

# The Banking Law Journal

Established 1889

An A.S. Pratt™ PUBLICATION

May 2025

**Editor's Note: Lessons Learned**  
Victoria Prussen Spears

**Lessons from 2024 Bank Secrecy Act / Anti-Money Laundering Enforcement Actions**  
John ReVeal and Jeremy M. McLaughlin

**Bankers Bond Insurance: Key Coverage Issues for Financial Institutions to Consider**  
Geoffrey B. Fehling and Olivia G. Bushman

**More on the Changes to the U.C.C.'s Definitions of Money**  
Mercedes Kelley Tunstall and Christopher McDermott

**Liability Management Exercises and the Litigation Quagmire**  
H. Peter Haveles Jr.

**Achieving Financial Stability and Resilience: How China Could Learn from the United States and the United Kingdom in Building a Financial Safety Net – Part II**  
Lerong Lu and Ci Ren



LexisNexis

# THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL

---

---

VOLUME 142

NUMBER 5

May 2025

---

**Editor's Note: Lessons Learned**

Victoria Prussen Spears 195

**Lessons from 2024 Bank Secrecy Act / Anti-Money Laundering  
Enforcement Actions**

John ReVeal and Jeremy M. McLaughlin 197

**Bankers Bond Insurance: Key Coverage Issues for Financial  
Institutions to Consider**

Geoffrey B. Fehling and Olivia G. Bushman 207

**More on the Changes to the U.C.C.'s Definitions of Money**

Mercedes Kelley Tunstall and Christopher McDermott 211

**Liability Management Exercises and the Litigation Quagmire**

H. Peter Haveles Jr. 216

**Achieving Financial Stability and Resilience: How China Could  
Learn from the United States and the United Kingdom in  
Building a Financial Safety Net – Part II**

Lerong Lu and Ci Ren 225

**QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?**

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call or email:

Matthew T. Burke at ..... (800) 252-9257  
Email: ..... matthew.t.burke@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call or email:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385  
Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341  
Customer Service Website ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (937) 247-0293

ISBN: 978-0-7698-7878-2 (print)

ISSN: 0005-5506 (Print)

Cite this publication as:

The Banking Law Journal (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2025 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office  
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

## **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **BOARD OF EDITORS**

**CARLETON GOSS**

*Partner, Hunton Andrews Kurth LLP*

**DOUGLAS LANDY**

*White & Case LLP*

**PAUL L. LEE**

*Of Counsel, Debevoise & Plimpton LLP*

**MICHAEL D. LEWIS**

*Partner, Sidley Austin LLP*

**TIMOTHY D. NAEGELE**

*Partner, Timothy D. Naegele & Associates*

**STEPHEN J. NEWMAN**

*Partner, Steptoe & Johnson LLP*

**ANDREW OLMEM**

*Partner, Mayer Brown LLP*

THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL (ISBN 978-0-76987-878-2) (USPS 003-160) is published ten times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2025 Reed Elsevier Properties SA., used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. 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 customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail [Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com](mailto:Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com). Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway, #18R, Floral Park, NY 11005, [smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com](mailto:smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com), 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to bankers, officers of financial institutions, and their attorneys. 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. The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of their employer, its clients, the editor(s), RELX, LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Co., Inc, or any of its or their respective affiliates.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave, 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to THE BANKING LAW JOURNAL, A.S. Pratt & Sons, 805 Fifteenth Street, NW, Third Floor, Washington, DC 20005-2207.

# More on the Changes to the U.C.C.'s Definitions of Money

*By Mercedes Kelley Tunstall and Christopher McDermott\**

*This series examines the impact of the 2022 amendments to the Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.). In this part, the authors discuss amended money-related definitions in U.C.C. Article 9.*

Uniform Commercial Code (U.C.C.) Article 9 (Secured Transactions) did not have its own definition of “money” before the 2022 amendments to the U.C.C. (the 2022 Amendments). Now the 2022 Amendments have added a definition, which is basically the same as the Article 1 definition (i.e., “a medium of exchange that is currently authorized or adopted by a domestic or foreign government”), except that the Article 9 definition excludes from the definition of money (i) a deposit account, and (ii) money in electronic form that cannot be subjected to control under Section 9-105A.<sup>1</sup>

