



Navigating the Evidence and Discovery Roadmap in Arbitration

March 9, 2016 – 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. ET

PROGRAM SUMMARY

Speakers: Richard T. Seymour and Edward T. Ellis

Arbitration is less formal than litigation, and arbitrators are not required to follow the rules of evidence. At the same time, many of the rules of evidence are grounded in the fundamental question—equally applicable to arbitration—of whether a particular item of evidence is reliable, and of the weight it should be given. Evidentiary objections can be important, as they alert the arbitrator to problems with any specific item of evidence

AGENDA

1:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introduction of Speakers	(5 minutes)
1:05 p.m.	Dispositive Motions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• recent developments in the law of evidence;• whether a party risks vacatur when it successfully opposes discovery or asks for the exclusion of evidence;• the role of e-discovery in arbitration;• the expansion of discovery if dispositive motions are to be filed;• best practices for counsel and arbitrators;• strategies for preparing a case in arbitration and how the arbitrator's rulings on relevance and hearsay may have a significant impact on the outcome of the case.	(75 minutes)
2:20 p.m.	Conclusion and Questions	(10 minutes)
2:30 p.m.	Evaluation	(5 minutes)
2:35 p.m.	Adjourn	

American Arbitration Association

March 9, 2016

**Navigating the Discovery and
Evidence Roadmap in
Arbitration**

by

Richard T. Seymour*

* Law Office of Richard T. Seymour, P.L.L.C., Suite 900, Brawner Building, 888 17th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20006-3307. Attorney, Arbitrator, Mediator. Telephone: 202-785-2145. Cell: 202-549-1454. Facsimile: 800-805-1065. E-mail: rick@rickseymourlaw.net. Many of my CLE papers are downloadable from www.rickseymourlaw.com.

Table of Contents

I.	Discovery Questions	1
A.	Limits on Discovery in the Arbitration Agreement	1
B.	Make Sure the Arbitrator Knows What the Case is About, on Both Sides	1
C.	Make Sure the Arbitrator Knows the Relief Sought and the Defenses to Relief.....	2
D.	Be Prepared to Discuss Discovery at the Case Management Conference	2
E.	What About Arbitration Agreements Restricting Discovery?	2
1.	Rules of Arbitration Service Providers	3
a.	Commercial Rules.....	3
b.	Employment Rules.....	4
F.	Should There Be External Rules, and Which Ones?	5
G.	The Effect of Failing to Waive the Right to File a Dispositive Motion	5
1.	Background.....	5
2.	Arbitration Rules Give Arbitrators Discretion Whether to Permit the Filing of a Dispositive Motion.....	6
3.	Cost-Saving Recommendation.....	7
H.	Arbitrators’ Subpoenas for Testimony or Documents	7
1.	Sec. 7 of the FAA.....	7
2.	What: Documents Only?.....	8
a.	Circuits Enforcing the Subpoenas.....	8
b.	Circuits Refusing to Enforce the Subpoenas	8
3.	When: Discovery?.....	8
a.	Circuits Enforcing the Subpoenas.....	8
b.	Circuits Enforcing the Subpoenas Only in Special Cases	9
c.	Circuits Refusing to Enforce the Subpoenas	10
4.	Where: Outside the Subpoena Power of Courts Where the Arbitrator Sits?	10
a.	Circuits Enforcing the Subpoenas.....	10
b.	Circuits Refusing to Enforce the Subpoenas	11
5.	What’s a Poor Advocate to Do?.....	11
I.	Discovery, in a Subsequent Dispute, of Confidential Materials in An Arbitration To Which the Discovering Entity Was Not a Party	13
II.	Evidence.....	13
A.	The Federal Arbitration Act Limits Refusals to Consider Evidence	13
B.	The Effect of the Form of the Award on Evidentiary Questions	14
C.	In Practice, Are Arbitrators Required to Admit Everything?	15
D.	Problems With Saying That Evidence Will Be Considered “For What It Is Worth” ...	17
E.	Should There Be Rules of Evidence, and Which Ones?.....	17
F.	Rules? Doesn’t Anything Go In, in Arbitration?	18
1.	Common Sense	18
2.	Commercial Rules.....	18
3.	Employment Rules.....	19
G.	Evidence on Motions	20
1.	Formality vs. Informality	20
2.	The Need for Some Evidence	20

Table of Cases

<i>Am. Fed'n of TV & Radio Artists v. WJBK-TV</i> , 164 F.3d 1004 (6th Cir. 1999)	8
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Kidney Ctr.</i> , 879 F. Supp. 878 (N.D. Ill. 1995)	11
<i>Baxter Int'l v. Abbott Labs.</i> , 297 F.3d 544 (7th Cir. 2002)	13
<i>Bell Aerospace Co. Div. of Textron, Inc. v. Int'l Union, United Auto., etc.</i> , 500 F.2d 921 (2d Cir. 1974)	15, 16
<i>Burton v. Bush</i> , 614 F.2d 389 (4th Cir. 1980)	9, 10
<i>COMSAT Corp. v. NSF</i> , 190 F.3d 269 (4th Cir. 1999)	9
<i>DIRECTV, Inc. v. Imburgia</i> , 136 S. Ct. 463 (2015)	17
<i>Donnelly v. United States</i> , 228 U.S. 243 (1913)	6
<i>Dynegy Midstream Servs. v. Trammochem</i> , 451 F.3d 89 (2d Cir. 2006)	11
<i>First Options of Chi., Inc. v. Kaplan</i> , 514 U.S. 938 (1995)	15
<i>Forsythe Int'l, S.A. v. Gibbs Oil Co.</i> , 915 F.2d 1017 (5th Cir. 1990)	15
<i>Gateway Techs. v. MCI Telecomms. Corp.</i> , 64 F.3d 993 (5th Cir. 1995)	16
<i>Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp.</i> , 500 U.S. 20 (1991)	3
<i>Gotham Holdings, LP v. Health Grades, Inc.</i> , 580 F.3d 664 (7th Cir. 2009)	13
<i>Grahams Serv., Inc. v. Teamsters Local 975</i> , 700 F.2d 420 (8th Cir. 1982)	16
<i>Hay Group, Inc. v. E.B.S. Acq. Corp.</i> , 360 F.3d 404 (3d Cir. 2004)	8, 12

<i>Hoffman v. Cargill Inc.</i> , 236 F.3d 458, 463 (8th Cir. 2001)	3
<i>Hooters of America, Inc. v. Phillips</i> , 173 F.3d 933 (4th Cir. 1999)	3
<i>Hoteles Condado Beach, La Concha & Convention Center v. Union de Tronquistas Local 901</i> , 763 F.2d 34 (1st Cir. 1985)	15, 16
<i>Imburgia v. DIRECTV, Inc.</i> , 225 Cal. App. 4th 338 (2014)	17
<i>JLM Indus. v. Stolt–Nielsen SA</i> , 387 F.3d 163 (2d Cir. 2004)	11
<i>Jepson, Inc. v. Makita Elec. Works</i> , 30 F.3d 854 (7th Cir. 1994)	13
<i>Lessin v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.</i> , 481 F.3d 813 (D.C. Cir. 2007)	15
<i>Life Receivables Tr. v. Syndicate 102 at Lloyd's of London</i> , 549 F.3d 210 (2d Cir. 2008)	10
<i>NBC v. Bear Stearns & Co.</i> , 165 F.3d 184 (2d Cir. 1999)	11
<i>Nat'l Post Office Mailhandlers v. U.S. Postal Serv.</i> , 751 F.2d 834 (6th Cir. 1985)	15, 16
<i>Newark Stereotypers' Union v. Newark Morning Ledger Co.</i> , 397 F.2d 594 (3d Cir. 1968)	16
<i>Robbins v. Day</i> , 954 F.2d 679 (11th Cir.)	15
<i>Sec. Life Ins. Co. of Am. v. Duncanson & Holt</i> , 228 F.3d 865 (8th Cir. 2000)	8, 9
<i>Sec. Life Ins. Co. of Am. v. Duncanson & Holt</i> , 11 F. App'x 926 (9th Cir. 2001)	10
<i>Sheldon v. Vermonty</i> , 269 F.3d 1202 (10th Cir. 2001)	16
<i>Stolt-Nielsen Transp. Group, Inc. v. Celanese AG</i> , 430 F.3d 567 (2d Cir. 2005)	11
<i>Tempo Shain Corp. v. Bertek, Inc.</i> , 120 F.3d 16 (2d Cir. 1997)	16

<i>The Quickstep</i> , 76 U.S. (9 Wall.) 665 (1869)	6
<i>Totem Marine Tug & Barge v. N. Am. Towing</i> , 607 F.2d 649 (5th Cir. 1979)	16
<i>Totem Marine Tug & Barge, Inc. v. N. Am. Towing, Inc.</i> , 607 F.2d 649 (5th Cir. 1979)	15
<i>United States v. Foster</i> , 564 F.3d 852 (7th Cir. 2009)	13
<i>United States v. du Pont</i> , 353 U.S. 586 (1957)	6

I. Discovery Questions

A. Limits on Discovery in the Arbitration Agreement

Some arbitration agreements contain tight limits on discovery, such as one or two depositions and limited document discovery.

