

AMERICAN  
CASEBOOK  
SERIES •

CASES AND MATERIALS  
**ARBITRATION LAW AND  
PRACTICE**

Sixth Edition



Thomas E. Carbonneau

**WEST**

**CASES AND MATERIALS**  
**on**  
**ARBITRATION**  
**LAW AND PRACTICE**

**Sixth Edition**

■ ■ ■

By

**Thomas E. Carbineau**

*Orlando Distinguished Professor of Law*

*Penn State University*

*PSU Arbitration Institute*



**AMERICAN CASEBOOK SERIES®**

**WEST®**

A Thomson Reuters business

THOMSON REUTERS  
AMERICAN CASEBOOK SERIES  
LAW AND PRACTICE  
Sixth Edition

Thomson Reuters created this publication to provide you with accurate and authoritative information concerning the subject matter covered. However, this publication was not necessarily prepared by persons licensed to practice law in a particular jurisdiction. Thomson Reuters does not render legal or other professional advice, and this publication is not a substitute for the advice of an attorney. If you require legal or other expert advice, you should seek the services of a competent attorney or other professional.

*American Casebook Series* is a trademark registered in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

© West, a Thomson business, 2007

© 2009 Thomson Reuters

© 2012 Thomson Reuters

610 Opperman Drive  
St. Paul, MN 55123  
1-800-313-9378

Printed in the United States of America

**ISBN: 978-0-314-27957-6**



# **WEST'S LAW SCHOOL ADVISORY BOARD**

---

**JESSE H. CHOPER**

Professor of Law and Dean Emeritus,  
University of California, Berkeley

**JOSHUA DRESSLER**

Professor of Law, Michael E. Moritz College of Law,  
The Ohio State University

**YALE KAMISAR**

Professor of Law, University of San Diego  
Professor of Law Emeritus, University of Michigan

**MARY KAY KANE**

Professor of Law, Chancellor and Dean Emeritus,  
University of California,  
Hastings College of the Law

**LARRY D. KRAMER**

Dean and Professor of Law, Stanford Law School

**JONATHAN R. MACEY**

Professor of Law, Yale Law School

**ARTHUR R. MILLER**

University Professor, New York University  
Formerly Bruce Bromley Professor of Law, Harvard University

**GRANT S. NELSON**

Professor of Law, Pepperdine University  
Professor of Law Emeritus, University of California, Los Angeles

**A. BENJAMIN SPENCER**

Professor of Law,  
Washington & Lee University School of Law

**JAMES J. WHITE**

Professor of Law, University of Michigan

*To my daughter:*  
***Sara Lucille Carbonneau***

## PREFACE

---

Arbitration occupies a dominant place in the U.S. legal system. Its significance and stature are unquestioned. Only the foolhardy would ignore its existence and impact upon the legal process. It has become, in effect, the primary means for resolving civil disputes.

Arbitration now exceeds its traditional range of application by a very substantial margin. Its use is no longer relegated to commercial relationships and contract disputes between merchants. Its jurisdictional reach extends to the purchase of securities and other consumer transactions. It is the remedy by which employment disputes are resolved. It also governs controversies that involve federal rights created by congressional statutes, the regulation of commerce, and fundamental civil liberty guarantees. Few, if any, disputes are deemed inarbitrable.

The most controversial question in the current law of arbitration centers upon the validity and enforceability of arbitration agreements. There appears to be resistance among some courts to the enforcement of adhesive arbitration agreements, especially in the consumer and employment areas. This development has centered upon class action waivers and is most pronounced among the state and federal courts in California. There, arbitration agreements are more frequently voided on the basis of unconscionability or for a lack of mutuality. These courts, it seems, have concluded that legal procedural regularity must be fully guaranteed in unilateral contracts for arbitration. The U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in *Rent-A-Center v. Jackson*, 561 U.S. \_\_\_, 130 S. Ct. 2772 (2010), substantially dampened that development. Courts in other jurisdictions have periodically invoked the costs of arbitration and their distribution among the contracting parties to nullify arbitration agreements. No matter the basis, opposition to arbitration agreements is confined to a relatively insignificant minority of courts. Their reluctance to enforce arbitration agreements is an uncharacteristic judicial position. In the vast majority of cases, courts give full effect to arbitration agreements.

Arbitral awards or judgments are also generally favored by courts and enforced. Vacatur or nullification is a rare result. The Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) codifies a policy that sustains the recourse to arbitration. It limits the judicial supervision of arbitral awards to procedural matters that are vital to the legitimacy of adjudication. Moreover, courts have interpreted the narrow grounds for review restrictively. Recent practice, however, has somewhat eroded the policy of near automatic enforcement of awards by developing an action to clarify awards and broadening the evident partiality ground for vacatur with a regime of arbitrator disclosure. Because of the new emphasis upon disclosure, alleging partiality in either neutral or party-appointed arbitrators has become the most effective means for challenging awards.

The action to clarify awards—despite its practical value—is likely to have a pernicious effect because it will eventually service the ends of adversarial representation. Under the decisional law, it is a common law doctrine that allows courts to remand an award to the arbitral tribunal to have opaque determinations explained or clarified. As a result, losing parties have already asked courts and tribunals to “clarify” arbitral determinations that go against their interests. The procedure then introduces full blown appeal into the arbitral process by the back door.

Challenging the neutrality of arbitrators on the basis of disclosures and their determinations for a would-be lack of clarity is ominous. It underscores the tension in arbitration law between the protection of rights and the functionality of the adjudicatory process. It highlights the difficulty of providing simultaneously for due process in and access to adjudication. The U.S. Supreme Court has nonetheless been unwavering and unequivocal over the last forty years in its support for arbitration. *Stolt-Nielsen v. AnimalFeeds Int’l Corp.*, 559 U.S. \_\_\_, 130 S. Ct. 1758 (2010), *Volt Info. Sciences v. Stanford Univ.*, 489 U.S. 468 (1989), and *Commonwealth Coatings Corp. v. Continental Casualty Co.*, 393 U.S. 145 (1968) are the primary exceptions. During that period, it has decided more than forty arbitration cases and articulated a judicial doctrine that admits of few, if any, exceptions or conditions to the right to arbitrate. All but matters of criminal liability fall within the purview of arbitration. Moreover, the arbitrator is the sovereign decider of the merits, the procedure, and even jurisdiction.

