

YEAZELL

CIVIL PROCEDURE

*Fifth
Edition*



ASPEN LAW & BUSINESS

CIVIL PROCEDURE

Fifth Edition

STEPHEN C. YEAZELL

Professor of Law

University of California, Los Angeles



ASPEN LAW & BUSINESS

Aspen Publishers, Inc.

Gaithersburg

New York

Copyright © 2000 by Stephen C. Yeazell

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission to make copies of any part of this publication should be mailed to:

Permissions
Aspen Law & Business
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

Printed in the United States of America

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

-- " - - -

Yeazell, Stephen C.

Civil procedure / Stephen C. Yeazell. — 5th ed.

p. cm.

Includes index.

ISBN 0-7355-1241-8

I. Civil procedure — United States — Cases. I. Title.

KF8839.Y43 2000
347.73'5 — dc21

99-049477

CIVIL PROCEDURE

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD



ASPEN PUBLISHERS
Legal Education Division

Richard A. Epstein

James Parker Hall Distinguished Service Professor of Law
University of Chicago

E. Allan Farnsworth

Alfred McCormack Professor of Law
Columbia University

Ronald J. Gilson

Charles J. Meyers Professor of Law and Business
Stanford University
Marc and Eva Stern Professor of Law and Business
Columbia University

Geoffrey C. Hazard, Jr.

Trustee Professor of Law
University of Pennsylvania

James E. Krier

Earl Warren DeLano Professor of Law
University of Michigan

Elizabeth Warren

Leo Gottlieb Professor of Law
Harvard University

Bernard Wolfman

Fessenden Professor of Law
Harvard University

About Aspen Law & Business Legal Education Division

With a dedication to preserving and strengthening the long-standing tradition of publishing excellence in legal education, Aspen Law & Business continues to provide the highest quality teaching and learning resources for today's law school community. Careful development, meticulous editing, and an unmatched responsiveness to the evolving needs of today's discerning educators combine in the creation of our outstanding casebooks, coursebooks, textbooks, and study aids.

ASPEN LAW & BUSINESS
A Division of Aspen Publishers, Inc.
A Wolters Kluwer Company
www.aspenpublishers.com

PREFACE

Process lies at the core of our legal system: it expresses many of our culture's basic ideas about the meaning of fairness; it determines the victor in close cases; and it further determines which cases will be close ones. Procedure is also the area of law least understood and most maligned by lay observers. We root for underdogs and insist that rules not be stacked against them. But we are equally quick to condemn a case for having been decided on a "legal technicality," a phrase commonly signifying that a procedural rule has come into operation.

A similar ambivalence pervades debate about the behavior of courts and lawyers. As a society we demonstrate a strong belief in the efficacy of lawsuits to solve social, business, and personal problems, and we extol the rule of law as a distinguishing virtue of our culture. But at the same time we worry about what many believe is an excessive willingness to seek legal solutions. The ensuing debate ranges from the role of courts in restructuring social institutions to the question of whether lawyers exacerbate disputes and waste social resources by reflexively behaving in competitive, adversarial ways.

All these issues are procedural. Lawyers thus need to understand process as a tool of their trade, as a constitutive element of the legal system, and as a focus of debate about social values. Yet civil procedure is, by most accounts, a difficult and frustrating first-year course. Students come to law school with little experience in thinking explicitly about procedure and with an impression that cases simply arrive at the point of decision. Moreover, students sense that procedure may be the area in which lawyers' skill counts most; the notion that meritorious cases can be lost because of bad lawyering outrages their sense of justice even as it creates anxiety.

This book seeks to show procedure as an essential mechanism for presenting substantive questions and as a system that itself often raises fundamental issues regarding social values. I hope that students will begin to appreciate that lawyers move the system and that, to a large extent, clients' fates depend on the wisdom, skill, and judgment of their lawyers. Moreover, although all would agree that cases should not be decided on the basis of "mere" technicalities, fierce debate quickly arises when one

tries to distinguish rules that merely direct traffic from those that guard the boundaries of fairness.

