

REFJ

The Real Estate Finance Journal

A THOMSON REUTERS PUBLICATION

SPRING 2022

FROM THE EDITOR

The Rise of Commercial Real Estate Derivatives and Their Role in the Real Estate Market *Jesse Stein*

COVID-19 as a Force Majeure Event: Key Judicial Decisions

Michael C. Lynch, Cameron R. Argetsinger and Noah Lindenfeld

Five Commercial Real Estate Trends to Watch in the Wake of COVID-19

Timothy G. Little and Scott M. Vetri

Delaware Supreme Court Finds COVID-19 Business Adjustments Entitle Company's Buyer to Terminate Contract

Oderah C. Nwaeze

Real Estate Outlook: Three Ways to Combat Challenges in 2022

James "Chip" Stuart and Lindsay Shapiro

FinCEN Issues a Proposed Beneficial Ownership Rule

Marc-Alain Galeazzi and Malka Levitin

Real Estate and Money Laundering: FinCEN Issues Advanced Notice of Regulations for the Real Estate Industry

Peter D. Hardy, Richard J. Andreano, Jr., Michael P. Robotti and Nikki A. Hatza

New York's Green Amendment: How Guidance from Other States Can Shape the Development of New York's Newest Constitutional Right

Sheila L. Birnbaum, Mark S. Cheffo, Rachel Passaretti-Wu, Lincoln Wilson, Allie Ozurovich and Marina Schwarz

You Win Some, You Lose Some: The Second Circuit Affirms Dismissal of Landlords' Free Speech Challenge to Harassment Laws and Reverses Dismissal of Landlords' Contract Clause Challenge to Guaranty Law


Steven M. Herman and Eunji Jo

Massachusetts' Push for More Multifamily: DHCD Releases Draft Guidelines for MBTA Communities

Karla L. Chaffee

A Legal Update for the Title Insurance Industry

Michael J. Heller, Peter P. McNamara and Matthew V. Spero



THOMSON
REUTERS

REFJ

The Real Estate Finance Journal

A THOMSON REUTERS PUBLICATION

Spring 2022

<i>FROM THE EDITOR</i>	3	Real Estate and Money Laundering: FinCEN Issues Advanced Notice of Regulations for the Real Estate Industry	
The Rise of Commercial Real Estate Derivatives and Their Role in the Real Estate Market <i>Jesse Stein</i>	5	<i>Peter D. Hardy, Richard J. Andreano, Jr., Michael P. Robotti and Nikki A. Hatza</i>	39
COVID-19 as a Force Majeure Event: Key Judicial Decisions <i>Michael C. Lynch, Cameron R. Argetsinger and Noah Lindenfeld</i>	9	New York's Green Amendment: How Guidance from Other States Can Shape the Development of New York's Newest Constitutional Right <i>Sheila L. Birnbaum, Mark S. Cheffo, Rachel Passaretti-Wu, Lincoln Wilson, Allie Ozurovich and Marina Schwarz</i>	45
Five Commercial Real Estate Trends to Watch in the Wake of COVID-19 <i>Timothy G. Little and Scott M. Vetri</i>	17	You Win Some, You Lose Some: The Second Circuit Affirms Dismissal of Landlords' Free Speech Challenge to Harassment Laws and Reverses Dismissal of Landlords' Contract Clause Challenge to Guaranty Law <i>Steven M. Herman and Eunji Jo</i>	51
Delaware Supreme Court Finds COVID-19 Business Adjustments Entitle Company's Buyer to Terminate Contract <i>Oderah C. Nwaeze</i>	23	Massachusetts' Push for More Multifamily: DHCD Releases Draft Guidelines for MBTA Communities <i>Karla L. Chaffee</i>	55
Real Estate Outlook: Three Ways to Combat Challenges in 2022 <i>James "Chip" Stuart and Lindsay Shapiro</i>	27	A Legal Update for the Title Insurance Industry <i>Michael J. Heller, Peter P. McNamara and Matthew V. Spero</i>	59
FinCEN Issues a Proposed Beneficial Ownership Rule <i>Marc-Alain Galeazzi and Malka Levitin</i>	31		

EDITOR

Robert G. Koen
Mintz, Levin, Cohn, Ferris,
Glovsky and Popeo, P.C.

MANAGING EDITOR

Erbayne W. Jarvis
Thomson Reuters

SUBMISSIONS EDITOR

Steven A. Meyerowitz
Meyerowitz Communications Inc.
All editorial correspondence, manuscripts, etc.,
should be sent to:
Steven A. Meyerowitz, Esq.
President/Meyerowitz Communications Inc.
26910 Grand Central Parkway, # 18R
Floral Park, NY 11005
631.291.5541
smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com

THE REAL ESTATE FINANCE JOURNAL
(ISSN 0898-0209) is published quarterly by Thomson
Reuters, 610 Opperman Drive, Eagan, MN 55123-1396.

