

Supreme Court Confirms Enforceability of Class Action Waivers

December 15, 2015



For the second time in four years, the U.S. Supreme Court has overruled a California decision that refused to enforce an arbitration agreement with a class action waiver, holding that the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) trumps California's attempts to restrict arbitration and class action waivers in consumer and employment lawsuits. In *DirecTV, Inc. v. Imburgia*, Case No. 14-462, the Supreme Court, in a 6-3 decision authored by Justice Stephen Breyer, upheld an arbitration clause requiring consumers to arbitrate their claims individually, and precluding class actions. The Court held that because the FAA preempts contrary California law that would make such class-arbitration waivers unenforceable, the arbitration agreement at issue must be enforced. The opinion is the latest in a series of battles between the U.S. Supreme Court and California state and federal courts over arbitration issues. In 2005, the California Supreme Court held in *Discover Bank v. Superior Court*, 113 P.3d 1100, 1110 (Cal. 2005), that class-arbitration waivers are "unconscionable" and unenforceable under California law. In its 2011 decision in *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, 131 S. Ct. 1740 (2011), the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a class-arbitration waiver, finding that the FAA preempted the rule created by the California Supreme Court in *Discover Bank*. With its latest opinion in *Imburgia*, the U.S. Supreme Court has

once again confirmed the enforceability of class-arbitration waivers. Whether a particular agreement protects against class litigation or even class arbitration can turn on the agreement's specific language. Arbitration agreements that include class-arbitration waivers are an important tool for businesses and employers to protect themselves from costly class-action litigation.

Authored By



Mark A. Neubauer



Julianna Thomas McCabe

Related Practices

[Labor & Employment](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our [Contact Us](#) form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.