At this stage in the development of the U.S. Supreme Court’s decisional law on arbitration, it is clear that the Court is using the FAA as a stepping stone to elaborating a judicial doctrine on arbitration. The Court has added significantly to the content of the legislation. For example, FAA § 2—unquestionably the key provision of the Act both historically and doctrinally—establishes that the surrender of judicial remedies by contract does not violate public policy and thereby validates arbitration agreements as a legitimate exercise of contract freedom. Nonetheless, in the Court’s rulings, arbitration agreements are not simply contracts. In the words of Justice Black, when he reacted critically to the majority’s endorsement of the separability doctrine in his dissent in *Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood & Conklin Mfg. Co.*, 388 U.S. 395 (1967), they are “super” contracts, “[e]levate[d]—above all other contractual provisions.” Glossing the FAA, the Court has made arbitration agreements nothing less than the means for correcting the dysfunctional provision of adjudicatory services in American society.

The Court has altered the governing legislation in other respects. The federal preemption doctrine, pieced together by the Court over a number of cases, has been instrumental to the creation and maintenance of the “strong federal policy on arbitration.” It guaranteed that a set of uniformly favorable principles to arbitration would apply in all United States jurisdictions. In establishing the doctrine, the Court literally rewrote the express content of the FAA, extending the statute’s application to state courts and legislatures. Federal preemption also allowed the Court to “promulgate” an implied federal right to arbitrate. The case law nevertheless acknowledged that several FAA provisions were directed to federal district courts and the governing legislation did not create federal question jurisdiction. These would-be anomalies did not impede the Court’s policy on arbitration. Federalization of the law is well-established; since *Dobson*, 513 U.S. 265 (1995), and *Doctor’s*

*Associates, Inc.*, 517 U.S. 681 (1996), it is essentially unquestioned. An expansive view of interstate commerce governs and states cannot enact laws restricting—directly or indirectly—arbitration agreements.

The Court has exhibited singular determination in upholding the federal policy on arbitration. It admits of no exceptions to settled views and demands compliance to them regardless of logic, legal tradition, or intrinsic truth. In this regard, the Court is more perspicacious than it is single-minded or arbitrary. It is generally acknowledged that exceptions, additions, or modifications to legal rules, once recognized, mutate over time and progressively swallow up or transform the original rule. The U.S. law of arbitration would not be as cohesive, viable, or effective were it riddled with the twists and turns of qualification. The campaign for federalization was waged to create a disciplined, uniform, and unambiguous regulation of arbitration. After all, the goal that is contemplated is nothing less than the building a workable system of civil adjudication and justice in U.S. society.

While there are misgivings, debates, and controversies, arbitration—despite imperfections—is in a golden era. The Court sustains every aspect of the operation of the arbitral process in both the domestic and transborder sphere. Doctrine is adapted to achieve the objectives of policy; everything is sacrificed to bring about an accessible form of adjudicatory justice. The judicial support not only is consistent, but it also is unequivocal. As a consequence, arbitration has expanded its range to new dispute areas and its scope of application beyond contract itself. With the extension of the contract to nonsignatory parties and the deference paid to adhesionary agreements, arbitral clauses implied at law may soon become a new feature of the U.S. court doctrine on arbitration. The critique, and possibly impairment, of arbitration can only effectively proceed from the legislative branch. It is to it that forces antagonistic to arbitration have directed their primary efforts.

These course materials convey a comprehensive picture of the arbitral process. In particular, they seek to provide legal professionals with the knowledge and understanding necessary to participate effectively in counseling on arbitration, the drafting of arbitration agreements, conducting arbitral proceedings, and managing court actions relating to arbitration. The principles, rules, and procedural structures that are described are basic to the law of arbitration and apply to all systems of arbitration.

The chapters describe the various stages of an arbitration, define the issues that are vital to its operation, assess the legal doctrines and concepts that regulate it, and point to critical doctrinal and practical developments. In some respects, the availability of recourse to arbitration has changed the face of traditional law-making and lawyering. Arbitration dislodges the application and activity of the traditional judicial process. Although arbitration is effective and valuable, it is hardly without drawbacks. Lawyers and clients need to assess the remedy and make a judgment about its transactional viability for them. The materials point to problems that are likely to arise in the practice of arbitration law and propose a framework for elaborating solutions.

The volume begins with a presentation of essential terms and definitions. It then introduces the basic statutory law in the area (the FAA and the

RUAA). Thereafter, it addresses the major themes in the decisional law on arbitration: federalization, contractualism, and arbitrability. It investigates particular applications of the arbitral remedy (traditional and nontraditional), *e.g.*, labor and employment, securities, consumer, and maritime arbitration. The issues that relate to the enforcement of arbitral awards are thoroughly outlined and discussed. Finally, in terms of domestic arbitration, the most recent and difficult problems of practice are identified and treated comprehensively.

The consideration of international commercial arbitration is equally complete and thorough. It begins with an evaluation of the contributions of the international commercial arbitration process to the conduct of transborder commerce and the harmonization of law and legal procedure. The central significance of the 1958 New York Arbitration Convention is highlighted in terms of the language of the treaty and the decisional law that underlies it.

The presentation emphasizes the importance of practical problems and underscores the fragility of existing rules and the need for professionals in the field to be analytically rigorous as well as creative in their approach to problems. The text that follows seeks to educate through a comprehensive presentation of relevant and timely information, the rigorous analytical evaluation of that data, and the identification of the practical implications of the “findings of fact” and “conclusions of law.”

