

Arbitrating Class Actions – *Does Arbitration Bind Employees Who Do Not Opt-in?*

Prepared by:
Rebecca M. McCloskey
Jackson Lewis P.C.



LORMAN[®]

Published on www.lorman.com - July 2018

Arbitrating Class Actions – Does Arbitration Bind Employees Who Do Not Opt-in?, ©2018 Lorman Education Services. All Rights Reserved.

INTRODUCING

Lorman's New Approach to Continuing Education

ALL-ACCESS PASS

The All-Access Pass grants you **UNLIMITED** access to Lorman's ever-growing library of training resources:

- ☑ Unlimited Live Webinars - 120 live webinars added every month
- ☑ Unlimited OnDemand and MP3 Downloads - Over 1,500 courses available
- ☑ Videos - More than 1300 available
- ☑ Slide Decks - More than 2300 available
- ☑ White Papers
- ☑ Reports
- ☑ Articles
- ☑ ... and much more!

Join the thousands of other pass-holders that have already trusted us for their professional development by choosing the All-Access Pass.



Get Your All-Access Pass Today!

SAVE 20%

Learn more: www.lorman.com/pass/?s=special20

Use Discount Code Q7014393 and Priority Code 18536 to receive the 20% AAP discount.

*Discount cannot be combined with any other discounts.

Arbitrating Class Actions – Does Arbitration Bind Employees Who Do Not Opt-in?

Written by Rebecca M. McCloskey on May 17, 2018

The Second Circuit Court of Appeals heard arguments last week to determine whether an arbitrator's award in a Title VII class action applies only to the 254 employees who are named plaintiffs or otherwise opted in to the class, *or* whether it extends to all 70,000 similarly situated employees. (Jock et al. v. Sterling Jewelers, Inc., Case No. 18-153 (2d Cir.)). The Second Circuit's decision could have a huge impact on employers whose arbitration agreements are silent on arbitrability of class actions claims (as in this case), because it raises the stakes in a forum where arbitrators are not bound to follow the law and their decisions are not appealable except in extremely narrow circumstances.

A major difference between class actions proceeding in federal court and class actions proceeding in arbitration is that federal courts derive jurisdiction over litigants pursuant to Article III of the U.S. Constitution, while arbitrators' jurisdiction is derived exclusively from contractual agreements. Thus, while similarly situated individuals can be included in a class action unless they opt out under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, arbitrators have no jurisdiction in the first instance over individuals who have not agreed to arbitrate their claims.

In a 2010 decision in this case, the Second Circuit held that an agreement to arbitrate class claims may either be expressly stated in an arbitration agreement, or it may be implied by the parties' consent to have an arbitrator decide the issue of class arbitrability. Appearing as a named plaintiff or opt-in plaintiff in a class arbitration constitutes consent.

Subsequently, in a 2017 decision in this case, the Second Circuit clarified that putative class members who did not opt-in to class arbitration may not have agreed to arbitrate their class claims if the arbitration agreement is silent on class actions, and remanded the issue to Judge Rakoff in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

In 2018, Judge Rakoff held that, absent language in the arbitration agreement compelling class arbitration, similarly situated employees who had not opted in to the class arbitration were not part of the class before the arbitrator because their consent to arbitrate could not be implied. Judge Rakoff's decision is currently being challenged on appeal to the Second Circuit.

In the Jock case, the plaintiffs are the ones who pursued their class claims in arbitration in the first instance, which constituted their consent to arbitrate class claims. No matter the outcome in the Jock case, there is still an argument to avoid arbitration of class actions in the typical case where a plaintiff files suit in court and resists arbitration. If an arbitration agreement is silent on class action arbitrability, a plaintiff may be limited to pursuing an individual claim in arbitration because they may not have consented to having the issue of class action arbitrability decided

by an arbitrator. We will continue to keep you abreast of developments in the arbitration of class actions. Should you have any questions regarding this or other related cases, please reach out to the Jackson Lewis attorney with whom you regularly work with.

The material appearing in this website is for informational purposes only and is not legal advice. Transmission of this information is not intended to create, and receipt does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship. The information provided herein is intended only as general information which may or may not reflect the most current developments. Although these materials may be prepared by professionals, they should not be used as a substitute for professional services. If legal or other professional advice is required, the services of a professional should be sought.

The opinions or viewpoints expressed herein do not necessarily reflect those of Lorman Education Services. All materials and content were prepared by persons and/or entities other than Lorman Education Services, and said other persons and/or entities are solely responsible for their content.

Any links to other websites are not intended to be referrals or endorsements of these sites. The links provided are maintained by the respective organizations, and they are solely responsible for the content of their own sites.