THE SURETY RELATIONSHIP IN THE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY STORAGE CONTEXT AND GRAIN INDEMNITY FUNDS: A JURISDICTIONAL SURVEY

PETER E. KARNEY & JOHN F. FATINO†

I. INTRODUCTION .................................................. 44
   A. The Case for Commentary .................................. 44
   B. An Overview of the Rules of Sales and Warehousing .......................... 46
   C. The Surety Relationship .................................. 48
   D. Bankruptcy and the State Surety Requirements ....................... 50

II. THE FEDERAL APPROACH ........................................ 51
   A. Federal Warehouse Provisions ................................ 51
      1. Statutes ................................................. 51
      2. Regulations ............................................. 55
      3. Practice pointers ....................................... 56
   B. Packers and Stockyards Act .................................. 58
      1. Statutes .................................................. 58
         (a) General provisions .................................. 58
         (b) Live poultry ........................................... 61
      2. Regulations ............................................... 62
         (a) General bonding provisions .......................... 62
         (b) Market agency, dealer, and packer bonds ............. 62
         (c) Proceeds of sale ...................................... 64
         (d) General practices ..................................... 65
         (e) Access by the Secretary ............................... 65
         (f) Records regarding live poultry ......................... 65
         (g) Credit terms ........................................... 66
         (h) Rules of practice ...................................... 66
         (i) General policy statements ............................. 66

III. THE JURISDICTIONS ............................................. 66
    A. Illinois ..................................................... 67
       1. Statutes .................................................. 67
       2. Case law ............................................... 70

† Peter E. Karney, member of the bar of Illinois, and John F. Fatino, member of the bars of Iowa and Minnesota. Mr. Karney is a vice-chair of the Fidelity-Surety Law Committee of the Section on Torts and Insurance Practice of the American Bar Association. Mr. Fatino is a member of Whitfield & Eddy, PLC in Des Moines, Iowa. The opinions expressed herein are solely those of the authors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Statutes</th>
<th>Case law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Case law</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Grain dealers</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Bargaining agents</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Warehouses</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Case law</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Common law and issues peculiar to Iowa statutes</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Procedural issues</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Surety law in jury instructions</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Damages</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Interest</td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Preservation of error and appellate practice</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Case law</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Grain buyers</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Warehouse operators</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Case law</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Statutory interpretation and the common law</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) The successive bonding dilemma</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Coverage for independent truckers</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) How Chapter 223 works</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Delivery as a defense to surety</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Evidentiary issues</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Grain dealers</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Warehouses</td>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Case law</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) The common law and the Missouri statutes</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Trial practice</td>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Interest</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Attorney fees</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Statutes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) Grain dealers</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) Warehouses ........................................ 106

2. Case law ........................................ 110
   (a) Contract formation ............................. 110
   (b) Inapplicability of the discretionary function ........................................ 111
   (c) How the statute works .......................... 114
   (d) Interest ........................................ 115
   (e) Surety law ...................................... 115
   (f) Administrative procedure and the due process claim .................................. 115
   (g) Appellate practice .............................. 115
   (h) Statutory interpretation .......................... 116

H. North Dakota ...................................... 116
   1. Statutes ........................................ 116
      (a) Grain warehouses ............................. 116
      (b) Grain buyers .................................. 119
   2. Case law ........................................ 121
      (a) The common law and the statute ........... 121
      (b) The claimant .................................. 121
      (c) The surety and the principal ............. 122
      (d) The surety and the roving grain buyer ... 122
      (e) The surety and the banker ................. 122
      (f) Conversion .................................. 122
      (g) Invalid defenses ............................. 122
      (h) Damages .................................... 123
      (i) Contribution and subrogation ............. 123
      (j) Interest ................................... 123
      (k) The surety and the bankruptcy wrinkle ... 123
      (l) Laches as an equitable defense ............ 124

I. South Dakota ..................................... 124
   1. Statutes ........................................ 124
      (a) Warehouses .................................. 124
      (b) Grain dealers ............................... 127
   2. Case law ........................................ 129
      (a) Surety coverage ............................. 129
      (b) Interest ................................... 130

J. Wisconsin ....................................... 130
   1. Statutes ........................................ 130
      (a) Grain dealers ............................... 130
      (b) Grain warehouses ........................... 132
      (c) Recovery proceedings ....................... 132
   2. Case law ........................................ 133

IV. CONCLUSION ..................................... 133
I. INTRODUCTION

The following Article discusses the federal and subject state jurisdictions’ statutory schemes for the regulation of those engaged in the storage of grain and related agricultural commodities and the requirements each of the jurisdictions imposes concerning surety bonds or other types of surety arrangements for such transactions. Each of the jurisdictions treats these matters differently both in terms of applicable statutory regulations and scope/types of coverage required. Each jurisdiction’s statute is somewhat unique; albeit case law from other jurisdictions can enlighten counsel and the courts when interpreting a particular statute or surety relationship in a given situation.

This Article will analyze the materials based upon an introduction and an examination of the applicable federal statutes and regulations. Finally, the subject state jurisdictions’ statutes and case law will be examined.

A. THE CASE FOR COMMENTARY

The topic is worthy of scholarly commentary as the courts, practitioners, producers, and the community alike can find themselves dealing with the ramifications of a failed agricultural storage facility. It has been estimated that at any one time at least five percent of all grain storage facilities are experiencing financial difficulties. The “ripple effect” of a grain storage facility failure can easily cause related failure of other producers. As grain storage is generally deemed to be “open storage,”—i.e., the same types of grain from multiple producers are commingled in common bins—hundreds of other producers are impacted by the failure and concomitant delay when a facility fails. This same causation would apply to any agricultural commodity that is stored by a party other than the producer.

While a myriad of causes exist for the failure of a grain storage facility, a discussion of each of those causes is beyond the scope of this Article. Suffice it to say, however, that the primary reason why such facilities fail is poor record keeping. In the long run, poor record keeping contributes to a net shortage of grain from which a financially strapped operator cannot recover. Thus, grain shortages are the “primary symptom of elevator insolvency.” Given the impact on the com-

1. Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.
3. Connolly & Beach, 19 Colo. L. Rev. at 635.
4. Id.
5. Id.
6. Id.
community as a whole, it would appear that the exercise of the state's police powers would be appropriate in this arena.\textsuperscript{7}

In addition, counsel must contemplate the actual nature of the relationship between the producer and the facility. Generally speaking, a storage facility may provide two separate services to producers. The first service is where the facility acts as a grain dealer wherein the operator engages in certain transactions such as cash or credit sales and commodity futures.\textsuperscript{8} However, this depends upon a particular jurisdiction's regulatory scheme.

The other service involves holding the commodity for the producer as a warehouse. For instance, some state statutes contemplate that a sale has not taken place between the producer and the facility; instead, grain storage contracts are considered "true bailments . . . and the depositors are thereby considered tenants in common of the commingled grain held in open storage."\textsuperscript{9} The same result could be reached under the case law as well.\textsuperscript{10} The latter category of service is called a "commercial bailment agreement."\textsuperscript{11} Those jurisdictions that regulate grain banks treat the relationship between a grain bank and a depositor as controlled by the common law of bailment.\textsuperscript{12}

Similar problems are experienced by those who have sold grain but have not been paid before the facility shuts down. The problems are largely those of proof and lack of sufficient funds to pay all of the depositors. If the facility agreed to purchase the grain directly, the "sales 'contract' may be written or oral, and may be based upon nothing more than a telephone conversation with the depositor. When the shutdown or bankruptcy finally arrives, many depositors that sold to the elevator may be unpaid or may have been paid with checks that later are dishonored."\textsuperscript{13}

These problems are compounded by the fact that the operator of a facility must also secure a line of operating capital. Needless to say, the commodity itself is the operator's greatest asset because, generally
speaking, the operator's fixed assets would be insufficient to collateralize a loan. In turn, the operator's lenders will not finance the operation without "receiving warehouse receipts covering sufficient grain to secure a loan."

Accordingly, this Article will examine the federal statutory scheme for grain warehouses and operators of packing and stock yard facilities. Further, this Article will examine the various jurisdictions' approaches to the imposition of a surety relationship on those entities which engage in the storage of grain and other agricultural commodities.

B. AN OVERVIEW OF THE RULES OF SALES AND WAREHOUSING

Before embarking on a case that involves a dispute concerning the storage of agricultural commodities and bonds written in connection with the endeavor, counsel will want to closely examine her state's adopted version of the Uniform Commercial Code concerning the requirement of a writing for the sale of goods. Counsel should also study when title passes to goods. A purchaser acquires all of the interest held by the transferor unless there was a transfer of a limited interest. After all, a commodity is a good within the meaning of the Uniform Commercial Code, and whether a transaction is covered by the Uniform Commercial Code is a question of law.

Further, in the absence of contrary statutory language that regulates the warehousing of agricultural commodities, the Uniform Commercial Code will most likely govern the transaction under the warehousing provisions of Article Seven. Needless to say, counsel will also want to examine the subject statute and any written evidence of a surety relationship.

At the same time, a short discussion concerning "warehouse law" or "documents of title" as described by the drafters of the Uniform Commercial Code is warranted. Ordinarily, a warehouse is liable for

14. Love, Note, 8 J. Corp. L. at 120.
15. Id. This may be critical because of cash needs during particular seasons. Id.
16. See infra notes 64-228 and accompanying text.
17. See infra notes 229-1012 and accompanying text.
22. Duxbury, 681 N.W.2d at 386 (citing Valley Farmers' Elevator v. Lindsay Bros., Co., 398 N.W.2d 553, 556 (Minn. 1987)).
23. See infra notes 26-39 and accompanying text.
damage to goods in its possession only if the warehouse fails to use
ordinary care, that is, a “failure to exercise care . . . that a reasonably
careful person would exercise under similar circumstances.”24 If the
damages could not have been avoided even if reasonable care was
used, the warehouse is not liable.25 Also, damages may be limited
under the warehouse receipt or the parties’ storage agreement.26
However, under no circumstances may the warehouse limit its lia-
Bility for conversion.27 Similarly, specifications may be placed in the
warehouse receipt concerning “reasonable” provisions for the “time
and manner of presenting claims and commencing actions based on
the bailment . . . .”28

The Uniform Commercial Code also contains provisions concern-
ing the purchase of a document of title, which represents goods held
by the warehouse. The Uniform Commercial Code provides that when
a document of title, other than a bill of lading, is purchased in good
faith, the purchaser may recover “damages caused by the nonreceipt
or misdescription of the goods” unless “the document conspicuously in-
dicates that either the issuer does not know” the contents or the pur-
chaser has notice of the fact.29

Like the provisions for the sale of goods, Article Seven of the Uni-
form Commercial Code contains a provision for the essential terms of
a warehouse receipt.30 However, in the case of agricultural commodi-
ties stored under a statute that requires a bond, “a receipt issued for
the goods is deemed to be a warehouse receipt even if issued by a per-
son that is the owner of the goods and is not a warehouse.”31

Iowa’s adoption of section 7-202 of the Uniform Commercial Code
contains additional provisions that are noteworthy. First, if applica-
ble, the receipt must reflect in its printed or written terms that the
“receipt is issued for goods of which the warehouse operator is owner,
either solely or jointly or in common with others . . . .”32 Second, the
receipt must contain a “statement of the amount of advances made
and of liabilities incurred for which the warehouse operator claims a

24. U.C.C. § 7-204(a) (amended 2003); See, e.g., Iowa Code Ann. § 554.7204(1)
(West 2001).
25. Id.
26. U.C.C. § 7-204(b); See, e.g., Iowa Code Ann. § 554.7204(2).
27. Id.
28. U.C.C. § 7-204(c); See, e.g., Iowa Code Ann. § 554.7204(3).
2001).
2001).
31. U.C.C. § 7-201(2) (amended 2003). See, e.g., Iowa Code Ann. § 554.7201(2)
(West 2001).
32. Iowa Code Ann. § 554.7202(2)(h).
lien or security interest.” Moreover, a “warehouse operator may insert in the receipt any other terms which are not contrary to the provisions of this chapter and do not impair the warehouse operator's obligation of delivery . . . or duty of care.”

Furthermore, the Uniform Commercial Code addresses the negotiable nature of the warehouse receipt. According to the 2001 and prior versions of section 7-104 of the Uniform Commercial Code, “a warehouse receipt, bill of lading or other document of title is negotiable” if the goods are deliverable to the bearer or the “order of a named person” or when the instrument concerns international trade and the instrument runs to a person so named or its assign. It is against this backdrop that the various statutory schemes set out to change the paradigm regarding agricultural commodity storage.

C. THE SURETY RELATIONSHIP

At the same time, in order to be an effective counselor and advocate, counsel must have a basic knowledge of the vocabulary and legal relationships that are the foundation of a surety agreement. While a detailed analysis of a surety relationship and the myriad of settings in which the device is used are the subject of many authoritative treatises, the definitions employed and the concepts underlying the relationship are common regardless of the enterprise in which the device is used. Moreover, the legal concepts are critical to an understanding of the balance of this Article. At the same time, the relationship will be distinguished from the traditional notion of insurance.

A surety relationship is a tripartite one involving a principal, an obligee, and a surety. The concept is an ancient one with historical antecedents that date to 2750 B.C. when agreements were made on tablets. The Bible warns against the practice. The practice was

33. § 554.7202(2)(i).
34. § 554.7202(3).
36. However, certain state statutes may define insurance to include the practice of suretyship, which often leads to confusion of the terminology and mixed results with respect to certain causes of action and statutory remedies. See, e.g., Benjamin B. Ullem & John F. Patino, Defeating the Bad Faith Claim Against the Miller Act Surety, FIDELITY & SURETY L. COMMITTEE NEWSL. (ABA/Tort Trial and Insurance Practice Section), Summer 2003, at 10-11. See also William H. Woods, Historical Development of Suretyship, in THE LAW OF SURETYSHIP 2-37 (Edward G. Gallagher ed., 1993) (discussing the problems that have arisen from applying principles of insurance law to the surety agreement).
38. Id. at 2-2.
39. Id. at 2-3.
used in ancient Greece, was observed by Roman law, continued across the continent, was cemented in English jurisprudence, and made its way to the newly formed colonies. Evidence of the release of a surety dating back to 1050 A.D. exists in Nuremberg, Germany. A "surety" is a person or entity "who contracts to answer for the debt or default of another." The principal is the primary obligor, the obligee is the person to whom the principal and the surety owe a duty and the surety is the secondary obligor. A contract of suretyship must be in writing.

Unlike insurance, a surety essentially extends credit to its principal in that the surety will make good on any loss or failure of performance by the principal to a person or entity known as the obligee, that is, the person to whom the "obligation" of performance or other condition is owed. (The obligation, of course, depends upon the surety's undertaking - e.g., performance or payment bond, bid bond, notary bond, etc.)

Suretyship is also unlike insurance in that it is not based upon the premise that the surety will suffer a loss from an actuarial standpoint. Underwriting for a surety bond is different from the underwriting used for a traditional insurance product. The surety's promise is only triggered when the principal fails to perform. In turn, the surety will only suffer a loss if the principal is unable to reimburse the surety. As such, surety underwriting is based upon the technical competency and financial wherewithal of the principal. Therefore, as the surety has access to information to validate the decision to extend such credit, evidence of any "appreciable likelihood of default" during the underwriting process will lead to a rejection of the opportunity to issue a particular bond. Insurance, on the other hand, spreads the risk of loss over its customers by assuming

40. Id. at 2-4 to 2-23.
41. HANS THIEME, NUREMBERG CITY GUIDE 10-11 (1995). A special thank you to Simone Siegler for bringing this information to the attention of the authors.
42. Edward G. Gallagher, Introduction, in THE LAW OF SURETYSHIP, supra note 36, at 1-1. See also State v. Bi-States Constr. Co., 269 N.W.2d 455, 458 (Iowa 1978) (citation omitted) ("A contract of suretyship is usually, in general terms, defined as a contract to answer for the debt, default, or miscarriage of another").
43. Gallagher, supra note 42, at 1-1.
44. Id. See, e.g., IOWA CODE ANN. § 622.32 (West 1999).
47. Gallagher, supra note 42, at 1-1.
48. Id.
49. Id.
50. Id.
that a certain number of losses will occur and charges the premiums to all of its customers accordingly. In any event, the surety's liability is limited to the penal sum of the bond.  

Additionally, unlike a surety, an insurer has no right to proceed against its insured in the event the insured caused a loss. This result follows because the insurer "has the primary obligation to pay and has no recourse against the insured." Instead, a surety has a right to proceed against its principal and other individuals who agreed to indemnify the surety in the event the surety should incur any cost, expense, or loss. The actual scope of the duty to indemnify will be determined by the actual language employed in the surety's indemnity agreement. Generally speaking, the indemnity agreement is executed prior to issuance of any bonds by the surety on the principal's behalf. This will, of course, depend upon the actual underwriting and procedures for issuance of bonds by a given surety.

D. Bankruptcy and the State Surety Requirements.

In order to expedite the resolution of claims arising out of the failure of commodity storage facilities, Congress enacted 11 U.S.C. § 557 as part of the federal bankruptcy code. Section 557 places specific duties upon the bankruptcy trustee. Other provisions of the bankruptcy code relate to agricultural storage facilities.

A trustee in bankruptcy is to move swiftly once the bankruptcy court invokes the section. To that end, notwithstanding the bankruptcy court's jurisdiction over a facility, there still is a role for state grain regulators to assist in the process. Some suggest that "the considerable expertise of state agricultural authorities can be of great help to the trustee during this initial phase."

51. Lynn M. Schubert, Modern Contract Bonds—An Overview, in The Law of Suretyship, supra note 36, at 3-1. However, as discussed, infra, there are exceptions to the proposition.

52. Gallagher, supra note 42, at 1-1. See also AID Ins. Co. v. United Fire & Cas. Co., 445 N.W.2d 767, 771 (Iowa 1989) (insurer has no right of subrogation against its insured).

53. Connolly & Beach, 19 Colo. Law. at 636. See also id. (discussing prior case law in effect that, in part, caused Congress to adopt section 557). For an excellent discussion of case law that has developed since the farm crisis of the 1980s, see Randy Rogers, Current Developments in Agricultural Bankruptcies and Insolvencies, 5 Drake J. Agric. L. 137 (2000).

54. For additional commentary concerning the available procedures under section 557, see Connolly & Beach, 19 Colo. Law. at 636-37. See also Dunekacke, Note, 64 Neb. L. Rev. at 474-75.


56. Connolly & Beach, 19 Colo. Law. at 637.

57. Id.
In the bankruptcy context, a strong argument can be made that the penal sum of the surety bond is not property of the bankruptcy estate. Such a result seems the only logical conclusion in that the penal sum of the bond is payable to the obligee (read as a given state’s Department of Agriculture) only upon the default of the principal and provided that the obligee has acted in accordance with the terms of the bond. In short, the penal sum of the bond never comes into possession of the debtor and is only due upon the debtor’s default.

With respect to state regulatory schemes, the goal is “to protect the grain producer above all. Their prevailing objective is to distribute the assets of the insolvent elevator as quickly as possible.” Nonetheless, counsel must be mindful of the interaction between state court proceedings and bankruptcy court. Findings in the state proceeding can preclude further litigation in bankruptcy court. For instance, a debtor’s issuance of warehouse receipts to a creditor representing the purchase of grain and soybeans when the warehouse does not have sufficient inventory to permit the creditor to redeem the receipts may result in a finding that the debt is non-dischargeable under 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(2)(A). The state court findings will prevent the relitigation of a state court fraud finding arising out of misrepresentation of warehouse receipts because of the doctrines of collateral estoppel and res judicata. At the same time, a bankruptcy court will not re-examine the result that arises from the invocation of the Fifth Amendment in a state court proceeding (with resultant adverse inference from the state tribunal).

II. THE FEDERAL APPROACH
A. FEDERAL WAREHOUSE PROVISIONS
1. Statutes

The federal government of the United States has established a statutory scheme for the regulation of warehouses that store agricultural commodities. The Act is generally known as the United States Warehouse Act (“Warehouse Act”). The determination of liability

---

58. Rogers, 5 Drake J. Agric. L. at 141 (citing In re Hallmark Builders, Inc., 205 B.R. 974 (Bankr. M.D. Fla. 1996)).
59. Bi-States Constr. Co., 269 N.W.2d at 458 (a bond is construed according to the law of contracts).
60. Love, Note, 8 J. Corp. L. at 115.
63. Id. at 747-48.
under a federal warehouse bond is governed by federal law and not state law.\textsuperscript{66} The Farm Service Agency of the United States Department of Agriculture maintains a website concerning the Warehouse Act.\textsuperscript{67}

The Warehouse Act is meant to reach agricultural products that are stored for interstate or foreign commerce.\textsuperscript{68} As used in the Warehouse Act, "'agricultural product' means an agricultural commodity . . . including a processed product of an agricultural commodity."\textsuperscript{69} A "warehouse" is a structure or other storage facility approved by the Secretary in which agricultural products are "stored or handled for the purposes of interstate or foreign commerce."\textsuperscript{70}

It is the prerogative of the Secretary of Agriculture to specify which types of agricultural products may be subject to warehouse licensing under the Warehouse Act.\textsuperscript{71} Likewise, the Secretary has the authority to "prescribe the duties of a warehouse operator" licensed under the Warehouse Act.\textsuperscript{72} This power includes the authority to conduct examinations and audits of persons that engage in the business of storing agricultural products subject to the Warehouse Act, state agencies that regulate the storage of agricultural products, and any commodity exchange.\textsuperscript{73}

Congress specifically authorized the Secretary to issue licenses for the operation of warehouses when "the Secretary determines that the warehouse is suitable for the proper storage of the agricultural" products and, in turn, "the warehouse operator agrees, as a condition of the license, to comply with the" Warehouse Act and regulations promulgated thereunder.\textsuperscript{74} At the same time, the Secretary has the authority to license other persons engaged in the process of storage, including those that inspect, sample, classify, and weigh such products.\textsuperscript{75} Nonetheless, Congress has authorized the Secretary to "cooperate with officers and employees of a State who administer or enforce

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{66} 7 C.F.R. § 735.1 (2005).
\item\textsuperscript{67} FSA: Commodity Operations, http://www.fsa.usda.gov/FSA/ (follow "Commodity Operations" hyperlink; then follow "Warehouse Services" hyperlink; then follow "United States Warehouse Act" hyperlink) (last visited Nov. 21, 2006).
\item\textsuperscript{68} Rice v. Santa Fe Elevator Corp., 331 U.S. 218, 229-30 (1946); see also In re Farmers Coop. Ass'n, 8 N.W.2d 557, 562 (S.D. 1943); see also Edward R. Bacon Grain Co. v. City of Chicago, 59 N.E.2d 689, 693 (Ill. App. Ct. 1945). The system does not preclude the application of local regulations provided the local regulations do not run afoul of the federal requirements.
\item\textsuperscript{69} 7 U.S.C. § 241(1) (2000).
\item\textsuperscript{70} § 241(10).
\item\textsuperscript{71} Id. § 242(b).
\item\textsuperscript{72} § 242(g).
\item\textsuperscript{73} § 242(i)(1)-(3); see also § 242(l).
\item\textsuperscript{74} § 242(j)(1)-(2).
\item\textsuperscript{75} § 242(k)(1)(A)-(D).
\end{itemize}
State laws relating to warehouses, warehouse operators, weighers, graders, inspectors, samplers, or classifiers" and enter cooperative arrangements with such states.\textsuperscript{76}

As a condition of obtaining a license under the Act, the applicant must file with the "Secretary a bond, or provide such other financial assurance as the Secretary determines appropriate, to secure the person's performance of the activities so licensed or approved."\textsuperscript{77} With respect to the "surety," the surety or other financial institution must "be subject to service of process in lawsuits or legal actions on the bond or other financial assurance in the State in which the warehouse is located."\textsuperscript{78} In addition, the Secretary, upon a determination that a previously approved bond or other financial assurance is insufficient, may require additional bonds or other financial assurance.\textsuperscript{79}

Congress has specifically provided for the rights of third parties against the bond.

