup>2</sup> The Court in *Basic* held that, in a securities fraud class action, the plaintiff is entitled to a rebuttable presumption of reliance and, therefore, does not have to prove that each investor in the class relied on any alleged material misrepresentation. The foundation for the fraud-on-the-market theory is the efficient-market theory, which presumes that, in an efficient market, all material, public information about a company is absorbed by the marketplace and reflected in the price of the security. The efficient-market theory has been under increasing attack in recent years, leading many to believe that the time may have come to overturn *Basic*.

In *Halliburton II*, the Supreme Court addressed whether to continue the fraud-on-the-market presumption unchanged, to cease the applicability of the fraud-on-the-market presumption altogether, or to alter the presumption. In the Court's opinion, the majority declined to overrule or modify *Basic*'s presumption of classwide reliance, but it did hold that defendants may rebut the presumption at the class certification stage by introducing evidence that the alleged misrepresentation did not impact the market price. The majority determined that Halliburton had not demonstrated the "special justification" necessary to overturn "a long-settled precedent."<sup>3</sup> The majority also rejected Halliburton's request that the plaintiffs be required to show a price impact to invoke the presumption because "this proposal would radically alter the required showing for the reliance element."<sup>4</sup> The majority did hold that defendants can rebut the presumption by showing lack of price impact at the class certification stage because "[t]his restriction makes no sense, and can readily lead to bizarre results."<sup>5</sup> The majority therefore vacated the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit's judgment and remanded for further proceedings.

In a concurring opinion, Justice Ginsburg, joined by Justices Breyer and Sotomayor, noted that, although the decision would "broaden the scope of discovery available at certification," the increased burden would be on defendants to show the absence of price impact, not on plaintiffs whose burden to raise the presumption of reliance had not changed.<sup>6</sup>

In a separate opinion concurring only in the judgment, Justice Thomas, joined by Justices Scalia and Alito, argued

1. No. 13-317 (U.S. June 23, 2014), available at [http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/13pdf/13-317\\_mlho.pdf](http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/13pdf/13-317_mlho.pdf).

2. 485 U.S. 224 (1988).

3. *Halliburton II*, No. 13-317, slip op. at 4; see generally *id.* at 4–16.

4. *Id.* at 17.

5. *Id.* at 19.

6. *Id.* at 1 (Ginsburg, J., concurring).

# Morgan Lewis

that *Basic* should be overturned for three reasons. First, the fraud-on-the-market theory has “lost its luster”<sup>7</sup> in light of recent developments in economic theory.<sup>8</sup> Second, the presumption permits plaintiffs to bypass the requirement—as set forth in some of the Court’s most recent decisions on class certification—that plaintiffs affirmatively demonstrate compliance with Rule 23. Third, the *Basic* presumption of reliance is “largely irrebuttable” because “[a]fter class certification, courts have refused to allow defendants to challenge any plaintiff’s reliance on the integrity of the market price prior to a determination on classwide liability,”<sup>9</sup> therefore effectively eliminating the reliance requirement.

The Supreme Court’s decision has significant implications for securities fraud litigation, particularly at the class certification stage. Although plaintiffs need not prove direct price impact and may instead still raise the presumption of reliance by showing an efficient market and that the information was material and public, defendants may now rebut this presumption before class certification by showing a lack of price impact. We believe that defendants’ ability to rebut the presumption by showing no price impact effectively swallows the rule that plaintiffs need not prove a price impact. This will undoubtedly lead to a battle of the experts at the class certification stage. Although the Court’s decision does not explicitly affect other proceedings, such as a motion to dismiss, the scope of the decision will certainly be tested in the coming months and years.

## Contacts

If you have any questions or would like more information on the issues discussed in this LawFlash, please contact any of the following Morgan Lewis lawyers:

### **Boston**

Todd S. Holbrook 617.341.7888 [tholbrook@morganlewis.com](mailto:tholbrook@morganlewis.com)

### **Chicago**

Merri Jo Gillette 312.324.1134 [mgillette@morganlewis.com](mailto:mgillette@morganlewis.com)  
Kenneth M. Kliebard 312.324.1774 [kkliebard@morganlewis.com](mailto:kkliebard@morganlewis.com)  
Scott T. Schutte 312.324.1773 [sschutte@morganlewis.com](mailto:sschutte@morganlewis.com)

### **Dallas**

Allyson N. Ho 214.466.4180 [aho@morganlewis.com](mailto:aho@morganlewis.com)

### **Houston**

Hugh E. Tanner 713.890.5180 [htanner@morganlewis.com](mailto:htanner@morganlewis.com)

### **Irvine**

Scott B. Garner 949.399.7182 [sgarner@morganlewis.com](mailto:sgarner@morganlewis.com)  
Robert E. Gooding, Jr. 949.399.7181 [rgooding@morganlewis.com](mailto:rgooding@morganlewis.com)

### **Los Angeles**

Joseph Duffy 213.612.7378 [jduffy@morganlewis.com](mailto:jduffy@morganlewis.com)  
John F. Hartigan 213.612.2630 [jhartigan@morganlewis.com](mailto:jhartigan@morganlewis.com)

