

The US Supreme Court confirms the United States is a pro-arbitration jurisdiction

January 2019

In a unanimous decision on January 8, 2019 in *Henry Schein, Inc. v. Archer & White Sales, Inc.* (**Henry Schein**), the US Supreme Court confirmed that the United States is a pro-arbitration jurisdiction that will honor parties' agreements to arbitrate. Specifically, where an arbitration clause clearly delegates the decision of arbitrability to the arbitrators, courts should have no say in the matter—even if they perceive the argument in favor of arbitration as “wholly groundless.” This decision provides clarity for potential disputants and is in line with prior Court precedent prohibiting courts from reviewing the merits of a dispute when properly delegated to an arbitrator.

Kompetenz-kompetenz

Kompetenz-kompetenz is a well-established doctrine in international arbitration. It holds that an arbitral tribunal is competent to determine its own jurisdiction. Although most, if not all, modern arbitration rules incorporate this doctrine, its effectiveness in a given jurisdiction depends on the willingness of courts of that jurisdiction to allow the relevant tribunal to decide on its competence. The doctrine of *kompetenz-kompetenz* is recognized in US law, but certain federal appeal courts in the US would nevertheless allow federal courts to preempt the arbitrators' exercise of that power where they (the courts) perceived the argument in favor of arbitration to be “wholly groundless.” That was the case until recently.

The decision in *Henry Schein*

The Supreme Court addressed *kompetenz-kompetenz* in its January 8, 2019 decision in *Henry Schein, Inc. v. Archer & White Sales, Inc.*, 586 US ___ (2019), when it held that the parties' agreement on who decides the question of arbitrability must be honored. Under the Supreme Court's ruling, where an arbitration clause delegates that decision to the arbitrators, courts should have no say on this matter – even if they perceive the argument in favor of arbitration as “wholly groundless.” The Supreme Court explained:

“Just as a court may not decide a merits question that the parties have delegated to an arbitrator, a court may not decide an arbitrability question that the parties have delegated to an arbitrator.”

The Supreme Court's reasoning

When a dispute arose, Archer & White Sales, Inc. (A&W) sued Henry Schein, Inc. (Schein) in Texas federal district court for antitrust violations, seeking damages and injunctive relief. Schein moved to dismiss the case and compel arbitration on the basis of the arbitration clause, which provided:

“[a]ny dispute arising under or related to this Agreement (except for actions seeking injunctive relief and disputes related to trademarks, trade secrets, or other intellectual property of [Henry Schein]), shall be resolved by binding arbitration in accordance with the arbitration rules of the American Arbitration Association [(AAA)].”

A&W objected to the removal to arbitration arguing that, since it sought injunctive relief, the dispute fell outside of the scope of the arbitration agreement. The district court agreed with A&W and held that Schein's argument was "wholly groundless" and thus, under Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals precedent, the court was authorized to make the decision on arbitrability. The Fifth Circuit affirmed.

The Supreme Court granted *certiorari* and unanimously rejected the "wholly groundless" exception recognized in some US federal courts as inconsistent with the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA). In doing so, the Court readily disposed of A&W's four arguments:

1. A&W argued that Sections 3 and 4 of the FAA mandate that the issue of arbitrability is to be decided by the court. Section 3 provides that a court must stay litigation "upon being satisfied" that the issue is referable to arbitration, and Section 4 requires a court to compel arbitration, but only "in accordance with the terms of the agreement." The Court found that A&W's interpretation would require courts to always resolve questions of arbitrability, which is clearly not the case under the Court's precedents. Although a court must satisfy itself that a valid arbitration agreement exists before referring the dispute to arbitration, if the arbitration agreement delegates decision on arbitrability to the arbitrators, the court has no role to play in that decision.
2. A&W pointed to Section 10 of the FAA, which provides for "back-end" (i.e., post-arbitration) judicial review of an arbitrator's decision if the arbitrator has exceeded its powers. A&W posited that if a court can rule then the dispute was not arbitrable after the arbitration ends, it should also be allowed to do before it begins, i.e., so at the "front end." Reiterating that it is not the Court's place to "redesign" the FAA, the Court rejected the argument.
3. A&W maintained that it would be wasteful to send the arbitrability question to an arbitrator if the argument for arbitration is wholly groundless. The Court again reiterated that the FAA contains no "wholly groundless" exception, and that the Court may not "engraft" its own exceptions onto the statutory text. The Court also disagreed with the premise that creating a "time-consuming sideshow" in court before referring the dispute to arbitration would be a more efficient to resolve disputes.
4. A&W argued that the "wholly groundless" exception is necessary to deter frivolous motions to compel arbitration. The Court considered that the potential problem was overstated and noted that it was "not aware [that] frivolous motions to compel arbitration have caused a substantial problem in those Circuits that have not recognized a 'wholly groundless' exception."

Notably, A&W also argued that no "clear and unmistakable" delegation had been achieved in that case because the *kompetenz-kompetenz* provision in the applicable arbitration rules only prescribes the positive competence of the arbitrators (i.e., authorizing the arbitrators to decide) without addressing the negative competence (i.e., barring courts from determining the competence of arbitrations at the outset of the case). Since that question had not been raised below, the Supreme Court abstained from deciding it.