If the case is an employer-mandated arbitration agreement and covered by the AAA Employment Rules, the rules trump any conflicting provisions in the employer's agreement. If it is an individually-negotiated agreement *or* is covered by the JAMS rules, the agreement may trump the rules.

However, JAMS has issued the "JAMS Policy on Employment Arbitration / Minimum Standards of Procedural Fairness," effective July 15, 2009. The policy governs which employment arbitration agreements JAMS will agree to administer. Standard 4 refers to the exchange of information, and the Comment to Standard 4 says there should be a pre-arbitration exchange of core information, including one deposition per side and core documents, with the arbitrator having discretion to order further discovery. It is unclear to me what force JAMS arbitrators give to the comment to a standard in a policy.

Advocates should be aware that parties can agree to use the rules of either AAA or JAMS without having the AAA or JAMS administer the arbitrations. If parties agree to use the JAMS rules without JAMS administration, there is a serious question whether the comment to Standard 4 in the JAMS Policy would apply.

In either situation, a showing of very good cause may be enough to justify additional discovery. Practitioners should focus their arguments on the functional reasons why they need the additional discovery in the case at bar, and the reasons why the burden of responding is justifiable. Legal arguments should be focused on showcasing the importance of the information, and how courts have balanced burden against need.

B. Make Sure the Arbitrator Knows What the Case is About, on Both Sides

The demand for arbitration is often very summary, and does not provide critical information about the case. The respondent's response is also often very summary.

In considering discovery disputes, the arbitrator has to make judgments and exercise discretion. That is very hard to do well if the arbitrator does not know what the contentions on each side are, or what the actual field of contention will be.

Claimants should always submit a detailed statement, citing any statutes governing your claim and explaining what it is about. Respondents should always submit a response explaining their view. Advocates should not waive the opportunity, and should not waive the opportunity to get more details from the other side, unless the stakes are so small that the parties would prefer the arbitrator to be flying blind.

Jacquelin Drucker, a very highly regarded arbitrator, said at a March 4, 2016 conference that it is important to include in every motion—even in an emergency motion requiring quick

action—an introductory paragraph reminding the arbitrator what the case is about. The arbitrator will have a number of cases, and may have to consider and rule on the motion without having the case file handy. That is very good advice.

C. Make Sure the Arbitrator Knows the Relief Sought and the Defenses to Relief

Sometimes, the relief sought and the defenses to the relief will inform the discovery the parties want to take, and should inform the arbitrator’s decision on any dispute.

Unfortunately, it is not unusual for claimants to fail to identify the relief they are seeking, and it is not unusual for respondents to fail to identify their defenses to the relief.

Unless the stakes are so small that the parties would prefer the arbitrator to be flying blind, they should submit a statement of the relief sought and of any defenses to the relief.

D. Be Prepared to Discuss Discovery at the Case Management Conference

The Case Management Conference should set the roadmap for discovery, which will be set out in the Case Management Order (“CMO”). The parties should confer in advance and try to present an agreed plan, like the mandatory counsel meet-and-confer under Fed.R.Civ.Pro. 26(f) in advance of the Rule 16 scheduling conference with the court.

In the absence of such a conference, each side should think in advance of what they really need, and be able to explain why “X” number of depositions and “Y” (or open-ended) document requests are important, and how long this should take, and either submit it to the arbitrator and other side in advance or be able to articulate them orally at the Conference.

One possibility advocates should keep in mind is suggesting to the arbitrator that the CMO include a second discovery tier, where the parties and the arbitrator have a second hearing halfway through, to see if the limits should be adjusted.

In my experience, advocates frequently fail to confer, occasionally fail to plan, and “wing it” at the CMO. This is not the best way to handle an arbitration.

E. What About Arbitration Agreements Restricting Discovery?

Some arbitration agreements explicitly limit discovery. This is not necessarily a bar to the enforceability of the arbitration agreement:

Gilmer also complains that the discovery allowed in arbitration is more limited than in the federal courts, which he contends will make it difficult to prove discrimination. It is unlikely, however, that age discrimination claims require more extensive discovery than other claims that we have found to be arbitrable, such as RICO and antitrust claims. Moreover, there has been no showing in this case that the NYSE discovery provisions, which allow for document production, information requests, depositions, and subpoenas ... will prove insufficient to allow ADEA claimants such as Gilmer a fair opportunity to present their claims. Although those procedures might not be

as extensive as in the federal courts, by agreeing to arbitrate, a party "trades the procedures and opportunity for review of the courtroom for the simplicity, informality, and expedition of arbitration." *Mitsubishi, supra*, at 628. Indeed, an important counterweight to the reduced discovery in NYSE arbitration is that arbitrators are not bound by the rules of evidence. ...

Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp., 500 U.S. 20, 31 (U.S. 1991).

Some restrictions on discovery and evidence, however, are so strict they can violate due process. Where one party frames the rules of discovery, it must observe the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing. The promulgation of too one-sided a set of rules may lead to the invalidation of the agreement:

We hold that the promulgation of so many biased rules -- especially the scheme whereby one party to the proceeding so controls the arbitral panel -- breaches the contract entered into by the parties. The parties agreed to submit their claims to arbitration -- a system whereby disputes are fairly resolved by an impartial third party. Hooters by contract took on the obligation of establishing such a system. By creating a sham system unworthy even of the name of arbitration, Hooters completely failed in performing its contractual duty.

Hooters of America, Inc. v. Phillips, 173 F.3d 933, 940 (4th Cir. 1999).

However, the Eighth Circuit had held that the mere lack of subpoena power under a set of rules is not enough by itself to invalidate a longstanding commercial arbitration process between grain buyers and grain sellers. *Hoffman v. Cargill Inc.*, 236 F.3d 458, 463 (8th Cir. 2001, stated:

If a "fundamental unfairness" standard exists, it must apply to arbitration schemes so deeply flawed as to preclude the possibility of a fair outcome. Such is not the case in this matter. The NGFA has been formally arbitrating cases since 1901 and the record does not sustain the charge that it systematically favors buyers over sellers. In drafting the FAA, Congress specifically chose to not empower arbitration parties with an enforceable subpoena, precisely to avoid the costs and delays of full-blown litigation. Finally, the NGFA's choice to provide an appellate proceeding, not required by statute, should not be grounds for attacking its form. The district court's ruling merely imported the very elements of litigation that arbitration seeks to avoid. Nothing compels us to conclude that this process was fundamentally unfair.

1. Rules of Arbitration Service Providers

a. Commercial Rules

Many AAA arbitrators believe that a contrary provision in the arbitration agreement will prevail over these rules, possibly subject to what they believe is necessary for a fair resolution of the dispute. Advocates with an agreement restricting discovery should seek information on potential arbitrators' approach to discovery.

AAA Commercial Rule 22 governs discovery.

R-22. Pre-Hearing Exchange and Production of Information

(a) Authority of arbitrator. The arbitrator shall manage any necessary exchange of information among the parties with a view to achieving an efficient and economical resolution of the dispute, while at the same time promoting equality of treatment and safeguarding each party's opportunity to fairly present its claims and defenses.

(b) Documents. The arbitrator may, on application of a party or on the arbitrator's own initiative:

i. require the parties to exchange documents in their possession or custody on which they intend to rely;

ii. require the parties to update their exchanges of the documents on which they intend to rely as such documents become known to them;

iii. require the parties, in response to reasonable document requests, to make available to the other party documents, in the responding party's possession or custody, not otherwise readily available to the party seeking the documents, reasonably believed by the party seeking the documents to exist and to be relevant and material to the outcome of disputed issues; and

iv. require the parties, when documents to be exchanged or produced are maintained in electronic form, to make such documents available in the form most convenient and economical for the party in possession of such documents, unless the arbitrator determines that there is good cause for requiring the documents to be produced in a different form. The parties should attempt to agree in advance upon, and the arbitrator may determine, reasonable search parameters to balance the need for production of electronically stored documents relevant and material to the outcome of disputed issues against the cost of locating and producing them.

JAMS arbitrations are different. JAMS Comprehensive Rule 2 (Party Self-Determination and Emergency Relief Procedures) provides that parties may specify their own procedures in lieu of the JAMS rules. JAMS Comprehensive Rule 17(b) provides that each party may take a minimum of one deposition, and that the arbitrator can exercise discretion to allow more.

b. Employment Rules

AAA Employment Rule 9 gives the arbitrator control over the scope and extent of discovery:

The arbitrator shall have the authority to order such discovery, by way of deposition, interrogatory, document production, or otherwise, as the arbitrator considers necessary to a full and fair exploration of the issues in dispute, consistent with the expedited nature of arbitration.

The AAA does not require notice of discovery related matters and communications unless a dispute arises. At that time, the parties should notify the AAA of the dispute so that it may be presented to the arbitrator for determination.

The AAA Employment Rules override any inconsistent provisions in the arbitration agreement or the employer's rules.

JAMS Employment Rule 17(b); like its Comprehensive Rules, provides that each party may take a minimum of one deposition, and that the arbitrator can exercise discretion to allow more. However, JAMS explicitly allows agreements to override anything in the JAMS employment rules. See JAMS Employment Rule 2 (Party Self-Determination). As noted above, however, the JAMS Policy on Employment Arbitration / Minimum Standards of Procedural Fairness has a comment to Standard 4, which has an unclear effect.