In addition to considering such theoretical issues, the book has some practical goals. It seeks to give students a working knowledge of the procedural system and its sometimes arcane terminology. The course also introduces the techniques of statutory analysis. It should give students a better understanding of the procedural context of the decisions they read in other courses. To these ends I have tried to select cases that are factually interesting and do not involve substantive matters beyond the experience of first-year students. The problems following the cases are intended to be answerable by first-year students and to present real-life issues. Finally, the book incorporates a number of dissenting opinions to dispel the notion that most procedural disputes present clear-cut issues.

The organization of the book adapts it to the most common sequences in contemporary procedure courses. After a brief overview of the procedural system in Chapter I, some courses will initially consider the materials in Part A, which covers jurisdiction and choice of law. Other courses will begin with discussion of remedies, pleading, discovery, resolution without trial, identifying the trier, trial, appeal, and former adjudication which are addressed in Part B. Part C, on joinder and complex litigation, recapitulates much of the material in Parts A and B and can be used either as a culmination of the course or as an insertion that follows pleading.

Cases have been severely edited to eliminate citations (without indicating their omission), and they read somewhat differently from real case reports; I hope they err in the direction of smoothness. Citations are retained only when they seem significant. Footnotes have been eliminated without indication. Those that survive retain their original numbers, while the editor's footnotes employ symbols. We have used several special citation forms: F. James, G. Hazard, and J. Leubsdorf, *Civil Procedure* (4th ed. 1992), is cited as James, Hazard, and Leubsdorf; C. Wright, *Federal Courts* (5th ed. 1994), is cited as Wright, *Federal Courts*; J. Moore, *Federal Practice and Procedure* (1969), is cited as Moore; C. Wright, A. Miller, and E. Cooper, *Federal Practice and Procedure* (1969), is cited as Wright and Miller.

We gratefully acknowledge the permissions granted to reproduce the following materials. The excerpts from Brazil, *The Adversary Character of Civil Discovery: A Critique and Proposals for Change*, 31 *Vand. L. Rev.* 1295 (1978), are reprinted by permission of the *Vanderbilt Law Review* (copyright © 1978 by the *Vanderbilt Law Review*). The passages from Kamp, *The History Behind Hansberry v. Lee*, 20 *U.C. Davis L. Rev.* (1987), are reprinted by permission of the author and the Regents

of the University of California (copyright © 1987 by the Regents of the University of California).

Those whose assistance was acknowledged in the preface of earlier editions built the foundations on which this book rests. This revision has incurred additional debts of its own, including the suggestions received from teachers and students using the book. This edition has benefited greatly from the perceptive comments of Allen M. Katz, Esq. A distinguished litigator, Mr. Katz has shared his insights about the way in which doctrine matters in the shaping of a lawsuit and has offered many valuable suggestions, particularly about pleading, discovery, and trial. Without giving him any responsibility for the errors that doubtless still remain, I also want to thank him for having read and commented on the draft of each chapter. I want also to thank Professors Richard D. Friedman, Lawrence W. Moore, and Philip Schrag for their detailed, thoughtful, and constructive comments. This edition has also benefited from the help of Heather Deetjen and Richard Kim, who tracked down citations, indexed, and improved the book's comprehensibility.

This edition bears the name of only one author. In many respects, however, it continues to be the work of Jonathan Landers and the late James Martin, on whose intellectual framework and approach I have continued to build; though neither bears any responsibility for errors of judgment or detail, both should get credit for much that is right and helpful about the book.

Stephen C. Yeazell

January 2000

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Contents	ix
Preface	xxvii
I. An Overview of Procedure	1
PART A	
<hr/>	
THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR U.S. LITIGATION	71
II. Personal Jurisdiction	77
III. Subject Matter Jurisdiction of the Federal Courts	213
IV. The <i>Erie</i> Problem	261
PART B	
<hr/>	
THE PROCESS OF LITIGATION	305
V. Incentives to Litigate	309
VI. Pleading	383
VII. Discovery	485
VIII. Resolution Without Trial	565
IX. Identifying the Trier	655
X. Trial	711
XI. Appeal	753
XII. Respect for Judgments	797
	vii

PART C

EXPANDING THE FRAMEWORK OF LITIGATION: ADDITIONAL CLAIMS AND PARTIES	889
XIII. Joinder	891
Table of Cases	1019
Table of Citations to the Judicial Code (28 U.S.C.)	1027
Table of Citations to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure	1029
Table of Authorities	1031
Index	1035

