

DC Circuit Strongly Reaffirms the Applicability of the Attorney-Client Privilege to Internal Compliance Investigations

by George B. Breen, Jonah D. Retzinger, Marshall E. Jackson Jr., and Stuart M. Gerson

July 2014

Especially in the District of Columbia Circuit, the home base for many fraud cases in which the government is opposed to health care providers and defense contractors, there had been considerable doubt that the attorney-client privilege attached to internal compliance investigations, particularly those investigations conducted on governmental mandate by company internal counsel. In a recent victory for companies and effective compliance, the United States Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit squarely removed that doubt in support of the application of privilege.

Reversing the controversial District Court decision in *United States ex rel. Barko v. Halliburton Co.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36490, 2-3 (D.D.C. Mar. 6, 2014), on June 27, 2014, the DC Circuit handed down its opinion in *In re Kellogg Brown & Root*, 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 12115 (D.C. Cir. 2014). The DC Circuit's holding reinforces the protections established by the Supreme Court 30 years ago in *Upjohn Co. v. United States*, 449 U.S. 383 (1981), that afford privilege to confidential employee communications made during a corporation's internal investigation led by company lawyers.

The District Court Decision

In *Barko v. Halliburton Co.*, a former contract administrator for Kellogg, Brown, and Root (KBR) alleged that Halliburton and other KBR contractors had inflated the costs of construction services on military bases in Iraq and passed on those inflated costs to the United States Government. KBR internally investigated tips about these potential procurement irregularities several years before the former contract administrator filed the *Barko* lawsuit. Non-attorney security investigators working under the direction and supervision of KBR's law department conducted the investigations. The investigators interviewed KBR employees and submitted reports to KBR's in-house attorneys, who, depending on whether the violation had been substantiated, would notify senior management and advise on further action.

Barko filed a *qui tam* suit and ultimately moved to compel the production of documents created in connection with these internal investigations. KBR opposed the production of documents, arguing that it had conducted the internal investigations for the purpose of obtaining legal advice, and the internal investigation documents were therefore protected by the attorney-client privilege. Barko countered that the internal investigation documents were unprivileged business records that he was entitled to discover.

The District Court ultimately concluded that the documents were not protected by attorney-client privilege, holding that KBR's investigation was not for the "primary purpose" of seeking legal advice. In rejecting application of the attorney-client privilege, the District Court found significance in the fact that (1) the KBR in-house attorneys conducted the investigation without consultation with outside lawyers; (2) the interviewees were not attorneys; and (3) the confidentiality statements signed by the interviewees mentioned business, rather than legal, purposes for limiting the disclosure of information.¹ Additionally, the District Court held that the work-product privilege did not apply because KBR conducted the internal investigation in the ordinary course of business, irrespective of the prospect of litigation.² The court therefore determined that the "investigations were undertaken pursuant to regulatory law and corporate policy rather than for purposes of obtaining legal advice."³ The court reasoned that KBR would have conducted an investigation regardless of whether legal advice was sought because regulatory law and corporate policy required such compliance investigations.

The DC Circuit Decision

KBR sought review of the District Court's decision by the DC Circuit. The DC Circuit rejected the District Court's conclusion that the attorney-client privilege did not apply because the investigations had been undertaken pursuant to regulatory law and corporate policy rather than for purposes of obtaining legal advice. The DC Circuit held that the District Court's privilege ruling was legally erroneous and materially indistinguishable from the assertion of the privilege in *Upjohn*.⁴ KBR had initiated an internal investigation to gather facts that would allow the company's lawyers to advise on whether the company was in compliance with the law, and as in *Upjohn*, KBR conducted its investigation under the auspices of KBR's in-house legal department, acting in its legal capacity. The court held "[t]he same considerations that led the Court in *Upjohn* to uphold the corporation's privilege claims apply here."⁵

In its analysis, the DC Circuit noted several reasons why the attorney-client privilege applied. The court found that the fact that the internal investigation was conducted by in-house counsel without consultation with outside lawyers did not undermine the privileged nature of the review because *Upjohn* does not hold or imply that the involvement of outside counsel is a necessary predicate for the privilege to apply. The

¹ *United States ex rel. Barko v. Halliburton Co.*, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 36490, *9-11 (D.D.C. Mar. 6, 2014).

