

FILED  
JAN 18 2017

OFFICE OF THE CLERK  
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

Nos. 220145 & 220146, Original (Consolidated)

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

DELAWARE,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

PENNSYLVANIA AND WISCONSIN,

*Defendants.*

ARKANSAS, *et al.*,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

DELAWARE,

*Defendant.*

---

*On Bill of Complaint in Original Action*

---

**PENNSYLVANIA'S RESPONSE TO DELAWARE'S  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND  
BILL OF COMPLAINT**

---

Matthew H. Haverstick\*  
Mark E. Seiberling  
Joshua J. Voss  
KLEINBARD LLC  
One Liberty Place, 46<sup>th</sup> Floor  
1650 Market Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 568-2000  
(215) 568-0140 (fax)  
mhaverstick@kleinbard.com  
mseiberling@kleinbard.com  
jvoss@kleinbard.com

Christopher B. Craig  
Chief Counsel  
Treasury Department  
Office of Chief Counsel  
127 Finance Building  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
(717) 787-2740  
ccraig@patreasury.gov

*Attorneys for Commonwealth  
of Pennsylvania*

*\*Counsel of Record*

Dated: January 18, 2017

---



**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
I. ARGUMENT .....	1
II. CONCLUSION .....	3

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**REGULATIONS AND STATUTES**

12 C.F.R. § 229.2 .....	2
12 U.S.C. §§ 2501-03 .....	2
6 Del.C. § 3-104 <i>et seq.</i> .....	2
13 Pa.C.S. § 3104 .....	2

## I. ARGUMENT

The Court should deny Delaware's Motion for Leave to Amend Bill of Complaint for three reasons.

*First*, with its Motion, Delaware asks the Court to take a discrete case regarding a particular instrument—MoneyGram Payment Systems, Inc. official checks—and turn it into an unnecessary wide-ranging inquiry. No need exists for the Court to grant such license. Whatever principles emerge from the Court's disposition of the dispute regarding MoneyGram official checks will apply with equal force to whatever "unclaimed negotiable instruments" Delaware has a "belief" may exist within Pennsylvania's custody. *See* De. Mot. 2; De. Amd. Compl. ¶ 22.

*Second*, Delaware's request would require a substantial, two-way expansion of this case. Indeed, if the request is granted, not only would the Court need to examine whatever so-called "official checks" and other "negotiable instruments" were escheated to Pennsylvania, but also the Court would need to examine whatever additional instruments were escheated to Delaware by entities other than MoneyGram. In consequence, this case would greatly expand beyond the single instrument before the Court.

*Third* and finally, Delaware's request is predicated in part on the flawed belief that "official checks" are a term of art in the banking industry (rather than a marketing designation for various business institutions), such that all "official checks" can be grouped together for purposes of discovery. Yet as Pennsylvania has previewed in its Answer to

Delaware's present Complaint, "official checks" do not have a set meaning. *See* Pa. Answer to De. Compl. ¶ 9 ("Pennsylvania admits that MoneyGram provides services regarding an instrument that it nominates as an 'Official Check'; Pennsylvania denies that 'Official Checks' or 'Official Check services' have a uniform definition or meaning."). In fact, as will be illuminated further as this case proceeds, "official checks" are not subject to a uniform definition under accepted authorities like Article 3 of the Uniform Commercial Code (concerning negotiable instruments). *See generally* 13 Pa.C.S. § 3104 (Pennsylvania UCC, Article 3; definitions for various negotiable instruments but not "official checks"); 6 Del.C. § 3-104 *et seq.* (Delaware UCC, Article 3; definitions for various negotiable instruments but not "official checks"); *see also* 12 C.F.R. § 229.2 (Federal Regulation CC, definitions for various negotiable instruments but not "official checks"). As such, while whatever rules the Court may establish regarding MoneyGram's "official checks" will apply to other instruments, *see supra*, examining those instruments in discovery will result in nothing other than identifying additional instruments that may be subject to re-allocation. But this examination will do nothing to aid the Court in its legal interpretation of the Disposition of Abandoned Money Orders and Traveler's Checks Act. 12 U.S.C. §§ 2501-03.

Accordingly, the expansion of the case sought with Delaware's Motion is unwarranted, and, as such, the Court should deny the Motion.

## II. CONCLUSION

Delaware's Motion for Leave to Amend Bill of Complaint should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Matthew H. Haverstick\*  
 Mark E. Seiberling  
 Joshua J. Voss  
 KLEINBARD LLC  
 One Liberty Place  
 46<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 1650 Market Street  
 Philadelphia, PA 19103  
 (215) 568-2000  
 (215) 568-0140 (fax)  
 mhaverstick@kleinbard.com  
 mseiberling@kleinbard.com  
 jvoss@kleinbard.com

Christopher B. Craig  
 Chief Counsel  
 Treasury Department  
 Office of Chief Counsel  
 127 Finance Building  
 Harrisburg, PA 17120  
 (717) 787-2740  
 ccraig@patreasury.gov

*Attorneys for  
 Commonwealth of  
 Pennsylvania*

*\*Counsel of Record*

Dated: January 18, 2017