Any person injured by the breach of any obligation arising under this Chapter for which a bond or other financial assurance has been obtained... may sue with respect to the bond or other financial assurance in a district court of the United States to recover the damages that the person sustained as a result of the breach.\textsuperscript{80}

A warehouse operator "may commingle agricultural products in a manner approved by the Secretary."\textsuperscript{81} Yet, a warehouse operator "shall be severally liable to each depositor or holder for the care and redelivery of the share of the depositor and holder of the commingled agricultural product to the same extent and under the same circumstances as if the agricultural products had been stored separately."\textsuperscript{82} The surety cannot avoid liability when the principal fails to comply with the Warehouse Act.\textsuperscript{83}

A warehouse operator, when requested by the depositor, is required to issue a receipt in the form prescribed by the Secretary.\textsuperscript{84} A receipt cannot be issued unless the product was "actually stored in the warehouse at the time of the issuance of the receipt."\textsuperscript{85} The Secretary has the authority to require the recording of additional information on

\begin{itemize}
\item 76. § 242(m)(1)-(2).
\item 77. \textit{Id.} § 245(a); see also 7 C.F.R. § 735.14 (2006).
\item 78. 7 C.F.R. § 735.14(e); see also 7 U.S.C. § 245(b).
\item 79. 7 U.S.C. § 245(c).
\item 80. § 245(d).
\item 81. \textit{Id.} § 248(a).
\item 82. § 248(b).
\item 84. 7 U.S.C. § 250(a) (2000).
\item 85. § 250(b).
\end{itemize}
the receipt. Unless the Secretary allows otherwise by regulation, additional receipts may not be issued for the same agricultural product when there are presently outstanding and uncanceled warehouse receipts for the product, nor may other duplicate documents be issued under such circumstances.

The warehouse operator has a duty of prompt delivery of the agricultural product upon demand made by “the holder of the receipt” or “the person that deposited the product,” if no receipt has been issued. At the same time, there is an obligation that payment is to accompany demand. That is, “[p]rior to delivery of the agricultural product, payment of the accrued charges associated with the storage of the agricultural product, including satisfaction of the warehouseman’s lien, shall be made if requested by the warehouse operator.” Whether the statute has been met is a jury question.

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, following notice and opportunity for hearing, to “suspend or revoke any license for a material violation of, or failure to comply with, any provision” of the Warehouse Act or the applicable regulations. This power includes the authority to suspend a license prior to hearing. Judicial review of final agency action rests only in the district courts of the United States. The Secretary is also empowered to issue civil monetary penalties for noncompliance with the Warehouse Act or the regulations.

The Warehouse Act enumerates which information maintained by the Secretary is public and further prohibits employees of the Department of Agriculture from divulging “confidential business information” obtained during warehouse examinations or obtained during other functions performed as part of their duties. Yet the Warehouse Act does not define the term “confidential business information.”

Federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over any dispute under the Warehouse Act without regard to the citizenship of the parties or

86. § 250(c).
87. § 250(d)(1).
88. § 250(d)(2).
89. Id. § 251(a)(1)-(2); see also 7 C.F.R. § 735.110 (2006).
90. 7 U.S.C. § 251(b).
91. Id.
93. 7 U.S.C. § 252(a) (2000); see also 7 C.F.R. § 735.6 (2006).
94. 7 U.S.C. § 252(b).
95. § 252(d)(1).
96. Id. § 254; see also 7 C.F.R. at § 735.5 (2006).
98. § 253(b).
the amount in controversy.\textsuperscript{99} Congress specifically articulated that nothing in the Warehouse Act was to preclude the enforceability of any arbitration agreement that would otherwise be enforceable under Title 9 of the United States Code.\textsuperscript{100}

2. Regulations

The adoption of the new regulations pursuant to the Grain Standards and Warehouse Improvement Act of 2000 ("Act") has not been without controversy.\textsuperscript{101} The regulations issued under the new Act do not state the exact language to be contained in the bond.\textsuperscript{102} Instead, the regulations now merely require a bond or other financial assurance.\textsuperscript{103} Nonetheless, the obligations undertaken by the entity providing financial assurance are quite clear.\textsuperscript{104}

On the other hand, the warehouse can provide a certificate that documents "participation in, and coverage by, an indemnity or insurance fund . . . established and maintained by a State . . . which guarantees depositors of the licensed warehouse full indemnification for the breach of any obligation of the licensed warehouse operator under the terms of the Act."\textsuperscript{105}

At the same time, the operator must comply with insurance policies for the warehouse and the products stored in the facility.\textsuperscript{106} Also, the operator has an obligation to comply with the duty of care imposed by the relevant licensing agreement.\textsuperscript{107}

Should the warehouse exceed its storage capacity, the warehouse is to immediately notify the Secretary of the situation.\textsuperscript{108} Moreover, the regulations address the procedures which inspectors, samplers, classifiers, and weighers must comply with when acting in such capacities.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{99} Id. § 255(a).
\textsuperscript{100} § 255(b).
\textsuperscript{101} Jerry Perkins, Iowa Targets Elevator Rule; State Officials Say Changing Regulation Puts Farmers at Risk, DES MOINES REG., Jan. 4, 2003, at D1. In addition to Iowa, letters from other states regarding rescission of state regulation under the new federal regulations were signed by the following states: Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Illinois, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio and South Dakota. Jerry Perkins, Regulations Hamper Protection of Elevators, DES MOINES REG., Sept. 29, 2002, at M1.
\textsuperscript{103} 7 C.F.R. § 735.14(a); Id. § 735.102(a).
\textsuperscript{104} § 735.102(a)(1)-(2).
\textsuperscript{105} § 735.102(a)(4).
\textsuperscript{106} Id. § 735.104.
\textsuperscript{107} Id. § 735.105.
\textsuperscript{108} Id. § 735.106(a).
\textsuperscript{109} Id. §§ 735.200-202.
In the event the warehouse is not covered by the federal Act, the warehouse must look to section 7-202 of the U.C.C. for its form for the warehouse receipt.\textsuperscript{110} The overwhelming number of warehouses that are subject to state rather than federal regulation reflects that state regulated elevators are much more common; yet it remains the choice of the elevator as to whether it will be federally or state licensed.\textsuperscript{111}

3. Practice pointers

At least one author has described several pragmatic considerations that arise under the federal Act.\textsuperscript{112} While the discussion focuses on an earlier edition of the Act and the regulations, the discussion remains instructive, as many of the obligations still exist.

First, under the Act, the warehouse has a duty to inspect, grade, and weigh grain before a receipt may be issued.\textsuperscript{113} Next, the warehouse has a mandatory obligation to issue receipts, which must also comply with the applicable federal forms, for all grain stored in the warehouse.\textsuperscript{114} Moreover, should the warehouse redeliver the grain to the depositor, the warehouse must both capture the original receipt and cancel it on its face and within the records of the warehouse.\textsuperscript{115}

Also, the warehouse must deliver out grain in accordance with the grade of delivered grain.\textsuperscript{116} This duty is described as follows: “In other words, if Farmer Jones deposited 10,000 bushels of No. 4 oats, the warehouseman is obligated to deliver out to Farmer Jones 10,000 bushels of No. 4 oats.”\textsuperscript{117} This is called a “quantity settlement.”\textsuperscript{118}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{110} Love, Note, 8 J. Corp. L. at 120.
  \item \textsuperscript{111} Id. at 121.
  \item \textsuperscript{114} Gillman, supra note 112, at 5-6 (citing former 7 U.S.C. §§ 259-60 & 7 C.F.R. §§ 736.30, .18, .26). See 7 C.F.R. § 735.300(a)(3).
  \item \textsuperscript{115} Gillman, supra note 112, at 6. See 7 U.S.C. § 251(c)-(d) (2000). See also 7 C.F.R. § 735.300(b)(5), (7), (8), (9).
  \item \textsuperscript{116} Gillman, supra note 112, at 7-8. The scope of the duty under the new Act is unclear, as the language has changed; yet, a duty to measure such qualities still exists. See, e.g., 7 C.F.R. § 735.300(b)(3). See also 7 U.S.C. § 249(b) (2000) (duty to redeliver "kind, quality, and grade called for by the receipt . . .").
  \item \textsuperscript{117} Gillman, supra note 112, at 8.
  \item \textsuperscript{118} Id.
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The reader will further note the unique obligation this places upon the warehouse.

Conversely, if the warehouse only has No. 3 oats on hand when the farmer wants the No. 4 oats, “the warehouseman can offer Farmer Jones the better oats, but if this is acceptable to Farmer Jones, he is only entitled to a lesser number of bushels sufficient to give him the dollar equivalent of ten thousand bushels of No. 4 oats.” 119 This is defined as a “quality settlement.” 120

It is worth noting, however, in order for the surety to be liable, “the warehouseman must have acted in his capacity as a warehouseman—not [in] his capacity as a grain dealer.” 121 In short, the “Federal Warehouse Bond does not cover the warehouseman’s transactions as a licensed grain dealer under state law.” 122 This result should still follow despite the adoption of the new Act and regulations; the language still exists that the bond or financial assurance only secures the person's compliance with the Act. 123

From a practical standpoint, once the surety or counsel for the surety learns of a claim, the surety should act promptly. As described by one commentator, the first task is to “get on the phone and call the warehouseman’s bank and the state and federal regulators as soon as possible . . . .” 124 From a practical standpoint, given the proximity to state regulators, this should probably be the first call made. 125

Then, the surety or its representative should examine all available records as quickly as possible. 126 Counsel should ask for “copies of all inspection reports and all other pertinent documents, including all notes from any statements they may have taken from the warehouseman’s employees and from the loan officers at the warehouseman’s bank.” 127 In that regard, counsel will want to pay particular attention to the “daily position records, financial statements, collateral register and all storage contracts.” 128 Thereafter, counsel should examine the regulators’ own reports to the extent they are available. 129 Once counsel has the factual backdrop, she can easily deal with the documents submitted in support of the claim. 130

---

119. Id.
120. Id.
121. Id. at 20.
122. Id. at 20 (citing In re Julien Co., 44 F.3d 426, 431 (6th Cir. 1995)).
125. Id. at 21.
126. Id. at 20.
127. Id. at 21.
128. Id.
129. Id.
130. Id.
Particularly when dealing with the claims submitted by a bank, “it is imperative for the surety’s attorney to examine all bank records regarding loans to the warehouseman . . . .”\textsuperscript{131} Then counsel will want to interview the loan officer.\textsuperscript{132} Once those interviews have been completed, or in the case of claims submitted by parties other than the bank, counsel will then want to interview the “claimant, the warehouseman, his manager and inspector, his accountant, his loan officer, [and] the state and federal inspectors . . . .”\textsuperscript{133}

B. PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT

1. Statutes

(a) General provisions

The practitioner should immediately note that the Warehouse Act does not cover livestock by its own definition.\textsuperscript{134} Instead, Congress has established a separate statutory scheme for the regulation of the animal livestock industry.\textsuperscript{135} Under the Packers and Stockyards Act, Congress has decreed that livestock acquired by cash sales and “all inventories of, or receivables or proceeds from meat, meat food products, or livestock products derived therefrom, shall be held by such packer in trust for the benefit of all unpaid cash sellers of such livestock until full payment has been received by such unpaid sellers . . . .”\textsuperscript{136} Any packer whose average annual purchases are not in excess of $500,000 is exempt from the section.\textsuperscript{137}

Under the Packers and Stockyards Act, the unpaid seller loses the benefit of the trust unless the seller, when unpaid, sends written notice to the packer and files the notice with the Secretary of Agricultural or, in the event of a dishonored instrument, within fifteen days of receiving notice of the dishonored payment.\textsuperscript{138} Of course, the sales component is not the only trigger for the Act; the actual sale must be deemed “in commerce.”\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{131} Id. at 21-22.
\textsuperscript{132} Id. at 22.
\textsuperscript{133} Id.
\textsuperscript{137} Id.
\textsuperscript{138} Id.
\textsuperscript{139} Id. § 183.
A similar statutory scheme exists for poultry.\textsuperscript{140} Average annual sales in excess of $100,000 trigger the poultry statute.\textsuperscript{141} A similar notice requirement exists for a notice of nonpayment to the Secretary of Agriculture and the live poultry dealer.\textsuperscript{142}

The Secretary may require bonds from every market agency, every packer, except those whose average annual purchases are not in excess of $500,000, and dealers under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may issue.\textsuperscript{143} In addition, the Secretary has the power to suspend registration if the bond requirement is not met or issue cease and desist orders if the entity is insolvent.\textsuperscript{144}

A "market agency" is defined as "any person engaged in the business of (1) buying or selling in commerce livestock on a commission basis or (2) furnishing stock yard services . . . ".\textsuperscript{145} In contrast, a "dealer" is "any person, not a market agency, engaged in the business of buying or selling in commerce livestock, either on his own account or as the employee or agent of the vendor or purchaser."\textsuperscript{146}

Beyond the duty to pay for livestock acquired, Congress has imposed upon the stockyard owner the obligation to regulate the stockyard "in a just, reasonable, and nondiscriminatory manner, to prescribe rules and regulations and to require those persons engaging in . . . the purchase, sale, or solicitation of livestock . . . to conduct their operations in a manner which will foster, preserve, or insure an efficient, competitive public market."\textsuperscript{147} If one fails to comply with this Chapter

relating to the purchase, sale, or handling of livestock, the purchase or sale of poultry, or relating to any poultry growing arrangement or swine production contract, he shall be liable to the person or persons injured thereby for the full amount of damages sustained in consequence of such violation.\textsuperscript{148}

The liability may be enforced in either an action brought to the Secretary or by suit in the United States District Court of competent jurisdiction.\textsuperscript{149} The provisions of the Act are cumulative to the existing common law and statutory remedies and are not to be construed to "in any way abridge or alter the remedies now existing . . . ."\textsuperscript{150}

\footnotesize
140. Id. § 197(b).
141. Id.
142. § 197(d).
143. Id. § 204.
144. Id.
145. Id. § 201(c).
146. § 201(d).
147. Id. § 208(b).
148. Id. § 209(a).
149. § 209(b).
150. Id.
The Secretary has broad powers to hear complaints under the Act.\textsuperscript{151} A complainant need not have suffered direct damage to initiate a complaint before the Secretary.\textsuperscript{152} Persons who have prevailed before the Secretary with respect to a complaint against a defendant, if unpaid, may bring suit in the district court. The Secretary’s order shall be prima facie evidence of the facts, and, if the petitioner prevails, the petitioner may recover reasonable attorney fees.\textsuperscript{153}

The Secretary has the power to prescribe rates and practices to prevent discrimination between intrastate commerce and interstate commerce.\textsuperscript{154} The Secretary also has the power to prevent unfair, discriminatory, or deceptive practices.\textsuperscript{155} Pursuant to such authority, the Secretary may assess civil penalties of not more than $10,000 per violation.\textsuperscript{156} Furthermore, failure to obey orders of the Secretary under 7 U.S.C. §§ 211, 212, or 213 shall result in a fine of $500 per offense per day.\textsuperscript{157} Likewise, the Secretary, the Attorney General, or an injured party may apply for an injunction to enforce the Secretary’s orders.\textsuperscript{158}

Congress, in adopting the Packers and Stockyards Act, sought to foreclose any potential \textit{respondeat superior} argument. Congress commanded that

[w]hen construing and enforcing the . . . Chapter, the act, omission, or failure of any agent . . . acting for or employed by any packer . . . within the scope of his employment or office, shall in every case also be deemed the act, omission, or failure of such packer . . . as well as that of such agent . . . .\textsuperscript{159}

The Secretary of Agriculture is specifically authorized to request temporary injunctions or restraining orders when the Secretary has reason to suspect that any person subject to the Act has “failed to pay . . . or has failed to remit to the person entitled thereto the net proceeds from the sale” of certain enumerated products and commodities.\textsuperscript{160} Likewise, the Secretary has the authority to request temporary injunctions or restraining orders when a person has operated while insolvent.\textsuperscript{161} The Secretary may also act when the person does

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{151} \textit{Id.} § 210(a).
\item \textsuperscript{152} § 210(d).
\item \textsuperscript{153} § 210(f).
\item \textsuperscript{154} \textit{Id.} § 212.
\item \textsuperscript{155} \textit{Id.} § 213.
\item \textsuperscript{156} § 213(b).
\item \textsuperscript{157} \textit{Id.} § 215(a).
\item \textsuperscript{158} \textit{Id.} § 216.
\item \textsuperscript{159} \textit{Id.} § 223.
\item \textsuperscript{160} \textit{Id.} § 228a(a).
\item \textsuperscript{161} § 228a(b).
\end{itemize}
not have a bond. Of course, the purpose of the statute is to address the responsibility of the packer to pay for the purchase of livestock. A purchaser of livestock has a statutory duty to promptly pay for the purchase of livestock. "Each packer, market agency, or dealer purchasing livestock shall, before the close of the next business day following the purchase of livestock and transfer of possession thereof, deliver to the seller . . . the full amount of the purchase price . . . ." Nonetheless, the parties may agree, subject to the conditions prescribed by the Secretary, to waive such requirements. Delay in payment and attempts to delay payment are deemed an unfair practice under the Act.

Federal law specifically provides that no state or territory of the United States may enforce any regulation "with respect to bonding of packers or prompt payment by packers for livestock . . . ." However, the statute allows that the state may enforce requirements that do not conflict with the Act or its regulations.

(b) Live poultry

Live poultry is subject to a similar requirement concerning prompt payment.

Each live poultry dealer obtaining live poultry . . . in a cash sale shall, before the close of the next business day following the purchase of poultry, and each live poultry dealer obtaining live poultry . . . shall, before the close of the fifteenth day following the week in which the poultry is slaughtered, deliver . . . the full amount due to such cash seller or poultry grower on account of such poultry.

Delays and attempts to delay the payment of funds are deemed an unfair practice under the Act. Under the Act, "a cash sale means a sale in which the seller does not expressly extend credit to the buyer."

Similarly, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, whenever the Secretary believes a violation of sections 197 or 228b-1 has occurred or is ongoing, to conduct a hearing, issue cease and desist or-

---

162. § 228a(c).
163. Id. § 228b.
164. § 228b(a).
165. § 228b(b).
166. § 228b(c).
167. Id. § 228c.
168. Id.
169. Id. § 228b-1(a).
170. § 228b-1(b).
171. § 228b-1(c).
ders, and impose civil penalties. Judicial review of the order lies in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the live poultry dealer has its principle place of business. The Court of Appeal's jurisdiction is exclusive. Violations of a final order are separate offenses, for each day on which the violation occurs, with additional fines.

2. Regulations

The Department of Agriculture set out the Packers and Stockyards Act regulations at 9 C.F.R. Part 201.

(a) General bonding provisions

The surety on these bonds must be a surety company approved by the Treasury Department of the United States "for bonds executed to the United States; and which has not failed or refused to satisfy its legal obligations under bonds issued under said regulations." Any entity required to maintain a surety bond may execute either a bond or a bond equivalent. The bond equivalent may be a trust fund agreement in fully negotiable instruments of the United States, a federally insured deposit, or an account which is readily convertible to currency. The equivalent may also be a trust agreement under an irrevocable standby letter of credit. Further, the bond and trust fund agreements must be filed on forms approved by the Department.

(b) Market agency, dealer, and packer bonds

The regulations also require specific bonds for market agencies, packers, and dealers. "Every market agency, packer, and dealer ... except packer buyers registered as dealers to purchase livestock for slaughter only, shall execute and maintain a reasonable bond on forms approved by the Administrator ... ." The bond must contain the "condition clauses." Moreover, the bond must be "applicable to the activity or activities in which the person or persons propose to engage, to secure the performance of obligations incurred by such mar-

---

172. *Id.* § 228b-2(a)-(b). This section concerns poultry.
173. *Id.* § 228b-3(a).
174. § 228b-3(h).
175. *Id.* § 228b-4.
176. 9 C.F.R. § 201.27(a) (2006).
177. § 201.27(b).
178. § 201.27(b)(1).
179. § 201.27(b)(2).
180. § 201.27(d).
181. *Id.* § 201.29(a).
182. *Id.* See infra notes 192-98 and accompanying text.
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ket agency, packer or dealer.” Operations shall not be conducted unless there is a bond on file and in effect.

However, a person who works both as a market agency and as a dealer may be covered by one bond. Yet, a “person operating as a market agency selling on a commission basis and as a market agency buying on a commission basis or as a dealer shall file and maintain separate bonds . . . .” "Each market agency and dealer whose buying operations are cleared by another market agency shall be named as clearee in the bond filed and maintained by the market agency registered to provide clearing services.”

In addition, a packer that purchases livestock directly or through “an affiliate or an employee or a wholly-owned subsidiary . . . shall file and maintain a reasonable bond.” A packer that maintains a wholly-owned subsidiary or an affiliate to buy livestock shall separately register as a packer buyer apart from the parent packing firm, but “the required bond shall be maintained by the parent packer firm.”

Bond coverage turns on the status of the entity, which may include a market agency selling, a market agency buying, a market agency acting as a clearing agency, or a packer. The required amount of bond coverage is determined by a regulatory formula.

The regulations define the condition clauses of the bond. Condition number one requires that “[w]hen the principal sells livestock for the accounts of others,” the principal shall pay the amount due to the person less any lawful charges. Condition number two applies “[w]hen the principal buys livestock for his own account or for the accounts of others.” Under this condition, the principal must pay the purchase price for all livestock and keep such funds safe and properly disburse funds which come into the principal’s hands. Condition clause number three governs when the principal “clears other registrants buying livestock” and is responsible for the obligations of other registrants.