² *Id.* at *11-14.

³ *Id.* at *8.

⁴ *In re Kellogg Brown & Root*, 2014 U.S. App. LEXIS 12115, *4-7 (D.C. Cir. 2014).

⁵ *Id.* at *7.

court also found that the use of non-lawyers by KBR's legal department in its investigations did not negate the attorney-client privilege, and communications made by and to non-attorneys serving as agents of attorneys are protected. The DC Circuit found that the confidentiality statements signed by the interviewees—which mentioned business, rather than legal, purposes for limiting the disclosure of information—did not negate the privilege because nothing in *Upjohn* requires a company to use specific language in its communications to employees in order to gain the benefit of the privilege for an internal investigation.

Finally, the DC Circuit rejected the District Court's attempt to distinguish *Upjohn* from *Barko* on the ground that KBR's internal investigations were undertaken to comply with Department of Defense regulations that require defense contractors, such as KBR, to maintain compliance programs and conduct internal investigations into allegations of potential wrongdoing. The DC Circuit found that “[s]o long as obtaining or providing legal advice was one of the significant purposes of the internal investigation, the attorney-client privilege applies, even if there were also other purposes for the investigation and even if the investigation was mandated by regulation rather than simply an exercise of company discretion.”⁶

The Impact of the DC Circuit's Decision

The decision in the *KBR* case has reinforced the protections of the attorney-client privilege in the context of internal investigations. *However, to receive such protection, both in-house and outside counsel must make sure to follow these steps when conducting and assisting in internal investigations:*

- 1) **Have attorneys direct the investigation and document the oversight.** Non-attorneys involved in the investigation should be given written instructions making clear that they are working at the direction and under the control of the company's legal department or outside counsel and that one of the significant purposes of the investigation is to obtain the relevant facts that would enable the lawyers to provide legal advice to the company.
- 2) **Provide an appropriate *Upjohn* warning.** All employees who are interviewed in connection with an internal investigation should receive a warning explaining that the conversation is for the purpose of providing legal advice to the company and protected by the company's attorney-client privilege. Although the D.C. Circuit stated that “magic words” are not required, it remains important to notify witnesses that information discussed in an investigation should be kept confidential and that counsel represents the company and not any particular individual or employee of the company.
- 3) **Mark documents appropriately.** Label all documents that are intended to be covered by the attorney-client privilege or the work product doctrine.

⁶ *Id.* at *10.

- 4) **Address the investigation report to the company's attorneys.** The report of an investigation should be addressed to the company's in-house legal department, which should memorialize its review of the report and any advice offered to the company as a result of the investigation.
- 5) **Record efforts to preserve privilege.** There should be a record of efforts to preserve privilege. Counsel should report the results of its investigation directly to the specific client, whether it is the company's management, general counsel, or board of directors.
- 6) **Document any threat of litigation.** The scope of the work product doctrine depends, in part, on precisely when a company is determined to have acted in anticipation of litigation. Clear documentation on this point will help prevent a later conclusion that the investigation was not connected to the threat of litigation. One way to document this is to issue a litigation hold because such a hold generally marks the point at which litigation or some other enforcement activity is anticipated.

* * *

*This Client Alert was authored by **George B. Breen, Jonah D. Retzinger, Marshall E. Jackson Jr., and Stuart M. Gerson.** For additional information about the issues discussed in this Client Alert, please contact one of the authors or the Epstein Becker Green attorney who regularly handles your legal matters.*

About Epstein Becker Green

Epstein Becker & Green, P.C., founded in 1973, is a national law firm with approximately 250 lawyers practicing in 10 offices, in Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles, New York, Newark, San Francisco, Stamford, and Washington, D.C. The firm is uncompromising in its pursuit of legal excellence and client service in its areas of practice: [Health Care and Life Sciences](#), [Labor and Employment](#), [Litigation](#), [Corporate Services](#), and [Employee Benefits](#). Epstein Becker Green was founded to serve the health care industry and has been at the forefront of health care legal developments since 1973. The firm is also proud to be a trusted advisor to clients in the financial services, retail, and hospitality industries, among others, representing entities from startups to Fortune 100 companies. Our commitment to these practices and industries reflects the founders' belief in focused proficiency paired with seasoned experience. For more information, visit www.ebglaw.com.