The reason for excluding deposit accounts is because of the changes to the definition of “money” in Article 1 and because the U.C.C. already provides for how a deposit account can be secured. The reason for excluding money in electronic form that cannot be subject to control from the Article 9 definition is that such money is not something that can be secured like other money – it would be a general intangible under Article 9.<sup>2</sup>

## DEPOSIT TOKENS

But recent developments in the market potentially complicate what is deemed to be a “deposit account.” Major banks (such as JPMorgan<sup>3</sup> and Citibank<sup>4</sup>) have implemented permissioned blockchain solutions permitting their customers to transact with funds on deposit via tokenized coins. While bank regulators might regard bank deposits as a kind of money,<sup>5</sup> what about the U.C.C.? Are deposit tokens “money” under the new Article 9 definition?

---

\* The authors, attorneys with Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP, may be contacted at [mercedes.tunstall@cwt.com](mailto:mercedes.tunstall@cwt.com) and [chris.mcdermott@cwt.com](mailto:chris.mcdermott@cwt.com), respectively.

<sup>1</sup> U.C.C. (Amended) §9-102(a)(54A).

<sup>2</sup> U.C.C. (Amended) §9-102(a), official comment 12A.

<sup>3</sup> <https://developer.payments.jpmorgan.com/docs/treasury/global-payments/capabilities/global-payments/jpm-coin-system>; <https://www.jpmorgan.com/kinexys/digital-payments>.

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.citigroup.com/global/news/press-release/2024/citi-token-services-marks-new-milestone>.

<sup>5</sup> See Money and Payments: The U.S. Dollar in the Age of Digital Transformation, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve (Jan 2022), Appendix B. <https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/files/money-and-payments-20220120.pdf>.

The answer turns on whether or not such deposit tokens are “deposit accounts,” and would therefore be excluded from Article 9 “money.” And, as with so much in the 2022 Amendments, the law looks to the technology for answers.

For example, let’s say that Bank A creates a “Bank A Coin” token for deposited funds. Further, let’s say that the permissioned blockchain system where Bank A Coin resides functions, not only as a payment rail, but also as Bank A’s deposit account ledger itself. On those facts, Bank A Coin would seem to be a deposit account, analogous to a deposit on a traditional off-chain ledger. But what if Bank A Coin was just a tokenized representation of a deposit held in a traditional ledger off-chain, a kind of shadow token. Would Bank A Coin be a deposit account in that case? Less clear.

Even if Bank A Coin is not a deposit account, though, does it pass muster under the other tests for Article 9 “money” that are inherited from Article 1? In particular, would the Bank A Coin be currently “authorized” or “adopted” by a government as a medium of exchange? Even if Bank A obtained approval for the Bank A Coin solution from its prudential banking regulator, for U.C.C. purposes, without some kind of new regulation from the Department of Treasury blessing such approval as being tantamount to governmental authorization or adoption of the Bank A Coin, the Bank A Coin would not be deemed money under the U.C.C. And that means that, unless things change, from an Article 9 perspective the Bank A Coin would potentially be subject to the provisions of Article 12 (see below).

## CONTROL

The second exclusion in the Article 9 definition deals with “control.” We are familiar with possessory control of tangible money (e.g., put bills and coins under your mattress) and Section 9-104 control of deposit accounts (DACAs, anyone?). But the 2022 Amendments to Article 9 add a new set of principles for taking control of “electronic money.” (The 2022 Amendments define “electronic money” as, naturally, “money in electronic form.”)<sup>6</sup>

These control principles for electronic money are set out in new Section 9-105A, and track the rules created under Article 12 for control of “controllable electronic records” (CERs). Such control principles reference three powers: they require the electronic money (or a logically related record or system) to give the controlling party:

---

<sup>6</sup> U.C.C. (Amended) §9-102(a)(31A).

- (i) The power to avail itself of substantially all the benefit of the electronic money;
- (ii) The exclusive power to prevent others from availing themselves of substantially all the benefit of the electronic money; and
- (iii) The exclusive power to transfer control of the electronic money to another person.<sup>7</sup>

If these rules for control strike you as kind of open-ended, that is exactly their intent. The 2022 Amendments seek to be technology-neutral, and once again demand those interpreting the law to look to the tech.