F. Should There Be External Rules, and Which Ones?

Parties to an arbitration proceeding have the freedom to decide whether particular rules should apply to discovery. In my experience, most choose the Federal discovery rules as to everything but the limits on numbers of requests. Some choose State rules. Some prefer to leave everything up to the arbitrator's discretion.

If rules are chosen, they are often chosen as a guide, and not as something to be applied strictly, in order to preserve the informality and discretion of arbitration.

I believe it is useful to the parties and the arbitrator alike to have a standard that can be referenced in briefing or opposing a motion, and on which there are useful court decisions offering guidance.

That said, every set of discovery rules I have seen provides substantial scope for the tribunal's exercise of discretion. This is even more true in arbitration. In arguing discovery matters, both sides should take care to be pragmatic, explaining the functional reasons why the discovery in question is or is not appropriate.

The informality of submission of a discovery motion to an arbitrator should never be used as an excuse to overlook the need to explain why the grant or denial of discovery is important to the party.

G. The Effect of Failing to Waive the Right to File a Dispositive Motion

1. Background

Litigators in Federal court are used to trying their cases on a cold paper record, in the context of Fed.R.Civ.Pro. 56 motions. Federal courts conduct extremely few trials on the merits. According to the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, in the twelve months ending June 30, 2015, the average Federal judge had 626 pending civil and criminal cases, 520 weighted civil and criminal new cases filed, *and conducted only 17 civil or criminal trials*. See the tables downloaded from <http://www.uscourts.gov/statistics/table/na/federal-court-management-statistics/2015/06/30-3>, downloaded March 5, 2016.

Federal judges resolve by trial only 3% of the civil and criminal matters filed each year. Even allowing for the cases settled, that is an alarming statistic suggesting systemic problems. Federal judges have by and large forgotten what arbitrators have always kept in mind: the importance of judging credibility and weighing evidence in light of the tone and demeanor of witnesses. “The court that can see the witnesses, hear their statements, observe their demeanor, and compare their degree of intelligence, is better able than an appellate tribunal to reconcile differences in testimony, or, if that be not possible, to ascertain the real nature of the transaction.” *The Quickstep*, 76 U.S. 665, 669 (1869). “The occurrence of events, the reasons why these events took place, and the motives of the men who participated in them are drawn in question. The issue of credibility is of great importance. The District Judge had the opportunity to observe the demeanor of the witnesses and to judge their credibility at first hand.” *United States v. E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 353 U.S. 586, 646 (1957). One of the leading justifications for the rule against hearsay is that the factfinder cannot assess the demeanor of the declarant. *Donnelly v. United States*, 228 U.S. 243, 273 (1913).

This is the gold standard for decisions on the merits. Unfortunately, motions for summary judgment and grants of such motions have become the norm, few involve disputes over legal questions, most involve disputed views of the facts, and few cases are now decided with an opportunity to observe the demeanor of witnesses.

The predictable result of resolving the vast majority of civil cases on summary judgment is that the parties have an enormous incentive to depose every available witness and obtain every possible document. If the parties believe they will not be able to cross-examine witnesses at a live hearing—as was the case before trials on paper replaced real trials—they have no choice but to take the most expansive discovery they can.

Commentators and Federal judges often observe that discovery is the great driver of litigation costs and delays, but fail to recognize that the prevalence of adjudication by summary judgment is the great driver of discovery.

One of the strongest arguments in favor of arbitration is that litigants normally get a live hearing on the merits, at which they can testify and can cross-examine opposing witnesses, and the arbitrator can observe the tone and demeanor of witnesses in judging credibility.

2. Arbitration Rules Give Arbitrators Discretion Whether to Permit the Filing of a Dispositive Motion

Arbitration providers are aware of this advantage over litigation in Federal court. Arbitration rules tend to discourage reflexive summary-judgment motions that would make arbitration mimic the dysfunctional summary-judgment practices of Federal courts, and require the arbitrator to act as a gatekeeper for such motions. AAA Commercial Rule 33, for example, states:

The arbitrator may allow the filing of and make rulings upon a dispositive motion only if the arbitrator determines that the moving party has shown that the motion is likely to succeed and dispose of or narrow the issues in the case.

AAA Employment Rule 27 similarly states:

The arbitrator may allow the filing of a dispositive motion if the arbitrator determines that the moving party has shown substantial cause that the motion is likely to succeed and dispose of or narrow the issues in the case.

JAMS Comprehensive Rule 18 and JAMS Employment Rule 18 state the same concept.

3. Cost-Saving Recommendation

Parties that wish to enjoy the promised benefits of “faster, better, cheaper” resolution of disputes should at the Case Management Conference promise not to seek to file dispositive motions on the merits of the claims, while preserving the right to seek to file dispositive motions on legal questions or on specific gateway questions independent of the merits, such as the defenses of failure to exhaust administrative remedies or expiration of the statute of limitations.

The certainty of being able to cross-examine witnesses at the hearing should reduce the number of depositions needed to prepare for the hearing. In the early days of employment discrimination litigation, before the summary-judgment trilogy, it was fairly routine for both sides to try cases without depositions of the other sides’ witnesses. Where there were depositions, they tended to be short and very narrowly focused; I once deposed seven department overseers in a single day, starting at 10:00 A.M., with a long lunch break, finishing before 4:00 P.M., and with much of the time in between spent chatting with defense counsel as we waited for the next witness to arrive. Each actual deposition took about twenty minutes.

While we often had extensive records at these trials, we did not need everything in advance. We often filed mid-trial subpoenas for additional documents made necessary by the testimony of an adverse witness or cross-examination of a friendly witness, and held the witness over until we had gotten the documents. Litigation then was oriented to the justice of the result, not the formalities of process, and arbitration remains informal and oriented to the justice of the result.

It seems to me relying on the strengths of arbitration—and waiving the opportunity to seek the filing of a motion for summary disposition—is a great way to cut costs.

H. Arbitrators’ Subpoenas for Testimony or Documents

1. Sec. 7 of the FAA

Sec. 7 of the FAA, 9 U.S.C. § 7, states:

The arbitrators selected either as prescribed in this title or otherwise, or a majority of them, may summon in writing any person to attend before them or any of them as a witness and in a proper case to bring with him or them any book, record, document, or paper which may be deemed material as evidence in the case. The fees for such attendance shall be the same as the fees of witnesses before masters of the United States courts. Said summons shall issue in the name of the arbitrator or arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be signed by the arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be directed to the said person and shall be served in the same manner as subpoenas to appear and testify before the court; if any person or persons so summoned to testify shall refuse

or neglect to obey said summons, upon petition the United States district court for the district in which such arbitrators, or a majority of them, are sitting may compel the attendance of such person or persons before said arbitrator or arbitrators, or punish said person or persons for contempt in the same manner provided by law for securing the attendance of witnesses or their punishment for neglect or refusal to attend in the courts of the United States.

2. What: Documents Only?

a. Circuits Enforcing the Subpoenas

In re Sec. Life Ins. Co. of America, 228 F.3d 865, 870-71 (8th Cir. 2000), held that arbitrators have the power to order the production of documents without the attendance of a witness.

b. Circuits Refusing to Enforce the Subpoenas

In an opinion by then-Judge Alito, the Third Circuit has held that document-only subpoenas are not enforceable under the FAA. *Hay Grp., Inc. v. E.B.S. Acquisition Corp.*, 360 F.3d 404, 407 (3d Cir. 2004), discussed § 7 of the FAA and continued:

This language speaks unambiguously to the issue before us. The only power conferred on arbitrators with respect to the production of documents by a non-party is the power to summon a non-party “to attend before them or any of them as a witness *and* in a proper case *to bring with him or them* any book, record, document or paper which may be deemed material as evidence in the case.” 9 U.S.C. § 7(emphasis added). The power to require a non-party “to bring” items “with him” clearly applies only to situations in which the non-party accompanies the items to the arbitration proceeding, not to situations in which the items are simply sent or brought by a courier. In addition, the use of the word “and” makes it clear that a non-party may be compelled “to bring” items “with him” only when the non-party is summoned “to attend before [the arbitrator] as a witness.” Thus, Section 7’s language unambiguously restricts an arbitrator’s subpoena power to situations in which the non-party has been called to appear in the physical presence of the arbitrator and to hand over the documents at that time.

(Emphases in original; footnote omitted). The court suggested that this would discourage the issuance of large discovery requests, which would otherwise be cost-free to the parties.

3. When: Discovery?

a. Circuits Enforcing the Subpoenas

Am. Fed’n of Television & Radio Artists, AFL-CIO v. WJBK-TV (New World Commc’ns of Detroit, Inc.), 164 F.3d 1004, 1009 (6th Cir. 1999), reasoned by analogy to § 7 of the FAA in holding that labor arbitrators have the power to enforce document subpoenas to be produced before the hearing on the merits. The court reserved the question whether a nonparty witness could be subpoenaed to provide testimony at a prehearing deposition. *Id.* at 109 n.7.