\* \* \*

#### Postscript

The Court granted *certiorari* to two cases for its 2011–2012 term. In *CompuCredit Corp. v. Greenwood*, 615 F.3d 1204 (9th Cir. 2010), the Ninth Circuit held that the Credit Repair Organizations Act (CROA) prohibits the enforcement of an arbitration agreement against a consumer in a consumer credit agreement. The Act specifically invalidates any agreement entered into by the consumer that constitutes a waiver of any protection or right under the Act. The Court will address whether CROA claims are arbitrable under a valid arbitration agreement 563 U.S. \_\_\_ (2011).

The Court decided *CompuCredit*, 132 S.Ct. 665, on January 10, 2012, holding that CROA was silent on the arbitrability of claims and that the FAA requires the enforcement of arbitration agreements as written. The decision can be fully aligned with *AT&T Mobility* and *Rent-A-Center (infra)*. In *Stok & Associates v. Citibank*, 58 So.3d 366 (3d Dist. Ct. App. Fl. 2011), the Court would have considered the more technical issue of what type and quantum of behavior are necessary to establish a waiver of the right to arbitrate. 131 S.Ct. 1556 (2011). The federal circuits are split on this question—with some maintaining that any judicial recourse amounts to a waiver, while others adopt a variable prejudice-to-the-rights-of-the-other-party standard. Because the parties settled, the granting of the petition for *certiorari* was dismissed on June 2, 2011, pursuant to Rule 46. See [www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/stok-associates-v-citibank/](http://www.scotusblog.com/case-files/cases/stok-associates-v-citibank/).

Finally, on November 7, 2011, the Court rendered a *per curiam* opinion in *KPMG v. Cocchi*, 132 S.Ct. 23 (2011), in which it confirmed the strength of the arbitrability mandate in U.S. arbitration law, which requires the enforceability of arbitration agreements in nearly all circumstances.

## COPYRIGHT ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

---

The author gratefully acknowledges the copyright permissions granted by the following organizations:

1. The Virginia Law Review Association and Fred B. Rothman & Co. to reprint excerpts from Cohen & Dayton, *The New Federal Arbitration Law*, 12 VA. L. REV. 265, 281 (1926);
2. Juris Publishing, Inc. to reprint a variety of excerpts from my arbitration treatise, entitled “The Law and Practice of Arbitration” (4th edition 2012) and to use “Paul Friedland, Arbitration Clauses for International Contracts” (2d edition 2007) as a general reference;
3. Phillip J. Loree Jr. to reprint excerpts from “Loree Reinsurance and Arbitration Forum” on honorable engagement clauses;
4. The International Bar Association to reprint excerpts from its “Guidelines for Drafting International Arbitration Clauses.”

# TABLE OF CASES

The principal cases are in bold type. Cases cited or discussed in the text are in roman type. References are to pages. Cases cited in principal cases and within other quoted materials are not included.

- Aames Funding Corp. v. Sharpe**, 2004 WL 2418284 (E.D.Pa.2004), **459**
- Abramson v. Juniper Networks, Inc., 9 Cal. Rptr.3d 422 (Cal.App. 6 Dist.2004), 526, 539
- Agrawal v. Agrawal**, 775 F.Supp. 588 (E.D.N.Y.1991), **644**
- Ainsworth v. Skurnick**, 960 F.2d 939 (11th Cir.1992), **681, 684**
- Alexander v. Gardner-Denver Co.**, 415 U.S. 36, 94 S.Ct. 1011, 39 L.Ed.2d 147 (1974), **326**
- Allied-Bruce Terminix Companies, Inc. v. Dobson**, 513 U.S. 265, 115 S.Ct. 834, 130 L.Ed.2d 753 (1995), 52, **198, 226**
- Allis-Chalmers Corp. v. Lueck, 471 U.S. 202, 105 S.Ct. 1904, 85 L.Ed.2d 206 (1985), 424
- Al-Safin v. Circuit City Stores, Inc., 394 F.3d 1254 (9th Cir.2005), 516
- American Safety Equipment Corp. v. J. P. Maguire & Co.**, 391 F.2d 821 (2d Cir. 1968), **374**
- AMF Inc. v. Brunswick Corp.**, 621 F.Supp. 456 (E.D.N.Y.1985), **2**
- Arbitration Between Chromalloy Aeroservices, a Div. of Chromalloy Gas Turbine Corp. and Arab Republic of Egypt, Matter of**, 939 F.Supp. 907 (D.D.C. 1996), **835, 842**
- Armendariz v. Foundation Health Psychcare Services, Inc.**, 99 Cal.Rptr.2d 745, 6 P.3d 669 (Cal.2000), 56, **517, 526**
- Arthur Andersen LLP v. Carlisle**, 556 U.S. 624, 129 S.Ct. 1896, 173 L.Ed.2d 832 (2009), **63**
- Asahi Metal Industry Co., Ltd. v. Superior Court of California, Solano County, 480 U.S. 102, 107 S.Ct. 1026, 94 L.Ed.2d 92 (1987), 732
- Asia Pacific Indust. Corp. v. Rainforest Café, Inc., 380 F.3d 383 (8th Cir.2004), 27, 56
- AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion**, — U.S. —, 131 S.Ct. 1740, 179 L.Ed.2d 742 (2011), 25, 36, 56, 224, **475**
- AT & T Technologies, Inc. v. Communications Workers of America**, 475 U.S. 643, 106 S.Ct. 1415, 89 L.Ed.2d 648 (1986), **417**
- Austin v. Owens-Brockway Glass Container, Inc., 78 F.3d 875 (4th Cir.1996), 343, 347
- Auwah v. Coverall North America, Inc., 554 F.3d 7 (1st Cir.2009), 244
- Baravati v. Josephthal, Lyon & Ross, Inc.**, 28 F.3d 704 (7th Cir.1994), **588**
- Bernhardt v. Polygraphic Co. of America**, 350 U.S. 198, 76 S.Ct. 273, 100 L.Ed. 199 (1956), **123**
- B.L. Harbert Intern., LLC v. Hercules Steel Co.**, 441 F.3d 905 (11th Cir.2006), **722**
- Bowen v. Amoco Pipeline Co., 254 F.3d 925 (10th Cir.2001), 266
- Bradford v. Rockwell Semiconductor Systems, Inc., 238 F.3d 549 (4th Cir.2001), 537
- Broughton v. Cigna Healthplans of California, 90 Cal.Rptr.2d 334, 988 P.2d 67 (Cal.1999), 454
- Brower v. Gateway 2000, Inc., 246 A.D.2d 246, 676 N.Y.S.2d 569 (N.Y.A.D. 1 Dept.1998), 434
- Brown v. ABF Freight Systems, Inc., 183 F.3d 319 (4th Cir.1999), 346
- Brown v. Rauscher Pierce Refsnes, Inc.**, 994 F.2d 775 (11th Cir.1993), **661, 681**
- Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegna**, 546 U.S. 440, 126 S.Ct. 1204, 163 L.Ed.2d 1038 (2006), 141, **211**
- Campbell v. General Dynamics Government Systems Corp., 407 F.3d 546 (1st Cir.2005), 27
- Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc. v. Shute, 499 U.S. 585, 111 S.Ct. 1522, 113 L.Ed.2d 622 (1991), 458, 732
- Carson v. Giant Food, Inc., 175 F.3d 325 (4th Cir.1999), 346
- CB Richard Ellis, Inc. v. American Environmental Waste Management, 1998 WL 903495 (E.D.N.Y.1998), 7
- Chanchani v. Salomon/Smith Barney, Inc., 2001 WL 204214 (S.D.N.Y.2001), 541
- Chase Bank USA, N.A. v. Hale, 859 N.Y.S.2d 342 (N.Y.Sup.2008), 277, 611
- Christensen v. Dewor Developments, 191 Cal. Rptr. 8, 661 P.2d 1088 (Cal.1983), 59
- Circuit City Stores, Inc. v. Adams, 279 F.3d 889 (9th Cir.2002), 514