Clarity and predictability

By rejecting the "wholly groundless" exception in *Henry Schein*, the Court effectively resolved a circuit split on this issue of arbitrability and provided contracting parties agreeing to arbitrate in the United States with more certainty and predictability.

Parties are advised to consult with disputes attorneys when drafting arbitration clauses for their contracts in light of the open question as to whether the requisite delegation can be achieved solely by a *kompetenz-kompetenz* provision in the applicable arbitration rules. Please reach out to our US-qualified attorneys located either in the United States or globally, if you have any questions.

Key contacts

United States



William O'Brien
Partner, Washington
International Dispute Resolution

D +1 202 496 7107
M +1 202 744 3327
E william.obrien@dentons.com

Will O'Brien, partner and Chair of Dentons' US International Dispute Resolution practice, acts as lead counsel in complex international arbitrations and litigation across a wide variety of sectors and before all major international arbitral institutions and U.S. courts, involving politically-charged cross-border enforcement of arbitration awards, government contracts, treaty issues, foreign sovereign immunity, defense against allegations of fraud or corruption and issues of first impression.



Meriam Al-Rashid
Partner, New York/London
Public International Law
and Investment Disputes

D +1 212 398 5808
M +1 949 378 9133
E meriam.al-rashid@dentons.com

Meriam is the US Head of Public International Law and Investment Disputes. She is also a member of Dentons' Litigation and Dispute Resolution practice group where she focuses on international investment and commercial arbitration and risk management, covering various industries globally, including infrastructure, oil and gas, mineral resources, hospitality and real estate.



John Hay
Partner, New York
Litigation and Dispute Resolution

D +1 212 398 5233
M +1 203 536 6758
E john.hay@dentons.com

John has more than 35 years' experience representing domestic and international clients in complex commercial and investment treaty disputes. His practice involves matters in federal and state courts throughout the United States and before arbitration tribunals throughout the world, including the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, the London Court of International Arbitration, the International Centre for Dispute Resolution of the American Arbitration Association, and the International Chamber of Commerce (ICC).



Ulyana Bardyn
Senior Managing Associate,
New York
Litigation and Dispute Resolution

D +1 212 768 5304
M +1 (646) 288-1007
E ulyana.bardyn@dentons.com

Ulyana's focuses her practice on complex cross-border disputes, including commercial arbitration, investor-state arbitration and commercial litigation. She appeared as counsel in cases governed by the rules of the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes, the International Chamber of Commerce, the London Court of International Arbitration (LCIA), the American Arbitration Association (AAA) and the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), as well as commercial litigation matters in US federal and state courts.



Ana Rocio Monzón Woc
Associate, New York
Litigation and Dispute Resolution

D +1 212 398 5807
M +1 617 949 9293
E rocio.monzon@dentons.com

Ana Rocio Monzón Woc is an associate in the Litigation and Dispute Resolution Practice Group in Dentons New York office. She focuses her practice on investment and commercial arbitration. Ana Rocio obtained an LL.M. from Harvard Law School and a degree as Attorney at Law and Notary Public from Universidad Francisco Marroquin in Guatemala. She is admitted to practice in Guatemala.

Key contacts

International



Bart Legum

Partner, Global Co-Chair, Paris
Litigation and Dispute Resolution

D +33 1 42 68 48 70
M +33 6 87 73 89 56
E bart.legum@dentons.com

Barton Legum is a partner in Dentons' Paris office and head of the firm's investment treaty arbitration practice. Bart has more than 30 years' experience in litigating complex cases and has argued before numerous international arbitration tribunals, the International Court of Justice and a range of trial and appeals courts in the United States. His practice focuses on international arbitration in general and arbitration under investment treaties in particular.



Amy Kläsener

Partner, Frankfurt
Litigation and Dispute Resolution

D +49 69 4500 12 290
M +49 172 638 5198
E amy.klaesener@dentons.com

Amy Kläsener is a partner in Dentons' Frankfurt Office. Her practice focuses on international commercial arbitration. Amy Kläsener advises and represents companies and state-owned entities in international arbitrations under the ICC, DIS, HKIAC, AAA and SCC rules as well as in ad hoc arbitrations, with a particular focus on engineering, construction and post-M&A disputes. She also sits as arbitrator.



Courtney Lotfi

Counsel, Frankfurt
Litigation and Dispute Resolution

D +49 69 450012 295
M +49 162 1062 587
E courtney.lotfi@dentons.com

Courtney represents clients in a variety of industries including energy (oil and gas), construction and industrial engineering, life sciences, and corporate disputes applying both civil and common laws. She has represented clients in more than 30 international arbitration proceedings as counsel under various rules including the ICC, VIAC, SCC, UNCITRAL, AAA, SIAC, DIS, DIA and in *ad hoc* proceedings. She is a member of the AAA, ICDR and VIAC roster of arbitrators, and is admitted to practice in Virginia, USA.