

# Index

---

- Abbot, C. 37, 60  
Aguilar, M. 218  
Ahmed, P. 189  
Akhigbe, A. 189  
Aleskerov, F. 17  
Allingham, M. 17, 18  
Amabile, T. 38  
American Law Institute, *Restatement of Law (Third) Agency* 106–8, 109  
amnesty and leniency programs 142–3, 274  
Aoki, K. 55  
arbitrariness 92–6, 252, 274  
Archer, M. 17  
Arlen, J. *xii*, 25, 132, 159, 160, 163–75  
*passim*, 190, 191, 199, 227  
Armour, J. 2, 10–11, 15  
Armstrong, A. 211  
Atiyah, P. 108–9  
Australia, Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) policy guidelines 153  
Avio, K. 36  
Aviram, A. 172  
Axelrod, R. 75, 79  
Ayles, I. 39, 41, 50, 51, 54, 57, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 72, 73, 80, 85, 91, 93, 94, 95  
  
Baggs, J. 66  
Balch, R. 211  
Baldwin, R. 2, 10, 15, 35, 39, 40, 42–3, 54, 55, 63–4, 66–7, 85  
Bandura, A. 20  
Bardach, E. 10, 35, 39–40, 41, 42, 50–60 *passim*, 65, 66, 67, 73, 83, 93, 94, 95, 96, 240, 257  
Bartley, R. 216  
Baylson, M. 139  
Bazerman, M. 18  
Beccaria, C. 16  
Becker, G. 4, 16, 18, 19–20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 32, 42, 68, 160, 176, 195, 249  
Bennett, K. 228  
Bentham, J. 16  
Bernstein, L. 76  
Bierschbach, R. 22  
Bittlingmayer, G. 11  
Black, J. 27, 86  
Blader, S. 55–6  
Bloch, R. 119, 138  
Block, M. 23, 27, 160, 176, 178  
Blumenthal, M. 39  
Blumstein, A. 36  
Boatright, J. 205  
Boozang, K. 210, 218  
Bose, P. 37  
bouncer enforcers (gatekeepers) 205–6, 208  
*see also* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements  
bounded rationality, deterrence-based regulatory enforcement 43–7  
Boutros, A. 206, 224, 225, 226, 227, 256  
Bowles, R. 22, 29, 68, 105  
Braithwaite, J. 39, 41, 50–57 *passim*, 61, 62–3, 64, 65, 72, 73, 80, 85, 91, 93, 94, 95  
Braithwaite, V. 39  
Brehm, S. and J. 39  
Brickey, K. 109, 110–11, 112, 116  
Brown, M. 154  
Burns, G. 225  
Burrows, M. 124, 147  
  
Calabresi, G. 167, 169–70  
Camerer, C. 44  
Canada, Competition Bureau  
*Corporate Compliance Programs* 153

- Carr-Hill, R. 36
- Casper, J. 39
- Cave, M. 2, 10, 15, 35, 39, 40, 42–3, 54, 55, 63–4, 66–7, 85
- Ceresney, A. 101
- Chang, J. 68
- chaperone enforcers (market third-party enforcers) 205, 206–8  
*see also* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements
- Chayes, A. and A. 76
- Chertoff, M. 139
- Chu, C. 122, 169
- Ciancio, N. 146–7
- civil liability *see* corporate liability and compliance management systems, corporate civil liability
- civil-public regime, deterrence-based regulatory enforcement 28
- Clark, N. 143
- Coffee, J. 42, 103, 110, 111, 177, 206, 207, 208, 225, 226, 254, 255, 256, 257
- cognitive evaluation theory and alienation of regulatory subjects 38–40
- Colvin, E. 103, 107, 110, 111, 113, 115, 116, 162
- Comey, J. 210
- common law *respondeat superior* doctrine 107–8, 109, 116, 121, 168
- compliance  
 management systems, and corporate liability *see* corporate liability and compliance management systems  
 monitoring *see* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements  
 as moral obligation 54–6  
 programs, use of, corporate monitors to facilitate efficient targeted monitoring systems 243–4, 245
- Cook, P. 35–6
- cooperative enforcement 48–70  
 building blocks 48–53  
 coercion, residual role of 53, 66–7  
 compliance as moral obligation 54–6  
 compliance through persuasion 52–3, 58–9  
 compromising enforcement and social goals 58–9  
 conciliatory strategy, discouraging effect of 68–9  
 corruption risk 68, 84  
 cost-effectiveness 54  
 credulousness risk 65, 84  
 and deterrence-based, dichotomy between 52–3, 72  
 discretionary powers and compromising enforcement 58–9  
 efficiency improvements and regulatory dealing 60–61  
 Enforcement Pyramid and responsive regulation 61–3  
 erosion of general deterrence 69  
 information sharing 57  
 law deficiencies, overcoming 56–7  
 law-abiding nature of regulatees 50–51  
 legal compliance and low sanction threat 49–50  
 negotiated compliance 59–60  
 pitfalls 65–9  
 policy implications 57–64  
 procedural justice theory 55–6  
 regulatees' normative commitment 48–51  
 regulatory dealing 60–61  
 regulatory violations and organizational incompetence 51  
 responsive regulation gradual, escalation of 61–3  
 self-regulation 63–4, 91–2  
 and social welfare 53–4  
 superfluous tolerance and regulatory capture 66–7  
 virtues of 53–7  
*see also* reconciliation of deterrence-based and cooperative enforcement
- Cooter, R. 2, 3, 5, 17, 19, 20, 23, 26, 126, 160, 171, 176, 261
- Corona, C. 189
- corporate liability and compliance management systems 101–3, 105–57