- Circuit City Stores, Inc. v. Adams**, 532 U.S. 105, 121 S.Ct. 1302, 149 L.Ed.2d 234 (2001), 53, 503, **503**
- Circuit City Stores, Inc. v. Ahmed, 283 F.3d 1198 (9th Cir.2002), 514
- Circuit City Stores, Inc. v. Mantor, 335 F.3d 1101 (9th Cir.2003), 515
- Citigroup Global Markets, Inc. v. Bacon**, 562 F.3d 349 (5th Cir.2009), 277, **615**
- Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc.**, 539 U.S. 52, 123 S.Ct. 2037, 156 L.Ed.2d 46 (2003), 52, 123, **142**
- Coffee Beanery, Ltd. v. WW, L.L.C.**, 2008 WL 4899478 (6th Cir.2008), 277, **624**
- Cole v. Burns Intern. Sec. Services, 105 F.3d 1465, 323 U.S.App.D.C. 133 (D.C.Cir.1997), 526
- Comedy Club, Inc. v. Improv West Associates**, 553 F.3d 1277 (9th Cir.2009), 276, **612**
- Commonwealth Coatings Corp. v. Continental Cas. Co.**, 393 U.S. 145, 89 S.Ct. 337, 21 L.Ed.2d 301 (1968), **563**
- Compania Espanola de Petroleos, S.A. v. Ner-eus Shipping, S.A., 527 F.2d 966 (2d Cir. 1975), 94
- Cortez Byrd Chips, Inc. v. Bill Harbert Const. Co.**, 529 U.S. 193, 120 S.Ct. 1331, 146 L.Ed.2d 171 (2000), 77, **691**
- Crow Construction v. Jeffrey M. Brown Assoc. Inc.**, 264 F.Supp.2d 217 (E.D.Pa. 2003), **568**
- Davis v. Continental Airlines, Inc., 69 Cal. Rptr.2d 79 (Cal.App. 2 Dist.1997), 59
- Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Byrd**, 470 U.S. 213, 105 S.Ct. 1238, 84 L.Ed.2d 158 (1985), 145, **182**
- District of Columbia Court of Appeals v. Feldman, 460 U.S. 462, 103 S.Ct. 1303, 75 L.Ed.2d 206 (1983), 85
- Doctor's Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto**, 517 U.S. 681, 116 S.Ct. 1652, 134 L.Ed.2d 902 (1996), **208**, 434
- D.R. Horton, Inc. v. Green**, 120 Nev. 549, 96 P.3d 1159 (Nev.2004), **465**
- Drummond Coal Co. v. United Mine Workers of America, Dist. 20, 748 F.2d 1495 (11th Cir.1984), 682
- Eastern Associated Coal Corp. v. United Mine Workers of America, Dist. 17**, 531 U.S. 57, 121 S.Ct. 462, 148 L.Ed.2d 354 (2000), **671**, 688
- Edwards v. Blockbuster Inc., 400 F.Supp.2d 1305 (E.D.Okla.2005), 56
- E.E.O.C. v. Frank's Nursery & Crafts, Inc., 177 F.3d 448 (6th Cir.1999), 57
- E.E.O.C. v. Kidder, Peabody & Co., Inc., 156 F.3d 298 (2d Cir.1998), 57
- E.E.O.C. v. Waffle House, Inc., 534 U.S. 279, 122 S.Ct. 754, 151 L.Ed.2d 755 (2002), 57
- Eljor Mfg., Inc. v. Kowin Development Corp.**, 14 F.3d 1250 (7th Cir.1994), **683**
- Engalla v. Permanente Medical Group, Inc.**, 64 Cal.Rptr.2d 843, 938 P.2d 903 (Cal. 1997), **437**
- Erie R. Co. v. Tompkins, 304 U.S. 64, 58 S.Ct. 817, 82 L.Ed. 1188 (1938), 121
- Exxon Shipping Co. v. Exxon Seamen's Union**, 11 F.3d 1189 (3d Cir.1993), **677**
- Fahnestock & Co., Inc. v. Waltman**, 935 F.2d 512 (2d Cir.1991), **645**
- Fine v. Bear, Stearns & Co., Inc.**, 765 F.Supp. 824 (S.D.N.Y.1991), **560**
- First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan**, 514 U.S. 938, 115 S.Ct. 1920, 131 L.Ed.2d 985 (1995), 32, 61, 91, 129, 227, 228, **239**, 258, 283
- Fittante v. Palm Springs Motors, Inc., 129 Cal. Rptr.2d 659 (Cal.App. 4 Dist.2003), 539
- Fotochrome, Inc. v. Copal Co., Ltd.**, 517 F.2d 512 (2d Cir.1975), **820**
- 14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Pyett**, 556 U.S. 247, 129 S.Ct. 1456, 173 L.Ed.2d 398 (2009), **348**
- Fuller v. Pep Boys—Manny, Moe & Jack of Delaware, Inc., 88 F.Supp.2d 1158 (D.Colo. 2000), 539
- Garrett v. Hooters—Toledo, 295 F.Supp.2d 774 (N.D.Ohio 2003), 539
- Garrity v. Lyle Stuart, Inc., 40 N.Y.2d 354, 386 N.Y.S.2d 831, 353 N.E.2d 793 (N.Y.1976), 229
- Garvey v. Roberts, 203 F.3d 580 (9th Cir.2000), 685
- Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp.**, 500 U.S. 20, 111 S.Ct. 1647, 114 L.Ed.2d 26 (1991), 53, **334**, 499
- Goodman v. ESPE America, Inc., 2001 WL 64749 (E.D.Pa.2001), 536
- Government of United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Through United Kingdom Defense Procurement Office, Ministry of Defense v. Boeing Co., 998 F.2d 68 (2d Cir.1993), 94
- Granite Rock Co. v. International Brotherhood of Teamsters**, — U.S. —, 130 S.Ct. 2847, 177 L.Ed.2d 567 (2010), **425**
- Green v. Ameritech Corp., 200 F.3d 967 (6th Cir.2000), 562
- Greenberg v. Bear, Stearns & Co.**, 220 F.3d 22 (2d Cir.2000), 153, **596**
- Green Tree Financial Corp. v. Bazzle**, 539 U.S. 444, 123 S.Ct. 2402, 156 L.Ed.2d 414 (2003), 36, 245, 283, **285**
- Green Tree Financial Corp.—Alabama v. Randolph**, 531 U.S. 79, 121 S.Ct. 513, 148 L.Ed.2d 373 (2000), 83, 245, 530, **531**
- Halligan v. Piper Jaffray, Inc., 148 F.3d 197 (2d Cir.1998), 602
- Hall Street Associates, L.L.C. v. Mattel, Inc.**, 552 U.S. 576, 128 S.Ct. 1396, 170 L.Ed.2d 254 (2008), 14, 25, **268**, 611
- Harden v. Roadway Package Systems, Inc., 249 F.3d 1137 (9th Cir.2001), 514
- Hardy v. Walsh Manning Securities, L.L.C.**, 341 F.3d 126 (2d Cir.2003), 79, **715**

