

DC Circuit: Willful Means Intentional Under the Advisers Act – Negligent Conduct Cannot Be Willful Conduct

July 11, 2019

In *Robare Group v. SEC*, the court clarified the meaning of “willfully” under Section 207 of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. A willful omission requires that a person “subjectively intended to omit material information.”

So, when the SEC alleges inadequate financial disclosure — for example, Form ADV disclosure that does not address receipt of “revenue sharing” payments (e.g., shareholder servicing fees paid when clients invest in certain eligible funds on an online platform) or the potential conflict of interest to clients created by those payments — an investment adviser cannot be held liable for willful violations of the Advisers Act if the adviser’s conduct was merely negligent.

Importantly, however, not all of the Advisers Act’s anti-fraud provisions are predicated on “willful” misconduct. Thus, courts have held that a violation of Section 206(1) requires proof of scienter (i.e., an intent to deceive, manipulate, or defraud) and a violation of Section 206(2) requires proof only of simple negligence. But, prior to *Robare*, the courts had not addressed the meaning of “willfully” in Section 207, which makes it unlawful for any person to willfully make any untrue statement of material fact, or omit to state any material fact, in Form ADV or reports filed with the SEC.

Robare is important for several reasons. In addition to clarifying that negligent conduct (failure to exercise reasonable care under all circumstances) is not sufficient to establish a willful violation under Section 207, the court:

- reinforced the importance of disclosure (in Form ADV) of “revenue sharing” arrangements;

- emphasized the importance of full and fair disclosure of potential conflicts of interest created by “revenue sharing” arrangements; and
- confirmed that the “everyone else does it this way” defense is not sufficient to overcome a negligence allegation. Rather, the fact that an adviser’s disclosure is consistent with industry practice does not mean that the adviser acted reasonably.

It also is possible that *Robare’s* interpretation of “willful” will be followed by other circuits or where that term appears in federal securities law provisions other than Section 207 of the Advisers Act. This could greatly amplify the decision’s relevance for advisers and their counsel in defending against allegations of willful misconduct.

Authored By



Ann Began Furman

Related Practices

[Financial Services Regulatory](#)

Related Industries

[Life, Annuity, and Retirement Solutions](#)

[Securities & Investment Companies](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.

