

## PUBLICATION UPDATE

Route to:  \_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_  \_\_\_\_\_

---

# CIVIL RICO

Publication 527 Release 57

April 2017

## HIGHLIGHTS

### Recent Case Law

- Release 57 discusses numerous important new cases related to the RICO statute.

*Recent developments discussed in Release 57 include:*

In *Vanlaanen v. Cornerstone Mortgage LLC*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 160249 (E.D. Wis. Nov. 18, 2016), and *Michelin North America Inc. v. Vehicular Testing Servs. LLC*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 124963 (D.S.C. Aug. 22, 2016), the courts concluded that a change in venue may be available under 28 U.S.C. § 1404 or under § 1406, but the moving defendant bears the burden of proving the appropriateness of a transfer, which is not satisfied when the relative inconveniences of the different forums are equivalent. See Chapter 6, *Instituting a Civil RICO Action*, ¶ 6.01[1].

In *Akishev v. Kapustin*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 169787 (D.N.J. Dec. 8, 2016), when confronted with an allegedly fraudulent Internet used car ring operating out of Russia by misrepresenting an inventory of

cars in the United States, the court acknowledged that the Supreme Court's opinion in *RJR Nabisco, Inc. v. European Community*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 136 S. Ct. 2090, 195 L. Ed. 2d 476 (2016), set different standards of extraterritoriality for RICO's reach as a criminal statute versus that of a private cause of action. For criminal actions, the RICO enterprise must be engaged in commerce with the United States, and the predicate acts must either occur in the United States or must themselves apply extraterritorially. For private civil actions, the Supreme Court's focus was not on the enterprise, but on where the private RICO plaintiff suffered the injury. Rejecting the contention that the plaintiff's residence in Russia was determinative of the site of injury, the court held that the locus delicti of the crime (Internet offerings of used cars allegedly located in New Jersey and Pennsylvania), was sufficient to qualify as a domestic injury. See Chapter 6, *Instituting a Civil RICO Action*, ¶ 6.03[4].

In *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 194 L. Ed. 2d 635 (2016), the Supreme Court held that the "injury in fact" requirement of constitutional standing

is not necessarily satisfied by a mere statutory violation. The *Spokeo* opinion isolated the two requirements for injury in fact—particularization and concreteness—and held that an injury is not “concrete” simply because Congress designated the related conduct a statutory violation. Recognizing that intangible injuries may qualify as injury in fact, the *Spokeo* opinion held that a bare procedural violation (i.e., the failure to correct factual information about the plaintiff in violation of a federal credit reporting statute) may be insufficient to establish concrete injury. See Chapter 6, *Instituting a Civil RICO Action*, ¶ 6.04[1].

In *George v. Urban Settlement Services*, 833 F.3d 1242 (10th Cir. 2016), the Tenth Circuit upheld the sufficiency of fraud allegations against Bank of America for defrauding its mortgage holders, in conjunction with its third party vendor Urban Settlement Services, out of qualifying for assistance from a federal loan modification program in which it participated to qualify for federal bailout monies after the financial crash in 2009. The Tenth Circuit construed Rule 9(b) as permitting a trial court to consider whether any pleading deficiencies resulted from the plaintiff’s inability to obtain information in the defendant’s exclusive control. See Chapter 7, *Pretrial Proceedings* ¶ 7.02[5].

In *Goel v. Bunge*, 820 F.3d 554 (2d Cir. 2016), the Second Circuit held that a New York savings statute did not toll RICO claims. Moreover, RICO claims are governed by federal tolling rules, and federal tolling law applied to this case, even though removed from state court, because federal tolling law applies to RICO cases filed in

state court. See Chapter 9, *Defenses*, ¶ 9.01[5][c].

New ¶ 9.01[6] discusses relation back of federal pleadings. Under the basic pleading philosophy of the Federal Rules, newly added claims generally relate back to the original commencement (filing) date of the initial complaint. For limitations purposes, if a RICO claim relates back to the original filing date, claims that are timely as of that earlier date are equally timely as of the time of their addition by way of pleading amendment. However, relation back of RICO claims is neither automatic nor certain, and courts will inquire into whether the original complaint gave the defendants fair notice of the newly alleged claims. See Chapter 9, *Defenses*, ¶ 9.01[6].

In *Chevron Corp. v. Donziger*, 833 F.3d 74 (2d Cir. 2016), after acknowledging that the Second Circuit had previously expressed doubts about the availability of private injunctive relief under RICO, the court upheld the district court’s issuance of such relief under RICO. The *Chevron* opinion rooted judicial authority to issue injunctive relief in RICO cases by construing 18 U.S.C. § 1964(a) as a conferral of general subject matter jurisdiction upon district courts, including all attendant equitable remedies. By contrast, it construed 18 U.S.C. § 1964(b) as authorizing equitable relief for the government, but limited to nonfinal restraining orders, with 18 U.S.C. § 1964(c) limiting damages relief to private parties. According to *Chevron*, all plaintiffs—including private plaintiffs—can pursue all remedies authorized under 18 U.S.C. § 1964(a). See Chapter 10, *Remedies* ¶ 10.03[1].