In re Sec. Life Ins. Co. of America, 228 F.3d 865, 870-71 (8th Cir. 2000), held that arbitrators have implicit power to order the production of documents prior to a hearing:

Although the efficient resolution of disputes through arbitration necessarily entails a limited discovery process, we believe this interest in efficiency is furthered by permitting a party to review and digest relevant documentary evidence prior to the arbitration hearing. We thus hold that implicit in an arbitration panel's power to subpoena relevant documents for production at a hearing is the power to order the production of relevant documents for review by a party prior to the hearing.

b. Circuits Enforcing the Subpoenas Only in Special Cases

COMSAT Corp. v. Nat'l Science Foundation, 190 F.3d 269, 275 (4th Cir. 1999), held that, generally, nonparties cannot be subpoenaed to provide prehearing discovery:

Nowhere does the FAA grant an arbitrator the authority to order non-parties to appear at depositions, or the authority to demand that non-parties provide the litigating parties with documents during prehearing discovery. By its own terms, the FAA's subpoena authority is defined as the power of the arbitration panel to compel non-parties to appear “before them;” that is, to compel testimony by non-parties at the arbitration hearing. ...

However, the court explained its rationale, and held open the possibility that a showing of special need might justify an exception:

The rationale for constraining an arbitrator's subpoena power is clear. Parties to a private arbitration agreement forego certain procedural rights attendant to formal litigation in return for a more efficient and cost-effective resolution of their disputes. *See Burton v. Bush*, 614 F.2d 389, 390–91 (4th Cir.1980) (“When contracting parties stipulate that disputes will be submitted to arbitration, they relinquish the right to certain procedural niceties which are normally associated with a formal trial.”). A hallmark of arbitration—and a necessary precursor to its efficient operation—is a limited discovery process. *See id.* at 391 (concluding that limitations on discovery promote the “policy underpinnings of arbitration [which are] speed, efficiency, and reduction of litigation expenses.”). Consequently, because COMSAT and AUI have elected to enter arbitration, neither may reasonably expect to obtain full-blown discovery from the other or from third parties.

Yet COMSAT argues quite persuasively that in a complex case such as this one, the much-lauded efficiency of arbitration will be degraded if the parties are unable to review and digest relevant evidence prior to the arbitration hearing. For this reason, in *Burton* we contemplated that a party might, under unusual circumstances, petition the district court to compel pre-arbitration discovery upon a showing of special need or hardship. 614 F.2d at 391.

We do not now attempt to define “special need,” except to observe that at a minimum, a party must demonstrate that the information it seeks is otherwise unavailable. COMSAT did not attempt to make such a showing before the district court,

and we infer from the record that no such showing would be possible. As COMSAT acknowledged, many if not all of the documents it sought were obtainable from AUI or with a FOIA request. In fact, the record indicates that prior to filing its petition to compel, COMSAT obtained hundreds of responsive documents from NSF via the FOIA process, continuing up to the point when COMSAT abandoned its FOIA request by ceasing to pay photocopying charges. Likewise, COMSAT has *277 not attempted to show that any information it might obtain from Van Horn and Dickman, both employees of non-party NSF, is otherwise unavailable from opposing party AUI.

Id. at 276-77.

c. Circuits Refusing to Enforce the Subpoenas

Life Receivables Trust v. Syndicate 102 at Lloyd's of London, 549 F.3d 210, 216-17 (2d Cir. 2008), refused to enforce a subpoena to a third party for production of documents before the hearing:

The language of section 7 is straightforward and unambiguous. Documents are only discoverable in arbitration when brought before arbitrators by a testifying witness. The FAA was enacted in a time when pre-hearing discovery in civil litigation was generally not permitted. The fact that the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure were since enacted and subsequently broadened demonstrates that if Congress wants to expand arbitral subpoena authority, it is fully capable of doing so. There may be valid reasons to empower arbitrators to subpoena documents from third parties,⁹ but we must interpret a statute as it is, not as it might be, since “courts must presume that a legislature says in a statute what it means and means in a statute what it says....” ... A statute's clear language does not morph into something more just because courts think it makes sense for it to do so. Thus, we join the Third Circuit in holding that section 7 of the FAA does not authorize arbitrators to compel pre-hearing document discovery from entities not party to the arbitration proceedings.

(Citation omitted.)

4. Where: Outside the Subpoena Power of Courts Where the Arbitrator Sits?

a. Circuits Enforcing the Subpoenas

Sec. Life Ins. Co. of Am. v. Duncanson & Holt, Inc., 11 F. App'x 926, 927 (9th Cir. 2001), held that a party to an arbitration can be held in contempt for playing fast and loose with a subpoena, designating a Rule 30(b)(6) deponent, failing to appear, and belatedly announcing the deponent was outside the subpoena power:

Rule 30(b)(6) and Rule 45 do not allow a corporate entity to avoid compliance with a subpoena by announcing—after it has refused to appear, and the deposition date has passed—that the employee it had designated for the deposition is outside the territorial limits of the subpoena.

b. Circuits Refusing to Enforce the Subpoenas

Dynegy Midstream Servs. v. Trammochem, 451 F.3d 89, 96 (2d Cir. 2006), reversed an order of the Southern District of New York compelling compliance with an arbitral subpoena requiring the Houston petitioner, not a party to the arbitration, to produce documents in Houston, with respect to an arbitration that would take place in New York. The court held that the FAA did not authorize the nationwide service of process, and that the subpoena was unenforceable:

Appellees argue that this holding will create the absurd result that FAA Section 7 authorizes the issuance of some subpoenas that cannot be enforced. They ask us either to adopt the compromise position created in *Amgen, Inc. v. Kidney Center of Delaware County*, 879 F.Supp. 878, 882–83 (N.D.Ill.1995), where the district court enforced an arbitration subpoena against a distant non-party by permitting an attorney for a party to the arbitration to issue a subpoena that would be enforced by the district court in the district where the non-party resided, or to suggest another method to get around this gap in enforceability. We decline to do so. We see no textual basis in the FAA for the *Amgen* compromise. Indeed, we have already held that Section 7 “explicitly confers authority only upon *arbitrators*; by necessary implication, the *parties* to an arbitration may not employ this provision to subpoena documents or witnesses.” *NBC v. Bear Stearns & Co.*, 165 F.3d 184, 187 (2d Cir.1999). Moreover, we see no reason to come up with an alternate method to close a gap that may reflect an intentional choice on the part of Congress, which could well have desired to limit the issuance and enforcement of arbitration subpoenas in order to protect non-parties from having to participate in an arbitration to a greater extent than they would if the dispute had been filed in a court of law. The parties to the arbitration here chose to arbitrate in New York even though the underlying contract and all of the activities giving rise to the arbitration had nothing to do with New York; they could easily have chosen to arbitrate in Texas, where DMS would have been subject to an arbitration subpoena and a Texas district court's enforcement of it. Having made one choice for their own convenience, the parties should not be permitted to stretch the law beyond the text of Section 7 and Rule 45 to inconvenience witnesses. As we have recently stated, “[w]hile the FAA expresses a strong federal policy in favor of arbitration, the purpose of Congress in enacting the FAA was to make arbitration agreements as enforceable as other contracts, but not more so.” *JLM Indus., Inc. v. Stolt-Nielsen SA*, 387 F.3d 163, 171 (2d Cir.2004) (citations, internal quotation marks, and emphasis omitted). DMS is not a party to the contract, and not even the strong federal policy favoring arbitration can lead to jurisdiction over a non-party without some basis in federal law.

5. What’s a Poor Advocate to Do?

Even if discovery depositions have been barred, the arbitrator(s) can hold an evidentiary hearing in advance of the hearing on the merits, at a location allowing enforcement of a subpoena, to receive the testimony in question. This has been specifically approved by the Second Circuit in *Stolt-Nielsen SA v. Celanese AG*, 430 F.3d 567, 577-81 (2d Cir. 2005).

Stolt does not dispute the power of arbitrators to subpoena non-parties for testimony and documents at what Stolt calls a “trial-like arbitration hearing on the

merits.” What fuels Stolt's objection, and what Stolt devotes its entire brief to arguing, is that Section 7 does not empower arbitrators to summon non-parties for the purpose of compelling testimonial and documentary discovery in advance of a “merits hearing,” and that the subpoenas in question were “a thinly disguised effort to obtain pre-hearing discovery.” ... In sum, Stolt alleges that Claimants and the arbitration panel have conspired to “circumvent Section 7's limitations through the contrivance of conducting its discovery in the presence of the arbitrators.”

Like the District Court, we are not persuaded that the December 21 hearing was the ruse Stolt claims it to be. Therefore, we have no occasion to rule on the authority of arbitrators to order non-parties to participate in discovery. Any rule there may be against compelling non-parties to participate in discovery cannot apply to situations, as presented here, in which the non-party is “summon[ed] in writing ... to attend before [the arbitrators] or any of them as a witness and ... to bring with him ... [documents] which may be deemed material as evidence in the case.” 9 U.S.C. § 7.

Several factors convince us that the subpoenas were well within the authority provided arbitrators under Section 7, although we hasten to add that we do not suggest that all of these factors need be present in every case in order to justify arbitration subpoenas under Section 7. First, the custodians and Mr. O'Brien were not ordered to appear for depositions. Depositions usually take place outside the presence of the decision maker, and they are designed to allow parties to prepare for the eventual presentation of evidence or examination of witnesses before the decision maker at trial or a hearing. *See Black's Law Dictionary* 451 (7th ed.1999) (defining “deposition” as “[a] witness's *out-of-court* testimony that is reduced to writing ... for later use in court or for discovery purposes” (emphasis added)). Here, by contrast, the custodians and Mr. O'Brien were directed to appear at a hearing before the arbitrators, and all three arbitrators were present at that hearing. *See Hay Group, Inc. v. E.B.S. Acquisition Corp.*, 360 F.3d 404, 407 (3d Cir. 2004) (noting that while Section 7 does not permit a subpoena to compel production from a non-party in absence of a hearing, it does permit subpoenas in which “the non-party has been called to appear in the physical presence of the arbitrator and to hand over the documents at that time”).