CONTENTS

Preface

xxvii

I. AN OVERVIEW OF PROCEDURE	1
A. The Idea and the Practice of Procedure	1
1. Locating Procedure	1
2. Procedure, Lawyers, and Clients	3
B. Where Can the Suit Be Brought?	5
1. Subject Matter Jurisdiction	6
<i>Gordon v. Steele</i>	7
Notes and Problems	11
2. Personal Jurisdiction	12
Notes and Problems	13
3. Venue	13
Notes and Problems	14
4. Service of Process	14
C. Stating the Case	15
1. The Lawyer's Responsibility	15
<i>Bridges v. Diesel Service, Inc.</i>	15
Notes and Problems	17
2. The Complaint	18
<i>Bell v. Novick Transfer Co.</i>	18
Notes and Problems	19
3. The Response — Motions and Answer	21
Notes and Problems	22
Notes and Problems	24
Notes and Problems	26
Notes and Problems	28
4. Amendment of Pleadings	29
D. Parties to the Lawsuit	30
1. Permissive Joinder	30
Notes and Problems	30

ix

2.	Compulsory Joinder	31
	<i>Temple v. Synthes Corp.</i>	32
	Notes and Problems	33
3.	Intervention	34
	Notes and Problems	34
4.	Class Actions	35
E.	Factual Development—Discovery	36
	Notes and Problems	36
	<i>Butler v. Rigby</i>	39
	Notes and Problems	42
F.	Pretrial Disposition—Summary Judgment	42
	<i>Houchens v. American Home</i>	
	<i>Assurance Co.</i>	43
	Notes and Problems	47
G.	Trial	49
	<i>Norton v. Snapper Power</i>	
	<i>Equipment</i>	53
	Notes and Problems	55
H.	Former Adjudication	56
	<i>Rush v. City of Maple Heights</i>	57
	Notes and Problems	63
I.	Appeals	64
	<i>Apex Hosiery Co. v. Leader</i>	64
	Notes and Problems	65
	Note on Appellate Structure	
	and Jurisdiction	67
	Note: Civil Procedure in Your	
	Substantive Courses	68

PART A

THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR U.S. LITIGATIONS

71

A.	Approaching Civil Procedure	71
B.	Constitutional Limits in Litigation	72
	1. The Idea of Jurisdiction	72
	2. Jurisdiction and the Constitution	73
	3. The Constitution and Choice of Law	75

II. PERSONAL JURISDICTION	77
A. The Origins	77
<i>Pennoyer v. Neff</i>	77
Notes and Problems	84
Note on the Mechanics of Jurisdiction: Challenge and Waiver	92
Notes and Problems	93
B. The Modern Constitutional Formulation of Power	94
1. Redefining Constitutional Power	94
<i>International Shoe Co. v.</i> <i>Washington</i>	95
Notes and Problems	100
2. Absorbing In Rem Jurisdiction	103
<i>Shaffer v. Heitner</i>	104
Notes and Problems	113
3. Specific Jurisdiction: The Modern Cases	115
<i>McGee v. International Life</i> <i>Insurance Co.</i>	116
<i>Hanson v. Denckla</i>	117
Notes and Problems	118
<i>World-Wide Volkswagen Corp.</i> <i>v. Woodson</i>	119
Notes and Problems	126
<i>Asahi Metal Industry Co.</i> <i>v. Superior Court</i>	129
Notes and Problems	135
<i>Burger King Corp. v. Rudzewicz</i>	137
Notes and Problems	144
4. General Jurisdiction	146
<i>Washington Equipment</i> <i>Manufacturing Co. v.</i> <i>Concrete Placing Co.</i>	148
Notes and Problems	149
<i>Burnham v. Superior Court</i>	150
Notes and Problems	157
5. The Outer Limits of Jurisdictional Power: Jurisdiction to Determine Jurisdiction	159
<i>Insurance Corp. of Ireland, Ltd.</i> <i>v. Compagnie des Bauxites de</i> <i>Guinée</i>	160