- amnesty and leniency programs 142–3
- business corporations, prosecution of 138–42
- collective knowledge theory 115
- common law *respondeat superior* doctrine 107–8, 109, 116, 121, 168
- comparative insights 152–6
- corporate *mens rea* 109–10, 113, 122, 136–7
- Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) compliance programs guidance 132–3, 143
- direct and vicarious corporate liabilities 106–16
- discouragement effect of strict liability regimes 121
- duty-based corporate liability regimes, rise of 119–23
- Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Bureau of Competition 133–4
- ‘good faith’ efforts 127
- identification doctrine 115–16
- impact of proactive compliance efforts 117–23
- internal-enforcement-related evidence, admissibility of 122–3
- punitive damages 126–7
- ‘reasonable care’ issue in sexual harassment cases 125–6
- Relevant Factor Approach 122–3
- respondeat superior* (common law) doctrine 107–8, 109, 116, 121, 168
- self-enforcing corporations and illegitimacy of sanctioning 121–2
- sexual harassment violations 124–6
- strict liability (traditional approach) 117–19, 154, 168
- ultra vires* actions 118
- unofficial regulatory enforcement policies 133–4
- corporate liability and compliance management systems, corporate civil liability 106–9
- compliance management systems as mitigating factor of civil penalties 128–34
- compliance management systems as shield from 123–7
- direct 106–7
- corporate liability and compliance management systems, corporate criminal liability 109–16
- affirmative defense from corporate criminal liability 134–8
- compliance management systems as mitigating factor of criminal penalties 143–52
- compliance management systems as shield from 134–43
- direct 109
- early history 110–14
- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) audit policy, declining recommendations for criminal prosecution 131
- vicarious criminal liability 109–10, 112–13
- corporate liability and compliance management systems, employee conduct
- controlling measures to monitor 112
- corporations as beneficiaries of 103–4, 111–12
- employee acted at least in part to benefit the corporation, stipulation of 114–15
- employee within scope of their employment, consideration of 137–8
- imputation consideration, decisions on 115–16, 117–18
- offender’s intent to benefit the corporation 137
- prosecution liability 123
- vicarious liability (committed by corporate employees) 107–9
- within scope of individual employee’s employment, stipulation of 114
- corporate liability and compliance management systems, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) audit policy 128–32, 139, 143, 174, 245
- declining recommendations for criminal prosecution 131

- elimination/mitigation of gravity-based penalties 129–31
- refraining from routine requests for audit reports 131–2
- corporate liability and compliance management systems, Organizational Sentencing Guidelines (OSG) 121, 143–4, 174
- compliance and ethics programs, effective 146–9, 150–51
- compliance management systems 146–50
- recalcitrant corporations and normative corporations, distinction between 144–5
- self-reporting, cooperation, and acceptance of responsibility 149–50
- sentencing structure 144–6
- corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements 203–36
  - bouncer enforcers (gatekeepers) 205–6, 208
  - chaperone enforcers (market third-party enforcers) 205, 206–8
  - compensation fee schedule 230
  - core list, bill requiring creation of 230
  - deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs), Cooperation Initiative and Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) recognition 218
  - deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs), overview 208–11
  - deferred prosecution agreements (DPAs), spectrum increase 218
  - deferred prosecution, evolution of 211–19
  - deferred prosecution, expansion of 217, 226
  - Department of Justice (DOJ) guidance, lack of 224–5
  - Department of Justice (DOJ) Memoranda 230–35
  - emerging policies 229–35
  - emerging policies, and Accountability in Deferred Prosecution Act 229–30, 248
  - emerging policies, challenges to 224–8
  - Enron scandal 216–17
  - gatekeepers 205–6, 207
  - judicial oversight proposal 230
  - non-prosecution agreements (NPAs), overview 208–11, 215
  - powers, over-expansion of 227–8
  - Pretrial Diversion Program 212, 215–16
  - prosecutorial discretion, overreach of 226–7
  - roles and responsibilities 221–2, 231, 232
  - selection of corporate monitors 223, 228, 230–32, 233
  - third-party enforcers, major prototypes of 204–8
  - use of corporate monitors 219–23
  - whistleblowers 207
- corporate monitors to facilitate efficient targeted monitoring systems 237–59
- classification of regulatees, challenge of 242–5
- compliance programs, use of 243–4, 245
- external professional enforcers, argument for 254–5
  - as facilitating mechanism 253–8
  - as facilitating mechanism, capacity 254–5
  - as facilitating mechanism, credibility 256–8
  - as facilitating mechanism, selection 255
- market forces and credibility of third-party enforcement 257
- noblesse oblige* and credibility of third-party enforcement 256, 257
- probability of detection and imposition of sanctions 242, 246, 248–9
- regulatee violation records, problems with use of 242–3
- risk neutrality of corporate regulatees 246
- sanctions equalling corporate asset value, adjustment needed 258