---

183. 9 C.F.R. § 201.29(a).
184. Id.
185. § 201.29(b).
186. Id.
187. § 201.29(c).
188. § 201.29(d).
189. Id.
190. Id. § 201.30.
191. Id.
192. Id. § 201.31.
193. § 201.31(a).
194. § 201.31(b).
195. Id.
196. § 201.31(c).
Condition clause number four governs when the principal buys livestock on his own behalf while acting as a packer.\textsuperscript{197} Under that scenario, the "principal shall pay when due to the person or persons entitled thereto the purchase price of all livestock purchased by said principal for his own account."\textsuperscript{198}

Also, each bond or bond equivalent must contain a provision that any person damaged by the "failure of the principal to comply with any condition clause" may bring suit to recover, even if the party bringing the suit is "not a party named in the bond or bond equivalent."\textsuperscript{199}

Any claim for recovery on the bond or the equivalent must be filed in writing with the surety, trustee, or the Administrator.\textsuperscript{200} Upon receipt of a claim, whichever party receives the claim is to notify the others.\textsuperscript{201} The regulations provide that the surety or the trustee shall not be liable on any claim if it is not filed in writing within sixty days from the date of the transaction at issue and a suit thereon is "commenced less than 120 days or more than 547 days from the date on which the transaction was based."\textsuperscript{202} The bond or bond equivalents may not be used to pay for the legal expenses, salaries or fees "for legal representation of the surety or the principal."\textsuperscript{203} The regulations specify the means by which market agency, dealer, and packer bonds may be terminated.\textsuperscript{204}

(c) Proceeds of sale

The regulations also define the means and manner of calculation of payments to consignors and shippers.\textsuperscript{205} The regulations sharply prohibit the payment of net proceeds to persons other than the consignors and shippers unless certain conditions are met.\textsuperscript{206}

The regulations further define payment for livestock as being "trust funds" and place the concomitant obligation upon the regulated entities to establish custodial accounts.\textsuperscript{207} "Each payment that a livestock buyer makes to a market agency selling on commission is a trust

\begin{footnotes}
\end{footnotes}
fund. Funds deposited in custodial accounts are also trust funds. 208

The regulations specify the requirements for custodial accounts. 209

At the same time, the regulations define the means and manner by which payment and accounting for livestock and live poultry must be made. 210 Similar regulations exist for market agencies. 211

(d) General practices

The requirements for scale tickets and the weighing of feed are established in the agency’s rules. 212 In addition, the regulations establish standards for scales, accurate weights, and the operation of weighing livestock. 213 Finally, prohibitions regarding a number of trade practices exist. 214

The regulations provide for the inspection of brands. 215 When an association or agency is granted the authority to inspect brands, it must register as a market agency, but it is exempt from the bonding requirements. 216

(e) Access by the Secretary

The regulations require that each stockyard owner, market agency, dealer, packer, and live poultry dealer shall, “upon proper request,” allow the Secretary or the Secretary’s designee to examine records pertaining to the business that is subject to the Act. 217 However, no employee or agent of the United States shall make facts known that were obtained as a result of the inspection without the consent of the regulated entity except to other employees or agents of the United States or by a court of competent jurisdiction. 218

(f) Records regarding live poultry

Specific provisions address the record keeping obligations of live poultry growers and sellers. 219 These include instructions for the weighing of live poultry. 220

208. § 201.42(a).
209. § 201.42(b)-(g).
210. Id. § 201.43.
211. Id. §§ 201.44-.45.
212. Id. § 201.49.
213. Id. §§ 201.71-.82.
214. Id. §§ 201.53-.61,.67-.70.
215. Id. § 201.86.
216. § 201.86(b).
217. Id. §§ 201.94-.95.
218. Id. § 201.96.
219. Id. § 201.100.
220. Id. § 201.108-1.
(g) Credit terms

The regulations set out the exact requirements for the sale of livestock to a packer on credit, including the requirements for a written acknowledgement.\(^{221}\) This can be excepted based on the lack of sales volume.\(^{222}\)

(h) Rules of practice

Part 202 of Title 9 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the rules of practice under the Act. The rules address rate proceedings and reparation proceedings.

(i) General policy statements

The Secretary has specifically set out a document retention policy for packers, live poultry, stockyard owners, market agencies and dealers under the Packers and Stockyards Act.\(^{223}\) The outside length of time for retention of records appears to be two years unless the party receives notice in writing from the Administrator that specified records shall be retained for a longer period of time.\(^{224}\)

Another general policy statement addresses insolvency. The test for insolvency under the Packers and Stockyards Act is “whether a person’s current liabilities exceed his current assets.”\(^{225}\) The general policy statement further defines the term and its discrete subparts.\(^{226}\)

Finally, the general policy statement addresses the mailing of checks for livestock purchases for slaughter.\(^{227}\) The statement is designed to provide the terms for notification of the purchaser when an individual is not present at the time of the sale and would instead prefer payment by the mailing of a check.\(^{228}\)

III. THE JURISDICTIONS

The National Association of State Departments of Agriculture has prepared tables comparing various licensing, bonding and audit requirements under grain and commodity related programs for a number of jurisdictions.\(^{229}\) The document can be of assistance when

\(^{221}\) Id. § 201.200.
\(^{222}\) Id.
\(^{223}\) Id. § 203.4.
\(^{224}\) § 203.4(a)-(c).
\(^{225}\) Id. § 203.10(a).
\(^{226}\) § 203.10(b)-(e).
\(^{227}\) Id. § 203.16.
\(^{228}\) Id.
comparing various state programs (including those not analyzed in this Article) on specific issues.

A. ILLINOIS

1. Statutes

The Illinois Department of Agriculture has broad control of “surety” and trust funds. Specifically, Illinois Compiled Statute section 205/205-410(b) provides:

The Department has the power to control surety bonds and trust funds and to establish trust accounts and bank accounts in adequately protected financial institutions, to hold monies received by the Director of Agriculture when acting as trustee, to protect the assets of licensees for the benefit of claimants, to accept security from licensees to collateralize licensees’ financial deficiencies (and that security shall be secondary to surety bonds in the collection process), to accept collateral and security in lieu of or in addition to a commercial surety bond, and to collect and disburse the proceeds of those bonds and trust funds when acting as trustee on behalf of claimants without responsibility for the management and operation of discontinued or insolvent businesses, those funds, or additions to those funds in which the State of Illinois has no right, title, or interest.\(^{230}\)

Moreover, the Department is statutorily authorized to hold hearings, to identify and verify claimants and claim amounts, and to collect the proceeds of surety bonds and other moneys.\(^{231}\) A “claimant” is any person “who is unable to secure satisfaction of financial obligations due from a person subject to regulation by the Department, in accordance with the applicable statute or regulation and the time limits provided for in that statute or regulation, if any . . .”\(^{232}\) The Illinois statute is not merely limited to “grain” but instead includes the following:

- the Illinois Egg and Egg Products Act;
- the Personal Property Storage Act;
- the Livestock Auction Market Law;
- the Illinois Pesticide Act;
- the Weights and Measures Act;
- the Illinois Livestock Dealer Licensing Act;
- the Slaughter Livestock Buyers Act; and
- the Illinois Feeder Swine Dealer Licensing Act.\(^{233}\)

\(^{230}\) 20 ILL. COMP. STAT. ANN. 205/205-410(b) (West 2001).
\(^{231}\) 205/205-410(c).
\(^{232}\) 205/205-410(a).
\(^{233}\) Id.
Likewise, the Act specifically enumerates what constitutes a failure. “Failure” under the Acts cited in the definition of “claimant” contained in this Section means any of the following:

(1) An inability to financially satisfy claimants in accordance with the applicable statute or regulation and the time limits provided for in that statute or regulation, if any.
(2) A public declaration of insolvency.
(3) A revocation of a license and the leaving of an outstanding indebtedness to claimants.
(4) A failure to pay claimants in the ordinary course of business and when a bona fide dispute does not exist between the licensee and the customer.
(5) A failure to apply for renewal of a license.
(6) A denial of a request for renewal of a license.
(7) A voluntary surrendering of a license.

The Department’s trust account is what drives the system. It is from the trust account that the Department takes funds to disburse to claimants. As discussed, infra, surety bonds are no longer a critical part of the Illinois process. Instead, Illinois places an assessment on licensees, applicants, first sellers of grain to grain dealers, and lenders. Yet, the Illinois process is instructive.

With the specific reference to grain, Illinois has created a Grain Indemnity Trust Account under the auspices of the Director of the Illinois Department of Agriculture. “[A] person may not engage in the business of buying of grain from producers, or storing of grain for compensation, in the State of Illinois without a license issued by the Department” or the federal government. With respect to specific storage issues, Illinois defines classes of warehousemen. A “Class I warehouseman” means a warehouseman who is authorized to issue negotiable and non-negotiable warehouse receipts.” A “Class II warehouseman” means a warehouseman who is authorized to issue only non-negotiable warehouse receipts.” Grain dealers, on the other hand, buy grain from producers. Licensing is governed by Article 5 of the Grain Code.

234. Id.
235. 205/205-410(d).
236. See infra notes 267-72 and accompanying text.
237. See 240 ILL. COMP. STAT. ANN. 40/5-30 (West 2005).
238. Id. 40/1-10.
239. Id. 40/5-5(a).
240. 40/1-10.
241. Id.
242. Id.
243. Id.
244. See id. §§ 40/5-5 to -35.
For purposes of the statute, a “claimant” includes parties that have written evidence of a storage obligation or that possess evidence of a sale at an Illinois location and remain unpaid.\textsuperscript{245} Entities that have loaned money to a warehouse that was to receive a warehouse receipt as collateral fall within the definition of claimant if the conditions of the statute are met.\textsuperscript{246}

“When grain is delivered to a warehouseman at a location where grain is also purchased, the licensee shall give written evidence of . . . ” the delivery of grain that shall indicate “whether the grain is delivered for storage or for sale.”\textsuperscript{247} In the absence of acceptable evidence of a sale, the grain will be considered in storage.\textsuperscript{248}

Illinois has, by statute, set out the requirements for the warehouse receipt.\textsuperscript{249} In turn, the warehouse may require a bond of the depositor in the event of a lost or destroyed warehouse receipt.\textsuperscript{250} Also, the Illinois statute requires that a warehouse receipt issued for collateral purposes by a warehouse first be issued by the warehouse to itself.\textsuperscript{251}

Upon a licensee's failure, the Department will process the claims.\textsuperscript{252} The Illinois statute contemplates published notice along with notice by mail to each potential claimant.\textsuperscript{253} The notice must contain the statutorily required information.\textsuperscript{254} Claims must be filed by the “claim date,” which is ninety days after the “failure of the licensee” or “[seven] days from the date notice was mailed to the claimant if the date notice was mailed to that claimant is on or before the claim date.”\textsuperscript{255} Also, the statute requires that the first date of publication be within thirty days of the date of the failure.\textsuperscript{256} Likewise, the mailed notice must be sent within sixty days of the failure.\textsuperscript{257}

In theory, claimants are entitled to 100% reimbursement unless insufficient assets exist, in which case the claim is paid on a pro rata

\begin{enumerate}
\item 40/1-10; see also id. 40/30-5.
\item 40/1-10.
\item Id. 40/10-25(a).
\item Id.
\item 40/10-25(d)(1)-(5).
\item 40/10-25(k).
\item 40/10-25(l).
\item Id. 40/25-5. See id. 40/1-10 (defining “failure”); see also 20 ILL. COMP. STAT. ANN. 205/205-410(a) (West 2001) (defining “failure” in a similar fashion, except that failure under the Warehouses Act, Chapter 240, does not include the test of financial inability to “satisfy claimants in accordance with the applicable statute or regulation . . . ”).
\item 240 ILL. COMP. STAT. ANN. 40/25-5(a).
\item 40/25-5(a)(1)-(4).
\item 40/25-5(a)(4)(A)-(B).
\item 40/25-5(b)(1).
\item 40/25-5(b)(3).
\end{enumerate}
basis “out of the net proceeds of the liquidation of grain assets . . .” subject to a statutory cap. However, if delivery and pricing were not completed 160 days before the failure, the claimant is entitled to 85% of the valid claim up to a statutory maximum. In the case of a price-later contract, the latter date of execution of the contract or the date of delivery will govern, and this must not have occurred more than 365 days “before the date of the failure” in order to receive compensation. Producers who sold on a price-later contract that was not final by the time of the failure are to be paid 85% of the claim, up to statutory maximum, if either the delivery or execution of the agreement occurred no more than 365 days prior to the failure.

On the other hand, the statute bars certain types of claims. Claims filed by producers who completed pricing of their grain in excess of 160 days before the date of the failure are barred. Secondly, the statute bars claims filed by producers for grain sold on price-later contracts if the latter date of execution of the contract or the date of the delivery of the grain took place more than 365 days prior to the date of the failure.

Furthermore, claims are allowed to be filed under the Illinois statute by secured parties of the producer and are deemed to be claims filed by a producer under the statute. The statute sets a maximum payout of one million dollars per claimant.

2. Case law

As discussed, infra, the statutory scheme has changed with respect to the use of a surety in Illinois. This statute is intended to only reimburse at the eighty-five percent level claimants whose claims are not supported by warehouse receipts or who are grain merchandisers. In essence, the new Illinois Act dispenses with the requirement of surety bonds or certificates of deposit because under that system claimants were not being paid late; they were not being paid at all. Thus, there is no reason to interpret the Act in the manner

258. Id. 40/25-10(a).
259. 40/25-10(d).
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261. Id.
262. 40/25-10(g)(1).
263. 40/25-10(g)(2).
264. 40/25-10(i).
265. 40/25-10(j).
267. Adams Farm, 727 N.E.2d at 642 (discussing the argument advanced by the Director of Agriculture that under prior law that required dealers to keep surety bonds or certificates of deposit, merchandising claimants received only 13% of their loss, while warehouse claimants recovered just 15% of the loss).
that would lift merchandising claimants' recovery above eighty-five percent. Those claims that are subject to the eighty-five percent cap include price-later contracts wherein the title passes to the dealer, but the price is not fixed until some later time. Indeed, the Department of Agriculture argued that the speculation inherent in price-later contracts had "been the primary reason for elevator failures." Accordingly, the Illinois legislature rationally chose to limit coverage under the Act on these price-later contracts. "With the adoption of the Act in 1983, surety bonds were no longer used for the protection of grain producers, who instead were afforded protection from the Insurance Fund, maintained by assessments on grain dealers."

B. INDIANA

1. Statutes

Indiana's Code requires that once the Indiana Grain Buyers and Warehouse Licensing Agency has determined that a grain buyer or warehouse has defaulted on payments or otherwise failed, the Board of the Indiana Grain Indemnity Corporation is to determine the value of the claims, authorize payment of money from the fund to compensate claimants, collect money through subrogated claims against any surety bonds, and borrow money in the event there is insufficient money to cover valid claims. In the event that the fund is insufficient to pay all valid claims, the Board is authorized to grant priority of payment of all of the claims in the order the claims were approved "as valid" by the Board.

In order to obtain a grain bank license or a warehouse license, an individual shall either post a bond, letter of credit, or cash deposit. The statute also sets out a requirement for minimum positive net worth for grain banks, warehouses, grain buyers, and buyer-warehouses. Indiana segregates between grain bank license/warehouse licenses, grain buyers' licenses, and buyer warehouse licenses. A person applying for two or more licenses on the basis of two or more facilities in Indiana "may give a single bond, letter of credit, or cash
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270. Id. (citation omitted).
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277. § 26-3-7-10(a)(1)-(3).
deposit to satisfy the requirements of this chapter . . . .” 278 Further, an applicant for a license must demonstrate proof of insurance on all grain that might be in the licensee's facilities for "full market value against loss by fire, internal explosion, lightning, and windstorm." 279

Any deficiency in the minimum positive net worth may be corrected "by adding to the amount of the bond, letter of credit, or cash deposit." 280 Similarly, the Director is authorized to accept, instead of a letter of credit, single cash deposit, or bond, an amount that consists of a combination of any of the three. 281 The Director has the authority to request an additional bond or cash. 282

The licensee cannot cancel an approved bond until the Director has provided prior written approval for cancellation and has received a substituted security. 283 Likewise, the surety may cancel a bond only after ninety days from the day the surety mailed the notice of the intent to cancel by either certified or registered mail to the Director. 284 A licensee may be subject to automatic suspension for failure to "file a new bond, letter of credit, or cash deposit within the ninety day period." 285

Also, a licensee may be subject to revocation in the event that the bond or cash deposit is not maintained. 286 "The suspension shall continue until the licensee complies with the bonding and insurance requirements." 287

Indiana has specifically defined by statute how liens against the assets of the licensee arise. 288 The statute divides the lien holders into two classes: lenders and claimants. 289 The lien attaches, in the case of a claimant, when the grain is delivered for sale, storage, or bailment. 290 The lien will also attach at the beginning of the storage obligation. 291 In the case of a lender, the lien attaches when the funds are advanced by a lender. 292 A lien granted by this section terminates upon the licensee discharging the lien. 293

---

278. § 26-3-7-10(f).
279. Id. § 26-3-7-12(a).
280. § 26-3-7-10(i)-(j).
281. § 26-3-7-10(l).
282. § 26-3-7-10(k), (m).
283. Id. § 26-3-7-14(a).
284. Id.
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286. § 26-3-7-14(b)(3).
287. § 26-3-7-14(b).
288. Id. § 26-3-7-16.8.
289. § 26-3-7-16.8(a)(1)-(4).
290. § 26-3-7-16.8(b)(1).
291. § 26-3-7-16.8(b)(2).
292. § 26-3-7-16.8(b)(3).
293. § 26-3-7-16.8(c).
Upon the failure of a licensee, the lien granted by the section is assigned to the agency. Consequently, the Director has the exclusive authority to "allocate and prorate the proceeds of the grain assets." However, the Director can assign the lien. The statute has its own priority scheme. Suffice it to say that a lender or a claimant with a receipt for grain owned or stored by the licensee has priority over other claimants.

2. Case law

Under Indiana case law, the doctrine of laches is available as a defense when a party fails to give timely notice of its claim.

C. Iowa

1. Statutes

(a) Grain dealers

Iowa regulates "grain dealers," which as part of the definition must meet the threshold of purchases of more than one thousand bushels or more of grain from a producer in a calendar month. There are a number of exceptions to the definition.

Under Iowa law, a grain dealer must have a license. Iowa also requires that in order to obtain a grain dealer license, a person post a surety bond, which varies based upon the type of license. Under certain circumstances, the condition can be met by maintaining current assets equal to 100% of current liabilities. An irrevocable letter of credit may be used in lieu of a bond.

Upon termination, revocation, or cancellation of the grain dealer’s license, any claims against the grain dealer must be made in writing and filed with the grain dealer and the issuer of the bond or irrevocable letter of credit and the Department of Agriculture and Land Stewardship within 120 days after the termination, revocation, or cancellation. Failure to timely make the claim constitutes waiver.

294. § 26-3-7-16.8(d).
295. § 26-3-7-16.8(e).
296. § 26-3-7-16.8(g).
297. § 26-3-7-16.8(f).
298. § 26-3-7-16.8(f)(1)-(3).
301. See § 203.1(10)(a)-(j).
302. Id. § 203.3.
303. § 203.3(4)-(5), (7).
304. § 203.3(4)(c), (5)(c).
305. § 203.3(4)-(5), (7), (8). See also § 203.1(1).
306. Id. § 203.12.
of the claim against the issuer, grain depositors, and the Sellers Indemnity Fund, but based upon the plain language of the statute, failure to make a timely claim does not relieve the grain dealer from liability to the claimant.\textsuperscript{307}

The Iowa statute expressly provides for the creation and perfection of liens on grain dealer assets when the seller has not received full payment for the grain.\textsuperscript{308} The lien arises when the “warehouse receipts or other written evidence of ownership” are surrendered and terminates “when the liability of the grain dealer to the seller has been discharged.”\textsuperscript{309}

Upon application of the Department, the district court may appoint the Department as the receiver if the grain dealer’s license has been revoked or suspended or if the grain dealer has engaged in or is presently engaging in business without obtaining a license.\textsuperscript{310} The Department may make plans for disposition of the grain dealer assets, continue the operation of the business on a temporary basis, or take any other course of action that would serve the interest of interested sellers.\textsuperscript{311} Such receivership actions are not deemed contested cases under the Iowa Administrative Procedures Act.\textsuperscript{312} The statute requires that the issuer of either the bond or the letter of credit be joined as a party in the receivership proceeding.\textsuperscript{313}

If the district court approves the sale of the grain, the Department shall appoint a merchandiser.\textsuperscript{314} The sale of grain “shall proceed in the same manner” as grain liquidated under a receivership for an agricultural warehouse.\textsuperscript{315} The Department is entitled to reimbursement from the grain dealer’s assets “for costs directly attributable to the receivership.”\textsuperscript{316} If the plan involves distribution of cash proceeds, the district court must approve the distribution.\textsuperscript{317}

Likewise, under Iowa law, a grain dealer may not purchase grain on a credit-sale contract basis except as allowed by the Iowa Code.\textsuperscript{318} The Iowa Code sets out the required contents of a credit-sale contract.\textsuperscript{319}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{307} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{308} Id. § 203.12A.
  \item \textsuperscript{309} § 203.12A(3).
  \item \textsuperscript{310} Id. § 203.12B(2)(a).
  \item \textsuperscript{311} § 203.12B(2)(b).
  \item \textsuperscript{312} § 203.12B(5).
  \item \textsuperscript{313} § 203.12B(6).
  \item \textsuperscript{314} § 203.12B(7).
  \item \textsuperscript{315} § 203.12B(8) (citing IOWA CODE § 203C.4).
  \item \textsuperscript{316} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{317} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{318} Id. § 203.15(1).
  \item \textsuperscript{319} § 203.15(2)(a)-(f).
\end{itemize}
Title to all grains sold on a credit-sale basis "is in the purchasing dealer as of the time the contract is executed," unless the parties agree otherwise. In the event of a "revocation, termination, or cancellation of the grain dealer's license, the payment date for all credit-sale contracts" is advanced to a date not later than thirty days after the effective date of the revocation, termination, or cancellation. Unpriced grain shall be priced as of the effective date of the revocation, termination, or cancellation. In the event of the sale of the grain dealer's business to another licensed dealer, credit-sale contracts may be assigned to the new purchaser.

According to Iowa law, "a grain dealer shall not purchase grain on credit-sale contract during any time period in which the grain dealer fails to maintain fifty cents of net worth for each outstanding bushel of grain purchased under credit." Under those circumstances, the dealer "may maintain a deficiency bond or an irrevocable letter of credit in the amount of two thousand dollars for each one thousand dollars or fraction thereof of deficiency in net worth." A dealer that holds a federal or state warehouse license and "does not have a sufficient quantity or quality of grain to satisfy the warehouse operator's obligations" shall not buy grain through credit-sale contracts to correct the shortfall.

Moreover, in order to engage in credit-sale contracts, the grain dealer must meet at least one additional condition: submission of the last financial statement submitted to the Department "accompanied by an unqualified opinion based upon an audit performed by a certified public accountant" or, in the alternative, the grain dealer engaging in credit-sales contracts must file "a bond with the Department in the amount of one hundred thousand dollars payable to the Department." The bond is to be used to indemnify sellers for losses resulting from breach of credit-sale contracts. This bond is in addition to any other bonds required by Chapter 203.