Second, the arbitrators heard testimony directly from Mr. O'Brien, and unlike a deposition, the panel ruled at the hearing on evidentiary issues such as admissibility and privilege and reserved on other evidentiary issues. Indeed, the hearing transcript reveals that the hearing was primarily devoted to resolving evidentiary issues, especially the issue of whether and to what extent attorney-client privilege foreclosed Mr. O'Brien's testimony. While the custodians were not required to testify, that was the result of a consensual agreement between Stolt and Claimants and not a function of the arbitration subpoena or the hearing process itself.

Third, the testimony provided at the hearing became part of the arbitration record, to be used by the arbitrators in their determination of the dispute before them. Finally, we note that if Judge Rakoff had been of the view that the arbitrators and Claimants were attempting by artifice to undermine his prior order forbidding the use of Section 7 to take discovery of non-parties, there is every reason to believe he would have so found. But, in

fact, he concluded based upon the record before him and the representations of the parties that the December 21 hearing was convened by the arbitrators in good faith and that it complied with Section 7, as well as the spirit and terms of his prior ruling. Section 7 does not deny arbitrators the power to summon witnesses to a hearing under such circumstances.

Id. at 577-78.

I. Discovery, in a Subsequent Dispute, of Confidential Materials in An Arbitration To Which the Discovering Entity Was Not a Party

Just as materials filed under seal in prior litigation may be subject to discovery in a subsequent dispute even if the discovering entity was not a party to the earlier dispute, a third-party litigant may obtain discovery of materials in an earlier confidential arbitration.

We affirm the district court's decision, for two reasons. First, ¶ 6 of the agreement between Health Grades and Hewitt Associates provides that materials from the arbitration may be disclosed in response to a subpoena. Second, even if the agreement had purported to block disclosure, such a provision would be ineffectual. Contracts bind only the parties. No one can “agree” with someone else that a stranger's resort to discovery under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will be cut off. We applied this principle in *Jepson, Inc. v. Makita Electric Works, Ltd.*, 30 F.3d 854 (7th Cir.1994), to confidentiality agreements reached during litigation. That conclusion is equally applicable to confidentiality agreements that accompany arbitration. Indeed, we have stated more broadly that a person's desire for confidentiality is not honored in litigation. Trade secrets, privileges, and statutes or rules requiring confidentiality must be respected, see Fed.R.Civ.P. 45(c)(3)(A)(iii), but litigants' preference for secrecy does not create a legal bar to disclosure. See *Baxter International, Inc. v. Abbott Laboratories*, 297 F.3d 544 (7th Cir.2002); *United States v. Foster*, 564 F.3d 852 (7th Cir.2009) (Easterbrook, C.J., in chambers).

Gotham Holdings, LP v. Health Grades, Inc., 580 F.3d 664, 665 (7th Cir. 2009).

II. Evidence

A. The Federal Arbitration Act Limits Refusals to Consider Evidence

Sec. 10(a)(3) of the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(3), states:

(a) In any of the following cases the United States court in and for the district wherein the award was made may make an order vacating the award upon the application of any party to the arbitration—

* * *

3) where the arbitrators were guilty of misconduct in refusing to postpone the hearing, upon sufficient cause shown, or in refusing to hear evidence pertinent and material to the controversy; or of any other misbehavior by which the rights of any party have been prejudiced; or

* * *

Where the parties—or one of them—have paid considerable sums to have an arbitral resolution of their dispute, it is incumbent on the arbitrator to avoid making a mistake as to the reception of evidence that would justify a vacatur of the award and the waste of the parties' time and money. In addition, it will do nothing good for the arbitrator to have a hotly contested and expensive result overturned because of a refusal to consider evidence. Unlike a judge who has bene reversed after a trial because of evidentiary errors, and who will still have the same number of cases assigned by the Clerk to her or him afterwards, an arbitrator who has wasted everyone's time and money should expect to see a sharp decline in business. And that is right and proper.

The result of this situation is that arbitrators are often trained to accept virtually everything in evidence, overruling even the strongest of objections and considering it "for what it is worth." This is an easy way to protect an award from a motion for vacatur.

B. The Effect of the Form of the Award on Evidentiary Questions

In commercial arbitrations, the parties can choose to have a simple, one-sentence award, a reasoned award, or findings of fact and conclusions of law.

AAA Commercial Rule 46(b) states: "The arbitrator need not render a reasoned award unless the parties request such an award in writing prior to appointment of the arbitrator or unless the arbitrator determines that a reasoned award is appropriate." The AAA default is for a simple statement of result, and the parties must ask for a reasoned award if they want one. JAMS Comprehensive Rule 24(h) states that the parties will receive a reasoned award unless they state that they do not want one. The JAMS default rule is the opposite of the AAA default rule, which might be explained by the greater prevalence of retired judges among JAMS arbitrators.

AAA Employment Rule 39(c) states that awards will be reasoned awards unless the parties agree otherwise, changing the default from that of the Commercial Rules. JAMS Employment Rule 24(h) requires a statement of reasons including essential findings and conclusions, with a statement that the parties can agree to any other type of award unless the arbitration is based on an agreement that is a condition of employment.

JAMS rules have more extensive default requirements than AAA rules, but both sets require more extensive default forms of awards for employment cases than for commercial cases.

Obviously, it takes more time for the arbitrator to write more. What is just as true, but not so obvious, is that the more an arbitrator has to write, the more evidence the parties will need to introduce to make the longer award possible. This can also affect the scope of discovery that will be appropriate. There are thus three ways in which longer award add to the expense and delay of arbitration.

My personal take is that the traditional one-sentence awards, along with the secrecy of the proceedings, are important parts of the reasons many distrust arbitration.

As with criminal prosecutions in high-tension situations, it is important not only that the results be fair and in compliance with the law, but also that they be seen to be fair and in compliance with the law. Arbitration awards need to include enough reasoning to show they are not arbitrary; the Delphic approach does not work.

This does not apply to sophisticated commercial parties, who are sometimes interested in the least expensive resolution possible, and neither care about the reasoning nor want to pay for its resolution. It also does not apply if the parties want to mend their relationship and want an award that does not point fingers at either side. They simply want to have a dispute settled quickly, either way, so they can move on.

It is very important for advocates to think about the types of awards they would like, and why, so they are prepared to discuss this at the Case Management Conference.

C. In Practice, Are Arbitrators Required to Admit Everything?

No. The First Circuit summed up the law in *Hoteles Condado Beach, La Concha & Convention Ctr. v. Union De Tronquistas Local 901*, 763 F.2d 34, 39-40 (1st Cir. 1985), a case involving a labor arbitration challenged under § 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act of 1947, 29 U.S.C. § 185 (1982):

... The arbitrator is not bound to hear all of the evidence tendered by the parties; however, he must give each of the parties to the dispute an adequate opportunity to present its evidence and arguments. *National Post Office, Mailhandlers, Watchmen, Messengers and Group Leaders Division, Laborers International Union of North America v. United States Postal Service*, 751 F.2d 834, 841 (6th Cir. 1985); *Totem Marine Tug & Barge, Inc. v. North American Towing, Inc.*, 607 F.2d 649, 651 (5th Cir. 1979); *Bell Aerospace Company Division of Textron, Inc. v. Local 516, International Union, United Automobile Workers of America*, 500 F.2d 921, 923 (2nd Cir. 1974). The arbitrator must then determine “the truth respecting material matters in controversy, as he believes it to be, based upon a full and fair consideration of the entire evidence and after he has accorded each witness and each piece of documentary evidence, the weight, if any, to which he honestly believes it to be entitled”. F. Elkouri & E. Elkouri, *How Arbitration Works* 273–74 (3d ed. 1973). Absent exceptional circumstances, therefore, a reviewing court may not overturn an arbitration award based on the arbitrator's determination of the relevancy or persuasiveness of the evidence submitted by the parties.

