



News

Craig Liljestrand CDLB Column: Wisconsin Supreme Court Rules 'Fraudulent Transaction' Exception to Successor Nonliability Not Governed by Wisconsin Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act

June 18, 2018

Hinshaw partner Craig Liljestrand has published his latest *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin* column titled "Push for successor liability comes with too little facts in asbestos case." The article analyzes the case of *Springer v. Nohl Electric Products Corp.*, 2018 Wisc. LEXIS 227, where the Wisconsin Supreme Court considered whether the "fraudulent transaction" exception to successor nonliability was governed by the Wisconsin Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act.

As described by Liljestrand, the common law principle of successor nonliability provides that a purchasing corporation does not succeed to the liabilities of the selling corporation. The court here ruled that the Wisconsin fraud act does not supplant the common-law fraudulent transaction exception, citing as authority the 1981 *U.S. v. Bestfoods* U.S. Supreme Court decision.

Read "[Push for successor liability comes with too little facts in asbestos case](#)" (PDF)

You can also read "[Push for successor liability comes with too little facts in asbestos case](#)," on the *Chicago Daily Law Bulletin* website (*subscription required*)

Attorneys

Craig T. Liljestrand

Service Areas

Complex Tort & General
Casualty

Offices

Chicago