The bond required by this section may not be canceled by the issuer unless ninety days have passed following notice to the Department and the principal by certified mail. This procedure may be

320. § 203.15(3).
321. Id.
322. Id.
323. Id.
324. § 203.15(4)(a).
325. Id.
326. § 203.15(4)(b).
327. § 203.15(4)(c)(1)-(2).
328. § 203.15(4)(c)(2).
329. Id.
330. § 203.15(4)(c).
modified if an adequate replacement bond is procured.\textsuperscript{331} If a replacement bond has not been procured within sixty days following notice, the Department shall automatically suspend the dealer’s license.\textsuperscript{332} Failure to file a replacement bond within thirty days after the suspension shall result in revocation of the grain dealer’s license.\textsuperscript{333} The Department may suspend the right of a grain dealer to purchase grain on a credit-sale basis based upon the failure to meet other enumerated conditions.\textsuperscript{334} Finally, a licensed grain dealer that purchases grain on a credit-sale contract basis must obtain from the seller a signed acknowledgment, on forms prescribed by the Department, “stating that the seller has received notice that grain purchased by credit-sale contract is not protected by the grain depositors and sellers indemnity fund.”\textsuperscript{335}

(b) Bargaining agents

Iowa used to separately regulate “bargaining agents” who are individuals or entities “who bargain with buyers for the sale of grain for agricultural producers,” but the statute was repealed.\textsuperscript{336}

(c) Warehouses

Iowa also maintains a statutory scheme for the regulation of warehouses for agricultural products.\textsuperscript{337} This statute also provides for oversight by the Department and for the appointment of the Department as a receiver.\textsuperscript{338} Likewise, this statute also requires bonds or letters of credit for issuance of a license.\textsuperscript{339} The statute also defines when liens arise on the warehouse operator’s assets.\textsuperscript{340}

At the end of the day, both grain dealers regulated under Chapter 203 and warehouses regulated under Chapter 203C are participants in the Grain Depositors and Sellers Indemnity Fund established under Chapter 203D.\textsuperscript{341} The fund arises from a per-bushel fee on purchased grain from licensed warehouses and grain dealers.\textsuperscript{342} A statutory lien may be enforced against the assets of a licensee.\textsuperscript{343}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{331} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{332} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{333} Id.
  \item \textsuperscript{334} § 203.15(5)(a)-(g).
  \item \textsuperscript{335} § 203.15(6).
  \item \textsuperscript{336} IOWA CODE ANN. § 203A.1 (West 2000), repealed by 2003 Iowa Acts 135.
  \item \textsuperscript{337} See generally IOWA CODE ANN. §§ 203C.1–203C.40 (West 2000 & Supp. 2006).
  \item \textsuperscript{338} §§ 203C.2–203C.3.
  \item \textsuperscript{339} § 203C.6.
  \item \textsuperscript{340} § 203C.12A.
  \item \textsuperscript{341} Id. §§ 203.4, 203C.12.
  \item \textsuperscript{342} Id. § 203D.3.
  \item \textsuperscript{343} Id. § 203D.5A.
\end{itemize}
The board of the fund reviews and makes a determination as to the validity of claims filed.\textsuperscript{344} The statute defines how claims are made, determined, and paid.\textsuperscript{345} Nonetheless, nothing in Chapters 203, 203C, or 203D creates any guarantee or obligation on behalf of the State of Iowa.\textsuperscript{346}

2. Case law

(a) The common law and issues peculiar to the Iowa statutes

As the Iowa Supreme Court observed in \textit{Avoca State Bank v. Merchants Mutual Bonding Co.},\textsuperscript{347} a grain elevator operates under one of two basic roles.\textsuperscript{348} Either the elevator buys and sells grain, making it a grain dealer, or it acts as a storer of grain, making it a warehouse.\textsuperscript{349} Nonetheless, in either role the operator "can work considerable financial harm upon the public, and the legislature has endeavored to provide the public a measure of protection."\textsuperscript{350} In \textit{Avoca State Bank}, the court examined the issue of whether a bank could recover on a warehouse's bond for issuance of invalid warehouse receipts.\textsuperscript{351} The Iowa Supreme Court rejected the argument that the bond required by the Code covers only a conversion of existing grain by a warehouse.\textsuperscript{352} Instead, the Iowa Supreme Court declared that it was not willing to isolate coverage of the bonds to a "conversion-type situation."\textsuperscript{353} An elevator acting as a warehouse is liable for the non-receipt of the goods when a warehouse receipt is issued.\textsuperscript{354} The court thus held that, "if a warehouseman issues a warehouse receipt for grain which he does not have, he breaches his duty of faithful performance as a warehouseman, and his bond covers."\textsuperscript{355} Applying the prevailing case law to the grain situation, the bond covers when the elevator:

\begin{quote}
    did not have the grain on which [it] issued receipts that [it] pledged to the bank. If [it] had the grain and disposed of it without the receipts, the bond covers. If [it] did not have the
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{344} Id. § 203D.4(2).
\textsuperscript{345} Id. § 203D.6.
\textsuperscript{346} Id. §§ 203.14, 203C.38, 203D.7.
\textsuperscript{347} 251 N.W.2d 533 (Iowa 1977).
\textsuperscript{349} Id.
\textsuperscript{350} Id. at 535. A warehouse bond was required under the then existing Iowa Code Chapter 543, which was later codified into Chapter 203C.
\textsuperscript{351} Id. at 539.
\textsuperscript{352} Id.
\textsuperscript{353} Id.
\textsuperscript{354} Id.
\textsuperscript{355} Id. (citations omitted).
\end{footnotes}
grain and issued the receipts and pledged them to the bank without notice, the bond covers.356

The next issue the Iowa Supreme Court addressed in Avoca State Bank was the requirement of a formal demand upon the warehouse. Iowa law does not require a demand be made upon the warehouse for grain stored pursuant to the receipts when no grain exists to fill the receipts.357

In the same case, the Iowa Supreme Court also addressed the issue of the rule at common law concerning a bank's ability to recover against the bond when the surety alleges that the bank knew there was insufficient grain but nonetheless took the documents as security.358 The issue is one of fact.359 Based upon the record in the case, the bank's argument went further. The bank maintained that nothing was recoverable under the receipts but instead looked to the bond because the receipts themselves were wrongfully issued and were invalid.360 Under that scenario, the bank could recover under the bond.361

However, if the bank knew the title documents were invalid when they were received, a different result would follow. As announced by the Georgia Supreme Court, "if the transaction was a mere scheme by which the warehouse . . . undertook to obtain from the bank funds for its own use . . . and if the bank knew the character of the transaction at the time . . . the surety . . . of the warehouse . . . would not be liable to the bank . . . "362

On the same day Avoca State Bank was decided, the Iowa Supreme Court held in two related cases that the warehouse's bond under then-existing Chapter 543 did not cover a cash sale of grain.363

(b) Procedural issues

The limitations period for filing of claims starts upon the date the order is affirmed by the agency and not the date upon which the administrative law judge's proposed order should issue.364 Payment of

356. Id. at 540 (citations omitted).
357. Id. (citations omitted).
358. Id. at 541-42.
359. Id. at 541.
360. Id.
361. Id. (citations omitted).
the full amount of the bond to the state discharges the surety even if there may be other potential claimants.\textsuperscript{365}

(c) Surety law in jury instructions

In \textit{Avoca State Bank}, the surety complained on appeal that the district court erred in not cautioning the jury that it was not a surety, guarantor, or insurer of the owner's notes to the bank.\textsuperscript{366} In the high court's view, there was no need for a cautionary instruction because the district court "narrowed the case to one major issue . . . and focused the jurors' attention on that issue."\textsuperscript{367} Therefore, based on the discretion a trial court has to submit cautionary instructions, there was no error in light of the fact that such an instruction would interject confusion concerning an unrelated issue.\textsuperscript{368}

Nonetheless, one can question whether the Iowa Supreme Court would reach the same conclusion today. The decision predates the adoption of the Iowa Rules of Evidence.\textsuperscript{369} Since the rules have been adopted, counsel could certainly argue that Iowa Rule of Evidence 5.411 provides a basis to exclude evidence of a surety.\textsuperscript{370} At the very least, the decision sends a strong signal to attorneys who represent surety companies to take a hard look at the decision whether to bifurcate the proceeding.\textsuperscript{371}

(d) Damages

\textit{Avoca State Bank} also addresses the measure of damages. The value of pledged grain is "the highest price between the time of the wrong and the commencement of the suit."\textsuperscript{372}

(e) Interest

Likewise, interest earned on the sale of grain proceeds is distributed to the claimants rather than used as an offset against the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{365} Iowa State Commerce Comm'n v. IGF Ins. Co., 309 N.W.2d 445, 447-48 (Iowa 1981).
\item \textsuperscript{366} \textit{Avoca State Bank}, 251 N.W.2d at 541.
\item \textsuperscript{367} \textit{Id.}
\item \textsuperscript{368} \textit{Id.} (citation omitted).
\item \textsuperscript{369} Iowa R. Evid. (Official Comment – 1983). The Iowa Rules of Evidence took effect on July 1, 1983.
\item \textsuperscript{370} See Iowa R. Evid. 5.411; \textit{see also} Fed. R. Evid. 411. At least one federal circuit court has held that the federal rule would preclude evidence of a fidelity bond under Federal Rule of Evidence 411. Garnac Grain Co. v. Blackley, 932 F.2d 1563, 1570 (8th Cir. 1991).
\item \textsuperscript{371} Benjamin B. Ullem & John F. Fatino, \textit{Evidence of a Surety Found to be Inadmissible Under Fed. R. Evid. 411 and Recent Successful Attempts to Bifurcate Proceedings Involving Sureties}, \textit{The Critical Path} (The Defense Research Institute, Inc., Construction Law Committee), Fall 1997, at 4-6.
\item \textsuperscript{372} \textit{Avoca State Bank}, 251 N.W.2d at 541 (citations omitted).
\end{itemize}
surety's liability. In the event a supersedeas bond is filed by the surety on appeal, interest may be recoverable under the supersedeas bond from the date of the trial court's judgment.

(f) Preservation of error and appellate practice

Harmless error analysis will be applied in actions involving a surety. When the trial court incorrectly instructs the jury, a new trial will not be granted if the jury verdict is not a result of the mistaken instruction.

From a procedural standpoint, when the surety asserts error on appeal, it must, like any other litigant, demonstrate to the appellate court that it assigned error on the point before the district court. Failure to do so leaves the appellate court nothing to review.

D. Kansas

1. Statutes

Kansas, by statute, gives the Secretary of Agriculture authority to regulate security requirements for licensed warehouses. This power includes the ability to require a bond to cover any shortage in commodities by a licensed warehouse for "outstanding receipts and scale tickets" after notice to require the warehouse to do any of the following: "(1) cover any existing shortage; (2) give additional bond or letter of credit; (3) submit to any further examination the Secretary may require." The Secretary may impose any or all of the requirements. Failure to comply may result in the issuance of a court order authorizing the Department of Agriculture to take "immediate possession of and maintain the commodities, records, and property" of the warehouse.

375. Avoca State Bank, 251 N.W.2d at 541. The trial court incorrectly instructed the jury that the verdict could have been $52,000, the amount of the bond, or less when actual loss exceeded the penal sum of the bond and "[u]nder the record, a finding that the beans and corn were worth less than $52,000 could not stand." Id. Since the jury returned a verdict of $52,000, no reversible error occurred. Id.
376. Michael, 251 N.W.2d at 533.
377. Id. See also Iowa State Commerce Comm'n v. Manilla Grain Terminal, Inc., 362 N.W.2d at 564 (noting the surety failed to preserve error on appeal when objection at trial court was to the number of hours involved in a staff attorney fee claim but the surety asserted on appeal that recovery of any staff time was an improper receivership expense and court did not have authority to order reimbursement from surety).
378. KAN. STAT. ANN. § 34-2,104(a) (2000). See also id. § 34-223(n).
379. § 34-2,104(a)(1)-(3).
380. § 34-2,104(a).
381. Id.
From a procedural standpoint, the Department of Agriculture's petition must be verified.\textsuperscript{382} The defendant may answer within ten days, and a hearing is to be set within fifteen days.\textsuperscript{383}

Once in possession, the Secretary is to give notice of the proceeding to the surety or issuer of the letter of credit on behalf of the warehouse and holders of all receipts and scale tickets.\textsuperscript{384} If the audit or investigation reveals a shortage of the commodity, the Secretary is to notify the warehouse, the surety or financial institution, and depositors of the approximate amount of the shortage.\textsuperscript{385}

On the other hand, if the warehouse is insolvent or cannot pay all claims, then the Department may liquidate the business or request appointment of a receiver.\textsuperscript{386} The statute specifically addresses the powers and temporal limitations placed on the receiver.\textsuperscript{387}

Kansas has also declared that receipt provisions that provide grain receipts are not negotiable and void.\textsuperscript{388} Warehouse receipts are to be issued only upon actual delivery of grain, and no receipt may be issued for a quantity greater than that which was received.\textsuperscript{389}

New receipts are to be issued when part of the grain covered by an existing receipt is delivered; such new receipt must state that it represents the balance of the original receipts, the old receipt shall be canceled, and reflect the specified statutory data.\textsuperscript{390} In any event, once grain has been delivered in its entirety, the receipt shall be marked as "canceled" and include the date and name of the individual who canceled the same.\textsuperscript{391}

A public warehouse has an obligation to insure stored grain with a "reliable insurance company" and failure to do so triggers liability on the bond.\textsuperscript{392}

2. \textit{Case law}

There is at least one Kansas case of note, and its teaching is instructive. In \textit{Appalachian Insurance Co. v. Betts},\textsuperscript{393} Appalachian Insurance Company of Providence sued Betts and his surety arising out
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of a shortage of grain. Appalachian alleged that Commodity Credit Corporation had entered into grain storage agreements with Betts. Ultimately, upon withdrawal of the grain, a shortfall was discovered and demand was made upon Betts for the value of the shortage. Commodity Credit Corporation then made demand upon Appalachian for payment of the loss pursuant to an insurance policy that Appalachian had issued to cover certain risks in connection with the storage of grain. Appalachian paid the claim and then became subrogated to the rights of Commodity Credit Corporation against Betts and its surety.

The defendants moved to dismiss on the basis that federal courts have exclusive jurisdiction over the claim because of 15 U.S.C. § 714b(c). The statute essentially provided that Commodity Credit Corporation could only sue and be sued in federal court. The district court agreed with Appalachian. The district court's rationale rested on the fact that the statute provided that the Commodity Credit Corporation may sue or be sued in federal court; thus, “exclusive original jurisdiction” rested in those courts. The district court further reasoned that if the Commodity Credit Corporation was limited to federal court, so was the subrogee.

The Kansas Supreme Court reversed the district court's decision. The court reasoned that as Commodity Credit Corporation had been compensated for its entire loss, Commodity Credit Corporation no longer had any financial interest in the case and was no longer the real party in interest. Moreover, the court did not construe section 714b(c) as narrowly as the district court in light of the fact that federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and state courts, under the United States Constitution, are not so limited unless otherwise restricted by Congress. Yet, in federal diversity cases, the subrogee may stand on its own citizenship. It follows therefore, that the subrogee is not limited to the same forum to which its subrogor may have been limited. Consequently, the Kansas Supreme Court held Ap-
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palachian could maintain an action in state court even if its subrogor could not.\textsuperscript{408}

Previously, the Kansas Supreme Court held that a growing immature wheat crop is not such personal property as can be disposed of on attachment or execution.\textsuperscript{409} On another occasion, the Kansas Supreme Court determined that directors of a defunct elevator cannot be sued in their individual capacities by a creditor.\textsuperscript{410} Consequently, claims by a creditor of retention of an employee who is “unworthy of trust” by a creditor fail to state a cause of action.\textsuperscript{411}

The United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit has held that the Kansas statute and the bond will not protect persons who enter into transactions that do not involve the actual delivery of grain.\textsuperscript{412} Thus, when based upon record evidence that demonstrated unregistered receipts had been issued for grain that was not in the warehouse, no judgment could be had on the bond.\textsuperscript{413}

Finally, the Kansas Supreme Court has held that statutory terms shall be read into a bond; conditions that are not required by the statute are stricken as surplusage.\textsuperscript{414}

E. MINNESOTA

1. Statutes

(a) Grain buyers

Minnesota requires that the application for a grain buyer’s license must be filed with the Commissioner of Agriculture and licenses issued before any grain is purchased.\textsuperscript{415} Minnesota provides for three categories of grain buyer’s licenses: “private grain warehouse operator’s license,” “public grain warehouse operator’s license,” and “independent grain buyer’s license.”\textsuperscript{416} Buying grain without a license is a misdemeanor.\textsuperscript{417} Also, the applicant must identify “all grain buying locations owned or controlled” by the buyer and all vehicles the buyer uses to transport purchased grain.\textsuperscript{418}

\textsuperscript{408} Id.
\textsuperscript{409} Blattler v. Westerman, 286 P. 217, 218 (Kan. 1930) (citations omitted).
\textsuperscript{411} Speer, 624 P.2d at 961.
\textsuperscript{412} Cent. States Corp. v. Trinity Universal Ins. Co., 237 F.2d 875, 877-79 (10th Cir. 1956).
\textsuperscript{413} Cent. States Corp., 237 F.2d at 879.
\textsuperscript{415} Minn. Stat. Ann. § 223.17(1) (West 2003 & Supp. 2006); see also id. § 223.16(3) (defining “Commissioner”).
\textsuperscript{416} § 223.17(1)(a)-(c).
\textsuperscript{417} Id. § 223.18.
\textsuperscript{418} § 223.17(1).
Licenses must be renewed annually. The Commissioner is required to set fees for inspections at the necessary levels to pay the expense of enforcing and administering the program. The Minnesota legislature thereby created the Grain Buyers and Storage Account in the Agricultural Fund. Money collected pursuant to sections 223.15-.19 is to be paid to the state treasury, then credited to the Grain Buyers and Storage Account, where it will be appropriated by the Commissioner for administration and enforcement of sections 223.15-.22. The Commissioner may adopt rules to carry out the statutes.

At the same time, the Minnesota legislature has determined that prior to a grain buyer's license being issued, the applicant "must file with the commissioner a bond in a penal sum" to be prescribed by the Commissioner in an amount not less than required by the statutory formula. The statute is determined by the gross annual purchases and ranges in penal sums from $10,000 to $150,000. Nonetheless, first-time applicants for a grain buyer's licenses shall file $50,000 bonds which are to remain in effect for the first year of the licenses, and thereafter the bonds may be adjusted as set out in the statute. The bonds must be in favor of the State of Minnesota as the obligee.

The statute specifically contemplates that an applicant may, in lieu of a bond, deposit with the commissioner:

- cash, a certified check, a cashier's check, a postal, bank, or express money order, assignable bonds or notes of the United States, or an assignment of a bank savings account or investment certificate, or an irrevocable bank letter of credit . . . in the same amount as would be required for a bond.

With respect to a cash sale, which is part of a multiple shipment sale, the "buyer shall tender payment to the seller . . . not later than 10 days after the sale of that shipment . . . ." However, "when the entire sale is completed, payment shall be tendered not later than the close of business on the next day, or within 48 hours, whichever is later." For other cash sales of grain, the buyer shall tender pay-

---
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ment to the seller in cash, check, or wire or mail "funds to the seller's account in an amount of at least 80% percent of the value of the grain at the time of delivery." A grain buyer is statutorily required to "complete final settlement as rapidly as possible through ordinary diligence."432

According to Minnesota law, "no grain buyer may refuse to purchase grain from a producer solely because the producer is not bonded or is not licensed by the Commissioner ... ."433 However, "any producer who buys grain from other producers shall be licensed and bonded as required by [Chapter 223]."434

In order to facilitate the Commissioner's determination of the correct amount of the bond, a licensee must submit to the Commissioner annual financial statements that are prepared in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.435 The financial statement must include at least all of the following: a balance sheet; a statement of profit and loss; a statement of retained earnings; a statement of change in financial position; and a "statement of the dollar amount of grain purchased in the previous fiscal year ... ."436 At the same time, the financial statement must be accompanied by a "compilation report ... that is prepared ... in accordance with standards established by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants."437 Finally, the financial statement must be accompanied by a certification, under penalty of perjury, of the chief executive officer or a designee that the financial statement accurately depicts the financial condition for the period of time the statement is intended to cover.438 In the event the assets of the licensee exceed $500,000,000, a financial statement need not be filed, but the licensee must still provide the Commissioner with a certified net worth statement.439 The financial statements are considered "private or nonpublic data."440

If an applicant fails to furnish financial statements, the Commissioner may refuse to issue the license.441 If a licensee fails to furnish
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the financial statements, the Commissioner can either refuse to renew the license or suspend the license.\textsuperscript{442}

The statute authorizes the Commissioner to refuse to issue a license or renew it when the Commissioner, based on the financial statement or other financial information, determines that the licensee or applicant is not financially able to operate the business.\textsuperscript{443} The entity may, in turn, request an administrative hearing within fifteen days of the Commissioner's decision.\textsuperscript{444}

Minnesota also provides a statutory process for resolution of bond and contract claims.\textsuperscript{445} A producer who claims to be damaged by a breach of contract for the purchase of grain is to file a claim with the Commissioner.\textsuperscript{446} The claim must be filed within 180 days of the purported breach.\textsuperscript{447} If the Commissioner determines the claim is valid, the Commissioner may immediately suspend the license.\textsuperscript{448} The licensee must request an administrative hearing within fifteen days; otherwise the Commissioner is directed to revoke the license.\textsuperscript{449}

The bond required by this section shall provide for payment of any loss caused by the failure of the grain buyer to pay "upon the owner's demand, the purchase price of grain sold to the grain buyer . . . including loss caused by failure to pay within the time required."\textsuperscript{450} The legislature has determined that the bond "shall be conditioned upon the grain buyer being duly licensed" as set out in Chapter 223.\textsuperscript{451} The Commissioner is to determine whether the claim as filed is valid and notify the claimant of that decision.\textsuperscript{452} The aggrieved party is allowed to appeal the Commissioner's determination.\textsuperscript{453} When a contested case proceeding is not filed, or following the issuance by the Commissioner of a final order, "the surety company shall issue payment promptly to those claimants entitled to payment."\textsuperscript{454} The Commissioner can apply to the district court to appoint a trustee and manage the operations of the defaulting grain buyer.\textsuperscript{455} If the grain buyer is liable to multiple producers and the amount of the bond is insufficient to pay the claims of all of the producers, the bond proceeds "shall be
apportioned among the bona fide claimants." In any event, the bond is not cumulative from one licensing period to the next, and under no circumstances, shall the liability on the bond exceed its face value.

(b) Warehouse operators

Minnesota has also established a similar statutory scheme for the licensing of grain warehouse operators. An application for a grain warehouse operator's license shall be filed with the Commissioner prior to the purchase or storage of grain. The license must be renewed annually. The fees for inspections, certifications, and licenses shall be set at levels necessary to pay the costs of administering and enforcing the program. Such proceeds shall be deposited into the Grain Buyers and Storage Account that, in turn, shall be appropriated to the Commissioner for administration and enforcement. Like a grain dealer, an applicant for a public grain warehouse license shall file a bond in the penal sum prescribed by the Commissioner by administrative rule and shall be based upon all grain outstanding on grain warehouse receipts.

