

# BUTTERFIELD SCHECHTER LLP

## ATTORNEYS & COUNSELORS

### Employee Benefits - ERISA Advisory Reports - Family Law Issues

FALL 2016

#### Edition Authors



Marc Schechter



Corey Schechter

#### Butterfield Schechter LLP

focuses primarily on employee benefits law, including pension plans, ERISA litigation, fiduciary counseling, IRS and DOL audits, QDRO preparation, tax law and estate planning.



10021 Willow Creek Road  
Suite 200  
San Diego, California 92131  
Phone: 858.444.2300  
Fax: 858.444.2345  
www.bsllp.com

Marc Schechter  
mschechter@bsllp.com

Corey Schechter  
cschechter@bsllp.com

#### Retroactive QDROs

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division, recently recognized a retroactive QDRO. The case involved the 1993 divorce of Henry Patterson and Ardella Patterson. The divorce decree awarded Ardella half of her former husband's pension benefits, which he began receiving in April of 1994 until his death in November of 2007. Ardella submitted her divorce judgment to the plan administrator in December of 1994 but was told that the judgment alone would not qualify as a domestic relations order. Ardella resubmitted her divorce judgment in 2008, and she was again denied her claim for benefits because the divorce judgment alone did not qualify as a domestic relations order. Henry Patterson had no remaining benefits to be assigned to her. The plan concluded that because Henry had elected a single life annuity and then died, no remaining benefits were available to be paid to Ardella. After a third unsuccessful submission in 2012, Ardella filed a Qualified Domestic Relations Order Nunc Pro Tunc, which is an order that is applied retroactively. The district court found in favor of Ardella and decided that it would accept the order as having been entered in 1993 so that at the time it was entered there was a benefit capable of being split. The court reasoned that had the order had been implemented in 1993, it would not have provided for increased benefits. Therefore, the plan was required to pay a survivor benefit to Ardella, even though Henry had elected (and been paid) a life annuity that was larger in amount than the benefits that would have been paid to him if he had elected a survivor annuity for Ardella's benefit.

The Case is *Patterson v. Chrysler Group, LLC*, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18862 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 17, 2016), and emphasizes that it is never too late to obtain a QDRO to receive pension benefits awarded pursuant to a divorce decree.

#### QDROs and Common Pitfalls

##### **AWAITING THE UNWARY FAMILY LAW ATTORNEY**

In most cases, a married couple's wealth is typically measured by their home, automobile, and pension assets. Because homes and automobiles are generally encumbered, a couple's pension is often the single most important marital asset. As a result, family law practitioners should be placing a high priority on pension issues when dividing the marital assets.

The Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA") was enacted to protect the interests of participants in employer-sponsored pension plans. ERISA and the Internal Revenue Code ("Code") impose numerous requirements on most pension plans. One such requirement is that a participant's benefits cannot be assigned or alienated to another person. This antialienation provision and ERISA's broad preemption provisions often conflicted with state laws designed to ensure that individuals satisfy their family support obligations.

In response to this conflict, the Retirement Equity Act of 1984 ("REA") established the qualified domestic relations order ("QDRO") exception to the antialienation provisions of ERISA and the Code. The QDRO exception was intended to provide a means of dividing the community property interest in retirement benefits while maintaining a high level of equity regarding pensions for participants, their spouses and, in certain cases, dependents of the plan participant. REA recognized, at the federal level, the status of marriage as an economic partnership whereby the spouse who worked within and/or outside the home was considered to have made substantial contributions to that partnership, resulting in a community property interest in the benefits earned during the marriage.

## New Website

Butterfield Schechter LLP has recently launched a redesigned website and established a presence on social media channels. We welcome you to follow us and learn more about the firm, our attorneys, and legal updates. Be sure to sign up for our firm e-newsletter as well at [www.bsllp.com](http://www.bsllp.com).

## QUESTIONS?

If you have questions or comments about this newsletter or any retirement benefits topic, please feel free to contact us.

