

securities lawflash

May 16, 2014

Updated: No Stay of SEC's Conflict Minerals Rules

Court denies emergency motion for a stay.

By order issued on May 14, 2014, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia denied the appellants' emergency motion for a stay of the Securities and Exchange Commission's Conflict Minerals rules. Therefore, companies must file their reports on Form SD if they manufacture, or contract to manufacture, any products that contain conflict minerals that are necessary to the functionality or production of the products by June 2, 2014. See our prior analysis of the case below.

May 12, 2014

Possible Future Stay of SEC's Conflict Minerals Rules

Stay of conflict minerals disclosure may be decided by May 26, 2014.

On May 7, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ordered the briefing schedule that was requested by the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and the Business Roundtable (the appellants) in an emergency motion for a stay of the Securities and Exchange Commission's (SEC's) conflict minerals rules, Rule 13p-1, and Form SD, pending a decision by the district court on remand regarding the appropriate remedy. Because the court ordered the filing of opposition briefs by May 9 and the reply brief by May 13, but did not address the appellants' request that the court rule by May 26, it is not clear whether the court will act by May 26. Accordingly, we recommend that companies continue to prepare their reports on Form SD but wait to file the reports until immediately before the June 2, 2014 due date in case the court stays the effectiveness of the conflict minerals disclosure requirements.

The appellants asked the court for expedited action given the three-judge panel's April 14 order to withhold the issuance of its mandate that the conflict minerals disclosure requirements are unconstitutional as a violation of the First Amendment until seven days after the disposition of a timely petition for rehearing or petition for rehearing en banc. The panel's April 14 opinion held that the conflict minerals disclosure rules violate the First Amendment to the extent they require companies to report to the SEC and state on their websites that any of their products have not been found to be "DRC conflict free."¹

In their emergency motion for a stay of the SEC's conflict minerals rules, filed on May 2, the appellants noted that the delay of the effectiveness of the panel's mandate would deny any relief for the initial Form SD filing obligation because the mandate could not be effective any earlier than June 5, 2014—three days after the due date for the conflict minerals disclosures on Form SD. In addition, the appellants criticized the SEC's actions in response to the April 14 decision, calling them inconsistent with the notice and comment rulemaking procedure required by the Administrative Procedure Act. On April 29, the Director of the SEC's Division of Corporation Finance (the Division Director) issued a statement² providing that, pending further SEC or court action, companies need not say in their reports on Form SD that products are "DRC conflict undeterminable," have "not been found to be 'DRC conflict

1. *Nat'l Ass'n. of Mfrs. v. Sec. & Exch. Comm'n*, No. 13-5252 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 14, 2014) at 23, available at [http://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/D3B5DAF947A03F2785257CBA0053AEF8/\\$file/13-5252-1488184.pdf](http://www.cadc.uscourts.gov/internet/opinions.nsf/D3B5DAF947A03F2785257CBA0053AEF8/$file/13-5252-1488184.pdf).

2. View the statement at <http://www.sec.gov/News/PublicStmnt/Detail/PublicStmnt/1370541681994>.

free,” or are “conflict free,” but that the SEC expects companies to file their conflict minerals disclosures on Form SD by the June 2, 2014 deadline. In the statement, the Division Director hinted that the SEC may provide additional guidance in advance of the filing due date. On May 2, the SEC issued an order that stayed “the effective date for compliance with those portions of Rule 13p-1 and Form SD that would require the statements by issuers that the Court of Appeals held would violate the First Amendment.”

The appellants’ most significant argument in their motion is that the elimination of the constitutionally protected language would no longer create any benefits to the disclosure requirement, “even assuming the Rule ever did.” Quoting the SEC’s adopting release for the conflict minerals disclosure requirements, the appellants observed that the remaining language in Form SD would “no longer ‘create incentives’ by shaming companies” and would “no longer ‘enhance transparency’ by purportedly informing the public whether an issuer sourced minerals from armed groups in the DRC.”³

Companies are now grappling with the challenges of drafting Form SD. The elimination of the constitutionally protected language puts additional focus on some of the other disclosure requirements of Form SD. In this regard, the Division Director’s statement provides as follows:

If the company has products that fall within the scope of Items 1.01(c)(2) or 1.01(c)(2)(i) of Form SD, it would not have to identify the products as “DRC conflict undeterminable” or “not found to be ‘DRC conflict free,’” but should disclose, for those products, the facilities used to produce the conflict minerals, the country of origin of the minerals and the efforts to determine the mine or location of origin.

The Division Director also reminded companies that they must submit the independent private sector audit report required by the rule if they voluntarily elect to describe any of their products as “DRC conflict free” in the conflict minerals report.