Grain storage warehouses must report to the Commissioner. By the tenth day of each month, the public grain warehouse operator must file with the Commissioner "a report showing the net liability of all grain outstanding on grain warehouse receipts as of the close of business on the last day of the preceding month." The report is used to determine the penal sum of the bond. Should a grain warehouse operator willfully neglect or refuse to file the report for two consecutive months, the Commissioner may suspend the license subject to an administrative hearing upon the operator's request.

The Minnesota legislature has determined that there is a duty on behalf of a grain warehouse operator to safely store records. The statute provides that every "public grain warehouse operator shall keep in a place of safety, complete and accurate records and accounts
relating to any grain warehouse operated." The statute identifies the exact information the grain warehouse operator is to keep. The statute enumerates what the record shall reflect:

- each commodity received and shipped daily, the balance remaining in the grain warehouse at the close of each business day,
- a listing of all unissued grain warehouse receipts in the operator's possession,
- a record of all grain warehouse receipts issued which remain outstanding and
- a record of all grain warehouse receipts which have been returned for cancellation.

Furthermore, the operator is to retain "receipts or other documents evidencing ownership of grain" for the duration of the liability or for at least a minimum of three years. At the same time, the operator must have in the warehouse "at all times" grain of a proper grade and "quantity to meet delivery obligations on all outstanding grain warehouse receipts."

A person claiming damage from the breach of a condition of a bond by a licensed warehouse operator must file a claim with the Commissioner setting forth the allegations. The claim must be filed within 180 days of the breach of the bond and, if the Commissioner believes the claim has validity, the Commissioner may immediately suspend the license of the operator, but the licensee may request an administrative hearing.

Minnesota further divides the bonds into "condition bonds." The first bond is defined as a "condition one bond." The bond is conditioned upon the liability of the operator who issued a grain warehouse receipt to the "depositor for the delivery of the kind, grade and net quantity of grain called for by the receipt."

The condition two bond is to provide for payment of losses caused by the grain buyer's failure to pay the purchase price of grain sold to the grain buyer once demanded by the owner. The bond is "conditioned upon the buyer being duly licensed." At the same time, the bond does not cover "any transaction which constitutes a voluntary extension of credit."
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Upon receiving notification of default, the Commissioner is to determine the validity of the claims and notify those parties that have filed claims. An aggrieved party may appeal the Commissioner's determination by commencing a contested case proceeding. In the absence of a contested case proceeding being initiated, or following the issuance of an order in a contested case proceeding, "the surety company shall issue payment to those claimants entitled to payment."  

To determine the amount of the liability on a condition one bond, "all grain owned or stored in the public grain warehouse shall be sold and the combined proceeds deposited in a special fund." Should liability exceed the special fund, the proceeds of the bond and the special fund are to be "apportioned among the valid claimants on a pro rata basis." Yet, the "bond is not cumulative from one licensing period to the next" and, in no event, shall the maximum liability of the bond exceed its face value for the licensing period.

2. Case law
(a) Statutory interpretation and the common law

Generally speaking, the "Statute of Frauds" as adopted by various jurisdictions in the United States requires that all contracts of indemnity and suretyship be in writing. In cases involving a surety, the requirement of a writing can be critical to the outcome of the case. In *Fidelity & Casualty Co. v. Lawlor*, the Cargill Elevator Company employed Lawlor as its agent for receipt of grain in Kindred, North Dakota, and Fidelity & Casualty Company of New York gave a bond to the Cargill Elevator Company against all acts of dishonesty or fraud committed by Lawlor.

At the end of the one-year period of the bond for which Cargill had paid, Lawlor then requested that Fidelity & Casualty Company renew its bond for Lawlor acting in its capacity as an agent at Clifford, North Dakota. The company consented by letter to this arrangement. Although the factual dispute that erupted is not clear from the context of the Minnesota Supreme Court's decision, the court stated that when the bond was sued upon, the bond was a continuous one and

---
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"bound the defendants to indemnify plaintiff against any loss by rea-
son of its guarantee to the elevator company of Lawlor's fidelity" in-
cluding any renewal or extension thereof. The Minnesota Supreme
Court further held that Lawlor's promise to indemnify Fidelity & Cas-
ualty Company was not within the statute of frauds. The court stated "as the defendants consented to continue on the counter bond
after Lawlor's transfer . . . it constituted a waiver of any rights they
might otherwise have had to claim that they were released by reason
of the change . . . ." The Minnesota Supreme Court has also determined in Eagle Roller-Mill Co. v. Dillman, that it is not a defense to the surety that
the scales and weights used for the measure of grain were never
proved and sealed by the sealer of weights and measures as required
by the Minnesota statutes.

In McBrady v. Monarch Elevator Co., the court decided "a pay-
ment induced by the fraud of the payee may be recovered." However, the proposition is one for the jury to resolve. In Central Metropolitan Bank v. Fidelity & Casualty Co., the court stated whether a party had actual or constructive notice of a particular fact
bearing on particular acts, which may or may not constitute a claim, a
jury question is engendered. Yet a bank, in the ordinary course as a lender, which receives bills
of lading as collateral, will not be charged with active supervision of
the grain company. Instead, the obligation falls to the surety: "It is
the business of the surety rather than the obligee to see that the prin-
cipal performs the duty which the surety has guaranteed." Thus,
as long as the bank acts in good faith, a bank is under "no active duty
to ascertain whether a loss was probable or to prevent the continuance
of the default . . . ."

According to the court's opinion in Torgerson v. Quinn-Sheper-
don Co., a demand and wrongful refusal to deliver constituted con-
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In the event of actual conversion, a demand for return of the property is not necessary.\textsuperscript{506}

As observed by the Minnesota Supreme Court, Minnesota, by adoption of its statutes, changed the common law rule regarding the intermingling of grain: "The storage of the oats with an agreement to return an equal amount in kind though not the identical oats deposited constitutes a bailment" and not a sale.\textsuperscript{507} As a result, the surety did not succeed on its argument that the elevator was not a warehouse because of the failure to give a bond and that therefore a sale was created (rather than a bailment as required by statute).\textsuperscript{508}

Likewise, under the proclamations of the Minnesota Supreme Court, a surety may not assert the defense that the warehouse failed to issue the prescribed storage ticket; the surety made itself responsible for the performance by the warehouse of all duties imposed upon it by statute.\textsuperscript{509}

Minnesota courts construe the bond, together with the statute requiring it, as the contract of the parties.\textsuperscript{510} The failure of the principal to comply with the statute would not be a defense as to the surety because the surety bond requires that the surety make good on the obligation of the principal to faithfully perform its duties and "in all respects, observe and comply with the laws of the state."\textsuperscript{511}

In addition, Minnesota case law reflects that parties have had their share of disputes wherein an action was brought to recover the value of certain grain and the defendant had undertaken conversion.\textsuperscript{512} Under Minnesota law, one who raises and harvests a crop of grain while in peaceful possession (even if wrongfully in possession) at the time of harvest has long been recognized as the owner of the grain.\textsuperscript{513} As a result, a tenant who harvested crop soon after the expiration of the right of redemption was the owner of the grain.\textsuperscript{514} It follows, therefore, that the landlord may maintain a cause of action for conversion of the landlord's share due from the tenant but held by another.\textsuperscript{515}
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The following discussion concerns one of the greatest dilemmas facing the courts, sureties, and claimants. The case is instructive even though the result has been changed by the legislature. In one case, St. Paul Fire and Marine Insurance Company commenced an interpleader action "to determine its liability under three public local grain warehouseman's bonds issued to Lafayette Farm Services, Inc." Following an audit by the Agricultural Marketing Service of the United States Department of Agriculture, Lafayette was found to have insufficient grain in storage to satisfy outstanding delivery obligations; Lafayette closed and the entity was placed into receivership. Ultimately, claims were served against St. Paul by various holders of storage receipts. The trial court found St. Paul liable under three bonds issued by St. Paul between 1967 and 1970.

One of the issues on appeal was whether St. Paul, as surety, was "liable under previous bonds which were in effect at the times Lafayette was in default." The record reflected that Lafayette had in fact been in a "short position" during previous bonding periods because it had concealed certain storage receipts that had been issued. As framed by the Minnesota Supreme Court, the issue of whether St. Paul's liability exceeded $140,000.00 (the penal sum of the bond in place during the year in which the default was discovered) depended upon whether the warehouseman's bonds that were renewed each year were to be viewed as a single continuing contract or as a separate contract. The court discussed the issue as follows:

If viewed as a continuing contract which is kept in force by the payment of annual premiums, then the surety's liability under the entire contract is limited to its specified amount regardless of when the default occurred. On the other hand, if the bonds are viewed as a series of separate contracts, then the surety is liable on each bond up to its stated limit for defaults which occur during the period each is in force, regardless of when the loss is actually discovered.
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After noting a split of authority among the jurisdictions, the Minnesota Supreme Court summarized the state of the case law: "many courts have concluded that each bond should be viewed as a separate undertaking by the surety to protect against the defaults of the principal which occur during that bonding period."

In response to St. Paul's argument that it should not be held liable on all three bonds because the bond protected only "against loss during the period," the Minnesota Supreme Court rejected the argument on the same basis that the identical argument had previously been rejected in a case by the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. The Tenth Circuit previously found that the surety was tied to the statute and the parties' agreement rather than the elements of the tort of conversion at common law. Once the statute was violated, the agreement was breached and the obligation on the bond was triggered. As the Minnesota Supreme Court concluded, "[w]e fully agree with the court's reasoning . . . [t]herefore, we hold that St. Paul is liable under its previous bonds for the defaults of its principal." At the same time, the Minnesota Supreme Court has stated that it will liberally construe "these types of surety bonds in order that they accomplish their statutory purpose of protecting persons who deal with a publicly licensed warehouseman in normal and usual transactions from sustaining loss because of the warehouseman's defaults." Albeit, the result in this case appears to have been legislatively changed.

Similarly, the Minnesota Supreme Court rejected St. Paul's argument that the bond did not protect the seller of grain. The court found no compelling distinction between a seller and a storer of grain. "A seller of grain places the same reliance on the warehouseman's faithful performance of its duties as does a storer of grain. If the warehouseman defaults in its duties, we see no logical reason for excluding the seller from the protection of the bond."
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(c) Coverage for independent truckers

The Minnesota Court of Appeals has determined that when an independent trucker buys grain from various farmers and resells it to an elevator, a buyer of grain is not liable to the producer for the purchase price under Minnesota Statute section 336.2-403. In Schulter v. United Farmers Elevator, the farmers did not receive payment for their grain and commenced suit on the bond of the elevator. The elevator maintained that it was a buyer in ordinary course under Minnesota Statute section 336.2-403. Under Minnesota law, the test of good faith is a subjective rather than an objective one. Thus, based upon the trucker's conduct over time, he had gained a reputation in the community that would qualify him as a "merchant" within the meaning of the Uniform Commercial Code as adopted in Minnesota. Moreover, "the elevator did a lien check on the trucker."

As a result, the Minnesota Court of Appeals concluded that since "the transaction between the trucker and the elevator was a sale with title shifting immediately, and because the elevator acted in good faith," the provisions of Minnesota Statute section 336.2-402(2) and (3) would apply to the facts of the case. As succinctly summarized by the Minnesota Court of Appeals, "the UCC mandates that the farmers not the elevator, bear the loss." At the same time, the Minnesota Court of Appeals rejected the argument that the Grain Storage Act would apply because there was no evidence in the record of a "storage agreement between the elevator and the farmers." Consequently, the trial court's grant of summary judgment was proper.

(d) How Chapter 223 works

The Minnesota Court of Appeals has described Minnesota Statute section 223.17 as creating two types of grain sales. One is a cash sale where payment is required contemporaneous with the sale.
The other type is a voluntary extension of credit sale.\textsuperscript{547} Voluntary extensions of credit will result in a loss of coverage under the grain buyer's bond.\textsuperscript{548}

Therefore, in the Minnesota Court of Appeal's view, it is irrelevant whether the seller allows the buyer a grace period "because the buyer must give written confirmation of credit to the seller before the close of the next business day or the transaction fails as a credit sale."\textsuperscript{549} In short, mere failure to meet the statutory test for a cash sale, does not automatically create a voluntary extension of credit with resultant loss of bond coverage.\textsuperscript{550} Thus, it follows that if there is a breach of a cash sale grain contract, the grain producer must file a claim with the Commissioner within 180 days of the breach before the producer can recover on the bond.\textsuperscript{551}

Moreover, the subsequent incorporation of a principal will not relieve a surety of its obligations under the bond.\textsuperscript{552} To allow a surety to avoid coverage based upon the subsequent incorporation of the principal would "thwart the legislature's intent in requiring a grain buyer to obtain a bond."\textsuperscript{553}

Multiple shipments are entitled to a different treatment under the Chapter. The Minnesota Court of Appeals has determined with respect to multiple shipments pursuant to Minnesota Statute section 223.17(5), that payment must be made "within ten days after each shipment, except that all payments are due within forty-eight hours after completion of the entire sale."\textsuperscript{554}

(e) Delivery as a defense to surety

In the commodity storage context, like other matters involving a surety, delivery of the bond is a critical component of suretyship and can constitute a defense by the surety.\textsuperscript{555} In Larson v. National Surety Co., the facts demonstrated that the bond had not been delivered at the time the claim arose.\textsuperscript{556} As noted by the Minnesota Supreme Court, "it is almost an elementary principle laid down in all of

\textsuperscript{547} Id.
\textsuperscript{548} Id.
\textsuperscript{549} Id. at 469. See also MINN. STAT. ANN. § 223.175 (West 2003) (specifying contents for written agreement).
\textsuperscript{550} Grain Buyer's Bond No. 877706-08624237, 486 N.W.2d at 469.
\textsuperscript{551} Id. at 470.
\textsuperscript{552} In re Claim Against the Grain Buyer's Bond No. MTC 182, 1995 Minn. App. LEXIS 825, at *3-*4 (Minn. Ct. App. June 20, 1995).
\textsuperscript{553} Grain Buyer's Bond No. MTC 182, 1995 Minn. App. LEXIS 825, at *4 (citation omitted).
\textsuperscript{554} In re Claim Against Grain Buyer's Bond of Mischel Grain & Seed, 591 N.W.2d 794, 798 (Minn. Ct. App. 1999) (emphasis in original).
\textsuperscript{556} Larson, 214 N.W. at 508 (citation omitted).
the books that a bond is not 'executed' until it is delivered... It
takes effect only from execution, on delivery, and, until delivery, it is
not a contract and is of no further value than the paper upon which it
written." Thus, because the bond issued had never been executed
and delivered in accordance with the law, it never became "operative
for any purpose because of its nondelivery."

(f) Evidentiary issues

Counsel would be well-advised to remember that in those states
that have an administrative-type proceeding for resolution of claims,
the rules of evidence may not fully apply before an administrative
body. Frequently, hearsay may be admitted in an administrative pro-
ceeding, if it is the type of evidence upon which a reasonably prudent
person would rely. The Minnesota Court of Appeals determined
that an administrative law judge did not err when it allowed docu-
mentary evidence in the form of invoices and receipts to be received as
evidence in support of a claim rather than live testimony.

F. MISSOURI

1. Statutes

Missouri Revised Statute section 276.406 provides that the Direc-
tor of the Missouri Department of Agriculture shall be responsible
for the approval of surety bonds required by sections 276.401-.581.
Moreover, the Director may promulgate rules and regulations to ac-
complish the efficient and effective enforcement of the enumerated
statutes. This power includes the authority to conduct administra-
tive hearings for the purposes of determining the liabilities of sureties
on bonds that have been issued on behalf of grain dealers.

(a) Grain dealers

Missouri law requires that a grain dealer file with the Director a
surety bond. The bond must be in favor of the State of Missouri, as

557. *Id.* at 506 (citation omitted).
558. *Id.* at 509.
*Iowa Code Ann.* § 17A.14(1) (West 2005) (“A finding shall be based upon the kind of
evidence on which reasonably prudent persons are accustomed to rely for the conduct of
their serious affairs, and may be based upon such evidence even if it would be inadmis-
sible in a jury trial”).
562. *Id.* § 276.406(1)(3).
563. *Id.* § 276.406(2)(4).
564. *Id.* § 276.406(2)(8).
565. *Id.* § 276.426(1).
trustee, "for the benefit of all persons selling grain to the grain dealer . . . ."566 The bond shall be conditioned upon the following factors:

1. The dealer as a buyer paying to the seller the agreed-upon purchase price of the grain purchased from the seller where title to said grain transferred from the seller to the buyer within the state of Missouri;567
2. The grain dealer's faithful performance of his duty as a licensed grain dealer . . . .568
3. The bond required by this section shall cover the agreed-upon minimum price of any valid minimum price contract . . . .569

The fourth factor is not so much a "factor" as it is a preclusion from coverage under the bond. The statute provides that the bond shall "not cover payment for any promissory note accepted by the seller of grain."570

Surety bonds issued under the chapter are effective from the date of issue and cannot be affected by the expiration of the license period and "continue in full force and effect until canceled."571 Unlike some jurisdictions, Missouri's statute specifically provides that the liability of the surety cannot be accumulated:

The continuous nature of a bond, however, shall in no event be construed to allow the liability of the surety under a bond to accumulate for each successive licensed period during which the bond is in force, but shall be limited in the aggregate to the amount stated on the bond . . . [or] appropriate endorsement or rider.572

The required bond is to be kept in force at all times; failure to maintain the bond is a basis for license revocation.573 Bonds may not be canceled without the prior written approval of the Director and the substitution of another bond.574

The statute also places specific requirements on the surety. Upon the Director's written demand for payment, the surety shall either pay over . . . the sum demanded up to the full face amount of the bond, or shall deposit the sum demanded in an interest-bearing escrow account at the highest

566. § 276.426(2).
567. § 276.426(2)(1).
568. § 276.426(2)(2).
569. § 276.426(2)(3).
570. § 276.426(2)(4).
571. § 276.426(3).
572. Id.
573. § 276.426(4).
574. Id.
rate of interest available. When a surety pays the director upon demand, the director shall either interplead the sum in court or hold an administrative hearing for the determination of the liability of the surety, and the validity of claims against the bond, and upon the conclusion thereof, the director shall distribute the bond proceeds accordingly.576

Yet, the surety maintains the right to appeal to the circuit court following the Director's determination.576 The surety's refusal to pay the sum demanded or failure to "deposit the sum demanded in an interest-bearing escrow account at the highest rate of interest available, shall be grounds for withdrawal of the surety's license and authorization to conduct business in this state . . ." with an additional penalty of twenty-five percent of the full face amount of the bond plus interest at the rate of nine percent or higher.577 Nonetheless, in the event the surety pays as demanded and the Director ultimately concludes that the surety is not liable, the Director is entitled to return to the surety the sum paid (or a proration of the sum paid plus all accumulated interest).578

No bond may be canceled without notice "via certified mail" to the Director at Jefferson City, Missouri, and the terms of the bond must so state.579 Cancellation of the bond does not affect the accrued liability of the surety or any liability which may accrue before the expiration of the statutory-required period prior to cancellation.580 Should the surety fail to follow the statutory procedures for cancellation, "the bond shall remain in full force and effect until properly canceled."581

Moreover, failure to obtain a substitute surety in the event of notice to the Director of the surety's intent to cancel shall result in the automatic revocation of the dealer's license if a new bond is not received "within thirty days of receipt of the notice of intent to cancel."582 If a substitute "bond is not received within sixty days of receipt of the notice of intent to cancel," the Director shall revoke the dealer's license and cause an inspection to take place with notice to sellers and claimants via the local news media.583

Contrary to other jurisdictions identified in these materials, Missouri recognizes the validity of a verbal or written surety bond binder

575. § 276.426(6).
576. Id.
577. Id.
578. Id.
579. § 276.426(7).
580. Id.
581. Id.
582. § 276.426(8).
583. Id.
as being legally effective. However, such agreements are not valid unless the bond meets the following conditions. First, “[t]he dealer or principal has paid, or has promised to pay the surety an agreed upon or tentatively agreed upon . . . premium” and the surety has agreed upon or “tentatively agreed upon premium or other consideration.”

Next, the surety must provide all of the following information: a bond number; the amount of the bond; and the bond’s effective date. The Director is free to reject a binder depending upon the particular circumstances.

The statute also allows for certificates of deposit and letters of credit in lieu of an actual surety bond. When the bank acts in lieu of a surety, it is subject to similar requirements as if it were acting as a surety. On the other hand, the statute allows a grain dealer with sufficient net worth to request relief from the Director that the dealer may only be required to post the minimum $20,000 bond.

A Missouri grain dealer is required to “make payment of the agreed-upon purchase price to the seller of grain upon delivery or demand of said seller or his authorized agent, unless a written grain purchase contract or valid deferred payment contract shall provide otherwise.” Under the Missouri statute, it is contemplated that a class I dealer shall promptly document the agreed-upon purchase price of the grain and shall make payment upon demand. In the event that a demand for payment is not made, a class I dealer has the option of entering the data onto a formal settlement sheet, which must occur within thirty days of delivery. If an account is entered on a formal settlement sheet, “payment shall be made the earlier of demand or one hundred eighty days from delivery.” If payment has not been made at the conclusion of the 180 day mark, a formal written contract shall be executed.

Likewise, a class II dealer is required to document the agreed upon purchase price of grain and make payment upon demand. A class II dealer is also required to make use of a formal settlement

---

584. § 276.426(9).
585. § 276.426(9)(1) (emphasis added).
586. § 276.426(9)(2)(a)-(c).
587. § 276.426(9)(2)(d).
588. Id. § 276.431(1)-(2).
589. § 276.431(3).
590. Id. § 276.441(1).
591. Id. § 276.461(1).
592. § 276.461(2).
593. Id.
594. Id.
595. Id.
596. § 276.461(3).
sheet if no demand for payment is made. Once the account is marked on a formal settlement sheet, payment must be made either upon demand or within 180 days of delivery, whichever first occurs. A class II dealer is prohibited from entering into any type of credit sales contract. Persons holding a class III, IV, V, or VI license are not to enter into any type of credit sales contract.

While a producer may make an oral demand from a dealer, the right to recover under a surety bond shall be based only upon a written demand to the surety. Recovery on the bond is not a person’s sole remedy and does not bar a subsequent “civil action based upon rights or obligations arising under the grain purchase contract.” Deferred price contracts are not eligible for recovery from the dealer’s surety bond. Deferred price contracts must contain a statement concerning the absence of bond coverage. The written contract must specifically state that the grain dealer is “not required to carry bond on the grain for the benefit of the seller . . . .”

With respect to deferred payment contracts, a class I dealer must notify the seller that the class I dealer is required to carry a bond on the grain for the benefit of the seller only for “twelve months from the date the contract was entered into,” and at the expiration of that time, “payment for the grain becomes a common claim against the dealer.” Nonetheless, should the grain dealer’s license be revoked by the Director “all deferred payment agreements executed within the twelve months prior to revocation shall be deemed unpaid obligations as of the effective date of the revocation and as such agreements are covered by the grain dealer’s bond.”