IRS Circular 230 Disclosure

To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of: (i) avoiding any tax penalty, or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

If you would like to be added to our mailing list or need to update your contact information, please contact Lisa C. Blackburn at lblackburn@ebglaw.com or 202-861-1887.

HEALTH CARE & LIFE SCIENCES

BALTIMORE

Helaine I. Fingold
Joshua J. Freemire
Thomas E. Hutchinson*

BOSTON

Emily E. Bajcsi
Bary A. Guryan

CHICAGO

Ryan R. Benz
Amy K. Dow
James M. Kunick
Griffin W. Mulcahey
Kevin J. Ryan

HOUSTON

Mark S. Armstrong
Daniel E. Gospin

LOS ANGELES

Adam C. Abrahms
Dale E. Bonner
Ted A. Gehring
J. Susan Graham
Kim Tyrrell-Knott

NEW YORK

Jeffrey H. Becker
Michelle Capezza
Aime Dempsey
Kenneth W. DiGia
Jerrold I. Ehrlich
Gregory H. Epstein
James S. Frank
Arthur J. Fried
John F. Gleason
Robert D. Goldstein
Robert S. Groban, Jr.
Gretchen Harders
Evan M. Hellman
Bethany J. Hills
Jennifer M. Horowitz
Kenneth J. Kelly
Joseph J. Kempf, Jr.
Stephanie G. Lerman
Leonard Lipsky
Purvi Badiani Maniar
Wendy G. Marcarì
Eileen D. Millett
Jackie Selby
Catherine F. Silie
Victoria M. Sloan
Steven M. Swirsky

Natasha F. Thoren
Benjamin M. Zegarelli

NEWARK

Joan A. Disler
James P. Flynn
Daniel R. Levy
Maxine Neuhauser
Mollie K. O'Brien
Sheila A. Woolson

STAMFORD

Ted Kennedy, Jr.
David S. Poppick

WASHINGTON, DC

Alan J. Arville
Kirsten M. Backstrom
Clifford E. Barnes
James A. Boiani
Selena M. Brady
George B. Breen
Lee Calligaro
Jesse M. Caplan
Jason E. Christ
Eric J. Conn
Tanya V. Cramer

Anjali N.C. Downs
Steven B. Epstein
John W. Eriksen
Daniel C. Fundakowski
Brandon C. Ge
Stuart M. Gerson
David C. Gibbons
Daniel G. Gottlieb
Philo D. Hall
Mark Hamelburg
Douglas A. Hastings
Robert J. Hudock
Marshall E. Jackson Jr.
S. Lawrence Kocot
William G. Kopit
Ali Lakhani
Amy F. Lerman
Christopher M. Locke
Katherine R. Lofft
Mark E. Lutes
Kara M. Maciel
Teresa A. Mason
David E. Matyas
Colin G. McCulloch
Frank C. Morris, Jr.
Evan J. Nagler
Leslie V. Norwalk

René Y. Quashie
Jonah D. Retzinger
Serra J. Schlanger
Bonnie I. Scott
Deepa B. Selvam
Lynn Shapiro Snyder
Adam C. Solander
Danielle L. Steele
David B. Tatge
Daly D.E. Temchine
Bradley Merrill Thompson
Linda V. Tiano
Carrie Valiant
Patricia M. Wagner
Robert E. Wanerman
Constance A. Wilkinson
Kathleen M. Williams
Lesley R. Yeung

**Not Admitted to the Practice of Law*

This document has been provided for informational purposes only and is not intended and should not be construed to constitute legal advice. Please consult your attorneys in connection with any fact-specific situation under federal law and the applicable state or local laws that may impose additional obligations on you and your company.

© 2014 Epstein Becker & Green, P.C.

Attorney Advertising