- self-policing costs 238, 253
- self-reporting, support for 244–5
- targeted monitoring systems, current use of 238–9
- targeted monitoring systems, literature 240–41, 242–5, 254–5
- corporate monitors to facilitate efficient targeted monitoring systems, third-party-based targeted monitoring (TPTM) system proposal 246–53
- building blocks 246–9
- independence assurances 248
- information asymmetry and arbitrariness concerns, lack of 252
- mixed regimes, comparison with 252
- optimal deterrence and social welfare perspective 248–9, 252–3
- program labels as evidence of proactive compliance 246–7, 250–53
- public list of corporate monitors to enhance selection 247–8
- self-policing motivation 250–52
- social welfare perspective and optimal deterrence 248–9, 252–3
- voluntary program opt-in and reduction of regulatory scrutiny 246, 246–7, 250–53
- corruption risk, cooperative enforcement 68, 84
- cost–benefit analysis
  - deterrence-based regulatory enforcement 26, 30–31, 33, 34, 36–7
  - deterrence-based regulatory enforcement, rational choice theory 17–18, 20
  - law and economics analysis of corporate liability regimes 176–82
  - reconciliation of deterrence-based and cooperative enforcement 84–5
- Creighton, V. 128
- criminal liability *see* corporate liability and compliance management systems, corporate criminal liability
  - criminal regime, deterrence-based regulatory enforcement 28–9
  - Crofts, L. 156
  - Croley, S. 46, 162
  - Curley, S. 44
  - Dahlström, K. 239
  - Dakin, L. 107, 112, 118, 119, 134, 136, 137, 139, 142, 172, 175, 213, 214
  - damages awards and judgment proof problem 31
    - see also* deterrence-based regulatory enforcement
  - Dana, D. 132
  - Davis, K. 94
  - Deci, E. 38, 39
  - deferred prosecution agreements *see* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements
  - Degoey, P. 54, 56
  - Deily, M. 82–3, 239
  - DeMott, D. 254
  - Desai, K. 154
  - detection probability
    - corporate monitors and imposition of sanctions 242, 246, 248–9
    - and deterrence-based regulatory enforcement, sanctions 21–2, 25–6, 41–3, 44
  - deterrence-based enforcement, reconciliation with cooperative enforcement *see* reconciliation of deterrence-based and cooperative enforcement
  - deterrence-based regulatory enforcement 15–47
    - administrative costs of public enforcement of regulations 36–7
    - administrative regime 28
    - alienation of regulatory subjects 38–41, 84
    - ambiguity avoidance 44
    - amoral calculators, regulatees as 19–20
    - availability heuristic and probability prediction 44–5
    - bounded rationality 43–7
    - bounded rationality, clarification of meaning 46–7
    - civil-public regime 28

- cognitive evaluation theory and
  - alienation of regulatory subjects 38–40
- and cooperative enforcement,
  - dichotomy between 52–3, 72
- cost–benefit analysis 26, 30–31, 33, 34, 36–7
- criminal regime 28–9
- damages awards and judgment proof
  - problem 31
- enforcement costs 26, 30–31, 34
- error costs 37
- evasion costs 37
- expected liability faced by market
  - players 22
- force, use of 31
- incapacitation measures 21, 31, 32–3
- information acquisition and analysis 32, 34
- innocent law violations 40–41
- judgment proof problem 31
- litigation costs 37
- optimal deterrence 20–23, 30, 33–4
- optimal expected liability,
  - impracticable 41–3
- pitfalls 35–47
- policy implications 27–35
- private enforcement of regulations 29–31
- private enforcement of regulations,
  - arguments against 30–31
- private and public enforcement,
  - choice between 33–5
- private-civil regime 29–30
- professionalism and consistency
  - in public enforcement of regulations 32
- profit-maximizers, regulatees as 19
- public enforcement domain 27–9
- public enforcement of regulations 32–5
- public enforcement of regulations,
  - drawbacks 33
- public servants' commitment, doubts
  - over 32, 33
- rational apathy problem 31
- regulatory 'cat-and-mouse' game 36–7, 54
- selective optimism and over-
  - confidence as cognitive bias 45–6
  - social cost (taxation) of public enforcement of regulations 33
- social welfare and efficient level of
  - deterrence 22–3, 25–6, 31, 32, 36–7, 42
- under-deterrence and over-
  - deterrence problems 22–3
- see also* reconciliation of deterrence-based and cooperative enforcement
- deterrence-based regulatory
  - enforcement, rational choice theory 16–19
  - completeness assumption 17
  - cost–benefit analysis 17–18, 20
  - and deterrence theory 19–20
  - expected outcomes, criticism of 18–19
  - expected outcomes, estimation of 18
  - punishment as deterrence 20
  - transitivity assumption 17
  - utility maximization assumption 17
- deterrence-based regulatory
  - enforcement, sanctions constraints 41–2
  - efficient 23–6
  - gain-based 23, 24
  - harm-based (and internalization goal) 23–6, 30
  - kinds of 21
  - optimal 23, 25–6
  - and probability of violation
    - detection 21–2, 25–6, 41–3, 44
    - severity of 21
- Dickinson, T. *xii*, 165, 166, 199, 210, 218, 219, 220, 221, 223, 228, 229, 247
- discretionary powers and
  - compromising enforcement 58–9
  - see also* cooperative enforcement
- Dougall, K. 209, 215, 218
- Downs, G. 76
- duty-based corporate liability regimes,
  - rise of 119–23
- Easton, D. 49
- Eckert, H. 83, 239
- economics analysis *see* law and

