



Consumer Protection Defense and Unfair Competition Law

ALERT

JUNE 2012

LOEB & LOEB adds Knowledge.

Second Circuit Refuses to Review Decision That Class Action Waiver in Arbitration Agreement Is Unenforceable

The Second Circuit has refused to grant en banc (full court) review of its earlier decision barring the enforcement of class action waiver provisions in business arbitration agreements involving federal statutory claims. The court's May 29, 2012 denial means that its earlier decision, *In Re American Express Merchants' Litigation*, 667 F.3d 204 (2d Cir. 2012) (*Amex III*), remains the law of the Second Circuit.

In *Amex III*, the Court of Appeals invalidated a class action waiver provision in the parties' arbitration agreement, finding that the "substantial upfront expenditures" required by individual proceedings would effectively bar the plaintiffs from vindicating their rights under federal antitrust law. The case arose from two consolidated class actions filed by merchants and supermarkets doing business with American Express (*Amex*). Plaintiffs claimed that the provision in *Amex's* Card Acceptance Agreement, requiring them to accept all *Amex* credit and debit cards, violated antitrust law as an unlawful tying arrangement.

After the lower court granted *Amex's* motion to compel arbitration, in 2009 the Second Circuit reversed in *Amex I*, finding that plaintiffs would be unable to vindicate their federal statutory rights in arbitration due to the high costs associated with proving liability on a case-by-case basis. The case returned twice more to the Second Circuit, once after the U.S. Supreme Court held in *Stolt-Nielsen v. Animal Feeds Int'l*, 130 S.Ct. 1758 (2010), that the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) dictates that a party can only be required to submit to arbitration where the party clearly agreed to arbitrate, and then again after *AT&T Mobility v. Concepcion*, 131 S.Ct. 1740 (2011), in which the high court held that the FAA preempted California state law declaring that class action waivers in consumer contracts were unconscionable. On both occasions, the Second Circuit

based its decisions that the class action waivers were unenforceable on public policy reasons.

Circuit Judge Rosemary Pooler, who, along with Judge Robert Sack, decided *Amex III* and concurred in the circuit court's denial of en banc rehearing, wrote a short opinion explaining how the court distinguished the seemingly contrary holding in *Concepcion*. Judge Pooler noted that while *Concepcion* addressed state contract rights under California law, *Amex III* dealt with federal statutory rights. Furthermore, *Concepcion* dealt with the issue of preemption rather than a statutory rights analysis.

Chief Judge Dennis Jacobs' dissenting opinion, joined by Judges Jose Cabranes and Debra Ann Livingston, asserted that the weight of authority requires arbitration of federal statutory claims, that public policy reasons are not sufficiently important to ignore the FAA's strong policy favoring arbitration, that the court relied on "dubious" grounds when it distinguished *Concepcion*, and that the court relied on dicta and language taken out of context to support its argument that high costs would prevent plaintiffs from adequately pursuing their claims. Judge Reena Raggi, joined by Judge Richard Wesley, and Judge Cabranes also issued their own brief dissents.

The decision creates a potential split between the Second and Ninth Circuits. Earlier this year, the Ninth Circuit ruled in *Coneff v. AT&T Corp.*, 673 F.3d 1155 (9th Cir. 2012), that, under the FAA, whether customers have a "sufficient incentive" to vindicate their rights is immaterial. The *Coneff* case involved wireless customers from eight states who signed contracts with clauses that precluded class action arbitrations. The contracts also required fee shifting, so

This publication may constitute "Attorney Advertising" under the New York Rules of Professional Conduct and under the law of other jurisdictions.

that customers would ultimately be made whole if they filed a claim. The *Coneff* court held that under *Concepcion* the fact that many customers would not bother to file their small claims did not trump the FAA's preemption of the Washington state law that invalidated class action arbitration waivers.

Whether the Supreme Court will grant certiorari in *Amex III* to resolve this potential split is uncertain, but given the Court's steadfast defense of arbitration as a vehicle for resolving business and consumer disputes alike under the FAA, it seems likely that the justices will eventually take the opportunity to address this issue once the right case comes along.