- Harris v. Green Tree Financial Corp., 183 F.3d 173 (3d Cir.1999), 55
- Harrison v. Nissan Motor Corp. in USA, 111 F.3d 343 (3d Cir.1997), 6
- Hasbro, Inc. v. Catalyst USA, Inc.**, 367 F.3d 689 (7th Cir.2004), **653**
- Hay Group, Inc. v. E.B.S. Acquisition Corp., 360 F.3d 404 (3d Cir.2004), 72
- Hayne, Miller & Farni, Inc. v. Flume**, 888 F.Supp. 949 (E.D.Wis.1995), **660**
- Hays and Co. v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc., 885 F.2d 1149 (3d Cir.1989), 367
- Henry v. Gonzalez**, 18 S.W.3d 684 (Tex.App.-San Antonio 2000), **380**
- Hereford v. D.R. Horton, Inc., 2009 WL 104666 (Ala.2009), 277, 611
- Heritage Bldg. Systems, Inc., In re, 185 S.W.3d 539 (Tex.App.-Beaumont 2006), 8
- Hill v. Gateway 2000, Inc., 105 F.3d 1147 (7th Cir.1997), 434
- HIM Portland, LLC v. DeVito Builders, Inc., 317 F.3d 41 (1st Cir.2003), 9
- Hoeft v. MVL Group, Inc., 343 F.3d 57 (2d Cir.2003), 266
- Howard v. Anderson, 36 F.Supp.2d 183 (S.D.N.Y.1999), 530
- Howsam v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.**, 537 U.S. 79, 123 S.Ct. 588, 154 L.Ed.2d 491 (2002), 245, 278, **279**
- Hoxworth v. Blinder, Robinson & Co., Inc., 980 F.2d 912 (3d Cir.1992), 59
- Hughes Training Inc. v. Cook, 254 F.3d 588 (5th Cir.2001), 265
- IMC-Agrico Co. v. International Chemical Workers Council of United Food and Commercial Workers Union, AFL-CIO, 171 F.3d 1322 (11th Cir.1999), 646
- Improv West Associates v. Comedy Club, Inc., 555 U.S. 801, 129 S.Ct. 45, 172 L.Ed.2d 6 (2008), 276
- Ingle v. Circuit City Stores, Inc., 328 F.3d 1165 (9th Cir.2003), 515
- In re (see name of party)**
- Insurance Corp. of Ireland, Ltd. v. Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinee, 456 U.S. 694, 102 S.Ct. 2099, 72 L.Ed.2d 492 (1982), 266
- Jeffers v. D'Alessandro, 169 N.C.App. 455, 612 S.E.2d 447 (N.C.App.2005), 85
- Johnson v. West Suburban Bank, 225 F.3d 366 (3d Cir.2000), 377
- Jones v. Citigroup, Inc.**, 38 Cal.Rptr.3d 461 (Cal.App. 4 Dist.2006), **470**
- Kabia v. Koch, 713 N.Y.S.2d 250 (N.Y.City Civ.Ct.2000), 9
- Kaplan v. First Options of Chicago, Inc., 19 F.3d 1503 (3d Cir.1994), 570
- Kashner Davidson Securities Corp. v. Mscisz, 531 F.3d 68 (1st Cir.2008), 277
- Keating v. Superior Court, 183 Cal.Rptr. 360, 645 P.2d 1192 (Cal.1982), 167
- Keating v. Superior Court, Alameda County, 109 Cal.App.3d 784, 167 Cal.Rptr. 481 (Cal.App. 1 Dist.1980), 167
- Kemiron Atlantic, Inc. v. Aguakem Intern., Inc., 290 F.3d 1287 (11th Cir.2002), 9
- KPMG v. Cocchi, 2011 WL 5299457 (Nov. 7, 2011), 225
- Kristian v. Comcast Corp., 446 F.3d 25 (1st Cir.2006), 245
- Kyocera Corp. v. Prudential-Bache Trade Services, Inc.**, 341 F.3d 987 (9th Cir. 2003), **259**
- LaPrade v. Kidder, Peabody & Co., Inc., 246 F.3d 702, 345 U.S.App.D.C. 358 (D.C.Cir. 2001), 537
- Leodori v. CIGNA Corp., 175 N.J. 293, 814 A.2d 1098 (N.J.2003), 56, 542
- Lindsay v. Lewandowski, 43 Cal.Rptr.3d 846 (Cal.App. 4 Dist.2006), 8
- Lingle v. Norge Div. of Magic Chef, Inc., 486 U.S. 399, 108 S.Ct. 1877, 100 L.Ed.2d 410 (1988), 424
- Little v. Auto Stiegler, Inc., 130 Cal.Rptr.2d 892, 63 P.3d 979 (Cal.2003), 526, 539
- Major League Baseball Players Ass'n v. Garvey, 532 U.S. 504, 532 U.S. 1015, 121 S.Ct. 1724, 149 L.Ed.2d 740 (2001), 688
- Masco Corp. v. Zurich American Ins. Co., 382 F.3d 624 (6th Cir.2004), 57
- MasTec North America, Inc. v. MSE Power Systems, Inc., 581 F.Supp.2d 321 (N.D.N.Y. 2008), 277
- Mastrobuono v. Shearson Lehman Hutton, Inc.**, 514 U.S. 52, 115 S.Ct. 1212, 131 L.Ed.2d 76 (1995), 25, 228, **229**
- Matter of (see name of party)**
- Maye v. Smith Barney Inc., 897 F.Supp. 100 (S.D.N.Y.1995), 244
- MBNA America Bank, N.A. v. Hill, 436 F.3d 104 (2d Cir.2006), 367
- M & C Corp. v. Erwin Behr GmbH & Co., KG**, 326 F.3d 772 (6th Cir.2003), **703**
- McGowan v. Progressive Preferred Ins. Co., 274 Ga.App. 483, 618 S.E.2d 139 (Ga.App. 2005), 8
- MedCam, Inc. v. MCNC, 414 F.3d 972 (8th Cir.2005), 56
- Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc. v. Ware, 414 U.S. 117, 94 S.Ct. 383, 38 L.Ed.2d 348 (1973), 179
- Mintze, In re**, 434 F.3d 222 (3d Cir.2006), 367, **367**
- Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.**, 473 U.S. 614, 105 S.Ct. 3346, 87 L.Ed.2d 444 (1985), 13, 28, 125, 292, **370, 754**
- Morgan Phillips, Inc. v. JAMS/Endispute, L.L.C., 44 Cal.Rptr.3d 782 (Cal.App. 2 Dist. 2006), 10
- Morrison v. Circuit City Stores, Inc., 317 F.3d 646 (6th Cir.2003), 537
- Moses H. Cone Memorial Hosp. v. Mercury Const. Corp.**, 460 U.S. 1, 103 S.Ct. 927, 74 L.Ed.2d 765 (1983), 7, 145, **146**
- National Oil Corp. v. Libyan Sun Oil Co.**, 733 F.Supp. 800 (D.Del.1990), **826**

