

X would be acquiring mutual fund shares at a cost that would exceed the net earnings it would normally have accumulated, and would become indebted to the lending bank in an amount approximately 70 percent of the prices of said shares.

(c) The Board held that the loans were for the purpose of purchasing the shares, and therefore subject to the limitations prescribed by this part. As pointed out in §221.114 with respect to a similar program for putting a high proportion of cash income into stock, then borrowing against the stock to meet needs for which the cash would otherwise have been required, a contrary conclusion could largely defeat the basic purpose of the margin regulations.

(d) Also considered was an alternative proposal under which X would deposit proceeds from accounts receivable in a time account for 1 year, before using those funds to purchase mutual fund shares. The Board held that this procedure would not change the situation in any significant way. Once the arrangement was established, the proceeds would be flowing into the time account at the same time that similar amounts were released to purchase the shares, and over any extended period of time the result would be the same. Accordingly, the Board concluded that bank loans made under the alternative proposal would similarly be subject to this part.

[32 FR 8357, June 10, 1967]

§221.117 When bank in “good faith” has not relied on stock as collateral.

(a) The Board has received questions regarding the circumstances in which an extension or maintenance of credit will not be deemed to be “indirectly secured” by stock as indicated by the phrase, “if the bank in good faith has not relied upon such stock as collateral,” contained in clause (2) of a recent amendment to §221.3(c) of Regulation U. A similar phrase is contained in §207.2(g) of Regulation G of this chapter and the following applies to that paragraph, insofar as appropriate and consistent.

(b) In response, the Board noted that in amending this portion of the regulation it was indicated that one of the

purposes of the change was to make clear that §221.3(c) does not apply to certain routine negative covenants in loan agreements. Also, while the question of whether or not a bank has relied upon particular stock as collateral is necessarily a question of fact to be determined in each case in the light of all relevant circumstances, some indication that the bank had not relied upon stock as collateral would seem to be afforded by such circumstances as the fact that (1) the bank had obtained a reasonably current financial statement of the borrower and this statement could reasonably support the loan, and (2) the loan was not payable on demand or because of fluctuations in market value of the stock, but instead was payable on one or more fixed maturities which were typical of maturities applied by the bank to loans otherwise similar except for not involving any possible question of stock collateral.

[33 FR 7485, May 21, 1968]

§221.118 Bank arranging for extension of credit by corporation.

For text of this interpretation, see §207.103 of this subchapter.

[34 FR 7005, Apr. 29, 1969]

§221.119 Status after July 8, 1969, of credit extended prior to that date to purchase or carry mutual fund shares.

(a) Prior to July 8, 1969, the margin and other requirements of Regulations G and U applied to credit extended to purchase or carry shares of a mutual fund (secured by certain described collateral), if (1) the portfolio of the fund did “customarily include” securities that would themselves have been subject to the regulations and (2) the fund was included in a list of such funds that the Board published for this purpose.

(b) It was found that virtually all mutual funds met the “customarily include” test. Accordingly, for administrative reasons, the Board discontinued publication of the list and restated the rule to cover all mutual funds except those at least 95 percent of whose assets are continuously invested in exempted securities.