---

Matthew Bender provides continuing customer support for all its products:

- Editorial assistance—please consult the “Questions About This Publication” directory printed on the copyright page;
- Customer Service—missing pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters (1-800-833-9844).
- Outside the United States and Canada, (518) 487-3000, or fax (518) 487-3584;
- Toll-free ordering (1-800-223-1940).



[www.lexis.com](http://www.lexis.com)

---

---

Copyright © 2017 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.  
Publication 527, Release 57, April 2017

LexisNexis, the knowledge burst logo, and Michie are trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender is a registered trademark of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.



## FILING INSTRUCTIONS

# Civil RICO

Publication 527 Release 57

April 2017

**Check  
As  
Done**

- 1. Check the Title page in the front of your present Volume 1. It should indicate that your set is filed through Release Number 56. If the set is current, proceed with the filing of this release. If your set is not filed through Release Number 56, DO NOT file this release. Please call Customer Services at 1-800-833-9844 for assistance in bringing your set up to date.
- 2. This Release Number 57 contains only White Revision pages.
- 3. Circulate the "Publication Update" among those individuals interested in the contents of this release.

Check  
As  
Done

Remove Old  
Pages Numbered

Insert New  
Pages Numbered

*For faster and easier filing, all references are to right-hand pages only.*

## VOLUME 1

### Revision

<input type="checkbox"/>	Title page thru ix . . . . .	Title page thru ix
<input type="checkbox"/>	2-3 thru 2-10.1 . . . . .	2-3 thru 2-10.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	2-33 thru 2-34.1. . . . .	2-33 thru 2-34.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	3-3 thru 3-4.1 . . . . .	3-3 thru 3-4.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	3-83 thru 3-88.1. . . . .	3-83 thru 3-88.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	4-5. . . . .	4-5 thru 4-6.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	4-29 thru 4-37 . . . . .	4-29 thru 4-37
<input type="checkbox"/>	4-46.5 thru 4-46.7. . . . .	4-46.5 thru 4-46.7
<input type="checkbox"/>	4-67 thru 4-71 . . . . .	4-67 thru 4-72.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	5-44.1 thru 5-46.1. . . . .	5-45 thru 5-46.2(1)
<input type="checkbox"/>	5-55 thru 5-56.1. . . . .	5-55 thru 5-56.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	6-5. . . . .	6-5 thru 6-6.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	6-74.1 thru 6-80.1. . . . .	6-75 thru 6-80.5
<input type="checkbox"/>	6-98.1 thru 6-99. . . . .	6-99 thru 6-100.5
<input type="checkbox"/>	6-153 thru 6-155 . . . . .	6-153 thru 6-156.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	7-25 thru 7-27 . . . . .	7-25 thru 7-28.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	7-30.13 thru 7-30.19. . . . .	7-30.13 thru 7-30.20(15)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9-1 thru 9-5. . . . .	9-1 thru 9-6.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	9-25 thru 9-38.13 . . . . .	9-25 thru 9-38.15
<input type="checkbox"/>	9-49 . . . . .	9-49 thru 9-50.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	9-97 . . . . .	9-97 thru 9-98.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	9-100.4(1) thru 9-100.5 . . . . .	9-100.5 thru 9-100.6(7)
<input type="checkbox"/>	9-114.9 thru 9-114.13 . . . . .	9-114.9 thru 9-114.15
<input type="checkbox"/>	10-4.1 thru 10-19 . . . . .	10-5 thru 10-20.1
<input type="checkbox"/>	TC-1 thru I-25 . . . . .	TC-1 thru I-25

FILE IN THE FRONT OF THE FIRST VOLUME  
OF YOUR SET

To order missing pages log on to our self service center, [www.lexisnexis.com/printcdsc](http://www.lexisnexis.com/printcdsc) or call Customer Services at 1 (800) 833-9844 and have the following information ready:

- (1) the publication title;
- (2) specific volume, chapter and page numbers; and
- (3) your name, phone number, and Matthew Bender account number.

Please recycle removed pages.

MISSING FILING INSTRUCTIONS?  
FIND THEM AT [www.lexisnexis.com/printcdsc](http://www.lexisnexis.com/printcdsc)

Use the search tool provided to find and download missing filing instructions, or sign on to the Print & CD Service Center to order missing pages or replacement materials. Visit us soon to see what else the Print & CD Service Center can do for you!



[www.lexis.com](http://www.lexis.com)

---

---

**Copyright © 2017 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.  
Publication 527, Release 57, April 2017**

LexisNexis, the knowledge burst logo, and Michie are trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender is a registered trademark of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