	Notes and Problems	165
	Note on Procedure in International Litigation	166
C.	Consent as a Substitute for Power	168
	<i>Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc.</i> <i>v. Shute</i>	169
	Notes and Problems	172
D.	The Constitutional Requirement of Notice	174
	<i>Mullane v. Central Hanover</i> <i>Bank & Trust Co.</i>	175
	Notes and Problems	183
	Notes and Problems on Service of Process	184
E.	Self-Imposed Restraints on Jurisdictional Power: Long-Arm Statutes, Venue, and Discretionary Refusal of Jurisdiction	191
	1. Long-Arm Statutes as a Restraint on Jurisdiction	191
	<i>Gibbons v. Brown</i>	192
	Notes and Problems	194
	2. Venue as a Further Localizing Principle	197
	Notes and Problems	197
	<i>Dee-K Enterprises, Inc. v.</i> <i>Heveafil Sdn. Bhd.</i>	199
	Notes and Problems	201
	3. Declining Jurisdiction: Transfer and Forum Non Conveniens	203
	a. Forum Non Conveniens	204
	<i>Piper Aircraft v. Reyno</i>	204
	Notes and Problems	209
	b. Transfer under 28 U.S.C. §§1404, 1406, and 1631	210
	Notes and Problems	211
III. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION OF THE FEDERAL COURTS		213
A.	The Idea and the Structure of Subject Matter Jurisdiction	213
B.	Federal Question Jurisdiction	215
	<i>Louisville & Nashville Railroad</i> <i>v. Mottley</i>	217

	Notes and Problems	219
	Note: Challenging Federal Subject Matter Jurisdiction	225
C.	Diversity Jurisdiction	228
	<i>Mas v. Perry</i>	229
	Notes and Problems	232
	<i>Saadeh v. Farouki</i>	236
	Notes and Problems	239
	Note: Amount in Controversy	242
D.	Supplemental Jurisdiction	244
	<i>United Mine Workers v. Gibbs</i>	244
	Notes and Problems	248
E.	Removal	251
	Notes and Problems	251
	<i>Caterpillar, Inc. v. Lewis</i>	252
	Notes and Problems	256
IV.	THE ERIE PROBLEM	261
A.	State Courts as Lawmakers in a Federal System	262
	1. The Issue in Historical Context	262
	2. Constitutionalizing the Issue	264
	<i>Erie Railroad v. Tompkins</i>	265
	Notes and Problems	270
	Note: <i>Erie</i> and the Persistence of Federal Common Law	274
B.	The Limits of State Power in Federal Courts	275
	1. Interpreting the Constitutional Command of <i>Erie</i>	276
	<i>Guaranty Trust Co. v. York</i>	276
	Notes and Problems	278
	<i>Byrd v. Blue Ridge Rural Electric Cooperative</i>	281
	Notes and Problems	284
	2. De-Constitutionalizing <i>Erie</i>	284
	<i>Hanna v. Plumer</i>	284
	Notes and Problems	292
	3. Determining the Scope of Federal Law: Avoiding and Accommodating <i>Erie</i>	295
	<i>Burlington Northern Railroad v. Woods</i>	296

	<i>Stewart Organization, Inc.</i>	
	<i>v. Ricoh</i>	297
	<i>Gasperini v. Center for</i>	
	<i>Humanities, Inc.</i>	297
	Notes and Problems	298
4.	Determining the Scope of State Law:	
	An Entailment of <i>Erie</i>	300

PART B

THE PROCESS OF LITIGATION 305

A.	Approaching Civil Procedure	305
B.	Choosing Procedure	306
C.	A Roadmap for Exploring Choices	307

V. INCENTIVES TO LITIGATE 309

A.	Litigation in the United States at the End of the Twentieth Century	309
1.	How Much Litigation?	309
	Notes and Problems	313
2.	Why Litigate?	314
B.	Substitutionary Remedies	315
1.	Compensatory Damages	315
	<i>United States v. Hatahley</i>	315
	Notes and Problems	318
2.	Liquidated, Statutory, and Punitive Damages	321
	<i>Honda Motor Co. v. Oberg</i>	323
	<i>BMW of North America v. Gore</i>	326
	Notes and Problems	328
C.	Specific Remedies	330
1.	The Idea of Specific Relief	330
2.	An Excursus on Equity and Specific Relief	331
3.	Is There a Remedial Hierarchy?	333
	<i>Sigma Chemical Co. v. Harris</i>	334
	Notes and Problems	337
D.	Declaratory Relief	338
E.	Financing Litigation	340
1.	The “American” Rule	341
	Notes and Problems	342