

February 8, 2016

Practice Groups:

Consumer Financial Services

Financial Institutions and Services Litigation

For more news and developments related to consumer financial products and services, please visit our [Consumer Financial Services Watch Blog](#) and subscribe to receive updates.

“Who Decides” Whether Class Arbitration Is Available?: The Third Circuit Provides New Guidance in *Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC v. Scout Petroleum, LLC*

Consumer Financial Services Alert

Financial Institutions and Services Litigation Alert

By Andrew C. Glass, Loly G. Tor, Robert W. Sparkes, III, and Roger L. Smerage

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit (the “Court”) has spoken again on the issue of “who decides” whether parties must arbitrate a dispute on a classwide basis. In 2014, the Court ruled that “unless the parties clearly and unmistakably provide otherwise,” the court, not the arbitrator, decides the question.¹ Now, in *Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC v. Scout Petroleum, LLC*, the Court provides guidance on assessing when an arbitration agreement clearly and unmistakably delegates the question of classwide arbitration to an arbitrator.²

Analysis

Scout Petroleum LLC (“Scout”) filed a putative class arbitration demand with the American Arbitration Association (“AAA”) against Chesapeake Appalachia LLC (“Chesapeake”) and similarly situated entities based on allegations that Chesapeake and putative defendant class members failed to pay sufficient royalties under natural gas leases. The leases provided for arbitration of certain disputes between the parties. Chesapeake objected to class arbitration, contending the leases neither contemplated class arbitration nor that an arbitrator would decide the question. Accordingly, Chesapeake filed suit seeking a judicial declaration on these points.

The arbitration provision stated that in the event of “a disagreement ... concerning this Lease ... the resolution of all such disputes shall be determined by arbitration” under AAA rules. The arbitration provision itself did not reference class arbitration, but the AAA Supplementary Rules for Class Arbitrations provided that an arbitrator has the authority to decide whether an agreement permits class arbitration. Thus, Scout asserted that by incorporating the AAA’s rules into the arbitration provision, the parties clearly and unmistakably agreed to have an arbitrator decide the question. The district court disagreed, ruling that the arbitration provision was “silent and ambiguous as to class arbitration” and thus, “far from the ‘clear and

¹ *Opalinski v. Robert Half Int’l Inc.*, 761 F.3d 326, 330 (3d Cir. 2014) (citing *Reed Elsevier, Inc. v. Crockett*, 734 F.3d 594 (6th Cir. 2013), *cert. denied*, 134 S. Ct. 2291 (2014)), *cert. denied*, -- U.S. --, 135 S. Ct. 1530, 191 L. Ed. 2d 558 (2015). The K&L Gates alerts on *Opalinski* are available [here](#) and [here](#); the K&L Gates alert on *Reed Elsevier* is available [here](#).

² --- F.3d ---, 2016 WL 53806 (3d Cir. Jan. 5, 2016) (“*Scout Petroleum*”).

Consumer Financial Services Practice Contact List

unmistakable' allowance needed for an arbitrator, and not a court" to determine whether class arbitration is permitted.³

The Court agreed with the district court, affirming that an arbitration provision that is silent on the issue of who decides the availability of class arbitration does not clearly and unmistakably delegate the question to an arbitrator. The Court explained that an agreement that fails to reference class arbitration and makes only a general reference to an arbitral body's rules is insufficient to clearly delegate authority to an arbitrator to decide whether the parties agreed to class arbitration.⁴ In so holding, the Court distinguished jurisprudence finding that incorporation of AAA rules is sufficient to delegate to an arbitrator the question of whether a dispute is subject to bilateral arbitration. Rather, the Court ruled that classwide arbitration is significantly different from two-party arbitration.⁵ Consequently, the Court held that caselaw addressing bilateral arbitrations "is entitled to relatively little weight in the class arbitrability context," because "the whole notion of class arbitration implicates a particular set of concerns that are absent in the bilateral context."⁶

Conclusion

The *Scout Petroleum* decision cements the notion in the Third Circuit that the availability of class arbitration is a gateway question reserved for a court to decide absent clear and unmistakable language delegating that authority to an arbitrator. Grounded in U.S. Supreme Court precedent that there are fundamental differences between bilateral and class arbitration, *Scout Petroleum* will likely be persuasive to other federal courts considering this question in the future.

Authors:

Andrew C. Glass

andrew.glass@klgates.com
+1.617.261.3107

Loly G. Tor

loly.tor@klgates.com
+1.973.848.4026

Robert W. Sparkes, III

robert.sparkes@klgates.com
+1.617.951.9134

³ *Id.* at *4 (summarizing lower court decision). In examining the same question regarding the same arbitration provision, a different judge in the same district court had reached the opposite conclusion, finding the arbitration provision satisfied the high burden in *Opalinski* by incorporating the AAA's rules. See *Chesapeake Appalachia, LLC v. Burkett*, No. CIV. A. 3:13-3073, 2014 WL 5312829, at *8 (M.D. Pa. Oct. 17, 2014). The earlier district court decision is abrogated by *Scout Petroleum*.

⁴ 2016 WL 53806, at *11.

⁵ *Id.* ("[T]he differences between bilateral and class-action arbitration are too great for arbitrators to presume ... that the parties' mere silence on the issue of class-action arbitration constitutes consent to resolve their disputes in class proceedings.") (quoting *Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v. AnimalFeeds Int'l Corp.*, 559 U.S. 662, 687 (2010)).