Editorial Offices: Thomson Reuters, 50 Broad Street
East, Rochester, NY 14694. All editorial correspondence,
manuscripts, etc., should be sent to this address.
Although the utmost care will be given material
submitted, we cannot accept responsibility for unsolicited
manuscripts.

Subscription: For subscription information or for customer
service, call 1-800-328-4880. Periodicals postage paid at
St. Paul, MN.

© 2022 Thomson Reuters. 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. This publication is designed to provide accurate
and 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 service. If legal or accounting
advice or other expert assistance is required, the
services of a competent professional should be sought.

Nothing contained herein is intended or written to be
used, and may not be used, for the purposes of 1)
avoiding penalties imposed under the Internal Revenue
Code, or 2) promoting, marketing or recommending to
another party any transaction or matter addressed
herein.

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

Ronald B. Bruder
President
The Brookhill Group

Stevens A. Carey
Partner
Pircher, Nichols & Meeks

Jonathan L. Kempner
Fellow, Advanced Leadership Initiative
Harvard University

Yonguo Liang, Ph.D.
Head, Global Research and
Public Markets
Abu Dhabi Investment Authority (ADIA)

Stephen Rushmore
President and CEO
HVS

Stuart M. Saft
Partner
Holland & Knight LLP

Joshua Stein
Partner
Joshua Stein PLLC

BOARD OF ADVISORS

Jason Barnett
Vice Chairman & General Counsel
RXR Realty LLC

Cia Buckley
Partner
Dune Capital Management

Dino P. Christoforakis
Acquisitions Director
CBRE Investment Management

Frederick N. Cooper
Senior Vice President
Toll Brothers, Inc.

Louis M. Dubin
Managing Partner
Redbrick LMD

Andrew L. Farkas
CEO
Island Capital

Kyle Gore
Managing Director, Real Estate Finance
CGA Group

David Hamm
Senior Managing Director
WAFRA, Inc.

Ross Hilton Kemper
President
Kingswood Capital LLC

Ronald J. Kravit
Chairman and President
RJK Partners Inc.

Richard J. Mack
Mack Real Estate Group

Joseph Mizrahi
Managing Member
Third Millennium Group

Anthony Orso
President, Capital Markets Strategies
Newmark

Shelby E.L. Pruett
CEO
Capri EGM, LLC

Lorenz Reibling
Chairman and Senior Partner
Taurus Investment Holdings LLC

Stephen Siegel
Chairman, Global Brokerage
CB Richard Ellis

Rick H. Singer
President
Winter Properties

David R. Soares
President and CEO
Lexden Capital, LLC

You Win Some, You Lose Some: The Second Circuit Affirms Dismissal of Landlords' Free Speech Challenge to Harassment Laws and Reverses Dismissal of Landlords' Contract Clause Challenge to Guaranty Law

By Steven M. Herman and Eunji Jo*

In this article, the authors discuss a decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in which New York City landlords alleged that certain laws enacted in response to the COVID-19 pandemic were unconstitutional.

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has ruled on *Melendez v. City of New York*, in which the plaintiffs, who are New York City landlords, alleged that certain laws enacted in response to the COVID-19 pandemic were unconstitutional.

THE ALLEGATIONS

First, the plaintiffs alleged that the amendments to the City's Residential and Commercial Harassment Laws (the "Harassment Law") that prohibit "threatening" tenants based on their status as COVID-19 impacted businesses or persons violate the plaintiffs' free speech rights by restricting commercial speech in the routine collection of rents and further

violate their due process rights by not providing fair notice of what constitutes "threatening" conduct.

Additionally, the plaintiffs alleged that the "Personal Liability Provisions in Commercial Leases" law (the "Guaranty Law"), which renders unenforceable personal liability guaranties of commercial lease obligations arising between March 7, 2020, and June 30, 2021, violates the Contracts Clause.

THE DECISIONS, IN BRIEF

The U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York dismissed both of the plaintiffs' constitutional challenges. The Second Circuit, however, concluded that while the

*Steven M. Herman is a partner at Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP concentrating his practice in the areas of real estate finance, development, joint ventures, acquisitions, dispositions, commercial leasing, restructurings, workouts, and commercial mortgage securitizations. Eunji Jo is an associate in the firm's Finance Group focusing on real estate finance. The authors may be reached at steven.herman@cwt.com and eunji.jo@cwt.com, respectively.

plaintiffs failed to allege plausible free speech/ due process claims, they did allege a plausible Contracts Clause challenge to the Guaranty Law, and as a result, their Contracts Clause claim should not have been dismissed in the lower court.