- Office & Professional Employees Intern. Union, Local No. 471 v. Brownsville General Hosp.**, 186 F.3d 326 (3d Cir. 1999), 79, **708**
- Omni Tech Corp. v. MPC Solutions Sales, LLC**, 432 F.3d 797 (7th Cir.2005), 8
- Orange County Choppers, Inc. v. Goen Technologies Corp.**, 374 F.Supp.2d 372 (S.D.N.Y. 2005), 57
- PacifiCare Health Systems, Inc. v. Book**, 538 U.S. 401, 123 S.Ct. 1531, 155 L.Ed.2d 578 (2003), **288**
- Palcko v. Airborne Express, Inc.**, 372 F.3d 588 (3d Cir.2004), 514
- Parsons & Whittemore Overseas Co., Inc. v. Societe Generale De L'Industrie Du Papier (RAKTA)**, 508 F.2d 969 (2d Cir. 1974), **814**
- Patten v. Signator Ins. Agency, Inc.**, 441 F.3d 230 (4th Cir.2006), **589**
- Penn v. Ryan's Family Steak Houses, Inc.**, 269 F.3d 753 (7th Cir.2001), 544
- Pennington v. Frisch's Restaurants, Inc.**, 2005 WL 1432759 (6th Cir.2005), 27
- Perez v. Globe Airport Sec. Services, Inc.**, 253 F.3d 1280 (11th Cir.2001), 537
- Perez v. Hospitality Ventures-Denver LLC**, 245 F.Supp.2d 1172 (D.Colo.2003), 539
- Perry v. Thomas**, 482 U.S. 483, 107 S.Ct. 2520, 96 L.Ed.2d 426 (1987), 179
- Photopaint Technologies, LLC v. Smartlens Corp.**, 335 F.3d 152 (2d Cir.2003), 73, **695**
- Pieper v. American Arbitration Ass'n, Inc.**, 336 F.3d 458 (6th Cir.2003), 86
- Porpora v. Gatliff Building Co.**, 160 Ohio App.3d 843, 828 N.E.2d 1081 (Ohio App. 9 Dist.2005), **462**
- Positive Software Solutions, Inc. v. New Century Mortg. Corp.**, 436 F.3d 495 (5th Cir.2006), **579**
- Preston v. Ferrer**, 552 U.S. 346, 128 S.Ct. 978, 169 L.Ed.2d 917 (2008), **216**
- Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood & Conklin Mfg. Co.**, 388 U.S. 395, 87 S.Ct. 1801, 18 L.Ed.2d 1270 (1967), 52, 54, 87, 122, **129**
- ProCD, Inc. v. Zeidenberg**, 86 F.3d 1447 (7th Cir.1996), 434
- Puerto Rico Telephone Co., Inc. v. United States Phone Mfg. Corp.**, 427 F.3d 21 (1st Cir.2005), 265
- Quiles v. Financial Exchange Co.**, 879 A.2d 281 (Pa.Super.2005), 543
- Ramos-Santiago v. United Parcel Service**, 524 F.3d 120 (1st Cir.2008), 277
- Randolph v. Green Tree Financial Corp.-Alabama**, 178 F.3d 1149 (11th Cir.1999), 376
- Remmey v. PaineWebber, Inc.**, 32 F.3d 143 (4th Cir.1994), **560**
- Rest-A-Center, West, Inc. v. Jackson**, — U.S. —, 130 S.Ct. 2772, 177 L.Ed.2d 403 (2010), 75, **245**
- Robert Lawrence Company v. Devonshire Fabrics, Inc.**, 271 F.2d 402 (2d Cir.1959), **126**
- Robert Lewis Rosen Associates, Ltd. v. Webb**, 566 F.Supp.2d 228 (S.D.N.Y.2008), 277
- Roby v. Corporation of Lloyd's**, 996 F.2d 1353 (2d Cir.1993), **775**
- Rodriguez v. Prudential-Bache Securities, Inc.**, 882 F.Supp. 1202 (D.Puerto Rico 1995), **586, 661**
- Rodriguez de Quijas v. Shearson/American Exp., Inc.**, 490 U.S. 477, 109 S.Ct. 1917, 104 L.Ed.2d 526 (1989), 22, 46, 227, 293, 318, **319**
- Rooker v. Fidelity Trust Co.**, 263 U.S. 413, 44 S.Ct. 149, 68 L.Ed. 362 (1923), 85
- Royal Ins. Co. of America v. BHRS, LLC**, 333 F.Supp.2d 1293 (S.D.Fla.2004), 27
- Rubin v. Sona Intern. Corp.**, 457 F.Supp.2d 191 (S.D.N.Y.2006), 142
- Salt Lake Tribune Publishing Co., LLC v. Management Planning, Inc.**, 390 F.3d 684 (10th Cir.2004), 8
- Scherk v. Alberto-Culver Co.**, 417 U.S. 506, 94 S.Ct. 2449, 41 L.Ed.2d 270 (1974), 125, 292, **740**
- Schoch v. InfoUnited States America, Inc.**, 341 F.3d 785 (8th Cir.2003), 267
- Securities Industry Ass'n v. Connolly**, 883 F.2d 1114 (1st Cir.1989), 22
- Seetransport Wiking Trader Schiffahrtsgesellschaft MBH & Co., Kommanditgesellschaft v. Navimpex Centrala Navala**, 989 F.2d 572 (2d Cir.1993), 809
- Shankle v. B-G Maintenance Management of Colorado, Inc.**, 163 F.3d 1230 (10th Cir. 1999), 529
- Shearson/American Exp., Inc. v. McMahon**, 482 U.S. 220, 107 S.Ct. 2332, 96 L.Ed.2d 185 (1987), 22, 227, 293, **299**
- Sims v. Montell Chrysler, Inc.**, 317 F.Supp.2d 838 (N.D.Ill.2004), 61
- Sobol v. Kidder, Peabody & Co., Inc.**, 49 F.Supp.2d 208 (S.D.N.Y.1999), 529
- Southland Corp. v. Keating**, 465 U.S. 1, 104 S.Ct. 852, 79 L.Ed.2d 1 (1984), 52, 145, 167, 168, **168**
- South Louisiana Cement, Inc. v. Van Aalst Bulk Handling, B.V.**, 383 F.3d 297 (5th Cir.2004), 85
- Sphere Drake Ins. Ltd. v. All American Life Ins. Co.**, 307 F.3d 617 (7th Cir.2002), **575**
- Spier v. Calzaturificio Tecnica, S.p.A.**, 77 F.Supp.2d 405 (S.D.N.Y.1999), 841
- Spinetti v. Service Corp. Intern.**, 324 F.3d 212 (3d Cir.2003), 538
- Statewide Realty Co., In re**, 159 B.R. 719 (Bkrcty.D.N.J.1993), **365**
- Stewart v. Covill and Basham Const., LLC**, 317 Mont. 153, 75 P.3d 1276 (Mont.2003), 9
- Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v. AnimalFeeds International Corp.**, — U.S. —, 130 S.Ct. 1758, 176 L.Ed.2d 605 (2010), 36, 75, 225, **627**