This rule applies to arbitrations under the FAA as well. *Forsythe Int'l, S.A. v. Gibbs Oil Co. of Texas*, 915 F.2d 1017, 1023 (5th Cir. 1990); *Robbins v. Day*, 954 F.2d 679, 685 (11th Cir. 1992), *cert. denied*, 506 U.S. 870 (1992).¹

The D.C. Circuit also summarized the law in *Lessin v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc.*, 481 F.3d 813, 816-17 (D.C. Cir. 2007):

Lessin contends that the arbitration panel engaged in misconduct by refusing to hear pertinent and material evidence from one of his designated expert witnesses. In considering this contention, the court is mindful of the fact that “[i]n making evidentiary

¹ *Robbins* was disapproved of by *First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan*, 514 U.S. 938, 947-48 (1995), on the different issue of the standard of review of a district court decision granting or denying vacatur.

determinations, an arbitrator ‘need not follow all the niceties observed by the federal courts.’” *Tempo Shain Corp. v. Bertek, Inc.*, 120 F.3d 16, 20 (2d Cir. 1997) (quoting *Bell Aerospace Co. Div. of Textron v. Local 516, UAW*, 500 F.2d 921, 923 (2d Cir. 1974)). The arbitrator “need only grant the parties a fundamentally fair hearing.” *Bell Aerospace*, 500 F.2d at 923; accord *Sheldon v. Vermonty*, 269 F.3d 1202, 1206 (10th Cir. 2001); see *Hoteles Condado Beach, La Concha & Convention Ctr. v. Union De Tronquistas Local 901*, 763 F.2d 34, 39 (1st Cir. 1985); *Nat'l Post Office Mailhandlers v. U.S. Postal Serv.*, 751 F.2d 834, 841 (6th Cir. 1985); *Totem Marine Tug & Barge v. N. Am. Towing*, 607 F.2d 649, 651 (5th Cir. 1979); *Newark Stereotypers' Union No. 18 v. Newark Morning Ledger Co.*, 397 F.2d 594, 599 (3rd Cir. 1968). It is well within an arbitrator's authority to refuse to hear evidence that is cumulative, see, e.g., *Hoteles Condado Beach*, 763 F.2d at 40; *Nat'l Post Office Mailhandlers*, 751 F.2d at 841, or of little relevance, see, e.g., *Hoteles Condado Beach*, 763 F.2d at 40; *Grahams Serv. Inc. v. Teamsters Local 975*, 700 F.2d 420, 422-23 (8th Cir. 1982); see also Sec. Indus. Conference On Arbitration, *The Arbitrator's Manual* 26 (May 2005)

Similarly, the Fifth Circuit has upheld an arbitrator’s decision to exclude cumulative evidence:

MCI makes no headway on this point because arbitrators' evidentiary decisions should be reviewed with unusual deference. Because the arbitrator could have easily found that the tapes were merely cumulative of testimony already before him, it was not an abuse of his discretion to exclude them from evidence.

Gateway Techs., Inc. v. MCI Telecommunications Corp., 64 F.3d 993, 997 n.4 (5th Cir. 1995), *disapproved on other grounds by Hall St. Associates, L.L.C. v. Mattel, Inc.*, 552 U.S. 576, 583 n.5 (2008).

Courts tend to accept exclusions from evidence based on reasons for which they would also exclude the evidence, particularly when the reason involves legal privilege, ensuring the fairness of proceedings by preventing one party from sandbagging the other, and managing the hearing by avoiding truly cumulative evidence. Since the latter involves a judgment call, judges may more willing to substitute their judgments for those of the arbitrator.

In all these situations, it is important for the arbitrator to include her or his full rationale in the award, in terms a court can recognize and understand. The failure to do so, or the use of reasoning a court cannot follow, may lead to vacatur. *E.g., Tempo Shain Corp. v. Bertek, Inc.*, 120 F.3d 16, 20 (2d Cir. 1997):

We find that there was no reasonable basis for the arbitration panel to determine that Pollock's omitted testimony would be cumulative with regard to the fraudulent inducement claims. Said differently, the panel excluded evidence plainly “pertinent and material to the controversy,” 9 U.S.C. § 10(a)(3). The panel did not indicate in what respects Pollock's testimony would be cumulative, but stated that there were “a number of letters in the file” and that Pollock was “speaking through the letters [he wrote], and the reports he[] received.” These letters and reports were not specifically identified by the arbitration panel. ... The reports, like the letters, addressed discrete problems and

possible courses of action. While the letters and reports might have been sufficient to represent what Pollock would have testified to in rebuttal of Neptune's breach of contract claims, which we do not decide, there is nothing to suggest that Pollock's intended testimony concerning appellees' fraudulent inducement claim and Bertek's counterclaim for fraudulent inducement was addressed by the documents admitted into evidence.

One of my touchstones is that I will not allow a party to be sandbagged by evidence that should have been provided in discovery, but was not, or that violates representations the party seeking its admission gave to the adverse party, or that was produced too late to make effective use of it. To protect the award from challenge under the FAA, my award will explain in detail why I refused to admit the evidence.

No one escapes the duty of supplementation, or the requirements of fair play, simply because the case is in arbitration.

D. Problems With Saying That Evidence Will Be Considered “For What It Is Worth”

Both sides are placed in some difficulty when a colorable objection to evidence is denied, and the evidence is admitted with the statement that it will be considered “for what it is worth.” The party offering the evidence does not know whether further evidence needs to be introduced in case the evidence in question is not given much weight, and the party objecting to the evidence does not know whether to introduce evidence in opposition.

To fulfill the promise of arbitration as being “quicker, faster, and better,” more clarity would be useful. Advocates should talk with the arbitrator about this in the Case Management Conference or one of the prehearing conferences.

E. Should There Be Rules of Evidence, and Which Ones?

Parties to an arbitration proceeding have the freedom to decide whether particular rules should apply to the reception of evidence. The Supreme Court commented on this freedom in *DIRECTV, Inc. v. Imburgia*, 136 S. Ct. 463, 468 (2015):

As the Court of Appeal noted, the Federal Arbitration Act allows parties to an arbitration contract considerable latitude to choose what law governs some or all of its provisions, including the law governing enforceability of a class-arbitration waiver. 225 Cal. App. 4th, at 342-343, 170 Cal. Rptr. 3d, at 194. In principle, they might choose to have portions of their contract governed by the law of Tibet, the law of pre-revolutionary Russia, or (as is relevant here) the law of California including the Discover Bank rule and irrespective of that rule's invalidation in *Concepcion*. The Court of Appeal decided that, as a matter of contract law, the parties did mean the phrase “law of your state” to refer to this last possibility. Since the interpretation of a contract is ordinarily a matter of state law to which we defer ... we must decide not whether its decision is a correct statement of California law but whether (assuming it is) that state law is consistent with the Federal Arbitration Act.

In my experience, most parties prefer to use the Federal Rules of Evidence as a guide, not to be strictly applied. Some prefer to use the State rules of evidence with which they may be more familiar. And as with discovery rules, some parties prefer to leave it to the arbitrator's discretion.

F. Rules? Doesn't Anything Go In, in Arbitration?

No.

1. Common Sense

Arbitration originated in specialized settings in commercial contracts and labor contracts, with many arbitrators having specialized knowledge in the field of the arbitration, but not admitted to the bar.

Mastery of the rules of evidence is not always easy for attorneys—if in doubt of that point, try writing down all exceptions to the hearsay rule without checking anything first—and would be impossible to expect of nonlawyers.

Common sense is at least equally available to nonlawyers as to lawyers, and many of us suspect it is more available to those who have not had to retrain their thinking along legal lines. Many, if not all, of the State and Federal rules of evidence have a strong basis in common sense, because they relate to the reliability of the evidence, and thus to the weight it should be accorded.

Even if the parties do not agree to use any rules of evidence, even as a guide, evidentiary objections can still be very useful in alerting the arbitrator to problems with the reliability of evidence. If a timely objection would alert the opposing party to a problem that can be cured, it also makes sense to place a burden on the objecting party to make the objection timely, on pain of waiver.

2. Commercial Rules

AAA Commercial Rule 34 states:

R-34. Evidence

(a) The parties may offer such evidence as is relevant and material to the dispute and shall produce such evidence as the arbitrator may deem necessary to an understanding and determination of the dispute. Conformity to legal rules of evidence shall not be necessary. All evidence shall be taken in the presence of all of the arbitrators and all of the parties, except where any of the parties is absent, in default, or has waived the right to be present.

(b) The arbitrator shall determine the admissibility, relevance, and materiality of the evidence offered and may exclude evidence deemed by the arbitrator to be cumulative or irrelevant.

(c) The arbitrator shall take into account applicable principles of legal privilege, such as those involving the confidentiality of communications between a lawyer and client.

(d) An arbitrator or other person authorized by law to subpoena witnesses or documents may do so upon the request of any party or independently.

JAMS Comprehensive Rule 22(d) is similar.

3. Employment Rules

AAA Employment Rule 30 also vests in the arbitrator the authority to determine whether evidence should be admitted:

30. Evidence

The parties may offer such evidence as is relevant and material to the dispute and shall produce such evidence as the arbitrator deems necessary to an understanding and determination of the dispute. All evidence shall be taken in the presence of all of the arbitrators and all of the parties, except where any party or arbitrator is absent, in default, or has waived the right to be present, however "presence" should not be construed to mandate that the parties and arbitrators must be physically present in the same location.

An arbitrator or other person authorized by law to subpoena witnesses or documents may do so upon the request of any party or independently.

The arbitrator shall be the judge of the relevance and materiality of the evidence offered, and conformity to legal rules of evidence shall not be necessary. The arbitrator may in his or her discretion direct the order of proof, bifurcate proceedings, exclude cumulative or irrelevant testimony or other evidence, and direct the parties to focus their presentations on issues the decision of which could dispose of all or part of the case. All evidence shall be taken in the presence of all of the arbitrators and all of the parties, except where any party is absent, in default, or has waived the right to be present.

If the parties agree or the arbitrator directs that documents or other evidence may be submitted to the arbitrator after the hearing, the documents or other evidence shall be filed with the AAA for transmission to the arbitrator, unless the parties agree to a different method of distribution. All parties shall be afforded an opportunity to examine such documents or other evidence and to lodge appropriate objections, if any.

