

A Future Without SEC Tolling Agreements? Some Say “Not So Fast”

May 05, 2021

The SEC routinely requests individuals who may be the subjects or targets of investigations to execute agreements that delay or suspend the time period in a statute of limitations for an agreed period (commonly referred to as “tolling agreements”). This practice generally benefits both parties: the SEC can investigate at its own pace, and the putative subjects or targets have more time to argue why the SEC should not bring an enforcement action against them.

So, what’s the problem? Turns out, these tolling agreements may not be enforceable under federal jurisprudence. Under 28 U.S.C. § 2462, “[e]xcept as otherwise provided by Act of Congress, an action, suit or proceeding for the enforcement of any civil fine, penalty, or forfeiture, pecuniary or otherwise, shall not be entertained unless commenced within five years from the date when the claim first accrued.”

Pending before the Second Circuit Court of Appeals is an issue of first impression. In *SEC v. Fowler*, Donald Fowler argues that section 2462 imposes a jurisdictional time limit on a court’s ability to hear cases, including those involving tolling agreements. He argues that such agreements cannot be used to circumvent the statute’s plain language and evade the statute’s purpose, i.e., to bar courts from “entertaining” claims brought outside a five-year period.

This novel argument rests, in part, on the statute’s rather unconventional wording, which focuses not on the plaintiff’s obligation to bring a case within a certain time period but rather on the court’s inability to “entertain” a case brought outside the statutory five-year period. This language is unusual in run-of-the-mill statutes of limitations.

If the Second Circuit agrees with Fowler’s arguments, the SEC, as well as potential subjects and their counsel, may find themselves in a tenuous position: the SEC may hasten its investigations and bring

claims that it might not have otherwise, while targets will have even less negotiating power and less time to present their arguments.

Authored By



Natalie A. Napierala

Related Practices

[Securities Litigation and Enforcement](#)

[Financial Services Regulatory](#)

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

Related Industries

[Securities & Investment Companies](#)

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

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

©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.