March 20, 2020

# Senior Executive Illness Due to COVID-19

# **Disclosure Considerations for U.S. Public Companies**

#### SUMMARY

The COVID-19 crisis may require certain public companies to address a long-standing challenge: whether to disclose that a senior executive is experiencing a serious health issue.

The news that a senior executive has been diagnosed with (or is suspected of having) a serious illness can be disruptive to a company's operations and unsettling for its shareholders. However, the news can be substantially more disruptive if it is leaked and therefore incomplete or unmanaged or if its disclosure is delayed such that the company's disclosure processes and its transparency with investors is called into question. Because there is no specific rule or duty that requires disclosure of a senior executive's health issues, companies facing this situation in the context of COVID-19 will likely be called upon to evaluate the specific circumstances and determine the best course among the available disclosure options (while taking into account the executive's own privacy rights and personal concerns).

#### DISCUSSION

U.S. federal securities laws do not specifically require disclosure when a senior executive becomes ill. Disclosure is only required if the information is material and the company has a duty to disclose it. Although investors may have a keen interest in a senior executive's health and disclosure has in cases meaningfully affected a company's stock price, market practice has weighed against finding senior executive health information material and neither the SEC nor the courts previously have found that a senior executive's health was sufficiently material to require disclosure. Accordingly, in most cases involving a key executive

with a serious and/or unpredictable health issue, companies have been able to choose whether and, if so, when to make a voluntary disclosure.<sup>1</sup>

We note, however, that this history was not developed in the context of communicable diseases and that considerations may be different in circumstances where multiple members of senior management are affected. Similarly, although companies have had significant leeway in public disclosure of executive health issues, considerations also may be different in circumstances where insiders transact in the company's securities with knowledge of such undisclosed issues.

In considering whether to disclose a senior executive's illness, companies often begin with an assessment of the impact of the executive's illness on the company, taking into account the duties of the executive, the seriousness and likely course of the illness, the ability of the executive to function during treatment, the projected length of any absence, whether other members of senior management have been affected and whether any previous disclosure (including in connection with a strategic transaction or securities offerings) may give rise to a duty to update, among other factors. The next consideration often relates to the likelihood of the information otherwise becoming public, and the reputational, operational and market risks associated with such a leak. Final considerations often include the desirability of transparent investor relations and factors relating to corporate governance best practices.

Due to the nature of COVID-19, including the recommended public health measures for containing its spread, there is a significant likelihood that a senior executive's actual or presumed positive COVID-19 diagnosis will leak. Under the current public health recommendations, and pursuant to the COVID-19-related policies adopted by many companies, if an individual tests positive for the virus (or is presenting serious symptoms or has been in contact with someone who is diagnosed), the number of people both within and outside the company who will be aware of an executive's actual or suspected illness is likely to be much higher than for another type of illness. Combined with the current public interest relating to COVID-19 infections, the likelihood of public dissemination is meaningfully increased.

If a leak is likely or has already occurred in the context of a senior executive's COVID-19-related illness, voluntary disclosure may be particularly important. Making a voluntary disclosure provides the company with an opportunity to present its assessment of the impact of an executive's illness and plans in place for mitigating such impact, including implementation of any interim officer roles or succession planning and the potential impact on the rest of the company's executive team and its board of directors to the extent they have come into contact with the affected executive, while framing the narrative in a way that is reassuring to the company's shareholders, employees and other stakeholders – and as respectful to the individual and his or her family – consistent with the circumstances.

However, if an illness is so significant that a senior executive has effectively ceased serving in one of a set of identified roles, current disclosure on Form 8-K is required.

The decision to make a voluntary disclosure can also be impacted by approaching scheduled corporate

events - namely, most U.S.-listed companies will have their annual shareholder meeting and first quarter

earnings call in April or May. If a senior executive is unable to participate due to illness, for the reasons

noted above, companies may want to make a voluntary disclosure in front of those events (rather than

announcing at the event).

If a company decides to make a voluntary disclosure, however, it is important to understand the associated

legal and practical issues. The company should consider the format of the disclosure. Often, when a

company discloses the illness of a senior executive, the company will issue a press release that is

subsequently filed or furnished on a Form 8-K, although, in some instances, the executive has announced

his or her illness through a personal social media account (without an accompanying press release from

the company). The format of the disclosure can have legal implications that should be further discussed

with counsel. The company should also consider the obligation to include all information necessary to

make any statements made not misleading. In the context of COVID-19, this implicates questions relating

to whether other executives have been diagnosed or exposed. A third consideration is under what

circumstances and to what extent the company intends to provide updates on the executive's or others'

condition once it has made an initial disclosure and if it intends to forego further comment, so indicate in

the initial announcement. The company should also consider whether it would be appropriate or advisable

to disclose its succession planning in the event that the executive's condition worsens.

In addition, the company should consider the timing of the disclosure, including whether there is any reason

(including due to a leak) to make a disclosure before a diagnosis is confirmed. The company will wish to

act rapidly to make disclosures before the information disseminates publicly (or respond in a timely manner

thereafter), but also must make sure it crafts an appropriate message and complies with relevant legal

requirements. Among other things, the company will need to be mindful of its obligations under applicable

privacy laws, including the American with Disabilities Act, which generally requires an employer to maintain

the confidentiality of employee health information.

Finally, while companies may have leeway in deciding whether to make public disclosure of the personal

health issues of its executives, the prohibitions on insiders trading on material nonpublic information

continue to apply to both the company and to individuals who are aware of undisclosed material information.

We are available to discuss any of the foregoing at your convenience and provide assistance in this

uncertain time.