⁶ 2016 WL 53806, at *15.

Consumer Financial Services Practice Contact List

Roger L. Smerage
roger.smerage@klgates.com
+1.617.951.9070

Consumer Financial Services Practice Contact List

K&L Gates' Consumer Financial Services practice provides a comprehensive range of transactional, regulatory compliance, enforcement and litigation services to the lending and settlement service industry. Our focus includes first- and subordinate-lien, open- and closed-end residential mortgage loans, as well as multi-family and commercial mortgage loans. We also advise clients on direct and indirect automobile, and manufactured housing finance relationships. In addition, we handle unsecured consumer and commercial lending. In all areas, our practice includes traditional and e-commerce applications of current law governing the fields of mortgage banking and consumer finance.

For more information, please contact one of the professionals listed below.

LAWYERS

Boston

R. Bruce Allensworth	bruce.allensworth@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3119
Gregory N. Blase	gregory.blase@klgates.com	+1.617.951.9059
David E. Fialkow	david.fialkow@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3126
Brian M. Forbes	brian.forbes@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3152
Irene C. Freidel	irene.freidel@klgates.com	+1.617.951.9154
Andrew C. Glass	andrew.glass@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3107
Sean R. Higgins	sean.higgins@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3128
Sean P. Mahoney	sean.mahoney@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3202
Jeffrey S. Patterson	jeffrey.patterson@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3124
Stanley V. Ragalevsky	stan.ragalevsky@klgates.com	+1.617.951.9203
Robert W. Sparkes, III	robert.sparkes@klgates.com	+1.617.951.9134
Ryan M. Tosi	ryan.tosi@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3257
Phoebe S. Winder	phoebe.winder@klgates.com	+1.617.261.3196

Charlotte

John H. Culver III	john.culver@klgates.com	+1.704.331.7453
Amy Pritchard Williams	amy.williams@klgates.com	+1.704.331.7429

Dallas

David A. Tallman	david.tallman@klgates.com	+1.214.939.4946
------------------	---------------------------	-----------------

Miami

Paul F. Hancock	paul.hancock@klgates.com	+1.305.539.3378
-----------------	--------------------------	-----------------

San Francisco

Jonathan Jaffe	jonathan.jaffe@klgates.com	+1.415.249.1023
----------------	----------------------------	-----------------

Seattle

Holly K. Towle	holly.towle@klgates.com	+1.206.370.8334
----------------	-------------------------	-----------------

Sydney

Andrea P. Beatty	andrea.beatty@klgates.com	+61.2.9513.2333
------------------	---------------------------	-----------------

Washington, D.C.

Costas A. Avrakotos	costas.avrakotos@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9075
David L. Beam	david.beam@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9026
Emily Booth-Dornfeld	emily.booth@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9112
Melanie Brody	melanie.brody@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9203
Holly Spencer Bunting	holly.bunting@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9853
Soyong Cho	soyong.cho@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9181
Krista Cooley	krista.cooley@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9257
Daniel F. C. Crowley	dan.crowley@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9447
Eric J. Edwardson	eric.edwardson@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9387
Jon Eisenberg	jon.eisenberg@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9348

Consumer Financial Services Practice Contact List

Shanda N. Hastings	shanda.hastings@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9119
Steven M. Kaplan	steven.kaplan@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9204
Kris D. Kully	kris.kully@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9301
Rebecca H. Laird	rebecca.laird@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9038
Ori Lev	ori.lev@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9058
Michael J. Missal	michael.missal@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9302
Laurence E. Platt	larry.platt@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9034
Stephanie C. Robinson	stephanie.robinson@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9856
Phillip L. Schulman	phil.schulman@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9027
Kerri M. Smith	kerri.smith@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9445
Stephen G. Topetzes	stephen.topetzes@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9328

PROFESSIONALS

Government Affairs Advisor / Director of Licensing

Washington, D.C.

Stacey L. Riggin	stacey.riggin@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9202
------------------	---------------------------	-----------------

Counsel

Washington, D.C.

Keisha Whitehall Wolfe	keisha.whitehallwolfe@klgates.com	+1.202.778.9124
------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------

K&L GATES

Anchorage Austin Beijing Berlin Boston Brisbane Brussels Charleston Charlotte Chicago Dallas Doha Dubai Fort Worth Frankfurt
Harrisburg Hong Kong Houston London Los Angeles Melbourne Miami Milan Moscow Newark New York Orange County Palo Alto Paris
Perth Pittsburgh Portland Raleigh Research Triangle Park San Francisco São Paulo Seattle Seoul Shanghai Singapore Spokane
Sydney Taipei Tokyo Warsaw Washington, D.C. Wilmington

K&L Gates comprises more than 2,000 lawyers globally who practice in fully integrated offices located on five continents. The firm represents leading multinational corporations, growth and middle-market companies, capital markets participants and entrepreneurs in every major industry group as well as public sector entities, educational institutions, philanthropic organizations and individuals. For more information about K&L Gates or its locations, practices and registrations, visit www.klgates.com.

This publication is for informational purposes and does not contain or convey legal advice. The information herein should not be used or relied upon in regard to any particular facts or circumstances without first consulting a lawyer.

© 2016 K&L Gates LLP. All Rights Reserved.