Minimum price contracts may also be entered into by a class I dealer. However, the written agreement must provide a statement that the “specified minimum price is covered under the dealer's bond for the benefit of the seller, for, and only for, twelve months from the date the contract was entered; and that payment for any subsequent price gains, if any, is not covered by the bond.” No other type of dealer may enter into minimum price contracts.

597. Id.
598. Id.
599. Id.
600. § 276.461(4).
601. § 276.461(5).
602. § 276.461(6).
603. § 276.461(7).
604. Id.
605. § 276.461(8).
606. § 276.461(9).
607. § 276.461(10).
608. Id.
609. Id.
Upon revocation of a license, all claims shall be filed with the Director against the former licensee and the surety company within 120 days after the date of the revocation. Failure to timely file a claim defeats recovery under the bond.

If the Director believes that a dealer is insolvent or "unable to satisfy the claims of all sellers," the Director may petition the circuit court for an ex parte order authorizing the Director to take control of the dealer and act as trustee. After taking possession, the Director shall give written notice of the action to the surety and any sellers as shown by the available records. The Director, acting as trustee, shall remain in possession "until such time as the dealer or the surety on the bond shall have satisfied the claims of all sellers" or when the circuit court orders the surrender of possession. While in possession, the Director is not authorized to operate the dealer's business nor is the Director liable for any claims that could have arisen from the non-operation of the dealer's facility.

(b) Warehouses

Missouri has also established the Director's authority to act under the Missouri Grain Warehouse Law. The Director's authority extends to conducting hearings on the liability of sureties that have filed bonds on behalf of licensed warehouses with the Department. Before a person may be issued a warehouse license, the person must file a bond (other than personal security) with the Director by a surety licensed to do business in Missouri. "The bond shall be in favor of the state of Missouri for the benefit of all persons storing grain ... conditioned upon the faithful performance of his duties as a public warehouseman relating to the storage of grain." Storage grain that has been priced is not covered by the warehouseman's bond. Grain deemed storage grain is covered by the bond.

The statute specifically describes what are not defenses upon the bond.

610. *Id.* § 276.491(6).
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617. § 411.070(2)(9).
618. *Id.* § 411.275(1).
619. *Id.*
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622. § 411.275(2).
Neither the issuance of warehouse receipts by a warehouseman to himself for grain owned in whole or in part by him; the commingling of grain owned by the warehouseman with grain stored for others or any violation by a warehouseman of this chapter or of the regulations . . . is a defense . . . .

Indeed, the bond must provide this information. The bond issued under Chapter 411 shall become effective on the date of issue and "shall not be affected by the expiration of the license . . . ." The bond continues in full force and effect until canceled. A warehouse, when using multiple bonds, "shall utilize the same corporate surety for all bonds required for the operation" of multiple warehouses.

Upon written demand by the Director for payment, the surety must either pay over the sum demanded up to the penal sum of the bond or deposit the funds in an interest bearing escrow account. Refusal or failure to pay on the behalf of the surety can result in onerous consequences.

Grain warehouse bonds are to contain similar provisions with respect to cancellation and substitution of bonds. Moreover, verbal or written surety bond binders are valid, provided, however, that the documents meet the statutory test.

Certificates of deposit and irrevocable letters of credit may be used to satisfy the requirement of a surety bond under Chapter 411. Chapter 411 also requires a bank, when acting as the surety, to obey the written demand of the Director.

Like the provision regarding grain dealers, the Director has similar authority, under the Grain Warehouse Law, upon learning of the insolvency of a grain warehouse. The Director is required to give written notice of the action to the surety and "holders of record." Similarly, the Director is authorized to retain possession until such time as the surety satisfies all the claims of the depositors. No

623. Id.
624. Id.
625. § 411.275(3).
626. Id.
627. § 411.275(5).
628. § 411.275(7).
629. Id.
630. § 411.275(8)-(9).
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632. Id. § 411.277(1)-(2).
633. § 411.277(3).
634. Id. § 411.519.
635. § 411.519(6).
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liability attaches to the Director's possession nor must the Director operate the facility.637

2. Case law
(a) The common law and the Missouri statutes

When a milling concern handles and stores grain products in the ordinary course of its business, it is not a warehouseman, either at common law or under the Missouri statutes, because the business is not engaged in the business of storing or receiving goods.638

As previously determined by the Supreme Court of Missouri, there is no basis for a lawsuit against the State of Missouri, the Missouri Department of Agriculture, or the Missouri Division of Grain Inspection for deficiencies purportedly committed by the State that trigger coverage under a surety's bond.639 As stated by the Missouri Supreme Court, "[i]f they are suable entities at all, they partake of the state's sovereign immunity."640 Moreover, the state's interest in bonding grain storage facilities is based upon a public interest in maintaining the food supply. "The statutes exist, not purely in the interest of persons in the grain trade, but principally because of the public's interest in an abundant food supply."641 It therefore follows that sovereign immunity was the exact type of doctrine to bar the instant claims against the public fisc.642

Under section 411.026(22), which defines interested person, when a company is acting as a custodian of pledged grain and is thereby compensated, the company is operating a public grain warehouse within the meaning of the statute.643 However, under the unique factual circumstances of State ex rel. Kruse v. SLT Warehouse Co., the Missouri Court of Appeals found that the surety was insulated from claims by virtue of section 411.491.644 The Missouri Court of Appeals demonstrated this conclusion by means of a hypothetical situation:

Suppose a grain dealer, after receiving grain from sundry producers, stores it in a public grain warehouse operated by a third party several miles away. A week later the grain dealer returns to the warehouse, presents the receipt, and demands the grain, which is surrendered by the warehouse. The grain

637. Id.
639. State ex rel. Mo. Dep't of Agric. v. McHenry, 687 S.W.2d 178, 180-81 (Mo. 1985).
640. State ex rel. Mo. Dep't of Agric., 687 S.W.2d at 181.
641. Id. at 182.
642. Id.
644. State ex rel. Kruse, 759 S.W.2d at 328.
dealer sells the grain but never pays the producers for it. Could it seriously be argued that the producers have any claim against the bond of the third party warehouseman? We believe the answer under § 411.491 is clearly no.\textsuperscript{645}

As the warehouse never assumed any contractual obligations with the claimants nor had any dealings with the claimants, "there was never an occurrence of any condition triggering liability to any claimant under appellants' public grain warehouseman's bond."\textsuperscript{646}

In another case, a corporate surety, as defendant, argued that because an elevator did not continue in business for 180 days, it had no further obligation under the bond.\textsuperscript{647} The Missouri high court rejected the argument, stating: "The bond by its terms, and by reason of the statutory requirements, continues in effect until terminated in the manner prescribed by law. No such termination is shown."\textsuperscript{648} As stated by the court, the circumstance, "even if established, makes no difference." Both the bond and the statute require the bond continue in effect until terminated as a matter of law.\textsuperscript{649}

(b) Trial practice

In the same case, the trial court was correct in rejecting testimony proffered by the surety, as an offer of proof, that "present and former officials of the Missouri Department of Agriculture . . . had consistently construed the governing statutes in accordance with" the surety's contention.\textsuperscript{650} The trial court had sustained an objection to the testimony.\textsuperscript{651}

While the Missouri Court of Appeals considered the testimony under the premise that the testimony should have been received "as evidence to show the construction placed on this statute by the officials in charge of its administration," the Missouri Supreme Court agreed with the trial court.\textsuperscript{652} The statute at the time did not allow the Department to serve as a tribunal for the adjudication of claims.\textsuperscript{653} As "[s]tatutory and contractual rights are to be adjudicated by the courts, not by bureaucrats," the testimony was properly ex-

---
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cluded.\textsuperscript{654} Albeit the result here appears to have been legislatively changed with respect to warehouses.\textsuperscript{655}

(c) Interest

The Missouri Supreme Court determined that claimants were entitled to interest from the time their demand was made, even if the interest would exceed the penal sum of the bond.\textsuperscript{656} In the Missouri Supreme Court's view, the "surety has the use of the money until payment is made and will receive a windfall if excused from paying interest."\textsuperscript{657}

(d) Attorney fees

Attorney fees are not guaranteed when a surety denies a claim. The Missouri Supreme Court has rejected the argument that claimants are entitled to attorney fees because of a surety's conduct in denying a claim.\textsuperscript{658} The court found "[b]ecause of the novelty of the point and the lack of authoritative construction, we are unwilling to say that the denial of payment was 'without just cause.'"\textsuperscript{659} Likewise, a surety's absence of a basis for denial of a claim will similarly not give rise to a claim for fees under the statute.\textsuperscript{660}

G. NEBRASKA

1. Statutes

(a) Grain dealers

Under Nebraska law, all grain dealers in the state must be licensed by the Public Service Commission.\textsuperscript{661} Nebraska also statutorily defined the required content of a grain dealer receipt.\textsuperscript{662} Licensing in Nebraska includes, \textit{inter alia}, the requirement of security that can be a bond issued by corporate surety companies.\textsuperscript{663}

\textsuperscript{654} Id.
\textsuperscript{655} Compare \textit{Id.} with \textit{Mo. ANN. STAT.} § 411.070(2)(9) (West 2001) (authorizing Director of the Missouri Department of Agriculture to conduct hearings and to adjudicate claims under chapters 411 and 536), \textit{with Mo. ANN. STAT.} § 276.501 (West Supp. 2006) (proceedings remain before circuit court).
\textsuperscript{656} \textit{State ex rel. Neese}, 706 S.W.2d at 859.
\textsuperscript{657} \textit{Id.} Nonetheless, section 411.275(6) can have a dramatic impact upon a surety that fails to perform as requested by the Director.
\textsuperscript{658} \textit{Id.} at 861.
\textsuperscript{659} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{660} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{662} \textit{Id.} § 75-904.
\textsuperscript{663} § 75-903(4).
The bond must be payable to the Public Service Commission “for the benefit of any producer or owner within this state who filed a valid claim arising from a sale to or purchase from a grain dealer.” The “security shall be furnished on the condition that the licensee will pay for any grain purchased on demand, not later than thirty days after the date of the last shipment of any contract.” The surety’s liability “shall cover purchases and sales made or arranged by the grain dealer” for the period of time in which the bond is in place.

The bond shall be “in continuous force and effect” until terminated by the surety. However, the surety’s liability is not accumulative for successive periods.

In the event the conditions of the security have been violated, the Commission may demand the security be forfeited and hold the proceeds of the security in an interest-bearing trust account until all claims have been determined. The Commission may also revoke or suspend the license for failure to comply with the Act or any regulations under the Act.

Should claims exceed the security, the “security shall be distributed pro rata among the claimants.” If the security is not turned over in ten days, the Commission may file suit and recover the security plus interest from the date the demand for the security was made “if the court finds that any claim determined by the commission against the grain dealer’s security was valid.”

(b) Warehouses

Nebraska has also adopted a Grain Warehouse Act. Grain warehouses are subject to the jurisdiction of the Public Service Commission. The term “warehouse” means “any grain elevator, mill, grist mill, building, or receptacle in which grain is held in storage for more than ten consecutive days.”

---
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A JURISDICTIONAL SURVEY

Nebraska's statute also attempts to reach those sales that take place beyond its borders. A grain “warehouseman” is a person or entity that receives or offers to store the grain of another for consideration or receives grain for shipment to other points for storage, consignment, or resale, either in or out of the state.\textsuperscript{676}

No person shall act as a warehouseman without obtaining a license.\textsuperscript{677} Note that additional examinations may be performed by the Commission, and the Commission may charge for such examination only when the examination was a follow-through on “irregularities from the previous examination or if financial conditions warrant additional examinations.”\textsuperscript{678}

The statute provides the Commission with the authority to share data with the “United States Government or any of its agencies, including the Commodity Credit Corporation . . .”\textsuperscript{679} Likewise, the Commission may enter into agreements with regulators in bordering states for examination or licensing purposes; however, the Commission “shall assume all jurisdiction over any warehouseman headquartered in Nebraska regarding . . . warehouse activity.”\textsuperscript{680} Yet, a warehouseman “headquartered and licensed in another state which acquires facilities in Nebraska is under the jurisdiction of the headquarter state . . ..”\textsuperscript{681}

As part of the application process, each applicant must submit to a criminal record background check and fingerprinting.\textsuperscript{682} The application must be accompanied by an “audited or reviewed fiscal year-end financial statement” prepared as required by the statute.\textsuperscript{683} The application must also reveal the “location of the warehouse to be used by the applicant, its relation to railroad trackage, its capacity, its general plan and equipment, and its ownership.”\textsuperscript{684} The Nebraska annual license fee is driven by the storage capacity in bushels.\textsuperscript{685} Additional storage capacity cannot be added without Commission approval.\textsuperscript{686} The Commission can request additional financial documents.\textsuperscript{687}
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\textsuperscript{677} Id. § 88-527(1).
\textsuperscript{678} § 88-527(2).
\textsuperscript{679} § 88-527(3).
\textsuperscript{680} § 88-527(6).
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Applicants are also to submit "a bond, a certificate of deposit, an irrevocable letter of credit, United States bonds or treasury notes, or other public debt obligations of the United States . . . " The security is to be in an amount required by the Commission, but shall not be less than $25,000, and shall run to the State of Nebraska for the benefit of each person who stores grain in such warehouse and of each person who holds a check for purchase of grain stored in such warehouse which was issued by the warehouse licensee not more than five business days prior to the cutoff date of operation of the warehouse, which shall be the date the commission officially closes the warehouse.

One license may be used to operate multiple facilities if certain conditions are met. Licenses must be renewed annually. The Commission also has the authority to set storage rates and inspect the books and records of a licensee.

A surety must be licensed to do business in the state. The security is conditioned upon sufficient insurance to cover losses to the grain arising from "combustion, fire, lightning, and tornado." Next, the security is conditioned upon delivery of grain in exchange for the receipt. Finally, the security is conditioned upon faithful performance of all lawful provisions regarding the storage of grain.

Like some other jurisdictions, the statute specifically addresses the cumulative nature of the security. "The liability of the surety on a bond shall not accumulate for each successive license period which the bond covers. The liability of the surety shall be limited to the amount stated on the bond or on an appropriate rider or endorsement to the bond."

Payment for grain is to be made upon demand of the seller, unless a written or oral contract specifies otherwise. At the time of delivery to the warehouse, each licensee is to provide a scale ticket to the owner or consignee of the grain, unless the grain arrived by water or rail. Within fifteen days following demand, the warehouse is to is-

---

688. *Id.* § 88-530.
689. *Id.*
690. *Id.* § 88-531.
691. *Id.* § 88-532.
692. *Id.* § 88-541.
693. *Id.* § 88-542.
694. *Id.* § 88-530.
695. *Id.*
696. *Id.*
697. *Id.*
698. *Id.*
699. *Id.* § 88-534.
700. *Id.* § 88-535.
sue either a negotiable or nonnegotiable receipt.\textsuperscript{701} Commission approval is required for the issuance of duplicate negotiable receipts in the event the document is lost (provided that a bond is delivered).\textsuperscript{702} A warehouse licensee can issue receipts to itself for grain that it owns, but such receipts must be registered with the Commission.\textsuperscript{703}

When presented with the receipt and payment for lawful charges, the grain represented by the receipt must be delivered immediately.\textsuperscript{704} If a partial delivery of a unit represented by a receipt is made, the partial delivery must be shown upon the face of the receipt and acknowledged by the recipient.\textsuperscript{705} Failure to deliver any grain within twenty-four hours of demand subjects the warehouse and the security to damages of one cent per bushel per day.\textsuperscript{706} The statute sets out special rules for terminal delivery.\textsuperscript{707} However, both parties have the right to terminate the storage agreement.\textsuperscript{708}

In Nebraska, it is a felony to issue a warehouse receipt for grain that was not actually received.\textsuperscript{709} The statute creates a presumption regarding missing grain. "If at any time there is less grain in a warehouse than outstanding receipts issued for grain, there shall be a presumption that the warehouse . . . has wrongfully removed grain . . . or has issued receipts for grain not actually received, and has violated this section."\textsuperscript{710} Apparently, no reported cases exist challenging the constitutionality of the presumption. A strong argument could be made that the presumption required by the statute violates a defendant's right to due process.\textsuperscript{711} The Commission is also allowed to as-

\begin{itemize}

\item \textsuperscript{701} Id. § 88-536(1).
\item \textsuperscript{702} Id. § 88-537. See also id. § 88-538 (requiring that the receipt be marked duplicate).
\item \textsuperscript{703} § 88-536(3).
\item \textsuperscript{704} Id. § 88-540.
\item \textsuperscript{705} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{706} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{707} Id.
\item \textsuperscript{708} Id. § 88-544.
\item \textsuperscript{709} Id. § 88-543. Other jurisdictions could reach the same result by means of an allegation of criminal fraud or false pretenses. See e.g., IOWA CODE ANN. 714.8(1) (West 2003) (defining a criminal fraudulent practice as any person who "[m]akes, tenders or keeps for sale any warehouse receipt, bill of lading, or any other instrument purporting to represent any right to goods, with knowledge that the goods represented by such instrument do not exist"). Nebraska's statute appears to be unique among the jurisdictions under examination, as the statute actually declares the act to be a felony regardless of the value involved.
\item \textsuperscript{710} NEB. REV. STAT. ANN. § 88-543.
\item \textsuperscript{711} See Sandstrom v. Montana, 442 U.S. 510 (1979) (holding that a presumption instruction in a criminal trial violated the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment because in a criminal case the burden is on the government to prove every element of the case beyond a reasonable doubt).
\end{itemize}
sessed a civil penalty,\footnote{NEB. REV. STAT. ANN. § 88-543.01 (LexisNexis Supp. 2005). Of course, counsel will want to contemplate whether the civil penalty and the imposition of a criminal penalty for the same act violates the defendant's right to be free from successive punishment for the same act. U.S. CONST. amend. V, and related state constitutional equivalents.} while the warehouse is liable for all damages suffered by the violation of the Grain Warehouse Act.\footnote{Id. § 88-545 (LexisNexis 2003).}

Should the need arise, the Commission also has the authority to suspend or revoke the license.\footnote{Id. § 88-546.} The Commission's power also allows it to close a warehouse.\footnote{Id. § 88-547.} As part of the liquidation authority, the Commission may distribute (either in grain or proceeds) the remaining grain to all depositors on a pro rata basis.\footnote{§ 88-547(1).} If a shortage exists, the Commission may require that all or part of the security be forfeited for subsequent distribution by the Commission following a hearing.\footnote{§ 88-547(2).} The Commission is also authorized to commence a suit in district court for the benefit of the depositors.\footnote{§ 88-547(3).} In any event, the depositors are paid before the licensee's claims are recognized.\footnote{§ 88-547(1).}

The warehouse must notify the depositors, in writing, of the amount and type of grain stored.\footnote{Id. § 88-549.} Failure to do so is a misdemeanor.\footnote{Id.}

2. Case law

(a) Contract formation

Courts generally will not permit a party to avoid a contract into which the party has entered on the grounds that he or she did not attend to its terms, that he or she did not read the document which was signed and supposed it was different from its terms, or that it was a mere form.\footnote{In re Claims Against Atlanta Elevator, Inc., 268 Neb. 598, 617, 685 N.W.2d 477, 493 (2004) (citing Omaha Nat'l Bank v. Goddard Realty, Inc., 210 Neb. 604, 316 N.W.2d 306 (1982)).}

Article Two of the Uniform Commercial Code generally governs contracts involving the sale of grain.\footnote{Atlanta Elevator, Inc., 268 Neb. at 618, 685 N.W.2d at 493.} A contract will not fail for indefiniteness under section 2-305(1) of the Uniform Commercial Code.

\footnote{NEB. REV. STAT. ANN. § 88-545 (LexisNexis Supp. 2005). Of course, counsel will want to contemplate whether the civil penalty and the imposition of a criminal penalty for the same act violates the defendant's right to be free from successive punishment for the same act. U.S. CONST. amend. V, and related state constitutional equivalents.}

\footnote{Id. § 88-545 (LexisNexis 2003).}

\footnote{Id. § 88-546.}

\footnote{Id. § 88-547.}

\footnote{§ 88-547(1).}

\footnote{§ 88-547(2).}

\footnote{§ 88-547(3).}

\footnote{§ 88-547(1).}

\footnote{Id. § 88-549.}

\footnote{Id.}


\footnote{Atlanta Elevator, Inc., 268 Neb. at 618, 685 N.W.2d at 493.}
even if the price is unsettled. "In such a case the price is a reasonable price at the time for delivery if . . . nothing is said as to price."\textsuperscript{724}

(b) Inapplicability of the discretionary function

In \textit{D.K. Buskirk & Sons, Inc. v. State},\textsuperscript{725} nineteen plaintiffs brought suit against the Nebraska Public Service Commission alleging negligent regulation of Quality Processing, Inc. ("QPI"), a grain dealer.\textsuperscript{726} The gravamen of the plaintiffs' allegation was that the Public Service Commission was negligent in its duty to enforce the Nebraska Grain Warehouse Act and the Nebraska Grain Dealer Act.\textsuperscript{727} When QPI filed for bankruptcy in February of 1990, the plaintiffs, as a group, suffered losses in excess of $400,000.\textsuperscript{728} QPI had not been licensed by the Public Service Commission as a grain warehouse pursuant to the Grain Warehouse Act and "was not permitted to accept grain for storage."\textsuperscript{729}

The district court sustained the state's motion for summary judgment on the basis of the "discretionary function exemption" to the Nebraska State Tort Claims Act.\textsuperscript{730} The Nebraska Court of Appeals reversed the order of the district court.\textsuperscript{731} The Nebraska Supreme Court affirmed the decision of the court of appeals "albeit on different grounds" from the court of appeals.\textsuperscript{732}

The gist of the state's motion for summary judgment was that in 1989 the Grain Warehouse Director for the Public Service Commission learned that QPI was engaged in the storage of beans as a grain dealer.\textsuperscript{733} Under Nebraska law, as a grain dealer, it could purchase grain from producers to sell but was not "permitted to accept grain for storage."\textsuperscript{734}

In an effort to bring QPI into compliance with state law, the Commission arranged for the appropriate forms to be sent to QPI.\textsuperscript{735} Also, two inspectors were sent to inspect two different storage facilities used

\textsuperscript{724} \textit{Id.} (citing Neb. U.C.C. § 2-305(1)(Reissue 2001)).  
\textsuperscript{725} D.K. Buskirk & Sons, Inc. v. State, 252 Neb. 84, 560 N.W.2d 462 (1997).  
\textsuperscript{728} \textit{Id.}  
\textsuperscript{729} \textit{Id.}  
\textsuperscript{730} \textit{Id.} at 87, 560 N.W.2d at 465 (citing \textit{Neb. Rev. Stat.} § 81-8, 219(1)).  
\textsuperscript{731} \textit{Id.} at 88, 560 N.W.2d at 465.  
\textsuperscript{732} \textit{Id.} at 94-95, 560 N.W.2d at 469.  
\textsuperscript{733} \textit{Id.} at 85-86, 560 N.W.2d at 464.  
\textsuperscript{734} \textit{Id.} at 85, 560 N.W.2d at 464.  
\textsuperscript{735} \textit{Id.} at 86, 560 N.W.2d at 464.
by QPI. A public service staff accountant was directed to contact QPI’s accountant to inquire as to the status of the application. QPI later informed the Public Service Commission that it had misplaced the application; another set was sent. Ultimately, QPI’s application was submitted to the Public Service Commission; however, QPI failed to provide the necessary financial statements. QPI never corrected the omission nor did it purchase all the grain it was holding in storage.