### **Miami**

Ivan P. Harris 305.415.3398 [iharris@morganlewis.com](mailto:iharris@morganlewis.com)

### **New York**

Michele A. Coffey 212.309.6917 [mcoffey@morganlewis.com](mailto:mcoffey@morganlewis.com)  
John Dellaportas 212.309.6690 [jdellaportas@morganlewis.com](mailto:jdellaportas@morganlewis.com)  
Anne C. Flannery 212.309.6370 [aflannery@morganlewis.com](mailto:aflannery@morganlewis.com)  
Bernard J. Garbutt III 212.309.6084 [bgarbutt@morganlewis.com](mailto:bgarbutt@morganlewis.com)

---

7. *Id.* at 7 (Thomas, J., concurring).

8. *Id.* at 8–9.

9. *Id.* at 13.

# Morgan Lewis

Brian A. Herman	212.309.6909	<a href="mailto:bherman@morganlewis.com">bherman@morganlewis.com</a>
Ben A. Indek	212.309.6109	<a href="mailto:bindek@morganlewis.com">bindek@morganlewis.com</a>
Michael S. Kraut	212.309.6927	<a href="mailto:mkraut@morganlewis.com">mkraut@morganlewis.com</a>
Robert M. Romano	212.309.7083	<a href="mailto:rromano@morganlewis.com">rromano@morganlewis.com</a>
Kevin T. Rover	212.309.6244	<a href="mailto:krover@morganlewis.com">krover@morganlewis.com</a>
John M. Vassos	212.309.6158	<a href="mailto:jvassos@morganlewis.com">jvassos@morganlewis.com</a>

## Philadelphia

J. Gordon Cooney, Jr.	215.963.4806	<a href="mailto:jgcooney@morganlewis.com">jgcooney@morganlewis.com</a>
Elizabeth Hoop Fay	215.963.5712	<a href="mailto:efay@morganlewis.com">efay@morganlewis.com</a>
Kristofor T. Henning	215.963.5882	<a href="mailto:khenning@morganlewis.com">khenning@morganlewis.com</a>
Timothy D. Katsiff	215.963.4857	<a href="mailto:tkatsiff@morganlewis.com">tkatsiff@morganlewis.com</a>
Karen Pieslak Pohlmann	215.963.5740	<a href="mailto:kpohlmann@morganlewis.com">kpohlmann@morganlewis.com</a>
Steven A. Reed	215.963.5603	<a href="mailto:sreed@morganlewis.com">sreed@morganlewis.com</a>
Marc J. Sonnenfeld	215.963.5572	<a href="mailto:msonnenfeld@morganlewis.com">msonnenfeld@morganlewis.com</a>
Thomas J. Sullivan	215.963.5146	<a href="mailto:tsullivan@morganlewis.com">tsullivan@morganlewis.com</a>

## San Francisco

Joseph E. Floren	415.442.1391	<a href="mailto:jfloren@morganlewis.com">jfloren@morganlewis.com</a>
Elizabeth A. Frohlich	415.442.1352	<a href="mailto:efrohlich@morganlewis.com">efrohlich@morganlewis.com</a>
Molly Moriarty Lane	415.442.1333	<a href="mailto:mlane@morganlewis.com">mlane@morganlewis.com</a>
Thomas M. Peterson	415.442.1344	<a href="mailto:tmpeterson@morganlewis.com">tmpeterson@morganlewis.com</a>
Susan D. Resley	415.442.1351	<a href="mailto:sresley@morganlewis.com">sresley@morganlewis.com</a>

## Washington, D.C.

Patrick D. Conner	202.739.5594	<a href="mailto:pconner@morganlewis.com">pconner@morganlewis.com</a>
J. Clayton "Clay" Everett, Jr.	202.739.5860	<a href="mailto:jeverett@morganlewis.com">jeverett@morganlewis.com</a>
Christian J. Mixter	202.739.5575	<a href="mailto:cmixter@morganlewis.com">cmixter@morganlewis.com</a>
E. Andrew Southerling	202.739.5062	<a href="mailto:asoutherling@morganlewis.com">asoutherling@morganlewis.com</a>

## About Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Founded in 1873, Morgan Lewis offers more than 1,600 legal professionals—including lawyers, patent agents, benefits advisers, regulatory scientists, and other specialists—in 25 offices across the United States, Europe, Asia, and the Middle East. The firm provides comprehensive litigation, corporate, transactional, regulatory, intellectual property, and labor and employment legal services to clients of all sizes—from globally established industry leaders to just-conceived start-ups. For more information about Morgan Lewis or its practices, please visit us online at [www.morganlewis.com](http://www.morganlewis.com).

This LawFlash is provided as a general informational service to clients and friends of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. It should not be construed as, and does not constitute, legal advice on any specific matter, nor does this message create an attorney-client relationship. These materials may be considered **Attorney Advertising** in some jurisdictions. Please note that the prior results discussed in the material do not guarantee similar outcomes. Links provided from outside sources are subject to expiration or change. © 2014 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. All Rights Reserved.