- Stolt-Nielsen SA v. AnimalFeeds Intern. Corp.**, 548 F.3d 85 (2d Cir.2008), 277, **621**  
**Stolt-Nielsen SA v. Celanese AG**, 430 F.3d 567 (2d Cir.2005), 72  
**Superadio Ltd. Partnership v. Winstar Radio Productions, LLC**, 446 Mass. 330, 844 N.E.2d 246 (Mass.2006), 75  
**Swift v. Tyson**, 41 U.S. 1, 16 Pet. 1, 10 L.Ed. 865 (1842), 121
- Textile Workers Union of America v. Lincoln Mills of Ala.**, 353 U.S. 448, 77 S.Ct. 912, 1 L.Ed.2d 972 (1957), **404**  
**The Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore Co.**, 407 U.S. 1, 92 S.Ct. 1907, 32 L.Ed.2d 513 (1972), **732**  
**Tinder v. Pinkerton Security**, 305 F.3d 728 (7th Cir.2002), 27  
**Tobey v. County of Bristol**, 23 F.Cas. 1313 (C.C.D.Mass.1845), 45  
**Towles v. United HealthCare Corp.**, 338 S.Ct. 29, 524 S.E.2d 839 (S.C.App.1999), 540
- UHC Management Co., Inc. v. Computer Sciences Corp.**, 148 F.3d 992 (8th Cir.1998), 267  
**United Paperworkers Intern. Union, AFL-CIO v. Misco, Inc.**, 484 U.S. 29, 108 S.Ct. 364, 98 L.Ed.2d 286 (1987), **420, 663, 688**  
**United States Dept. of Treasury v. Fabe**, 508 U.S. 491, 113 S.Ct. 2202, 124 L.Ed.2d 449 (1993), 379  
**United States Life Ins. Co. v. Insurance Commissioner of California**, 2005 WL 3150272 (9th Cir.2005), **657**  
**United Steelworkers of America v. American Mfg. Co.**, 363 U.S. 564, 80 S.Ct. 1343, 4 L.Ed.2d 1403 (1960), **406**  
**United Steelworkers of America v. Enterprise Wheel & Car Corp.**, 363 U.S. 593, 80 S.Ct. 1358, 4 L.Ed.2d 1424 (1960), **415, 688**
- United Steelworkers of America v. Warrior & Gulf Nav. Co.**, 363 U.S. 574, 80 S.Ct. 1347, 4 L.Ed.2d 1409 (1960), **411**  
**United Steelworkers of America, AFL-CIO-CLC v. Rawson**, 495 U.S. 362, 110 S.Ct. 1904, 109 L.Ed.2d 362 (1990), 423
- Vaden v. Discover Bank**, 556 U.S. 49, 129 S.Ct. 1262, 173 L.Ed.2d 206 (2009), **155**  
**Vandenberg v. Superior Court**, 88 Cal.Rptr.2d 366, 982 P.2d 229 (Cal.1999), 455  
**Vimar Seguros y Reaseguros, S.A. v. M/V Sky Reefer**, 515 U.S. 528, 115 S.Ct. 2322, 132 L.Ed.2d 462 (1995), 288, **781**  
**Vireo, P.L.L.C. v. Cates**, 953 S.W.2d 489 (Tex. App.-Austin 1997), 60  
**Vold v. Broin & Associates, Inc.**, 699 N.W.2d 482 (S.D.2005), **647**  
**Volt Information Sciences, Inc. v. Board of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior University**, 489 U.S. 468, 109 S.Ct. 1248, 103 L.Ed.2d 488 (1989), 24, 95, **188, 227, 228**
- Walker v. Ryan's Family Steak Houses, Inc.**, 400 F.3d 370 (6th Cir.2005), **547**  
**Wallace v. Buttar**, 378 F.3d 182 (2d Cir. 2004), **604**  
**Waste Management, Inc. v. Residuos Industriales Multiquim, S.A. de C.V.**, 372 F.3d 339 (5th Cir.2004), 61  
**Westvaco Corp. v. United Paperworkers Intern. Union, AFL-CIO ex rel. Local Union 676**, 171 F.3d 971 (4th Cir.1999), 679  
**Wilko v. Swan**, 346 U.S. 427, 74 S.Ct. 182, 98 L.Ed. 168 (1953), 46, 125, 186, 293, **294**  
**Williams v. Cigna Financial Advisors Inc.**, 197 F.3d 752 (5th Cir.1999), 537  
**Wolsey, Ltd. v. Foodmaker, Inc.**, 144 F.3d 1205 (9th Cir.1998), 7  
**Wright v. Universal Maritime Service Corp.**, 525 U.S. 70, 119 S.Ct. 391, 142 L.Ed.2d 361 (1998), 343, **343, 500**
- Zumpano v. Omnipoint Communications, Inc.**, 2001 WL 43781 (E.D.Pa.2001), 536