- economics analysis of corporate liability regimes
- Edgerton, H. 111
- efficiency
  - efficient sanctioning 23–6
  - improvements and regulatory dealing 60–61
  - targeted monitoring systems *see* corporate monitors to facilitate efficient targeted monitoring systems
- Eger, T. 29, 30
- Ehrlich, I. 21, 36
- Elkins, J. 111, 112
- Ellickson, R. 76
- Emmett, R. 9
- employees
  - conduct *see* corporate liability and compliance management systems, employee conduct
  - corporations benefiting from employee violations, results of 195
- enforcement
  - comprehensive regulatory policy *see* regulatory enforcement policy, comprehensive
  - cooperative *see* cooperative enforcement
- Enforcement Pyramid and responsive regulation 61–3
- Enron scandal 216–17
- Engate, A. 45
- Estes, W. 20
- EU
  - Competition policy 154–6
  - Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) 246–7, 275
  - Environmental Management System (EMS) 239
  - leniency program 155
- ex-ante* and *ex-post* self-policing *see* under law and economics analysis of corporate liability regimes, self-enforcement function
- external professional enforcers, argument for 254–5
  - see also* corporate monitors to facilitate efficient targeted monitoring systems
- Faure, M. 29, 35, 43, 44, 45, 66, 72, 105, 131
- Favretto, R. 119, 137, 139
- Fenn, P. 2, 15, 59, 69
- Filip, M. 141, 142, 233–4
- Fisher, C. 38
- Forrence, J. 67
- Foster, D. 101, 102
- Franck, T. 76
- French, J. 49
- Friedman, D. 25, 249
- Friedman, H. 116
- Friedman, M. 17
- Friesen, L. 80, 240
- Gagné, M. 38, 39
- Galen, M. 139
- Garoupa, N. 68
- Garrett, B. 226, 256
- gatekeepers, corporate monitors 205–6, 207
  - see also* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements
- Gerritsen, L. 44
- Gibbs, J. 36
- Gilboy, J. 19, 42, 203, 204, 205, 206, 254
- Gilson, R. 172, 175, 177, 204, 205, 206, 247, 248, 255, 256, 257–8
- Goldsmith, J. 76
- Goldsmith, M. 123, 191
- ‘good faith’ efforts 127
- Goodman, R. 189
- Gordon, N. 228, 233
- Graafland, J. 189
- Grabosky, P. 203, 204, 254
- Gray, W. 82–3, 239
- Green, C. 110
- Greenberg, J. 68, 80, 81, 240
- Greenblum, B. 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 224, 226, 227
- Greene, D. 38
- Grindler, G. 141, 234–5
- Groskaufmanis, K. *xii*, 101, 103, 107, 108, 112, 116, 119, 120, 121, 125, 126, 127, 134, 135, 137, 163, 164, 243–4, 247

- Gunningham, N. 27, 40, 53, 65, 67, 73, 86–7
- Guzman, A. 76
- Haines, F. 63
- Hamdani, A. 205, 254, 259
- Handler, J. 94
- Handler-Hutchinson, S. 210, 218
- Harford, J. 80, 240
- Harrington, W. 26, 42, 49–50, 80, 81–2, 84, 86, 240–41, 245, 249, 270
- Harris, J. 21
- Hawkins, G. 36
- Hawkins, K. 19, 41, 50, 51, 52–3, 65, 72, 83, 95, 239–40
- Hayek, F. 30
- Hefendehl, R. 1, 110, 116
- Heineman, B. *xii*, 165, 166, 199
- Hendricks, W. 139
- Heyes, A. 2, 4, 15, 20, 23, 26, 31, 37, 50, 60, 160, 162, 176, 249
- Hicks, J. 4–5
- Hirshleifer, J. 18
- Holder, E. 140–41, 161, 215–16, 234
- Huff, K. *xii*, 101–2, 103–4, 110, 112, 120–21, 122–3, 163, 164, 165, 166, 199
- Huntington, S. 67
- Hur, R. 209
- identification doctrine 115–16
- Illovsy, E. 208–9, 210, 211
- Inciardi, J. 211
- inclusiveness 84, 273
- individual-liability schemes, deficiencies in 161–2
- information acquisition  
   collective knowledge theory 115  
   deterrence-based regulatory enforcement 32, 34  
   sharing and cooperative enforcement 57
- information asymmetry problems  
   lack of, third-party-based targeted monitoring (TPTM) system proposal 252  
   law and economics analysis of corporate liability regimes 171–2  
   and past performance 85–92  
   regulatory enforcement policy, comprehensive 273–4  
   information burden and negligence corporate liability 170–72, 175
- Innes, R. 37, 185
- Inniss, D. 211
- innocent law violations 40–41  
   *see also* deterrence-based regulatory enforcement
- internal-enforcement-related evidence, admissibility of 122–3
- internalization function 163, 168, 170, 178–80  
   *see also* law and economics analysis of corporate liability regimes
- Jiménez, M. 101, 102
- Johnstone, R. 27, 86, 90
- Jolls, C. 45
- judiciary  
   judgment proof problem 31  
   judicial oversight proposal 230  
   *see also* law and economics analysis of corporate liability regimes; prosecution
- Kagan, R. 10, 20, 35, 39–40, 41, 42, 50–60 *passim*, 65, 66, 67, 73, 83, 93, 94, 95, 96, 240, 257
- Kahneman, D. 19, 45
- Kaldor, N. 4–5
- Kaplan, J. 143
- Kaplow, L. 166, 185, 187
- Karpoff, J. 189
- Kennedy, E. 172
- Keohane, R. 76
- Keren, G. 44
- Kerwin, C. 69
- Khanna, V. *xii*, 103, 107, 110, 115, 132, 160–73 *passim*, 199, 210, 218, 219, 220, 221, 223, 228, 229, 247
- Kim, S. 121, 206, 207, 228, 254–5, 257
- King, C. 123, 191
- Kinsey, K. 40
- Kirstein, R. 246
- Klerman, D. 68
- Kornhauser, L. 161, 162
- Korobkin, R. 43
- Kraakman, R. *xii*, 25, 40, 43, 105, 110, 132, 159–75 *passim*, 191, 199,