For more information about the content of this alert, please contact Michael Thurman at mthurman@loeb.com or Michael Mallow at mmallow@loeb.com.

For more information about Loeb & Loeb's Consumer Protection and Unfair Competition Practice, please contact:

ARTHUR W. ADELBERG	AADELBERG@LOEB.COM	202.618.5020
ROBERT M. ANDALMAN	RANDALMAN@LOEB.COM	312.464.3168
MARK D. CAMPBELL	MCAMPBELL@LOEB.COM	310.282.2273
CHRISTIAN D. CARBONE	CCARBONE@LOEB.COM	212.407.4852
TAMARA CARMICHAEL	TCARMICHAEL@LOEB.COM	212.407.4225
DARLENE M. CHO	DCHO@LOEB.COM	310.282.2168
AURELE A. DANOFF	ADANOFF@LOEB.COM	310.282.2398
THERESA L. DAVIS	TDAVIS@LOEB.COM	312.464.3188
PATRICK N. DOWNES	PDOWNES@LOEB.COM	310.282.2352
ERIC GUERRERO	EGUERRERO@LOEB.COM	310.282.2214
EMILY R. HAUS	EHAUS@LOEB.COM	312.464.3126
JESSICA M. HIGASHIYAMA	JHIGASHIYAMA@LOEB.COM	310.282.2072
DEREK K. ISHIKAWA	DISHIKAWA@LOEB.COM	310.282.2364
MICHAEL W. JAHNKE	MJAHNKE@LOEB.COM	212.407.4285
JENNIFER A. JASON	JJASON@LOEB.COM	310.282.2195
THOMAS P. JIRGAL	TJIRGAL@LOEB.COM	312.464.3150
BENJAMIN KING	BKING@LOEB.COM	310.282.2279

This alert is a publication of Loeb & Loeb and is intended to provide information on recent legal developments. This alert does not create or continue an attorney client relationship nor should it be construed as legal advice or an opinion on specific situations.

Circular 230 Disclosure: To ensure compliance with Treasury Department rules governing tax practice, we inform you that any advice contained herein (including any attachments) (1) was not written and is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding any federal tax penalty that may be imposed on the taxpayer; and (2) may not be used in connection with promoting, marketing or recommending to another person any transaction or matter addressed herein.

© 2012 Loeb & Loeb LLP. All rights reserved.

RICHARD M. LORENZO	RLORENZO@LOEB.COM	212.407.4288
MICHAEL MALLOW	MMALLOW@LOEB.COM	310.282.2287
DOUGLAS N. MASTERS	DMASTERS@LOEB.COM	312.464.3144
FIONA P. MCKEOWN	FMCKEOWN@LOEB.COM	310.282.2064
DANIEL G. MURPHY	DMURPHY@LOEB.COM	310.282.2215
JAY K. MUSOFF	JMUSOFF@LOEB.COM	212.407.4212
JERRY S. PHILLIPS	JPHILLIPS@LOEB.COM	310.282.2177
RACHEL RAPPAPORT	RRAPPAPORT@LOEB.COM	310.282.2367
CHRISTINE M. REILLY	CREILLY@LOEB.COM	310.282.2361
AMANDA J. SHERMAN	ASHERMAN@LOEB.COM	310.282.2261
MICHAEL B. SHORTNACY	MSHORTNACY@LOEB.COM	310.282.2315
MEREDITH J. SILLER	MSILLER@LOEB.COM	310.282.2294
DENISE A. SMITH-MARS	DMARS@LOEB.COM	310.282.2028
WALTER STEIMEL, JR.	WSTEIMEL@LOEB.COM	202.618.5015
MICHAEL A. THURMAN	MTHURMAN@LOEB.COM	310.282.2122
LAURAA. WYTSMA	LWYTSMA@LOEB.COM	310.282.2251
MICHAEL P. ZWEIG	MZWEIG@LOEB.COM	212.407.4960