*The insert of this newsletter consists of Frequently Asked Questions which you are welcome to use as a handout to your clients or as a quick reference guide for general questions.*



10021 Willow Creek Road  
Suite 200  
San Diego, California 92131  
Phone: 858.444.2300  
Fax: 858.444.2345  
[www.bsllp.com](http://www.bsllp.com)

**Marc Schechter**  
[mschechter@bsllp.com](mailto:mschechter@bsllp.com)

**Corey Schechter**  
[cschechter@bsllp.com](mailto:cschechter@bsllp.com)

Copyright 2016© Butterfield Schechter LLP. All rights reserved. This newsletter is published as an information source for our clients and colleagues. The articles appearing in it are current as of the date of publication, are general in nature, and are not the substitute for legal advice or opinion in a particular case. In response to new IRS rules of practice, we inform you that any federal tax information contained in this writing cannot be used for the purpose of avoiding tax-related penalties or promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any tax-related matters in this newsletter.

When pensions are part of the marital assets, complex federal laws directly impact state court proceedings. Moreover, in addition to substantive state law issues, a QDRO must be prepared to satisfy certain federal requirements as a prerequisite to dividing pension benefits. In addition to being familiar with the federal laws that govern pensions, the family law practitioner must also possess a thorough understanding of both the plan document and the plan's QDRO procedures to be able to draft an order that the plan administrator will deem to be a "qualified" domestic relations order. For example, family law practitioners often utilize model QDRO language provided by the plan administrator which may expedite the QDRO review process, and yet such boilerplate language may not equitably secure the former spouse's or dependent's interest in the participant's benefits. Under the Code, the former spouse or dependent recovering a portion of the participant's pension benefits is referred to as the "alternate payee."

Retirement plans covering employees of federal, state, and local governmental entities are exempt from ERISA. Because governmental plans are not subject to ERISA, each governmental entity can establish laws and regulations that govern its pension plan. Additionally, each such plan has procedures that must be followed when pension benefits are assigned pursuant to a divorce. While these ERISA-exempt plans are not subject to the QDRO rules under the Code, most, if not all, such plans still require an order to divide the community property which, in almost all respects, essentially mirrors the provisions that must be contained in a QDRO.

Since the enactment of the QDRO rules, there has been a remarkable increase in the complexity of QDROs, both because plan sponsors have become more sophisticated as to what their own procedures require and more than thirty years of litigation has added to what counsel drafting a QDRO needs to include to protect the client's interest. Due to the substantial dollar amount often involved, the numerous types of plans covering employees, the ambiguities in the QDRO statute, and the absence of regulatory guidance, it is not surprising that federal and state QDRO litigation have increased dramatically.

With careful drafting and an understanding of both how the community property interest is to be determined and the optional forms such benefits can take, much of the litigation could be avoided. Some of the frequent problems we encounter when retained to draft a QDRO post-divorce include: (1) marital settlement agreements ("MSAs") which leave open the issue of whether survivor benefits are to be elected and, if so, who between the participant and alternate payee bears the cost to provide the survivor benefit; (2) use of the term "Brown formula" or "time rule" to divide the interest in retirement plans where the benefit is not based upon years of service; (3) attempting to have the plan pay benefits at a time before benefits are actually payable under the terms of the plan; (4) attempting to provide for attorneys' fees in the dissolution proceeding to be paid directly to family law counsel by the plan; and (5) in the case of a QDRO to be drafted to provide dependents' support, an improper attempt to transfer the income tax liability on payments received by a non-spouse alternate payee.

With the importance that the division of pension-related marital assets plays in most divorce proceedings, we suggest coordinating with benefits counsel at the MSA stage to minimize the post-divorce disputes and a return to court to clarify many of the pension division issues left unresolved by the MSA. While there may be other issues involving post-divorce proceedings to resolve, engagement of competent and experienced benefits counsel can prevent issues relating to retirement benefits from being one of these areas.

As part of our overall Employee Benefits Law/ERISA practice, our firm has enjoyed working with a large number of family law attorneys and their clients on QDRO matters. Our attorneys combined have over 60 years of experience in:

- Analyzing and valuing the community property in all types of retirement plans, stock option plans and other executive compensation plans, disability pensions, and severance benefits
- Drafting QDROs to divide these benefits