**CASES AND MATERIALS**  
**on**  
**ARBITRATION**  
**LAW AND PRACTICE**

**Sixth Edition**

# SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

---

	<b>Page</b>
PREFACE .....	v
TABLE OF CASES .....	xxi
<b>Chapter One. An Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1. What Is Arbitration? .....	1
2. Why Choose Arbitration? .....	11
3. How Does Arbitration Work? .....	13
4. The Impact of Arbitration .....	20
<b>Chapter Two. Basic Concepts</b> .....	<b>24</b>
1. Freedom of Contract .....	24
2. Arbitration Agreements .....	26
3. Arbitrability .....	28
4. The Separability Doctrine and Kompetenz-Kompetenz .....	30
5. The Arbitrators' Adjudicatory Powers .....	32
6. Enforcement of Awards .....	34
7. Consolidation and Aggregation Through Class Litigation .....	35
8. A-National Arbitration .....	37
9. Hypothets .....	40
<b>Chapter Three. U.S. Statutes on Arbitration</b> .....	<b>45</b>
1. The Period of "Hostility" .....	45
2. The United States Arbitration Act of 1925 .....	46
3. The Uniform Law for States .....	88
<b>Chapter Four. Arbitration and Federalism</b> .....	<b>121</b>
1. Introduction: Initial Steps Toward "Federalization" .....	121
2. The Federalism Trilogy .....	145
3. A Note of Dissonance .....	187
4. Affirming the Federalization Policy .....	197
<b>Chapter Five. Decisional Power: The Parties, the Arbitrator, the Courts, and the Legislature</b> .....	<b>226</b>
1. The Federal Decisional Edifice on Arbitration .....	226
2. Contract Freedom .....	228
3. The Limit on Contract Freedom: Functus Officio (as to arbitrators and the parties) .....	259
4. Who Decides?: Arbitrator Power at the Threshold of the Process .....	278
5. When a Court Can Decide: Ripeness .....	288
6. When Can the Legislature Prohibit Arbitration?: The Arbitrability of Statutory Claims .....	291