The last straw occurred when the Public Service Commission was informed by a deputy sheriff that QPI issued insufficient funds checks. Over two weeks later, the Public Service Commission began proceedings for the suspension of QPI’s grain dealer license. During this entire period, the Public Service Commission allowed QPI to continue to function as a grain warehouse without a license.

Thereafter, following the suspension of its license, QPI failed. Thirty-four businesses and individuals filed forty-four claims with the Public Service Commission seeking a share of QPI’s grain dealer’s bond. Only eight of the claims were allowed, and the bond covered only half of the allowed claims. The majority of the claims were denied for one of two reasons. Either the claim was submitted untimely or, in the alternative, the claim was based on a contract for grain storage and not for the sale of grain. The court stated “QPI’s bond could reimburse only those contracts in which QPI acted in its capacity as a grain dealer.” The bond did not cover losses caused by QPI’s conduct as a “unlicensed grain warehouse.” Thus, the nineteen individual plaintiffs in D.K. Buskirk & Sons, Inc. were those individuals or entities whose claims were denied.

736. Id.
737. Id.
738. Id.
739. Id.
740. Id.
741. Id.
742. Id.
743. Id.
744. Id.
745. Id.
746. Id.
747. Id., 560 N.W.2d at 464-65.
748. Id., 560 N.W.2d at 465.
749. Id.
750. Id. at 86-87, 560 N.W.2d at 465.
751. Id. at 87, 560 N.W.2d at 465.
752. Id.
The state’s summary judgment motion was based upon “the discretionary function exception to the State Tort Claims Act.” The district court granted the summary judgment and stated, in part:

No rules or regulations have been established by the PSC setting forth a procedure to be used in issuing a grain warehouse license to an applicant. No rule or regulation exists which says that an application must be filled out and received by the PSC within ‘x’ number of days after the PSC becomes aware that a person is operating without the appropriate license. No rule or regulation authorizes [PSC] to allow a person to operate as a grain warehouse while the application process is ongoing. Conversely, no rule or regulation prohibits [PSC] from trying to work with an operator while attempting to bring it into compliance.

As the Nebraska Supreme Court stated, “[w]hen a statute does not prescribe the action to be taken, leaving the agency to make a judgment and this judgment is based upon social, economic or political considerations, it will be protected by the discretionary function.” The Nebraska State Tort Claims Act immunizes conduct “based upon an act or omission of an employee of the state . . . based upon the exercise or performance or the failure to exercise or perform a discretionary function or duty on the part of a state agency or an employee of the state, whether or not the discretion is abused.”

Only when the facts are undisputed is the applicability of the discretionary function exemption a question of law. Consequently, the Nebraska Supreme Court found the court of appeals erred in reversing the district court’s judgment on the grounds that a genuine issue of material fact had been presented, as both sides acknowledged the facts were undisputed.

However, the Nebraska Supreme Court continued in its analysis and found the Grain Warehouse Act contained a nondiscretionary term when it commanded that the Public Service Commission “shall enforce the Grain Warehouse Act . . . and ‘no person shall operate a warehouse nor act as a warehouseman without a license issued pursuant to the Grain Warehouse Act . . . .” The plaintiffs argued that the plain language of the statute made its terms mandatory and, as a result, the Public Service Commission was without discretion in its

753. Id.
754. Id.
755. Id. at 87-88, 560 N.W.2d at 465 (citations omitted).
756. Id. at 89, 560 N.W.2d at 466 (quoting Neb. Rev. Stat. § 81-8,219(1)(a)).
757. Id. at 90, 560 N.W.2d at 467.
758. Id. at 91, 560 N.W.2d at 467.
duty to not allow QPI to act as a grain warehouse in the absence of the license.\textsuperscript{760} Thus, “a statute prescribes a clear course of conduct” for the Public Service Commission.\textsuperscript{761} Consequently, “the discretionary function exemption is inapplicable.”\textsuperscript{762} In short, the statute mandates that the Public Service Commission not allow an unlicensed grain warehouse to operate.\textsuperscript{763}

(c) How the statute works

On a different occasion, the Nebraska Supreme Court determined, pursuant to Nebraska Revised Statute section 75-905, that no seller of grain can have recourse to a grain dealer’s security, unless the seller demands payment from the grain dealer within ten days of the date of delivery and upon non-payment notifies the Commission within ten days of the apparent loss to be covered under the terms of the security.\textsuperscript{764} Furthermore, the statute provides that when grain is delivered in multiple shipments but comprised of a single contract, the seller must notify the Commission of any apparent loss to be covered by the security within forty-five days of the date of the first shipment.\textsuperscript{765} Accordingly, the seller had no recourse to the security when the statute was not followed.\textsuperscript{766}

The Nebraska Supreme Court also concluded that under the Nebraska Grain Warehouse Act, the Nebraska Public Service Commission had jurisdiction over public warehouses as limited by the statutory scheme set out in Nebraska Revised Statute Chapter 88, Article 5.\textsuperscript{767} Nebraska Revised Statute section 88-513(3) provides the Commission the authority to take title to all grain stored and distribute the same on a pro rata basis to all owners.\textsuperscript{768} The distribution can be made either in the form of grain or proceeds from the sale of grain.\textsuperscript{769} In the alternative, the Commission may bring “a suit . . . for the benefit of owners, depositors, or storers of grain.”\textsuperscript{770} However, in-

\textsuperscript{760} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{761} \textit{Id.} at 94, 560 N.W.2d at 468.
\textsuperscript{762} \textit{Id.} (citation omitted).
\textsuperscript{763} \textit{Id.}, 560 N.W.2d at 469.
\textsuperscript{764} \textit{Fecht v. Quality Processing, Inc.}, 244 Neb. 522, 523-24, 508 N.W.2d 236, 237 (1993) (citing \textit{NEB. REV. STAT.} § 75-905(1)(a)-(c) (Reissue 1990)).
\textsuperscript{765} \textit{Quality Processing, Inc.}, 244 Neb. at 524-25, 508 N.W.2d at 237-38 (citing \textit{NEB. REV. STAT.} § 75-905(2) (Reissue 1990)).
\textsuperscript{766} \textit{Id.} at 525, 508 N.W.2d at 238.
\textsuperscript{768} \textit{Complaint of Fecht}, 216 Neb. at 540, 344 N.W.2d at 639 (quoting \textit{NEB. REV. STAT.} § 88-515(3) (Reissue 1981)).
\textsuperscript{769} \textit{Id.}
\textsuperscript{770} \textit{Id.} (quoting \textit{NEB. REV. STAT.} § 88-515(3) (Reissue 1981)).
demnitors on the bond have no standing before the Public Service Commission.\textsuperscript{771}

(d) Interest

The Nebraska Supreme Court has concluded that the producer delivering grain to a grain warehouse is entitled to interest from the date of the last delivery of the grain.\textsuperscript{772}

(e) Surety law

While not expressly decided under either the Nebraska Grain Warehouse Act or the Nebraska Grain Dealer Act, the Nebraska Supreme Court previously found, with respect to a dispute between an elevator company and a railroad, that an indemnity bond executed by an elevator company to protect carriers from losses occasioned by the delivery of grain was not breached by a proper delivery of a consignment nor did the bond protect the carrier from loss resulting from its own negligence or mistakes.\textsuperscript{773}

Furthermore, "pro tanto" discharge does not exist under Nebraska law.\textsuperscript{774} Nevertheless, the doctrine of subrogation will be recognized in Nebraska.\textsuperscript{775} However, the surety cannot collect attorney fees against the indemnitors.\textsuperscript{776}

(f) Administrative procedure and the due process claim

Given the administrative-type hearings that take place to resolve the claims before a public agency, the elimination of cross-examination does not constitute a deprivation of due process.\textsuperscript{777}

(g) Appellate practice

In Nebraska, the rules of error preservation apply. Failure to challenge an evidentiary finding from an administrative-type hearing will result in waiver of the claim on the appeal in the absence of as-

\textsuperscript{771} Id. at 541, 344 N.W.2d at 640.
\textsuperscript{775} Omaha Grain Exch., 103 Neb. at 824-25, 174 N.W. at 427-28.
\textsuperscript{777} In re Claims Against Atlanta Elevator, Inc., 268 Neb. 598, 620, 685 N.W.2d 477, 495 (2004).
assignment of error and a specific argument in the brief of the party alleging the error.\textsuperscript{778}

Likewise, Nebraska appellate courts will defer to an administrative agency's findings of fact. A finding will not be disturbed by an appellate court unless the finding was "arbitrary or unreasonable."\textsuperscript{779}

(h) Statutory interpretation

With respect to statutory construction in this arena, the doctrine of in pari materia applies.\textsuperscript{780}

H. NORTH DAKOTA

1. Statutes

(a) Grain warehouses

Under North Dakota law, before any license may be issued to a public warehouseman, the applicant must file a bond that must be in a sum of not less than $5,000, be continuous, and run to the State of North Dakota.\textsuperscript{781} The bond must be conditioned upon the faithful performance of the licensee's duties, compliance with the provisions of law and rules of the Public Service Commission, and specify the location of each warehouse covered by the bond.\textsuperscript{782} Failure to keep the grain insured against specified risks will result in suspension of the license.\textsuperscript{783}

The bond must be for the specific purpose of "protecting the holders of outstanding receipts" and cover the costs incurred by the Commission in the event of a licensee's insolvency.\textsuperscript{784} However, the bond does not accrue to the benefit "of any person entering into a credit-sale contract with a public warehouseman."\textsuperscript{785}

The liability of the surety on the bond may accumulate "for each successive annual license renewal period during which such bond is in force but, for losses during any annual license renewal period, shall be limited in the aggregate to the bond amount stated or changed by appropriate endorsement or rider."\textsuperscript{786} The Commission is empowered to require regular reports from the warehouse.\textsuperscript{787} In lieu of a surety

\textsuperscript{778} Atlanta Elevator, Inc., 268 Neb. at 603-04, 685 N.W.2d at 484 (citing Misle v. HJA, Inc., 267 Neb. 375, 382, 674 N.W.2d 257, 263 (2004)).
\textsuperscript{779} Id.
at 610, 685 N.W.2d at 488.
\textsuperscript{780} Id. at 606, 685 N.W.2d at 486 (citations omitted).
\textsuperscript{781} N.D. CENT. CODE § 60-02-09(1)-(3) (2003).
\textsuperscript{782} § 60-02-09(4)-(5). \textit{See also id.} § 60-02-01(1).
\textsuperscript{783} Id. §§ 60-02-35 to -35.1.
\textsuperscript{784} § 60-02-09(6)(a)-(b).
\textsuperscript{785} § 60-02-09(7).
\textsuperscript{786} § 60-02-09(8).
\textsuperscript{787} Id. § 60-02-24.
bond, the Commission may accept cash, negotiable instruments, or a
bond executed by personal sureties if the Commission believes it will
protect the holders of outstanding receipts.788

The statute provides the means by which a surety bond may be
canceled. The surety is released from future liability ninety days after
notice is given to the Commission.789 Failure to have security and
insurance in place will result in suspension and may result in revoca-
tion of the license.790 Statutory requirements exist for the closure791
or transfer of a warehouse.792

The statute does not require that the surety information be
posted. Instead, only the license must be posted.793

North Dakota statutorily defines the content of scale tickets.794
In the event stored grain is purchased by the warehouse, a specific
receipt is required, the format for which is set out in the statute.795
Warehouse receipt and documentation requirements are denominated
per the Code.796 The storage contract must be on the receipt as
well.797 Failure to issue a receipt or the issuance of an incorrect re-
cipient is a misdemeanor.798 A warehouse may include a covenant
against liens in the warehouse receipt.799 In any event, a warehouse is
liable to the owner of the grain to deliver the exact "kind, grade, qual-
ity, and quantity of grain called for by the warehouse receipt."800 The
receiptholder has a "first priority lien" on both the grain contained in
the warehouse and grain owned by the warehouse.801 The lien is pre-
ferred over the liens and security interests of other creditors regard-
less of the time in which the creditor's lien attached.802

The state also tightly regulates credit-sales contracts. The con-
tracts may only be entered into as allowed and as defined by the
statute.803

788. § 60-02-09(8).
789. Id. § 60-02-09.1.
790. Id. § 60-02-10.1.
791. Id. §§ 60-02-39, 60-02-41.
792. Id. § 60-02-40.
793. Id. § 60-02-10.
794. Id. § 60-02-11.
795. Id. § 60-02-13.
796. Id. §§ 60-02-14, 60-02-16 (2003 & Supp. 2005). See also id. § 60-02-23.
797. Id. § 60-02-17.
798. Id. § 60-02-21.
799. Id. § 60-02-18.
800. Id. § 60-02-22.
801. Id. § 60-02-25.1. See also id. § 60-02-36.
802. § 60-02-25.1.
803. Id. § 60-02-19.1.
North Dakota, like some other jurisdictions, provides that delivery of grain to a warehouse constitutes a bailment. As such, the grain is exempt from execution, except in an action by the owner of the subject grain. The statute also defines how storage contracts terminate and the required notice to be provided to the owner. If the storage contract is renewed, a new receipt must issue.

Insolvent warehouses are subject to coverage in a different Chapter. The provisions are very similar to those concerning North Dakota grain buyers, which are discussed infra. Insolvency is broadly defined. "A licensee is insolvent when the licensee refuses, neglects, or is unable upon proper demand to make payment for grain purchased or marketed by the licensee or to make redelivery or payment for grain stored."

Upon the insolvency of a warehouse, the Commission is appointed trustee of the warehouse. In this proceeding, the surety must be joined. The trust includes various assets, claims, and property of an insolvent grain warehouse. The trust consists of the following assets:

1. The grain in the warehouse of the insolvent warehouseman or the proceeds as obtained through the sale of such grain.
2. The proceeds, including accounts receivable, from any grain sold from the time of the filing of the claim that precipitated an insolvency until the commission is appointed trustee must be remitted to the commission and included in the trust fund.
3. The proceeds of insurance policies upon grain destroyed in the elevator.
4. The claims for relief, and proceeds therefrom, for damages upon any bond given by the warehouseman to ensure faithful performance of the duties of a warehouseman.
5. The claim for relief, and proceeds therefrom, for the conversion of any grain stored in the warehouse.
6. Unencumbered accounts receivable for grain sold prior to the filing of the claim that precipitated an insolvency.

804. Id. § 60-02-25.
805. Id.
806. Id. § 60-02-30.
807. Id. § 60-02-31.
808. Id. § 60-02-32.
810. See infra § III(H)(1)(B) and accompanying text.
812. Id. § 60-04-03.
813. Id. § 60-04-03.3.
814. Id. § 60-04-03.1.
7. Unencumbered equity in grain hedging accounts.
8. Unencumbered grain product assets.\textsuperscript{815}

The statute specifically provides that grain on hand is to be sold, and the proceeds are to be included in the trust fund.\textsuperscript{816} The Commission has the authority to marshal the trust assets\textsuperscript{817} and prosecute or compromise claims.\textsuperscript{818}

The statute restricts the remedies of receiptholders by barring separate claims for relief upon the warehouse’s bond unless certain exceptions are met.\textsuperscript{819} The receiptholder must, after notice, timely file a claim or the claim may be barred.\textsuperscript{820}

(b) Grain buyers

Grain buyers are also regulated by the Commission\textsuperscript{821} and are required to be licensed.\textsuperscript{822} Similar to a warehouse, the grain buyer, as part of the licensing process, must provide a bond\textsuperscript{823} and financial statements.\textsuperscript{824} Like the warehouse bond, the grain buyer’s bond must “run to the State of North Dakota for the benefit of all persons selling grain to or through the grain buyer.”\textsuperscript{825} The grain buyer’s bond is conditioned upon the licensee faithfully performing his duties in compliance with the law and regulations concerning grain buyers.\textsuperscript{826}

The grain buyer provisions are very similar to the warehouse provisions. For instance, the grain buyer statute addresses cancellation of the bond,\textsuperscript{827} posting of the license,\textsuperscript{828} revocation and suspension of the license,\textsuperscript{829} credit-sale contracts,\textsuperscript{830} and scale ticket contents.\textsuperscript{831} Grain buyers are also subject to record keeping requirements\textsuperscript{832} and are required to make routine reports to the Commission.\textsuperscript{833} The grain buyer is to be insured,\textsuperscript{834} and failure to do so will result in suspension

\textsuperscript{815} Id.
\textsuperscript{816} Id. § 60-04-03.2.
\textsuperscript{817} Id. § 60-04-06.
\textsuperscript{818} Id. § 60-04-07.
\textsuperscript{819} Id. § 60-04-05.
\textsuperscript{820} Id. § 60-04-04.
\textsuperscript{821} Id. § 60-02.1-1 to -40 (2003 & Supp. 2005).
\textsuperscript{822} Id. § 60-02.1-07.
\textsuperscript{823} Id. § 60-02.1-08.
\textsuperscript{824} § 60-02.1-07.
\textsuperscript{825} § 60-02.1-08(3). \textit{Cf.} Id. § 60-02-09(3) (warehouse bonding obligations).
\textsuperscript{826} § 60-02-08(4).
\textsuperscript{827} § 60-02.1-09.
\textsuperscript{828} Id. § 60-02.1-10.
\textsuperscript{829} Id. § 60-02.1-11.
\textsuperscript{830} Id. § 60-02.1-14.
\textsuperscript{831} Id. § 60-02.1-12.
\textsuperscript{832} Id. § 60-02.1-16.
\textsuperscript{833} Id. § 60-02.1-17(1)-(2).
\textsuperscript{834} Id. § 60-02.1-21.
Liens are statutorily provided to the holders of scale tickets.\textsuperscript{836} The statute also creates a framework in which facilities are closed\textsuperscript{837} or transferred.\textsuperscript{838}

Once a licensee becomes insolvent,\textsuperscript{839} upon application or an order of the district court,\textsuperscript{840} a trust fund is established by the Commission for the benefit of all claimants and to pay any costs the Commission might incur in administering the insolvency proceedings.\textsuperscript{841}

The trust fund shall consist of "[n]onwarehouse receipt grain . . . held in storage or the proceeds obtained from the conversion of such grain."\textsuperscript{842} Also, the fund shall include "[t]he proceeds, including accounts receivable, from any grain sold from the time of the filing of the claim that precipitated an insolvency . . . ."\textsuperscript{843} The proceeds of any insurance policies on destroyed grain are included in the trust.\textsuperscript{844} The claims for relief of damages on any bond are also included in the trust.\textsuperscript{845} This includes a "claim for relief, and proceeds therefrom, for the conversion of any grain stored in the warehouse."\textsuperscript{846} Moreover, the trust funds shall include, "[u]ncumbered accounts receivable for grain sold prior to the filing of the claim that precipitated an insolvency."\textsuperscript{847} The fund shall also include unencumbered equity in grain hedge accounts as well as the unencumbered grain product assets.\textsuperscript{848}

Claimants do not have a claim for separate relief on the bond or any person converting grain.\textsuperscript{849} The surety must be joined as a party in a proceeding regarding an insolvent grain buyer.\textsuperscript{850} Receipt holders are to be notified by publication and failure to file a claim within the time allotted will result in the claim being barred.\textsuperscript{851} Albeit, "receiptholders are not parties to the insolvency action unless admitted by the court upon a motion for intervention."\textsuperscript{852}

\textsuperscript{835} Id. § 60-02.1-22.
\textsuperscript{836} Id. § 60-02.1-23.
\textsuperscript{837} Id. §§ 60-02.1-25, 60-02.1-27.
\textsuperscript{838} Id. § 60-02.1-26.
\textsuperscript{839} Id. § 60-02.1-28.
\textsuperscript{840} Id. § 60-02.1-29.
\textsuperscript{841} Id. § 60-02.1-30.
\textsuperscript{842} § 60-02.1-30(1).
\textsuperscript{843} § 60-02.1-30(2).
\textsuperscript{844} § 60-02.1-30(3).
\textsuperscript{845} § 60-02.1-30(4).
\textsuperscript{846} § 60-02.1-30(5).
\textsuperscript{847} § 60-02.1-30(6).
\textsuperscript{848} § 60-02.1-30(7)-(8).
\textsuperscript{849} Id. § 60-02.1-33.
\textsuperscript{850} Id. § 60-02.1-31.
\textsuperscript{851} Id. § 60-02.1-32.
\textsuperscript{852} Id.
The Commission has the authority to prosecute and compromise claims.\textsuperscript{853} Although, "[u]pon payment of the amount of any settlement or of the full amount of any bond, [the Commission may] exonerate the person so paying from further liability growing out of the action."\textsuperscript{854}

2. Case law

(a) The common law and the statute

Under the common law of the State of North Dakota, as between the holder of the storage ticket and the warehouseman, there exists a bailment.\textsuperscript{855} The statutes still require as much:

The holders of warehouse receipts are owners in common of the grain in the warehouse up to the quantity required to redeem the receipts. There is nothing in our statutes which can reasonably be construed as a recognition of an actual authority in the warehouseman to sell stored grain required for the redemption of outstanding receipts.\textsuperscript{856} Nonetheless, it is "plain that the ticket holder has no claim or right to the identical grain stored by him."\textsuperscript{857}

The authority of the Commission is also quite clear in the case law. "The commission is the holder of the receipt for the purpose of enforcing the storage contract and has all the rights and privileges of the party to whom the receipt was issued."\textsuperscript{858}

(b) The claimant

A recent North Dakota case discusses the definition of "claimant" for purposes of the North Dakota Century Code.\textsuperscript{859} As observed by the North Dakota Supreme Court, the term "claimant" is not defined in section 60-02.1 of the North Dakota Century Code.\textsuperscript{860} Employing the plain, ordinary, and commonly understood meaning, the court concluded that "[a] 'claimant' is one who claims or asserts a right or demand."\textsuperscript{861} Thus, "[u]nder the plain meaning of the term, a claimant is a person who asserts a right to payment for grain sold to a licen-
see . . . ."\textsuperscript{862} It follows, therefore, that a person entering into credit sale contracts may be eligible to participate in the Commission's trusts funds other than bond proceeds.\textsuperscript{863}

(c) The surety and the principal

Under North Dakota law, a judgment for conversion against the principal is admissible evidence against the surety.\textsuperscript{864}

(d) The surety and the roving grain buyer

Pooling agreements whereby members of a production cooperative are paid the net proceeds from all sales on a quarterly basis would defeat a claim on a "roving grain or hay buyers" bond.\textsuperscript{865}

(e) The surety and the banker

The North Dakota Supreme Court has also concluded that "warehouse receipts" given by a production association to a bank to secure the bank's line of credit with the association are not warehouse receipts within the meaning of the statute and, consequently, the bank is not entitled to share in the trust fund assets marshaled upon the insolvency of the warehouse.\textsuperscript{866}

(f) Conversion

North Dakota has found that conversion may occur when the warehouse ships out grain and sells it without substituting other grain, though the default may be cured before demand.\textsuperscript{867} As acknowledged by the North Dakota Supreme Court, its holding is different from that reached on the same point by the South Dakota Supreme Court.\textsuperscript{868}

(g) Invalid defenses

The North Dakota Supreme Court has previously determined that when the warehouseman fails to produce grain because of a fire that

\textsuperscript{862} Id.
\textsuperscript{863} Id. at 194, 196.
\textsuperscript{864} State ex rel. Coan v. Plaza Equity Elevator Co., 261 N.W. 46, 50 (N.D. 1935).
\textsuperscript{866} N.D. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. Valley Farmers Bean Ass'n, 365 N.W.2d 528, 538 (N.D. 1985).
\textsuperscript{867} State ex rel. Harding v. Hoover Grain Co., 248 N.W. 275, 279 (N.D. 1933) (citations omitted).
\textsuperscript{868} Cf. id. (distinguishing S.D. Wheat Growers' Ass'n v. Farmers' Grain Co., 237 N.W. 723 (S.D. 1931) (wherein South Dakota Supreme Court holds that conversion does not take place until failure or refusal to deliver on demand)).
destroys the stored grain, the warehouseman is liable notwithstanding the failure of the parties to reach an agreement with respect to the degree of care required of the warehouse.\footnote{Larkin v. Doerr, 255 N.W. 567, 568 (N.D. 1934).} Moreover, the failure to convert scale tickets into storage tickets will not defeat the warehouse's (and ultimately the surety's) liability because the failure to do so is placed upon the warehouse.\footnote{Larkin, 255 N.W. at 568-69.}

Under North Dakota law, it is not a valid defense to a bond claim that notice of the acceptance of a bond is required in order to make a binding surety contract.\footnote{State ex rel. Harding v. Lane, 236 N.W. 353, 355 (N.D. 1931). Cf. § III(E)(2)(e) supra (discussing case law regarding obligation of delivery of a surety bond).} Thus, the law of guarantees is inapplicable to a delivered surety bond.