In other words, when money that is not excluded from Article 9's definition is subjected to control pursuant to Section 9-105A, lawyers will have to look under the hood of technological control mechanisms – how crypto wallets work, how tokens are programmed, how blockchain protocols are governed, and so on – to figure out if tokens like Bank A Coin are capable of being “controlled,” and thus can be considered “money” under Article 9.

Why bother with all this? After all, Bitcoin is not considered “money” for U.C.C. purposes, and stablecoins like UST or USDC are not considered money either (they are probably best classified as CERs). The reason all of this matters is because U.C.C. characterizations of assets are not optional – every asset must be defined as one thing or another. And it is important to understand whether the cryptocurrency token you are dealing with is or is not “money” under Article 9 because the answer can have serious knock-on ramifications.

For example, even though one token might look identical to another technologically, how the tokens are characterized under Article 9 makes a difference in how to perfect a security interest by control over that token. “Control” for electronic money is different from “control” for deposit accounts, which in turn is different from “control” for uncertificated securities, for electronic chattel paper, for transferable records, for CERs, and so on. In sum, you need to take the time to understand which rule book applies.

One additional sticky wicket regarding “money” in Article 9 exists – the question of “monetary obligations.” That sneaky phrase shows up in some places in the U.C.C. and not in others. Importantly, “accounts” and “payment intangibles” are defined under Article 9 as monetary obligations. Crucially, however, the “money” that may constitute part of such “monetary obligations”

---

<sup>7</sup> U.C.C. (Amended) §9-105(a)(1)(A), (B). For the parallel control rules for CERs, see U.C.C. (Amended) §12-105(a)(1)(A), (B).



is the Article 1 definition of “money” (not the Article 9 definition “money”).<sup>8</sup> Meaning that “monetary obligations” does not exclude deposit accounts or non-controllable electronic forms of money.

Here is how that works: Imagine a receivable that is denominated, not in dollars, but in Bank A Coin. That receivable could be a monetary obligation and therefore an “account” or “payment intangible,” even if Bank A Coin were deemed a “deposit account” and therefore in and of itself not “money” under Article 9.<sup>9</sup>

On the other hand, if the receivable were payable in Bitcoin or USDC (i.e., CERs), then that receivable could not constitute a “monetary obligation,” because Bitcoin and USDC are not money under Article 1. And, for purposes of Article 9, those receivables would not be “accounts” or “payment intangibles.” They would be something else.

Finally, by following the differences in the definitions of “money” in the U.C.C. and considering whether something can be a “monetary obligation,” you can go even further into the weeds. For example, “instruments,” like negotiable instruments, must evidence the right to a “monetary obligation,”<sup>10</sup> but the U.C.C. definition of “letter of credit” only requires payment or delivery of “an item of value” – not necessarily money.<sup>11</sup>

## CONCLUSION

The landscape of digital asset transactions is evolving rapidly. Questions of which types of such tokens or cryptocurrencies would be considered “money” under the 2022 Amendments (and which are not) are important questions and can be quite complex. And, it is important to get the answers right so as to apply the appropriate rules for transacting with them. As more different types of “money” get invented for use on-chain, the more urgent it becomes to find answers to these questions.

The Notorious B.I.G. may not be your go-to authority for U.C.C. analysis. But in this case, you’ve got to admit that he is on to something:

*I don’t know what they want from me*

*It’s like the more money we come across*

---

<sup>8</sup> U.C.C. (Amended) §9-102, official comment 12A.

<sup>9</sup> Those receivables could even be “controllable accounts” or “controllable payment intangibles” under Article 12 – which in many ways could be considered even better than plain accounts or payment intangibles.

<sup>10</sup> U.C.C. (Amended) §9-102(a)(47).

<sup>11</sup> U.C.C. (Amended) §5-102(a)(10).

*The more problems we see. . .*<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Bernard Edwards, Christopher Wallace, J Phillips, Mason Betha, Nile Gregory Rodgers, Sean Combs, Steve Jordan, "Mo Money Mo Problems," lyrics © Sony/ATV Music Publishing LLC, Warner Chappell Music, Inc.; [https://www.google.com/search?q=mo+money+mo+problems+lyrics&&sei=S6\\_-Z9\\_7Bsnb2roPh5\\_GwAM](https://www.google.com/search?q=mo+money+mo+problems+lyrics&&sei=S6_-Z9_7Bsnb2roPh5_GwAM).