JAMS Employment Rule 22(d) is similar.

G. Evidence on Motions

1. Formality vs. Informality

Everything in this section may be handled differently by different arbitrators, and advocates are well advised to seek the views on these matters of the arbitrators in their cases, at their Case Management Conferences or subsequently.

Many motions have a factual predicate, and arbitrators are often comfortable relying on documents or other factual matters submitted in connection with a motion, as long as the opposing party does not question the foundation, accuracy, or reliability of the factual information. Only if there is a challenge will the moving party need to make a more formal presentation, as would be required in court.

2. The Need for Some Evidence

It is unfortunately not uncommon for parties to arbitration to submit motions or oppositions that make bare factual assertions that may or may not be correct, but which are unaccompanied by any evidentiary materials from which the arbitrator may determine if the asserted matter is correct or incorrect.

For example, suppose an arbitration agreement says that the arbitration will be conducted in a certain city, and the claimant wants to change the location. We can imagine two cases.

In the first, the claimant simply says it will be expensive to hold the hearing in that location, and the respondent disagrees. Since the claimant has the burden and no one has submitted any facts, I believe most arbitrators would reject the assertion.

In the second, the claimant lists the witnesses who would have to travel from the location in which the events occurred to a distant location, shows the large scale of the expenses required, and shows that he or she would be unable to subpoena the attendance of key witnesses at the location specified in the agreement. I believe that many arbitrators would either grant the motion or bifurcate the hearing and hold one in the location of those witnesses and one in the originally specific location.

Since these outcomes are fairly easy to predict, why do so many attorneys make motions without showing any evidence supporting their points?

Edward T. Ellis

Co-Chair, Whistleblowing and Corporate
Ethics Practice Group
Shareholder

Three Parkway
1601 Cherry Street, Suite 1400
Philadelphia, PA 19102
main: (267) 402-3000
direct: (267) 402-3008
fax: (267) 402-3131
eellis@littler.com



Focus Areas

Whistleblowing and Retaliation
Ethics, Compliance and Investigations
Litigation and Trials
Discrimination and Harassment
Unfair Competition and Trade Secrets

Overview

For over 30 years, Edward T. Ellis has defended employers in age, race, sex and disability lawsuits; whistleblower actions; and trade secret and non-compete matters. Ed has tried more than 40 cases to verdict before juries and has represented clients at hundreds of bench trials, arbitrations and administrative proceedings. He has tried federal and state court cases involving:

- The Sarbanes-Oxley Act
- Title VII of the Civil Rights Act
- The Age Discrimination in Employment Act
- The Americans With Disabilities Act
- The New Jersey Conscientious Employee Protection Act
- The First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution

He also has extensive knowledge of common law wrongful discharge cases, as well as ERISA litigation. His comprehensive range of trial experience includes appearing before federal and state courts across the country, as well as handling, and winning, the first case tried in the federal court system on Court TV.

He is the Co-Chair of Littler's Whistleblower and Retaliation practice.

Prior to entering private practice in 1988, Ed spent five and a half years as an Assistant United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania. There, he handled district court and appellate civil litigation involving the United States and its agencies with a concentration in:

- Labor matters
- Employment discrimination cases
- Procurement fraud
- Government contract issues

Ed also was a staff attorney with the United States Department of Labor Office of the Regional Solicitor in Philadelphia.

Professional and Community Affiliations

- Member, Labor and Employment Section, American Bar Association

Recognition

- Named, The Best Lawyers in America®, 2007-2016
- Awarded, AV® Peer Review Rating, *Martindale-Hubbell*

Education

J.D., University of Pennsylvania Law School, 1976

B.A., University of Notre Dame, 1973

Bar Admissions

Pennsylvania

New Jersey

Courts

U.S. Supreme Court

U.S. Tax Court

U.S. Court of Appeals, 3rd Circuit

U.S. Court of Appeals, 9th Circuit

Pennsylvania Supreme Court

New Jersey Supreme Court

U.S. District Court, Middle District of Pennsylvania

U.S. District Court, Eastern District of Pennsylvania

U.S. District Court, District of New Jersey

Publications & Press

November 18, 2015

SEC Report Indicates Whistleblower Program Going Strong
Littler ASAP

November 5, 2015

Whistle-Blower Who Delayed Gets Reduced \$325K Reward
Bloomberg BNA Securities Law Daily

October 25, 2015

Whistleblower Ruling Headed to High Court?
Business Insurance

September 14, 2015

Second Circuit Rules Dodd-Frank Safeguards Also Apply to Internal Whistleblowers
Corporate Secretary

August 18, 2015

Littler Attorneys Recognized in the Best Lawyers in America© 2016 Edition
Littler Press Release

August 14, 2015

SEC Continues its Efforts to Make Dodd-Frank Whistleblowing Easier
Littler Insight

July 31, 2015

Survey Roundup: Whistleblower Awards Concern Executives
The Wall Street Journal

July 17, 2015

Where the human resource worries reside
Fleet Owner

July 14, 2015

Overtime Reform, ACA, LGBT Policies Among Concerns for Today's Employers
Littler Press Release

June 11, 2015

District Court Holds False Claims Act Applies to Employee Allegedly Terminated for Engaging in Protected Activity Against Unrelated Former Employer

Littler Insight

April 28, 2015

Compliance Officer Bounties Call for Faster Internal Investigations

Corporate Secretary

February 27, 2015

NY AG Whistleblower Plan May Make SEC Up Bounty Game

Law360.com

January 30, 2015

New False Claims Act theories raise the stakes for healthcare providers

Becker's Hospital Review

January 13, 2015

5 Questions Weighing On Whistleblower Lawyers In 2015

Law360.com

October 27, 2014

Seminal Decision Could Make it Harder for Publicly Traded Employers to Defeat Sarbanes-Oxley Whistleblower Claims

Littler Insight

September 26, 2014

Will the SEC's \$30 million award encourage more whistleblowers?

InsideCounsel

August 19, 2014

A Low Note for Whistleblowers at the Second Circuit

Corporate Counsel

August 18, 2014

Littler Attorneys Included in the Best Lawyers in America© 2015 Edition

Littler Press Release

July 18, 2014

Littler Employer Survey Highlights Whistleblowing Concerns, Regulatory Enforcement

Xpert HR

July 1, 2014

"Pay Me, Or Else...": California Court Rules Employee's Pre-Litigation Qui Tam Threat is Extortionate
Littler Insight

June 23, 2014

Avoiding Discrimination in a Multigenerational Workforce
Corporate Counsel

June 17, 2014

2nd Circ. May Create Split On Dodd-Frank Whistleblower Shield
Law360.com

May 21, 2014

5 Questions To Ask Before Suing Over Whistleblower Theft
Law360.com

May 15, 2014

4th Circ. SOX Ruling A Rare Employer Win On Causation
Law360.com

May 9, 2014

Warning to Rainmakers in Private Law Firms and Accounting Firms: SOX Now Says, 'Don't Shoot the Messenger'
Bloomberg BNA Corporate Law & Accountability Report

April 4, 2014

High Court Extends Sarbanes-Oxley Whistleblower Law to Most Employees
TLNT

March 18, 2014

Court Decision Could Advance Compliance at Private Companies
Corporate Counsel

March 10, 2014

Court: Fund Whistleblowers Shielded By SOX
Fund Action

March 6, 2014

Supreme Court extends SOX whistleblower protections to private firms
Corporate Secretary

March 6, 2014

Supreme Court's First Sarbanes-Oxley Decision Promises Expansion of Coverage to Most Privately Held Businesses
Littler Insight

March 5, 2014

High Court Extends Employee Whistle-blower Protections
Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM)

March 4, 2014

Justices Expand Corporate Whistleblower Protection
National Law Journal

March 4, 2014

Sarbanes-Oxley whistle-blower rules apply to private firms: High court
Business Insurance

March 4, 2014

Supreme Court 6-3 Says SOX Section 806 Protects Employees of Private Contractors
Bloomberg BNA Daily Labor Report

March 4, 2014

High Court Ruling To Spur Rise In SOX Whistleblower Cases
Law360.com

February 24, 2014

Doral Ruling Shows SOX's Teeth Getting Sharper
Law360.com

February 14, 2014

Doctor's High-Court Plea Tests Whistleblower Protections
Law360.com

December 30, 2013

Supreme Court decisions may affect compliance
Corporate Secretary

November 19, 2013

Whistle-blower tips, complaints increase 7.9% in 2013: SEC
Business Insurance

November 18, 2013

SEC Whistleblower Program Gaining Momentum
Law360.com

November 18, 2013

Deciding whistleblower law's limits
Corporate Secretary

November 15, 2013

High Court Thinking On 1st SOX Whistleblower Case
Law360.com

October 1, 2013

\$14M SEC Whistleblower Award Is Just The Beginning
Law360.com

August 15, 2013

Littler Attorneys Named in Best Lawyers in America[®] 2014 Edition
Littler Press Release

June 12, 2013

3rd Circuit Adopts New Broader Standard for Defining Protected Activity for Whistle-Blowers
Westlaw Journal – Employment