(h) Damages

When determining the loss arising from a conversion, the court will use the value of the grain on the date of the demand; that is, the date on which the conversion occurred.\footnote{Huether v. McCaull-Dinsmore Co., 204 N.W. 614, 620 (N.D. 1925), overruled in part by Sollin v. Wangler, 627 N.W.2d 159 (N.D. 2001).}

(i) Contribution and subrogation

There is no right of contribution among successive sureties, but the paying surety is subrogated to the rights of its principal.\footnote{Stutsman, 204 N.W. at 983.}

(j) Interest

Interest begins to run on a claim from the date the warehouseman fails to redeem a receipt upon proper demand (that is, the date on which the insolvency occurred), rather than the date upon which the district court signs the order that the warehouse is insolvent.\footnote{Valley Farmers Bean Ass'n, 365 N.W.2d at 548 (citing N.D. CENT. CODE §§ 60-04-09, 60-04-02).}

(k) The surety and the bankruptcy wrinkle

The North Dakota Supreme Court has concluded the surety is not liable for damages to the grain when the grain is in the care and custody of the trustee for the bankruptcy estate following the principal's bankruptcy.\footnote{N.D. Pub. Serv. Comm'n v. Jamestown Farmers Elevator, Inc., 422 N.W.2d 405, 407-09 (N.D. 1988).}

At a subsequent time, however, the North Dakota Supreme Court rejected the argument that a surety's liability on a bond is determined...
by state law irrespective of the bankruptcy court’s determination of the grain ownership claim.\textsuperscript{876} Ordinarily, the North Dakota courts “give effect” to bankruptcy court decisions as a matter of comity to avoid the prospect of “state and federal courts . . . reaching different results, ultimately resulting in unseemly and unnecessary conflict as each properly sought to enforce its determinations.”\textsuperscript{877} In any event, to the extent the surety in \textit{North Dakota Public Service Commission v. Central States Grain} believed it was entitled to a credit, the surety’s remedy was in the federal bankruptcy proceeding and not in state court. In the North Dakota Supreme Court’s view the surety was not without a remedy; once the surety had paid the receiptholders’ claims it could seek relief from the bankruptcy proceedings and acquire the right of subrogation pursuant to 11 U.S.C. \textsection{509(a)}.\textsuperscript{878}

However, on another occasion, the North Dakota Supreme Court rejected the argument that the Commission should be required to seek relief from the bankruptcy court to acquire the proceeds of sunflower inventories.\textsuperscript{879}

(l) Laches as an equitable defense

The claim on a storage ticket can be barred by the doctrine of laches.\textsuperscript{880}

I. SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Statutes

(a) Warehouses

South Dakota has defined by statute that delivery of grain to a warehouse is a bailment and not a sale.

If any grain is delivered to any person doing a public grain warehouse business in this state, and a receipt is issued therefor providing for delivery of a like kind, amount and grade to the holder of the receipt in return, such delivery is a bailment and not a sale of the grain so delivered.\textsuperscript{881}

Grain held pursuant to a storage receipt is not “liable to seizure upon process of any court in any action against the bailee, except an action

\textsuperscript{877} \textit{Woods Farmers Coop. Elevator, Co.}, 488 N.W.2d at 863 (citations omitted).
\textsuperscript{878} \textit{Id.} at 865-66.
\textsuperscript{880} State ex rel. Reilly v. Farmers’ Coop. Elevator Co., 167 N.W. 223, 225 (N.D. 1918).
\textsuperscript{881} S.D. CODIFIED LAWS \textsection{49-43-2} (2004).
by the owner or holder of such warehouse receipt to enforce the terms of the same.\footnote{882}{Id. § 49-43-3.}

Upon initial delivery, the warehouse must indicate in a writing whether the grain should be sold or stored.\footnote{883}{Id. § 49-43-1.} The statute defines the contents of the receipt.\footnote{884}{Id. § 49-43-2.1.} A warehouse storing its own grain must comply with the statute as well.\footnote{885}{Id. § 49-43-2.1.}

Warehouses are subject to licensing and an application process.\footnote{886}{Id. § 49-43-5.1.} Pooling agreements between competing companies are prohibited.\footnote{887}{Id. § 49-43-33.} The Public Utilities Commission also has the authority to investigate and set storage rates.\footnote{888}{Id. § 49-43-7.} Once licensed, warehouses must make monthly reports to the Commission.\footnote{889}{Id. § 49-43-9.}

A bond is required for the purpose of protecting those persons storing the grain with the warehouse.\footnote{890}{Id. § 49-43-5.8(2); see also id. § 49-43-1.1(1).} The bond must have a minimum value of $25,000 per location and particularly describe the exact locations of any warehouses to be covered.\footnote{891}{Id. § 49-43-5.8(2); see also id. § 49-43-1.1(1).} The fact that the bond is issued on a per location basis does not diminish the security available to depositors. “Such minimum bond amounts . . .” do not “limit the bond coverage available to depositors at any one warehouse location. The entire bond, up to the amount on its face, shall provide coverage to a depositor conducting business at any of the warehouse’s locations.”\footnote{892}{Id. § 49-43-5.8(2); see also id. § 49-43-1.1(1).} Should the surety fail or cease to do business in South Dakota, by rule, other financial documents may be received instead of a corporate surety bond.\footnote{893}{Id. § 49-43-1.1.}

In South Dakota, an injured depositor has the right to sue in the depositor’s own name for damages sustained by the depositor.\footnote{894}{Id. § 49-43-5.8(2); see also id. § 49-43-1.1(1).} The action may be brought directly against the surety.\footnote{895}{Id. § 49-43-5.8(2); see also id. § 49-43-1.1(1).}

In the event that the Public Utilities Commission takes over the facility, notice is to be given to the surety.\footnote{896}{Id. § 49-43-5.8(2); see also id. § 49-43-1.1(1).} Also, an immediate audit is to take place.\footnote{897}{Id. § 49-43-5.8(2); see also id. § 49-43-1.1(1).}
Once a warehouse license is revoked, terminated, or canceled, any claim against the warehouse must be made in writing with the Commission, surety and warehousemen within six months of receiving notice of any termination, cancellation, or revocation. Failure to make a claim will relieve the surety of all obligations to the claimants, but such failure to make a claim will not reduce the aggregate liability on the bond. The statute defines the specific notice that the Commission must provide to the holders of grain storage receipts and scale tickets. However, the provisions do not apply if a receiver is appointed before the expiration of six months after receiving the cancellation, revocation, or termination notice. The statute also commands that, “grain on hand in the public grain warehouse shall first be applied to the redemption and satisfaction of outstanding receipts . . .” upon failure or insolvency of the bailee.

South Dakota’s legislation only allows for a one-year storage contract. After the expiration of one year, the product is sold and funds are provided to the owner (minus storage charges and advances) “upon surrender of the storage receipt.”

South Dakota statutorily prohibits a grain warehouse that has issued receipts for the storage of grain from denying that the grain represented by the receipt is the property of the person to whom the receipt was issued. Under the state’s law, the receipt is “conclusive evidence of the fact that the person to whom the receipt was issued,” or assigned, “is the owner of such grain and is the person entitled to make surrender of such receipt and receive the grain thereby promised to be delivered.” No modification of the warehouse’s liability may be placed on the receipt.

Once the receipt is received by the warehouse, the receipt must be marked canceled and “such grain or an equal quantity of the same grade, kind and quality shall immediately be delivered . . .” Willful refusal to deliver constitutes theft. Delivery contrary to the

898. Id. § 49-43-5.9.
899. Id.
900. Id.
901. Id.
902. Id. § 49-43-3.
903. Id. § 49-43-13.
904. Id.
905. Id. § 49-43-21.
906. Id.
907. Id. § 49-43-17.
908. Id. § 49-43-18.
909. Id. § 49-43-22.
910. Id. § 49-43-25.
A JURISDICTIONAL SURVEY

owner's instruction is a misdemeanor.911 Partial deliveries require a new receipt.912

(b) Grain dealers

South Dakota separately regulates grain dealers. A person is subject to both a civil penalty and a misdemeanor for dealing in grain without a license.913 The Commission has the authority to issue and suspend licenses914 as well as conduct inspections of facilities.915 Licenses expire annually.916

Reports must be provided to the Commission by the dealer.917 Failure to do so constitutes a misdemeanor.918 The licensee is also required to post the statutes and rules regarding their conduct.919 Failure to post is also a misdemeanor.920

Upon receipt of the application and the bond, a license may be issued.921 The bond must be in a minimum amount of $50,000, which may be increased upon order of the Commission.922 The bond is conditioned upon the “faithful performance of the applicant’s obligations as a grain dealer and full and unreserved compliance with the laws” of South Dakota and the Commission’s regulations.923 The bond is only for the protection of those selling grain to the grain dealer; credit sales are not covered.924 It is a misdemeanor not to have a bond in place, and each day of operation without the bond constitutes a separate offense.925

In the event of a credit sale, the payment must be made in accordance with the statute and the Commission’s regulations.926 The agreement must also be in writing.927

Payment for grain must be upon demand of either the owner or agent.928 Failure to redeem the receipt or the loss of bond coverage

911. Id. § 49-43-32.
912. Id. § 49-43-19. See also id. § 49-43-20 (regarding consolidation).
913. Id. § 49-45-1. See supra note 774 and accompanying text (regarding potential constitutional violation arising from successive punishments).
914. § 49-45-1.
915. Id. § 49-45-13.
916. Id. § 49-45-3.
917. Id. § 49-45-14.
918. Id.
919. Id. § 49-45-20.
920. Id.
921. Id. § 49-45-7.
922. Id. § 49-45-9.
923. Id.
924. Id.
925. Id.
926. Id. § 49-45-10.
927. Id. § 49-45-11.
928. § 49-45-10.
will result in the Commission requesting a county circuit court to appoint a receiver that will have the powers and duties provided to it by the circuit court. In addition, the Commission must take possession of the facility, conduct an audit, and notify the surety. Simultaneously with steps taken by the Commission, the injured party may bring an action against the surety directly to recover damages.

The state's provision for claims against dealers is almost identical to the provision regarding warehouses. Once the dealer's license is revoked, terminated, or canceled, any claim against the dealer must be made in writing with the Commission and others; such claim shall be made within six months after receiving notice of the termination, cancellation, or revocation. Failure to make a claim relieves the surety of any obligation to the claimant. Yet, failure of a claimant to make a claim will not reduce the aggregate liability on the bond. The statute defines the specific notice that the Commission must provide to the holders of scale tickets. However, if a receiver is appointed before the expiration of six months after receiving the cancellation, revocation, or termination notice, the provisions do not apply.

It is noteworthy that the grain dealer statute does not command the Commission to use grain on hand to satisfy any outstanding claims. Presumably, this is the case because the grain dealer would not have grain on hand.

Finally, South Dakota's statute has a unique provision among those midwestern states that are the subject of this Article. The statute specifically allows the Commission to contract with the following South Dakota commissions to determine compliance with assessment and check off requirements: Wheat Commission, Oilseeds Council, Soybean Research and Promotion Council, Corn Utilization Council, and the South Dakota Pulse Crop Council.

929. Id. § 49-45-16.
930. Id. § 49-45-18(1)-(2).
931. Id. § 49-45-17.
932. Id. § 49-45-19.
933. Id.
934. Id.
935. Id.
936. Id.
937. See id. Cf. id. § 49-43-3 (grain on hand shall be applied to satisfy outstanding receipts).
2. Case law

(a) Surety coverage

While the case of Farmers' Elevator Co. v. Swanson\textsuperscript{939} predates the existing South Dakota statutory scheme, the case is nonetheless instructive. In Farmers' Elevator Co. v. Swanson, F.M. Swanson ("Swanson") was employed as a manager and grain buyer.\textsuperscript{940} Swanson provided a bond that he would well and faithfully discharge his duties as a grain buyer with his employer as obligee under the bond.\textsuperscript{941}

During his tenure as a grain buyer, Swanson engaged in options trading, which resulted in a net loss to the elevator.\textsuperscript{942} Thereafter, his employer filed suit on the bond.\textsuperscript{943} A specific resolution of the elevator company's board of directors that prohibited dealing in options was presented at trial.\textsuperscript{944} The situation was compounded when Swanson, in order to make good his loss, settled losses by means of misappropriation of moneys and grain held by the employer.\textsuperscript{945}

In affirming the decision of the trial court, the South Dakota Supreme Court concluded under the circumstances present in the record that Swanson had violated the terms of the bond.\textsuperscript{946} The evidence supported the fact that he could not account for the employer's grain and moneys.\textsuperscript{947} Thus, liability fell upon Swanson and the sureties.\textsuperscript{948}

Under South Dakota law, merely being a stockholder and a holder of a storage ticket will not preclude a party from recovering on the bond.\textsuperscript{949} When a party deposits grain prior to issuance of the bond and is aware that the warehouseman has not yet obtained a permit to store grain, there can be no liability under the bond.\textsuperscript{950}

While the result may vary from state to state, the South Dakota Supreme Court has determined that a separate bond is not required for each building where grain might be stored by a particular warehouseman.\textsuperscript{951} However, the statute now clarifies the requirement.\textsuperscript{952}

\textsuperscript{939} 146 N.W. 586 (S.D. 1914).
\textsuperscript{940} Farmers' Elevator Co. v. Swanson, 146 N.W. 586, 586 (S.D. 1914).
\textsuperscript{941} Swanson, 146 N.W. at 586.
\textsuperscript{942} Id.
\textsuperscript{943} Id.
\textsuperscript{944} Id.
\textsuperscript{945} Id. The employer's net loss totaled $980. Id.
\textsuperscript{946} Id. at 586-87.
\textsuperscript{947} Id.
\textsuperscript{948} Id. at 586.
\textsuperscript{950} State ex rel. Vojta v. Deibert, 240 N.W. 332, 334 (S.D. 1932).
\textsuperscript{951} Sommers, 201 N.W. at 720-21.
\textsuperscript{952} S.D. Codified Laws § 49-43-5.3 (2004).
Counsel should also be cautioned that a client may waive its right to interest by acceptance of the payment of the principal.\textsuperscript{953}

\section*{J. WISCONSIN}

\subsection*{1. Statutes}

Wisconsin regulates a number of agriculturally related storage facilities under the broad notion of “agricultural producer security.”\textsuperscript{954} Wisconsin state law requires the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection to procure “contingent financial backing to secure payment” from milk contractors, grain dealers, grain warehouse keepers, and vegetable contractors.\textsuperscript{955} The balance of this discussion will focus on grain dealers and grain warehouse keepers.\textsuperscript{956}

At the same time, some provisions are common to the statute. The statute requires that the Department procure surety bonds or “contract to provide a cash loan” to a subject fund.\textsuperscript{957} To accomplish this end, the legislature appropriated a start-up loan of $2,000,000 to the Agricultural Producer Security Fund, which is to be repaid in installments back to the Agrichemical Management Fund.\textsuperscript{958} The Agricultural Producer Security Fund is a public trust that secures payments to producers.\textsuperscript{959}

\subsection*{a. Grain dealers}

Grain dealers are not to procure grain from producers unless the dealer is licensed, subject to two exceptions.\textsuperscript{960} An entity need not be licensed if it pays cash on delivery for producer grain or the dealer acquires less than $400,000 annually for grain that is used by the dealer for feed or seed.\textsuperscript{961} Licenses expire on an annual basis and are not transferable or assignable.\textsuperscript{962}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{954} Wis. Stat. Ann. §§ 126.01-.90 (West Supp. 2006).
\item \textsuperscript{955} Wis. Stat. Ann. §§ 126.06, 126.01(8) (West Supp. 2006). \textit{See also} § 126.01(5) (defining contractors).
\item \textsuperscript{957} § 126.06(1)(a)-(b).
\item \textsuperscript{958} \textit{Id.} § 126.08.
\item \textsuperscript{959} \textit{Id.} § 126.05(1).
\item \textsuperscript{960} \textit{Id.} § 126.11(1).
\item \textsuperscript{961} § 126.11(2)(a)-(b).
\item \textsuperscript{962} § 126.11(2m).
\end{itemize}
The license application is defined by statute. The process includes a review of financial information. Wisconsin now charges a license fee. Once established as a dealer, the dealer must pay annual fund assessments. It is the annual fund assessments that now drive the system.

Simultaneously, if certain conditions apply, the dealer must also post security in the form of cash or a surety bond. If a commercial surety is used, the bond must be made payable to the Department "for the benefit of grain producers and producer agents." The bond may be canceled only upon permission of the Department or upon ninety days notice to the Department. The Department must physically hold the security. If security is required under the Code, additional reports are required by the Department. The security may be released as provided for in the Code.

At the same time, the dealer is required to carry insurance as specified in the statute. Grain dealers are required to display the license and keep certain records. The receipt used by the dealer is statutorily defined. Deferred payment contracts must also be in writing, contain a special notice, and are subject to a special assessment.

The statute also specifies required and prohibited business practices of the grain dealer. These include a duty of accuracy, timely payment to producers, and maintenance of a permanent business location that is open during hours the Chicago Board of Trade is open for trading. Meanwhile, a grain dealer may not, inter alia, misrepresent the amount of grain delivered or received, falsify records, make false statements to the Department or producers, or fail to file security

963. § 126.11(3).
964. § 126.11(3)(g). See also id. § 126.13.
965. § 126.11(4).
966. Id. § 126.15. Wisconsin’s system formerly utilized surety bonds exclusively before the adoption of the new system in 2001. See id. § 126.06.
967. Id. § 126.16(4)(a)-(b).
968. § 126.16(4)(b)(1).
969. § 126.16(4)(b)(3).
970. § 126.16(5).
971. § 126.16(6).
972. § 126.16(8).
973. Id. § 126.12(1).
974. Id. § 126.11(11).
975. Id. § 126.17.
976. Id. § 126.18.
977. Id. § 126.19(1)-(2).
978. § 126.19(4).
979. § 126.19(5).
980. Id. § 126.20.
981. § 126.20(1)-(3).
(if required). On the other hand, the dealer can require that the producer or the producer's agent disclose the existence of any liens or security interest in the grain. Likewise, if the producer contracted to sell at a certain price, the producer cannot refuse to deliver.

(b) Grain warehouses

Grain warehouse keepers must also be licensed if their capacity exceeds 50,000 bushels of grain stored for others, unless the entity proves it is not holding more than 50,000 bushels. The grain warehouse is, likewise, subject to an application process along with the subject fees and surcharges. Financial statements must be submitted. Insurance also must be maintained. So too must the warehouse pay assessments into the fund and post security, if required by the statute. The security requirements are identical to the grain dealer provisions. The grain warehouse is statutorily required to keep certain records.

The warehouse is duty-bound to use the receipt prescribed by statute. In addition to other duties enumerated in the statute, the warehouse has a duty to protect the grain from "loss or abnormal deterioration." To that end, the warehouse must keep adequate equipment and facilities.

(c) Recovery proceedings

In Wisconsin, claims against both the dealer and the warehouse are dealt with by means of a recovery proceeding. The claim is triggered when a producer or depositor is not paid. The claim must be filed with the Department within thirty days of the claimant's knowl-
edge of the default. If the Department believes that others are unpaid, it may provide broader notice to other potential claimants.

Once a claim has been filed, the Department is to review the claim and, if necessary, disallow it. Under either circumstance, the Department will issue a proposed decision. If no objections are filed, the decision becomes the final decision of the Department; otherwise, upon objection, a public hearing is performed.

Claims are paid first from the security, if applicable. If the contractor is not a contributor to the fund, then the claims are paid from the security on a prorated basis. If the contractor is both a contributor and has security, the security is used to reimburse the fund when the security exceeds the claims. If the security is insufficient to pay all claims on a contributing contractor, the Department is to pay the claimants on a prorated basis. The claimant is still entitled, under any scenario, to pursue the contractor.

The statute preserves the surety's right to subrogation against its principal. However, the surety is obligated to give notice of its demand upon the principal to the Department.

2. Case law

At the time this Article was submitted for publication, Wisconsin had no published cases discussing Chapter 126 in its present state or former Chapter 127 (which regulated warehouses prior to the rewrite of Chapter 126). Nonetheless, the Wisconsin Supreme Court has previously determined that a grain buyer can be considered a merchant for purposes of the Uniform Commercial Code (as adopted in Wisconsin).

IV. CONCLUSION

The foregoing Article has discussed the obligations imposed upon warehouses, grain dealers, and various other agricultural enterprises.
under both federal and state law. Counsel can benefit from an analysis of the various obligations imposed upon all of the players in the industry. Most of all, counsel's client is well-served when counsel (be it for a claimant or a surety) understands the limits and preconditions to obtaining surety coverage for such transactions.