THE LAW

Effective May 26, 2020, the Harassment Law prohibits threatening any lawful residential occupant “based on such person’s actual or perceived status as an essential employee, status as a person impacted by COVID-19, or receipt of a rent concession or forbearance for any rent owed during the COVID-19 period.” Violations could result in fines of \$2,000 to \$10,000. The Harassment Law also prohibits threatening a lawful commercial tenant based on such tenant’s “status as a person or business impacted by COVID-19 or . . . receipt of a rent concession or forbearance for any rent owed during the COVID-19 period” with fines for violations ranging from \$10,000 to \$50,000.

Also effective May 26, 2020, the Guaranty Law pertains to leases held by commercial tenants who were required to cease or limit operations under certain Executive Orders issued in response to the pandemic. The Guaranty Law releases a guarantor from its obligations on such commercial leases and applies retroactively to rent arrears dating from March 7, 2020, and prospectively through June 30, 2021, regardless of the financial circumstances of the tenant, guarantor, or the landlord. The court noted that the Guaranty Law does not defer a landlord’s ability to enforce a personal guaranty, but “forever extinguishes it.”

THE DISTRICT COURT

The district court granted the defendants’ motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim. With respect to the commercial Harassment Law, the district court reasoned that nothing in the laws prevented landlords from communicating with tenants about past-due rent and pursuing available remedies to either collect rent or repossess their property.

As for the residential Harassment Law, the district court concluded that demands for rent in the ordinary course of business were not prohibited, pointing to New York case law that distinguished “improper threats” from “permissible warnings of adverse but legitimate consequences” for non-payment of past-due rent.

Finally, with respect to the Guaranty Law, the district court concluded that although the plaintiffs plausibly alleged a substantial impairment of their contract rights, dismissal was warranted because the Guaranty Law advances a legitimate public purpose and is a reasonable and necessary response to a “real emergency.”

THE SECOND CIRCUIT

The Second Circuit upheld the dismissal of the challenges to the Harassment Law. It agreed with the district court that the relevant statutory text, viewed in context and as construed by New York courts, does not support the construction that landlords are prohibited from making reasonable, lawful demands for the payment of past-due rent. However, the Second Circuit disagreed with the district court that the challenge to the Guaranty Law can be dismissed as a matter of law. It applied the same three-part balancing test as the district court:

You Win Some, You Lose Some: The Second Circuit Affirms Dismissal of Landlords' Free Speech Challenge to Harassment Laws and Reverses Dismissal of Contract Clause Challenge

- Whether the challenged law substantially impairs plaintiffs' commercial leases;
- Whether, nevertheless, the impairment serves a significant and legitimate public purpose; and
- Whether the challenged law is appropriate and reasonable to advance that purpose. The district court found the answer to be "yes" to all three prongs.

The Second Circuit also concluded that the Guaranty Law significantly impairs the plaintiffs' contracts because it appears to permanently render unenforceable commercial lease guaranties for arrears arising over a 16-month period. Further, relying on precedent that mitigation of economic emergencies as a public purpose can support contract impairment, the court concluded that because the City asserted a legitimate public purpose (i.e., to mitigate the economic emergency in New York City resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic) that appears at least plausible on the pleadings record, the Court must conduct further inquiry.

However, the court disagreed with the district court at the last step, finding that the plaintiffs pleaded sufficient facts to preclude a court from finding as a matter of law that the Guaranty Law is a reasonable and appropriate means to serve the City's public purpose. The court reasoned that the totality of five features of the Guaranty Law precludes dismissal of the Contracts Clause claim:

(1) The Guaranty Law is not a temporary or limited impairment of contract;

(2) The court cannot conclude as a matter of law that the Guaranty Law is an appropriate means to achieve its proffered purpose: "to help shuttered small businesses survive the pandemic so that they can reopen after the emergency, ensuring functioning neighborhoods throughout the City";

(3) The Guaranty Law allocates the economic burden not to the public but to a discrete group of private persons: commercial landlords;

(4) The relief is not conditioned on need but rather extinguishes the obligations of guarantors for up to 16 months of rent arrears regardless of their ability to pay, raising reasonableness concerns; and

(5) The reasonableness of the Guaranty Law is also called into question by the law's failure to provide for landlords to be compensated for damages or losses sustained as a result of their guaranties' impairment.

Thus, the court ruled that it cannot conclude as a matter of law that the Guaranty Law is a reasonable and appropriate means to serve the public purpose so as to warrant dismissal of the claim. The court made sure to note, however, that it would be premature for it to declare the Guaranty Law unconstitutional as a matter of law. The court remanded the case to the district court.