- 203–8 *passim*, 247, 248, 253, 255, 256, 257–8  
 Krawiec, K. 171, 175, 244
- Lacovara, P. 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 112  
 Laffont, J.-J. 67  
 Landes, W. 30  
 Landsberger, M. 80, 81, 82  
 Langbein, L. 69  
 Laufer, W. 110, 111, 112, 120, 171, 172, 243
- law deficiencies, overcoming 56–7  
 law and economics analysis of  
   corporate liability regimes 158–95  
   adjusted strict liability regime 173  
   central decision-making level of  
     business corporations 161  
   compliance decision-making  
     180–81  
   composite liability regime 174–5  
   compound corporate liability regime  
     176–93  
   compound corporate liability regime,  
     analytical framework 176–85  
   compound corporate liability  
     regime, corporate self-reporting  
     on total variable enforcement  
     costs associated with regulatory  
     violations, impact of 185–93  
   corporate liability, assessment of  
     need for 160–62  
   corporations benefiting from  
     employee violations, results of  
     195  
   cost–benefit analysis 176–82  
   economic functions of corporate  
     liability 162–6  
   economics of corporate liability  
     159–66  
   execution level of business  
     corporations 161  
   expected liability for misconduct at  
     level of total social costs 176–8  
   individual-liability schemes,  
     deficiencies in 161–2  
   information asymmetry problems  
     171–2  
   information burden and negligence  
     corporate liability 170–72, 175
- internalization function 163, 168,  
 170, 178–80  
 major liability regimes, comparative  
 evaluation 167–76  
 negligence corporate liability regime  
 169–72  
 social costs 159, 160, 163–5, 167,  
 168, 182–5  
 strict liability regime 167–9  
 ‘window dressing’ compliance  
 programs 171–2
- law and economics analysis of  
 corporate liability regimes, self-  
 enforcement function 164–6,  
 168–9, 170–71, 173, 174–5, 178–82  
*ex-ante* self-policing 165, 167, 168,  
 170–71, 179, 181, 184, 191–2  
*ex-post* self-policing 166, 167, 168,  
 169, 171, 173, 175, 179, 181–2,  
 183, 189–91  
 optimal decisions from social  
 perspective 182–5  
 perverse effects 168, 169, 173,  
 190–91  
 self-reporting 166, 167, 168, 169,  
 170, 174, 176, 182–3
- Lawler, E. 38  
 Lederman, E. 115  
 Lee, F. 189
- legal compliance  
 and low sanction threat 49–50  
 reconciliation of deterrence-based  
 and cooperative enforcement  
 83–4
- leniency policies 142–3, 274
- Lepper, M. 38  
 Levine, J. 234  
 Levine, M. 67
- liability  
 corporate *see* corporate liability  
 and compliance management  
 systems  
 corporate liability component,  
 regulatory enforcement policy  
 273
- Lichtblau, E. 228  
 Lieder, K. 124–5  
 Lind, E. 49, 51, 54, 55, 56  
 Liska, A. 36  
 Lowi, T. 94–5

- McKendall, M. 171
- McNulty, P. 116, 141, 217
- Mahoney, B. 212
- Makkai, T. 55
- Malik, A. 5, 26, 37, 166, 177, 185
- Marcus, A. 189
- Marjit, S. 68
- market forces and credibility of third-party enforcement 257  
*see also* corporate monitors to facilitate efficient targeted monitoring systems
- Marks, S. 11
- Mascini, P. 96
- Matthews, C. 220, 228, 233, 237
- Maurer, R. 143
- May, P. 53, 67, 73, 83
- Mazzoli, C. 124–5
- Mearsheimer, J. 76
- Meilijson, I. 80, 81, 82
- mens rea*, corporate 109–10, 113, 122, 136–7
- Miller, G. 163
- monitoring  
 component, regulatory enforcement policy 272–3  
 controlling measures to monitor employee conduct 112  
 corporate *see* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements; corporate monitors to facilitate efficient targeted monitoring systems  
 problems, reconciliation of deterrence-based and cooperative enforcement 91–4
- Montesquieu, C. 16
- Mookherjee, D. 25, 249
- Moore, D. 18
- morality  
 amoral calculators, regulatees as 19–20  
 compliance as moral obligation 54–6  
 sanction threats and moral obligations, roles of 73
- Morford, C. 141, 231–3, 234
- Muir, W. 51, 65
- Mukasey, M. 101
- Murphy, J. 134
- Murphy, K. 39, 51, 55, 56
- Nagel, I. 143
- negligence corporate liability regime 169–72  
*see also* law and economics analysis of corporate liability regimes
- Newman, D. 105, 110, 111, 112, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 127, 226, 243
- Nicoli, D. 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 110, 112
- Nielsen, V. 91, 96
- noblesse oblige* and credibility of third-party enforcement 256, 257  
*see also* corporate monitors to facilitate efficient targeted monitoring systems
- non-prosecution agreements (NPAs), overview 208–11, 215  
*see also* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements
- Nyborg, K. 49–50, 239, 242
- Ogus, A. 1, 2, 21, 22–3, 24, 28, 29, 37, 60, 63, 64, 261
- Oh, A. 216, 224
- O’Hare, J. 222, 223, 227, 228–9
- Palmrose, Z.-V. 189
- Parker, J. 143
- Paternoster, R. 50, 73
- Paulsen, E. 226, 227, 256
- Pearce, F. 19, 47, 67, 72
- penalties *see* sanctions
- Perino, M. 68
- Perry, W. 107, 112, 118, 119, 134, 136, 137, 139, 142, 172, 175, 213, 214
- persuasion, compliance through 52–3, 58–9  
*see also* cooperative enforcement
- Pfaff, A. 92, 128, 245
- Phillips, L. 36
- Pitt, H. *xii*, 103, 108, 112, 116, 119, 120, 121, 126, 135, 137, 163, 164, 243–4, 247
- plea bargaining contexts 274
- Png, I. 25, 249
- policy implications  
 cooperative enforcement 57–64

