



LEGAL ALERT

www.swlaw.com

June 9, 2009

SNELL & WILMER

Founded in 1938, Snell & Wilmer is a full-service business law firm with more than 425 attorneys practicing in eight offices throughout the western United States and in Mexico, including Phoenix and Tucson, Arizona; Los Angeles and Orange County, California; Denver, Colorado; Los Cabos, Mexico; Las Vegas, Nevada; and Salt Lake City, Utah. Representing corporations, small businesses, and individuals, our mission is to take a genuine interest in our clients, understand their objectives, and meet or exceed their expectations.

Snell & Wilmer
L.L.P.
LAW OFFICES

The Future of Employment Arbitration

By Gerard Morales and Joe Kroeger

For years, many non-union employers have entered into alternative dispute resolution (ADR) agreements with their employees that require, in essence, that disputes that may arise during the employment relationship be resolved through arbitration, rather than through the judicial process. ADR agreements seek to avoid the delays and significant legal expenses inherent in the judicial process. Recent developments regarding the enforceability of ADR agreements will affect employers and employees both union and non-union.

On April 1, 2009, the Supreme Court held¹ that provisions in a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) which *clearly and unmistakably* require that employment discrimination claims be resolved through arbitration are enforceable with respect to all employees covered by the CBA. However, while the Supreme Court reaffirmed the enforceability of CBA provisions that require the resolution of employment discrimination disputes through arbitration, Congress is considering a bill that would drastically limit the enforceability of non-union ADR agreements.

¹ *14 Penn Plaza LLC v. Byett*, ___ U.S. ___, 129 S.Ct. 1456. The case involved a claim of discrimination under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA).



The Arbitration Fairness Act of 2009 (AFA), H.R. 1020, was introduced in the House of Representatives on February 12, 2009. Section 2(b) of this Act provides:

- (b) No pre-dispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable if it requires arbitration of: (1) an employment, consumer, or franchise dispute. . .

The AFA expressly exempt CBAs from its application.

It seems clear, therefore, that if the AFA becomes law, while employees covered by CBAs

may be required to submit their employment discrimination claims to binding arbitration, employees who are not covered by CBAs, but who have entered into ADR (arbitration) agreements with their employers, may not be able to enforce those agreements.

Employers should follow these developments closely as they will have a significant impact on the resolution of employment discrimination claims. If you have any questions on the subject of this article or would like more information, please contact the authors or another Snell & Wilmer attorney at 602.382.6000.



Gerard Morales
602.382.6362
jmorales@swlaw.com

Jerry is a partner at the Phoenix office of Snell & Wilmer. His practice is concentrated on labor, employment, and construction law. Representation in employment-related matters includes wrongful termination, employment discrimination, arbitration, and other alternative dispute resolution proceedings.



Joseph A. Kroeger
520.882.1254
jkroeger@swlaw.com

Joe is an associate at the Tucson office of Snell & Wilmer. His practice is concentrated in labor and employment. He represents employers in a variety of areas, including employment discrimination and harassment, wrongful discharge, breach of contract, misappropriation of trade secrets, non-competition/non-solicitation matters, alternative dispute resolution and arbitration agreements, and a variety of other related areas.