

FINANCIAL FRAUD LAW REPORT

VOLUME 3

NUMBER 2

FEBRUARY 2011

GUEST HEADNOTE: REVIEWING RECORDS FOR FRAUD

David J. Cook

97

FEDERAL AGENCIES TURN UP EFFORTS TO CURB HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE

Kimberly Brandt, Michael H. Park, and Elinor Hiller

99

NAVIGATING POTENTIAL PRIVILEGE PITFALLS IN CONDUCTING INTERNAL INVESTIGATIONS: *UPJOHN* WARNINGS, "CORPORATE *MIRANDA*," AND BEYOND

Craig D. Margolis and Lindsey R. Vaala

121

AUDITING STANDARDS UNDERGO OVERHAUL FOR RISK AND FRAUD TESTING

Joseph J. Floyd

165

RETALIATION CLAIM BY INVESTMENT MANAGER'S CHIEF COMPLIANCE OFFICER IS BARRED BY NEW YORK'S EMPLOYMENT-AT-WILL DOCTRINE

Steven A. Meyerowitz

175

CLAMPING DOWN ON CORRUPTION: THE OVERDUE CLASH WITH CULTURES

Kathleen Brush

185

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Steven A. Meyerowitz

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

Frank W. Abagnale
Author, Lecturer, and Consultant
Abagnale and Associates

Stephen L. Ascher
Partner
Jenner & Block LLP

David J. Cook
Partner
Cook Collection Attorneys

Thomas C. Bogle
Partner
Dechert LLP

Robert E. Eggmann
Partner
Lathrop & Gage LLP

Joseph J. Floyd
Founder
Floyd Advisory, LLC

Jeffrey T. Harfenist
Managing Director,
Disputes & Investigations
Navigant Consulting (PI) LLC

James M. Keneally
Partner
Kelley Drye & Warren
LLP

Frank C. Razzano
Partner
Pepper Hamilton LLP

Bethany N. Schols
Member of the Firm
Dykema Gossett PLLC

The FINANCIAL FRAUD LAW REPORT is published 10 times per year by A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW., Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207, Copyright © 2011 ALEX eSOLUTIONS, INC. Copyright © 2011 ALEX eSOLUTIONS, INC. All rights reserved. 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 permission to photocopy or use material electronically from the *Financial Fraud Law Report*, please access www.copyright.com or contact the Copyright Clearance Center, Inc. (CCC), 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, MA 01923, 978-750-8400. CCC is a not-for-profit organization that provides licenses and registration for a variety of users. For subscription information and customer service, call 1-800-572-2797. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 10 Crinkle Court, Northport, NY 11768, smeycrow@optonline.net, 631-261-9476 (phone), 631-261-3847 (fax). Material for publication is welcomed — articles, decisions, or other items of interest. 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 the Financial Fraud Law Report, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW., Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207. ISSN 1936-5586

GUEST HEADNOTE

Reviewing Records for Fraud

DAVID J. COOK

There are numerous irregularities in financial records that can be the touchstones of financial fraud.

Cancelled checks are memorialized in a statement, but one or both sides of a check is missing from the production.

Cancelled checks show the disposition of funds. Checks show the payee and the endorsement shows the actual recipient, which might differ from the payee, and the account number and recipient's bank. This is the first level of disbursement and guides counsel to the second level (i.e., what the recipient did with the money). Cancelled checks show patterns and the maker might be the purported wrongdoer. A check missing from a continuous sequence is the first sign of fraud in hiding incriminating evidence. If funds were electronically disbursed, the authorization is the equivalent to the paper trail.

Excessive fund transfers, or transfers to "dummy named accounts," but records of those accounts are missing or incomplete and serve no viable purpose.

Although wire transfers are routine, an excessive number of transfers payable to entities that lack any rationale relationship to the operation of a business, that are bunched and inconsistent with prior patterns, or that lack a simple paper trail points to fraudulent activities.

Disbursements for large dollars or even amounts, to non-traditional payees or payees related to the debtor, or for "fees," "commis-

David J. Cook, the senior attorney partner with Cook Collection Attorneys PLC in San Francisco, is a member of the Board of Editors of the *Financial Fraud Law Report*. He can be reached at davidcook@cookcollectionattorneys.com.

sions,” “services” or “miscellaneous.”

Today’s accounting software describes receipts and disbursements with the greatest minutiae. Generalized nomenclature of disbursements are contrary to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”), normal business practices and the parameters established by the accounting software. Large, erratic amounts, or amounts that are inconsistent with prior disbursements or categorized with bland or non-descript titles, represent a pattern and practice of fraud.

Excessive wire, bank or “account to account” transfers.

Few businesses wire funds directly to another account under their control or under the control of their principals, or to an account whose name, title, or identity contravenes the norm of business practices or the pattern or practice of their industry. Excessive wires are a tip-off.

Excessive number of accounts or limited liability companies that lack any business reason or purpose.

Businesses have specified accounts with clear identities deployed for a specific purpose. Businesses are housed in one or more entities, for specific purposes. Entities are expensive to maintain, create inadvertent confusion, and employees must ensure that the right entity is attached to the right business. Excessive entities holding assets of the same coherent business is a key feature of an asset protection strategy or efforts to divert funds, particularly when the extraneous entities bear the same name, locale, and principals and hold closely aligned or related assets.

A transfer or disbursement untethered to accounting entries, reflected by accounting entries such as “suspense” or “miscellaneous,” or untethered to traditional source documents, such as invoices, statements, contracts, or notes that are regular, routine, or re-occurring on their face.

GAAP classifies items (money coming or going) as income, expense, asset, or liability. Classifying large dollar items with non-specific terms contravenes GAAP and hides the true recipient. The failure to attach any transaction to routine accounting entries implies fraud.