- deterrence-based regulatory enforcement 27–35
- see also* regulatory enforcement policy, comprehensive
- Polinsky, M. 3, 4, 20, 22, 23, 24, 26, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 37, 42, 68, 95, 126, 160, 163, 164, 170, 176, 177, 178, 195, 249, 261
- Porter, L. 38
- Posner, E. 76
- Posner, R. 17, 30, 31, 33
- Poundstone, W. 74
- prisoner's dilemma game,
  - reconciliation of deterrence-based and cooperative enforcement 74–5, 76–7, 78–9
- private enforcement
  - deterrence-based regulatory enforcement 29–31
  - and public enforcement, choice between 33–5
- proactive compliance
  - impact of 117–23
  - inducement 199–200
  - program labels as evidence of,
    - third-party-based targeted monitoring (TPTM) system proposal 246–7, 250–53
  - regulatory enforcement policy design to induce 260–61
- procedural justice theory 55–6
- prosecution
  - agreements, deferred *see* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements
  - prosecutorial discretion, overreach of 226–7
  - see also* judiciary; law and economics analysis of corporate liability regimes
- Pyrich, A. *xii*, 46–7, 109, 110, 112, 115, 116, 121, 122, 161, 163, 164, 165, 166, 199
- Qian, Y. 122, 169
- Rabinowitz, R. 69
- Raman, S. 209, 224, 225
- Randall, M. 21
- Randhawa, R. 189
- rational choice theory, deterrence-based regulatory enforcement *see* deterrence-based regulatory enforcement, rational choice theory
- Raven, B. 49
- Raymond, M. 80, 240
- reconciliation of deterrence-based and cooperative enforcement 71–97
  - actual use of 82–3
  - arbitrariness pitfall 92–6
  - attitude targeting 84–5
  - compliant regulatees, effect on 88, 89, 90
  - cost–benefit analysis 84–5
  - enforcement dilemma and regulatee heterogeneity 72–3
  - evading regulatees, effect on 88, 89, 90
  - inclusiveness 84
  - information asymmetry problem and past performance 85–92
  - legal compliance aspect 83–4
  - misperceived regulatory responses 96
  - monitoring errors, dealing with 91–2
  - monitoring problems 93–4
  - optimal periods for information gathering 91
  - penalty leverage and state-dependent enforcement 81
  - pitfalls 85–96
  - prisoner's dilemma game 74–5, 76–7, 78–9
  - regulatee past performance effects 77, 81, 82
  - regulatee violation records, use of 82, 87–90
  - regulatory 'cat-and-mouse' game restrictions 83–4
  - regulatory discretion, misuse of 92–5
  - regulatory inconsistency 95–6
  - regulatory mixed regimes 73–83
  - sanction threats and moral obligations, roles of 73
  - social welfare maximization assumptions 92–3
  - Tit-for-Tat (TFT) regulatory enforcement 75–81, 85–6, 87–8
  - Tit-for-Tat (TFT) regulatory

- enforcement, state-dependent enforcement 80–81
- tripartism 95
- virtues of regulatory mixed regimes 83–5
- voluntary compliance, promotion of 84
- see also* cooperative enforcement; deterrence-based regulatory enforcement
- regulatees
  - classification, challenge of 242–5
  - normative commitment 48–51
  - past performance effects 77, 81, 82
  - reconciliation of deterrence-based and cooperative enforcement, effects of 88, 89, 90
  - violation records, problems with use of 242–3
  - violation records, use of 82, 87–90
- regulatory enforcement policy
  - 'cat-and-mouse' game 36–7, 54, 83–4
  - comparative welfare evaluation of major corporate liability regimes 268
  - and corporate compliance 1–3
  - dealing, and cooperative enforcement 60–61
  - design to induce corporate proactive compliance 260–61
  - Enforcement Pyramid and responsive regulation 61–3
  - optimal corporate liability regime, working towards 266–9
  - optimal regulatory monitoring regime, working towards 269–72
  - responsive regulation, gradual, escalation of 61–3
  - traditional schools of thought 262–3
  - traditional schools of thought, reconciliation between 263–6
  - violations and organizational incompetence 51
- regulatory enforcement policy, comprehensive 272–5
  - arbitrariness 274
  - corporate liability component 273
  - inclusiveness 273
  - information asymmetry 273–4
  - leniency policies 274
  - monitoring component 272–3
  - plea bargaining contexts 274
  - remediation, restitution, or restoration of harm 274
  - targeting attitudes 273
  - see also* policy implications
- Reisinger, S. 228
- Resnik, S. 209, 215, 218
- respondet superior* (common law) doctrine 107–8, 109, 116, 121, 168
- Rickman, N. 50, 60
- Riesel, D. 131
- Riley, J. 18
- Robinson, J. 208, 209, 210, 211, 214, 217, 220, 222, 223
- Rosenblum, L. 211
- Ross, H. 49
- Rousseau, S. 83, 239
- Rupp, N. 189
- Russell, C. 49, 80, 82, 83, 86, 91, 239, 240, 246
- Sanchirico, W. 92, 128, 245
- sanctions
  - and deterrence-based regulatory enforcement *see* deterrence-based regulatory enforcement, sanctions
  - equalling corporate asset value, adjustment needed 258
  - illegitimacy of, and self-enforcing corporations 121–2
  - imposition and detection probability 242, 246, 248–9
  - legal compliance and low sanction threat, cooperative enforcement 49–50
  - penalty leverage and state-dependent enforcement 81
  - threats and moral obligations, roles of 73
  - and violation detection, probability of 21–2, 25–6, 41–3, 44
- Schäfer, H.-B. 167
- Schmidt, P. 203, 204, 206
- Scholz, J. 10, 19, 20, 27, 37, 39, 41, 42, 50–58 *passim*, 65, 66, 68, 73–87 *passim*, 90, 91, 93, 94, 95, 239, 240, 242–3
- Schönenberger, A. 167