^ ^

Copyright © Sullivan & Cromwell LLP 2020

-3-

### **ABOUT SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP**

Sullivan & Cromwell LLP is a global law firm that advises on major domestic and cross-border M&A, finance, corporate and real estate transactions, significant litigation and corporate investigations, and complex restructuring, regulatory, tax and estate planning matters. Founded in 1879, Sullivan & Cromwell LLP has more than 875 lawyers on four continents, with four offices in the United States, including its headquarters in New York, four offices in Europe, two in Australia and three in Asia.

### **CONTACTING SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP**

This publication is provided by Sullivan & Cromwell LLP as a service to clients and colleagues. The information contained in this publication should not be construed as legal advice. Questions regarding the matters discussed in this publication may be directed to any of our lawyers listed below, or to any other Sullivan & Cromwell LLP lawyer with whom you have consulted in the past on similar matters. If you have not received this publication directly from us, you may obtain a copy of any past or future publications by sending an e-mail to <a href="mailto:scPublications@sullcrom.com">SCPublications@sullcrom.com</a>.

### **CONTACTS**

New York	<
----------	---

Werner F. Ahlers	+1-212-558-1623	ahlersw@sullcrom.com
Francis J. Aquila	+1-212-558-4048	aquilaf@sullcrom.com
Nicolas Bourtin	+1-212-558-3920	bourtinn@sullcrom.com
Catherine M. Clarkin	+1-212-558-4175	clarkinc@sullcrom.com
Audra D. Cohen	+1-212-558-3275	cohena@sullcrom.com
H. Rodgin Cohen	+1-212-558-3534	cohenhr@sullcrom.com
Scott B. Crofton	+1-212-558-4682	croftons@sullcrom.com
Robert W. Downes	+1-212-558-4312	downesr@sullcrom.com
Mitchell S. Eitel	+1-212-558-4960	eitelm@sullcrom.com
John Evangelakos	+1-212-558-4260	evangelakosj@sullcrom.com
Jared M. Fishman	+1-212-558-1689	fishmanj@sullcrom.com
Sergio J. Galvis	+1-212-558-4740	galviss@sullcrom.com
C. Andrew Gerlach	+1-212-558-4789	gerlacha@sullcrom.com
Matthew B. Goodman	+1-212-558-4995	goodmanm@sullcrom.com
Brian E. Hamilton	+1-212-558-4801	hamiltonb@sullcrom.com
Matthew G. Hurd	+1-212-558-3122	hurdm@sullcrom.com
Stephen M. Kotran	+1-212-558-4963	kotrans@sullcrom.com
Mark J. Menting	+1-212-558-4859	mentingm@sullcrom.com
Scott D. Miller	+1-212-558-3109	millersc@sullcrom.com
Keith A. Pagnani	+1-212-558-4397	pagnanik@sullcrom.com
Richard A. Pollack	+1-212-558-3497	pollackr@sullcrom.com
George J. Sampas	+1-212-558-4945	sampasg@sullcrom.com

	Melissa Sawyer	+1-212-558-4243	sawyerm@sullcrom.com
	Alan J. Sinsheimer	+1-212-558-3738	sinsheimera@sullcrom.com
	Marc Trevino	+1-212-558-4239	trevinom@sullcrom.com
	Krishna Veeraraghavan	+1-212-558-7931	veeraraghavank@sullcrom.com
	Benjamin H. Weiner	+1-212-558-7861	weinerb@sullcrom.com
Washi	ngton, D.C.		
	Julia M. Jordan	+1-202-956-7535	jordanjm@sullcrom.com
	Robert S. Risoleo	+1-202-956-7510	risoleor@sullcrom.com
Los Ar	ngeles		
	Eric M. Krautheimer	+1-310-712-6678	krautheimere@sullcrom.com
	Rita-Anne O'Neill	+1-310-712-6698	oneillr@sullcrom.com
	Alison S. Ressler	+1-310-712-6630	resslera@sullcrom.com
Palo A	ilto		
	Scott D. Miller	+1-650-461-5620	millersc@sullcrom.com
	Sarah P. Payne	+1-650-461-5669	paynesa@sullcrom.com
Londo	n		
	John Horsfield-Bradbury	+44-20-7959-8491	horsfieldbradburyj@sullcrom.com
	Jeremy B. Kutner	+44-20-7959-8484	kutnerj@sullcrom.com
	Ben Perry	+44-20-7959-8477	perryb@sullcrom.com
	Richard A. Pollack	+44-20-7959-8404	pollackr@sullcrom.com
	Evan S. Simpson	+44-20-7959-8426	simpsone@sullcrom.com
Paris			
	Olivier de Vilmorin	+33-1-7304-5895	devilmorino@sullcrom.com
Frankf	urt		
	Carsten Berrar	+49-69-4272-5506	berrarc@sullcrom.com
	York Schnorbus	+49-69-4272-5517	schnorbusy@sullcrom.com
Brusse	els		
	Michael Rosenthal	+32-2896-8001	rosenthalm@sullcrom.com
Melbo	urne		
	Waldo D. Jones Jr.	+61-3-9635-1508	jonesw@sullcrom.com
Sydne	y		
	Waldo D. Jones Jr.	+61-2-8227-6702	jonesw@sullcrom.com
Tokyo			
	Keiji Hatano	+81-3-3213-6171	hatanok@sullcrom.com

Hong Kong		
Garth W. Bray	+852-2826-8691	brayg@sullcrom.com
Kay lan Ng	+852-2826-8601	ngki@sullcrom.com
Beijing		
Gwen Wong	+86-10-5923-5967	wonggw@sullcrom.com