It is highly likely that a company that has been unable to determine whether its products are DRC conflict free will not have been able to identify the facilities used to produce the conflict minerals or the country of origin of the minerals. Therefore, the company will only be able to describe its efforts to determine the mine or location of origin. It is far from clear whether the disclosure about a company’s due diligence efforts as well as its reasonable country of origin inquiry will accomplish Congress’s goals.

We will continue to monitor the court’s actions to determine if it issues a stay prior to the due date for reports on Form SD.

Contacts

If you have any questions or would like more information on the issues discussed in this LawFlash, please contact the authors, **Linda L. Griggs** (202.739.5245; lgriggs@morganlewis.com), **David Sirignano** (202.739.5420; dsirignano@morganlewis.com), **Sean M. Donahue** (202.739.5658; sdonahue@morganlewis.com), and **Albert Lung** (650.843.7263; alung@morganlewis.com).

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:

Beijing

Lucas S. Chang

+86 10 5876 3688

lchang@morganlewis.com

Irvine

Ellen S. Bancroft

949.399.7001

ebancroft@morganlewis.com

Bryan S. Gadol

949.399.7140

bgadol@morganlewis.com

Joo Ryung “J.R.” Kang

949.399.7133

jrkang@morganlewis.com

3. Appellants’ Emergency Motion for Stay at 1, *Nat’l Assoc. of Mfrs. v. Sec. & Exch. Comm’n*, No. 13-5252 (D.C. Cir. filed May 5, 2014), available at <https://www.morganlewis.com/documents/SEC-AmnestyInternational.pdf>.

Morgan Lewis

Los Angeles

John F. Hartigan	213.612.2630	jhartigan@morganlewis.com
Ingrid A. Myers	213.612.2696	imyers@morganlewis.com
Richard A. Shortz	213.612.2526	rshortz@morganlewis.com

London

Carter Brod	+44 (0)20 3201 5623	cbrod@morganlewis.com
Iain Wright	+44 (0)20 3201 5630	iwright@morganlewis.com

Moscow

Roman A. Dashko	+7 495 212 2517	rdashko@morganlewis.com
Vasilisa Strizh	+7 495 212 2540	vstrizh@morganlewis.com

New York

Bradley K. Edmister	212.309.6110	bkedmister@morganlewis.com
Stephen P. Farrell	212.309.6050	sfarrell@morganlewis.com
Thomas P. Giblin, Jr.	212.309.6277	tgiblin@morganlewis.com
John T. Hood	212.309.6281	jhood@morganlewis.com
Christopher T. Jensen	212.309.6001	cjensen@morganlewis.com
Howard A. Kenny	212.309.6843	hkenny@morganlewis.com
Finnbarr D. Murphy	212.309.6704	fmurphy@morganlewis.com
Steven A. Navarro	212.309.6147	snavarro@morganlewis.com
David W. Pollak	212.309.6058	dpollak@morganlewis.com
Kimberly M. Reisler	212.309.6289	kreisler@morganlewis.com
Allan D. Reiss	202.309.6390	areiss@morganlewis.com

Palo Alto

Thomas W. Kellerman	650.843.7550	tkellerman@morganlewis.com
Albert Lung	650.843.4001	alung@morganlewis.com

Philadelphia

Richard B. Aldridge	215.963.5001	raldridge@morganlewis.com
Jeffrey P. Bodle	215.963.5001	jbodle@morganlewis.com
Justin W. Chairman	215.963.5001	jchairman@morganlewis.com
Steven M. Cohen	215.963.5089	schoen@morganlewis.com
Stephen A. Jannetta	215.963.5092	sjannetta@morganlewis.com
James W. McKenzie, Jr.	215.963.5134	jmckenzie@morganlewis.com
Howard L. Meyers	215.963.5536	hmeyers@morganlewis.com
Michael N. Peterson	215.963.5025	mpeterson@morganlewis.com
Alan Singer	215.963.5224	asinger@morganlewis.com
Joanne R. Soslow	215.963.5262	jsoslow@morganlewis.com
Benjamin R. Wills	215.963.5541	bwills@morganlewis.com

Pittsburgh

Marlee S. Myers	412.560.3310	msmyers@morganlewis.com
Amy I. Pandit	412.560.7415	apandit@morganlewis.com
Kimberly A. Taylor	412.560.3322	ktaylor@morganlewis.com

Princeton

Emilio Ragosa	212.309.6633	eragosa@morganlewis.com
---------------	--------------	--

San Francisco

Morgan Lewis

Scott D. Karchmer	415.442.1091	skarchmer@morganlewis.com
-------------------	--------------	--

Washington, D.C.

Linda L. Griggs	202.739.5245	lgriggs@morganlewis.com
David A. Sirignano	202.739.5420	dsirignano@morganlewis.com
George G. Yearsich	202.739.5255	gyearsich@morganlewis.com

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.

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 states. 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.