- Schwartz, B. 20  
 Schwartz, G. 46, 162  
 Schwartz, J. 212, 213, 214, 215, 224–5  
 Segal, I. 30, 31, 32, 33, 42  
 self-enforcement  
   cooperative 63–4, 91–2  
   corporations and illegitimacy of  
     sanctioning 121–2  
   costs, targeted monitoring systems  
     238, 253  
   function, law and economics analysis  
     *see* law and economics analysis  
     of corporate liability regimes,  
     self-enforcement function  
   motivation, third-party-based  
     targeted monitoring (TPTM)  
     system proposal 250–52  
 self-reporting  
   cooperation, and acceptance of  
     responsibility, Organizational  
     Sentencing Guidelines (OSG)  
     149–50  
   law and economics analysis of  
     corporate liability regimes 166,  
     167, 168, 169, 170, 174, 176,  
     182–3  
   support for, targeted monitoring  
     systems 244–5  
 Selten, R. 46  
 sexual harassment violations 124–6  
 Shafir, E. 44  
 Shapiro, S. 69, 95  
 Shavell, S. *xii*, 4, 20–34 *passim*, 37, 42,  
   68, 95, 160–67 *passim*, 170, 176,  
   177, 178, 185, 187, 195, 199, 249  
 Shenefield, J. 119, 137, 139  
 Shi, H.-L. 68  
 Short, J. 238, 244–5  
 Shover, N. 35, 52, 67  
 Simon, H. 43  
 Simpson, S. 50, 73  
 Sjostrom, W. 25, 249  
 Smid, H. 189  
 Smith, H. 55, 56  
 social welfare  
   and cooperative enforcement 53–4  
   and efficient level of deterrence  
     22–3, 25–6, 31, 32, 36–7, 42  
   maximization assumptions 92–3  
   and optimal deterrence, third-party-  
     based targeted monitoring  
     (TPTM) system proposal 248–9,  
     252–3  
   social costs 159, 160, 163–5, 167,  
     168, 182–5  
   social goals compromising  
     enforcement 58–9  
 Spence, D. 4, 20, 40  
 Spivack, P. 209, 224, 225  
 Spratling, G. 140  
 Stafford, S. 83, 91–2, 244  
 Staw, B. 46, 162  
 Steer, J. 143  
 Stein, A. 22  
 Stein, M. 234  
 Stern, N. 36  
 Stigler, G. 3, 4, 20, 23, 24–5, 26, 32, 67,  
   68, 160, 176, 177, 178, 249, 261  
 Strader, K. 110  
 strict liability (traditional approach)  
   regime 117–19, 154, 167–9  
 Sunstein, C. 43  
 Sutherland, E. 46, 162  
 Suurmond, G. 81  
 Swaine, E. 76  
 Swenson, W. 143  
 Sykes, A. 76, 161, 162, 170  
 targeted monitoring systems *see*  
   corporate monitors to facilitate  
   efficient targeted monitoring  
   systems  
 targeting attitudes, regulatory  
   enforcement policy 273  
 Telang, R. 189  
 Telle, K. 49–50, 239, 242  
 Thibaut, J. 55  
 third-party enforcers  
   major prototypes of, corporate  
   monitors and deferred  
   prosecution agreements 204–8  
   targeted monitoring (TPTM)  
   system proposal *see* corporate  
   monitors to facilitate efficient  
   targeted monitoring systems,  
   third-party-based targeted  
   monitoring (TPTM) system  
   proposal  
 Thompson, L. 141, 142, 216–17, 234  
 Thompson, V. 18

- Thornton, D. 20  
 Tigar, M. 109, 113, 115, 119  
 Tirole, J. 67  
 Tit-for-Tat (TFT) regulatory enforcement 75–81, 85–6, 87–8  
 Toffel, M. 238, 244–5  
 Tombs, S. 19, 47, 67, 72  
 Tritter, J. 17  
 Turner, J. 17  
 Tversky, A. 19, 44, 45  
 Tyler, T. 36, 39, 49, 51, 54–6, 85
- UK  
 Bribery Act 152  
 Office of Fair Trading (OFT) guidelines 153, 172  
*Tesco Supermarkets, Ltd. v. Natrass* 113, 116  
 Ulen, T. 2, 3, 5, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 26, 43, 261  
*ultra vires* actions, corporate liability and compliance management systems 118  
 unofficial regulatory enforcement policies 133–4
- US  
 Accountability in Deferred Prosecution Act 229–30, 248  
 American Law Institute, *Restatement of Law (Third) Agency* 106–8, 109  
 corporate liability and compliance management systems *see* corporate liability and compliance management systems  
 corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements *see* corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements  
 Deferred Prosecution Act 229–30  
 Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) compliance programs guidance 132–3, 143  
 Department of Justice (DOJ) and corporate monitors *see* under corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements  
 Elkins Act 113  
 Enron scandal 216–17  
 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) *see* corporate liability and compliance management systems, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)  
 False Claims Act 212, 218  
 Federal Trade Commission (FTC) Bureau of Competition 133–4  
 Foreign Corrupt Practices Act (FCPA) 218, 221–2, 232  
 Organizational Sentencing Guidelines (OSG) *see* corporate liability and compliance management systems, Organizational Sentencing Guidelines (OSG)  
 Pretrial Diversion Program 212, 215–16  
 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act 219  
 Sarbanes Oxley Act (SOX) 101, 102  
 Sherman Antitrust Act 112, 115, 212
- US, cases  
*AGA Medical* 232, 233  
*Aibel Group* 235  
*American Society of Mechanical Engineers v. Hydrolevel Corp.* 117  
*American Standard Credit Inc. v. Nat'l Cement Co.* 114  
 AOL 221  
*Arthur Andersen* 209, 216, 225  
*Bristol-Myers Squibb* 222, 225  
*Burlington Industries Inc. v. Ellerth* 124–5, 127  
 CIBC 222, 223  
*City of Vernon v. Southern California Edison Co.* 119  
*Commonwealth v. Proprietors of New Bedford Bridge* 111–12  
*Cooper & Lybrand* 215, 219  
*Copley v. Bax Global* 127  
*Corrugated Container Antitrust Litigation v. Alton box Board Co.* 137  
*Cox v. Adm'r U.S. Steel & Carnegie* 114

- Cumberland & Oxford Canal Corp. v. Portland* 112
- Deffenbaugh-Williams v. Wal-Mart* 127
- Deters v. Equifax Credit Info. Serv., Inc.* 127
- Dollar S.S. Co. v. United States* xi, 117–18
- DPC* 221
- EEOC v. V & J Foods Inc.* 125
- EEOC v. Wal-Mart* 127
- Egan v. United States Union Electric Co. of Missouri* 116, 118
- Faragher v. City of Boca Raton* 124–5, 127
- Fierro v. Saks Fifth Avenue* 125
- Hellenic Inc v. Bridgeline Gas Distribution Llc.* 114
- H.L. Bolton (Engineering) Co. v. T.J. Graham & Sons, Ltd.* 116
- Holland Furnace Co. v. United States* 134–6
- InVision* 221, 222
- J.S. Young Co. v. United States* 112
- Kolstad v. American Dental Association* 126–7
- KPMG* 222
- Lake Shore & Michigan Southern R. Co. v. Prentice* 113
- Lancaster v. Sheffler Enterprises* 125
- Lowery v. Circuit City Stores, Inc.* 127
- Medical Slenderizing, Inc. v. State* 171
- Micrus* 222, 223
- Monsanto* 221, 223
- Montero v. AGCO Corp.* 125
- New York Central & Hudson River Railroad v. the United States* 1, 113–14
- Old Monastery Company v. United States* 114
- P & E Boat Rentals Inc. v. Ennia General Insurance Co. Inc.* 126
- Pacific Mut. Life Ins. Co. v. Haslip* 119
- People v. Canadian Fur Trappers' Corp.* 116
- Prudential Securities* 213–14, 219
- Salomon Brothers* 212–13
- Sequa Corporation* 213
- Shell* 225
- Standard Oil Co. v. United States* 114–15, 118
- State v. First Nat'l Bank* 113
- State v. Morris & Essex Railroad Co.* 112
- Tenaris* 225
- Titan* 221
- Trustees of Dartmouth College v. Woodward* 103
- United States v. 7326 Highway 45 N.* 114
- United States v. American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.* 118, 137
- United States v. Armour & Co.* 118, 135
- United States v. Automated Medical Laboratories* 114, 115
- United States v. Basic Constructions Co.* 119, 137
- United States v. Beusch* 138
- United States v. Booker* 144
- United States v. Cadillac Overall Supply Co.* 119
- United States v. Cincotta* 114
- United States v. Greyhound Corp.* 171
- United States v. Harry L. Young & Sons, Inc.* 119
- United States v. Hilton Hotels Corp.* 112, 114, 115, 118
- United States v. International Paper Co.* 136–7
- United States v. Koppers Co., Inc.* 137
- United States v. LBS Bank-New York, Inc.* 171
- United States v. MacAndrews & Forbes Co.* 112
- United States v. Potter* 114
- United States v. Sun-Diamond Growers of California* 115, 116–17
- United States v. Thompson-Powell Drilling Co.* 135
- United States v. T.I.M.E.-D.C., Inc.* 115
- United States v. Twentieth Century*

- Fox Film Corporation and Leila J. Goldstein* 118–19, 135–6  
*Volkswagen of America, Inc. v. Robertson* 114  
*Washington Gas Light Co. v. Lansden* 113  
*Willbros Group* 232–3  
*Wilson v. Tulsa Junior College* 125  
*W.R. Grace & Co. v. W. U.S. Indus., Inc.* 114  
*Wright Medical Group* 235
- Van Bael, I. 154  
 Van den Bergh, R. 22, 23, 30, 31, 32, 34, 176  
 Van Dijk, E. 44  
 Van Wijk, E. 96  
 Veljanovski, C. 2, 15, 59, 69  
 Vianale, K. 214  
 vicarious liability 107–10, 112–13  
 Vinegrad, A. 216, 217–18  
 violation detection, probability of, and sanctioning 21–2, 25–6, 41–3, 44  
 Vito, G. 211  
 voluntary compliance, promotion of 84  
 Votey, H. 36  
 Vu, S. 115
- Walker, L. 55  
 Walsh, C. *xii*, 46–7, 109, 110, 112, 115, 116, 121, 122, 161, 163, 164, 165, 166, 199  
 Warin, F. 206, 212, 213, 214, 215, 224–5, 226, 227, 256  
 Wattal, S. 189  
 Webb, B. 239  
 Weber, M. 44  
 Weise, P. 29, 30  
 Weiss, B. 214  
 Weissmann, A. 105, 110, 111, 112, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 125, 127, 226, 243  
 welfare *see* social welfare  
 Wenzel, M. 55  
 Whinston, M. 30, 31, 32, 33, 42  
 whistleblowers, corporate monitors and deferred prosecution agreements 207  
 Wilkinson, B. 216, 224  
 Wils, W. 32  
 Wilson, D. 211  
 Winter, S. 53, 67, 73, 83  
 Wolpin, K. 36  
 Wray, C. 209
- Yu, J. 36
- Zeelenberg, M. 44  
 Zey, M. 19  
 Zimring, F. 36