May 20, 2013

High Court May Use SOX Case To Put DOL In Its Place
Law360.com

March 29, 2013

Retaliation and Whistleblower Claims by In-House Counsel
Littler Report

March 26, 2013

Meritless whistleblower retaliation claims are on the rise
InsideCounsel

March 25, 2013

Third Circuit Adopts New Broader Standard for Defining Protected Activity for Whistleblowers
Littler Insight

February 21, 2013

The 2012 Global Employer: Highlights of Littler's Fifth Annual Global Employer Institute
Littler Report

February 1, 2013

No Longer Black and White, Is the "Definitively and Specifically" Standard Now Grey?
Littler Insight

January 29, 2013

Whistleblower Cases On The Rise, OSHA Stats Show
Law360.com

January 18, 2013

DOL's Whistleblower-Friendly SOX Approach Faces Key Tests
Law360.com

January 8, 2013

Annual Report on EEOC Developments – Fiscal Year 2012
Littler Report

October 9, 2012

Fired for being too old? Know your rights
Yahoo! Finance

September 7, 2012

Best Lawyers in America® Names 164 Littler Attorneys to 2013 Edition
Littler Press Release

August 22, 2012

SEC issues \$50,000 in first whistleblower award
InsideCounsel

August 22, 2012

What's with all the commotion at the SEC?
Corporate Secretary

April 27, 2012

Reconstituted ARB Expanding Sarbanes-Oxley Whistleblower Protections
BNA Daily Labor Report

April 4, 2012

The EEOC Misses the Mark with New Rule on the ADEA's Reasonable Factors Other Than Age Defense
Littler Insight

January 1, 2012

Does SOX protect whistleblowers who steal confidential information?
InsideCounsel

November 17, 2011

Whistleblower Office Received 334 Tips Since Start of Operations, SEC Report Says
BNA Securities Regulation & Law Report

November 17, 2011

Protecting Whistleblowers
Human Resource Executive Online

November 15, 2011

When The Whistle Blows, Do You Know What You Need to Do?
TLNT

November 14, 2011

Companies Anticipate Rise in Whistleblower Claims According to Littler Survey, 96 Percent of Senior Executives Reveal Growing Concern
Littler Press Release

November 14, 2011

Hear the Whistle Blow: Is Your Company Prepared?
Bloomberg Law Reports

October 26, 2011

New SOX Decision by the U.S. Department of Labor's ARB Expands Whistleblower Protection Yet Again, Including Protection for Theft from Employer's Computer System
Littler Insight

October 14, 2011

DOL Administrative Review Board Holds that Breach of a SOX Complainant's Confidentiality Is Retaliation Under SOX
Littler Insight

September 12, 2011

Best Lawyers in America® Names 108 Littler Lawyers to 2012 Edition
Littler Press Release

September 6, 2011

Littler Reports Uptick in Whistleblower Matters and Formalizes Practice Group
Littler Press Release

July 1, 2011

Dodd-Frank and The SEC Final Rule: From Protected Employee to Bounty Hunter
Littler Report

June 9, 2011

Whistleblowers Cannot Rely on Documents Received in Response to FOIA Requests to Maintain a Qui Tam Action
Littler Insight

August 31, 2010

Littler Mendelson Welcomes Prominent Defense Attorney Edward T. Ellis to Its Philadelphia Office
Littler Press Release

2002

Protection of Intangible Assets: Trade Secrets in the Age of Federal Computer Legislation
2002 ALI-ABA Course Materials Journal

2000

Current Developments in the Law of Retaliation
2000 ALI-ABA Course Materials Journal

1998

Racial Harassment and How Employers Try to Prevent It
1998 ALI-ABA Course Materials Journal

1996

Employee Use of Surreptitious Tape Recordings to Gather Evidence for an Employment Lawsuit", 1
1996 ALI-ABA Course Materials Journal

Speaking Engagements

November 19, 2015

Corporate Compliance & Financial Services Update
New York, NY

May 19, 2015

2015 Whistleblower Update "Speaking Up" Gets Louder

July 26, 2014

Emerging Issues in Whistleblower Law

21st Annual Advanced Course Webinar - The American Law Institute Continuing Legal Education Group (ALI CLE)

July 25, 2014

Recurring Discovery and Evidence Issues in Employment Cases

21st Annual Advanced Course Webinar - The American Law Institute Continuing Legal Education Group (ALI CLE)

July 25, 2014

Settlement of Employment Cases: The Hot Button Issues

21st Annual Advanced Course Webinar - The American Law Institute Continuing Legal Education Group (ALI CLE)

July 25, 2014

Practical Tips to Handle Departing Employees in a Digital Age

21st Annual Advanced Course Webinar - The American Law Institute Continuing Legal Education Group (ALI CLE)

June 18, 2014

New Challenges Avoiding Claims of Age Discrimination: How Generation X Bosses Manage an Aging Workforce

April 3, 2014

2014 Whistleblowing & Retaliation Update

Association of Corporate Counsel, Philadelphia Chapter

January 29, 2014

2014 Whistleblowing & Retaliation Update

June 12, 2013

What Every Multinational Should Know About Bounty Hunters and Whistleblowers

April 30, 2013

Strategies for Dealing with the Whistleblower

Tysons Corner, VA

December 6, 2012

Strategies for Dealing with the Whistleblower

Chicago, IL

December 5, 2012

Hear the Whistle Blow: Dealing with Retaliation and Whistleblower Claims

Phoenix, AZ

November 8, 2012

What Every Multinational Should Know About Bounty Hunters and Whistleblowers
Littler Mendelson, Washington D.C.

October 30, 2012

Conducting Lawful Investigations: An Interactive Program for Internal Investigators
Philadelphia, PA

July 28, 2012

Emerging Issues in Retaliation and Whistleblower Law
19th Annual Advanced CLE - American Law Institute (ALI-ABA), Santa Fe, NM

July 27, 2012

Non-Compete, Non-Solicitation, and Trade Secret Developments
19th Annual Advanced CLE - American Law Institute (ALI-ABA), Santa Fe, NM

July 27, 2012

Recurring Evidence Issues in Employment Cases
19th Annual Advanced CLE - American Law Institute (ALI-ABA), Santa Fe, NM

May 9, 2012

Retaliation & Whistleblowing Workshop
Littler Mendelson, Scottsdale, AZ

July 28-30, 2011

Current Developments In Employment Law
18th Annual Advanced CLE - American Law Institute (ALI-ABA)

April 28, 2011

Deposing The Expert Witness -- The New Rules
Pennsylvania Bar Institute

March 15, 2011

The Rising Tide of Retaliation and Whistleblower Claims
Philadelphia, PA

Books & Book Chapters

- *ABA Section of Litigation, Employment Litigation Handbook, chapter editor, 2010*



Richard T. Seymour, Esq.
Law Office of Richard T. Seymour, P.L.L.C.

Current Employer-Title	Law Office of Richard T. Seymour, P.L.L.C. - Principal and Owner; Of Counsel, The Employment Law Group, LLC, 2011-present
Profession	Attorney, Mediator, Arbitrator, Advisor
Work History	Principal and Owner, Law Office of Richard T. Seymour, P.L.L.C., 2005-present; Of Counsel, The Employment Law Group, 2011-present; Partner, Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein LLP, 2001-05; Project Director, Lawyer's Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, 1977-2001; Principal and Owner, Richard T. Seymour, Attorney at Law, 1973-77; Attorney, Washington Research Project, 1969-73; Attorney/Law Clerk, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1967-69.
Experience	<p>Named 2007 "Lawyer of the Year" by Metropolitan Washington Employment Lawyers Association. Currently Immediate Past Chair of 26,000-member ABA Labor and Employment Law Section. Complex litigation and shaping injunctions. Extensive understanding of employers' and employees' perspectives, through ABA work and joint task forces. For additional information, please see website at www.rickseymourlaw.com.</p> <p>Advises attorneys on both sides of the fence. Sometimes serves as an expert on class settlements. Understands the perspectives of employers, employees, labor unions, and persons accused of harassment, and at various times has represented all of them.</p> <p>Represents executives negotiating hiring and severance agreements, plaintiffs in discrimination and wage and hour cases, class actions, and collective actions, and occasional unjustly accused employers. Currently, or has served as lead counsel in cases under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Equal Pay Act, the Age Discrimination in Employment Act ("ADEA"), 42 U.S.C. secs. 1981 and 1983, the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), New York Labor Law ("NYLL"), the New York State Human Rights Law, and the New York City Human Rights Law. Has been counsel in cases involving the Washington Minimum Wage Act and the Washington Consumer Protection Act.</p>
Alternative Dispute Resolution Experience	<p>Experience with arbitration includes: (1) Commercial franchisor-franchisee breach-of-contract dispute; (2) Employment discrimination (partner of a law firm); (3) Employment discrimination (executive of a corporation); (4) Employment contract (dispute over commissions); (5) Employment discrimination (three-arbitrator panel in gender discrimination class action).</p> <p>Most recent mediation was a Sarbanes-Oxley case before the Department of Labor while a related discrimination case was before the U.S. District Court in Maryland.</p>

Richard T. Seymour, Esq.
Neutral ID : 155323

Earlier mediations involved a Fair Labor Standards Act collective action involving 50 to 60 claimants; gender discrimination class action, and a sexual harassment/destruction of property case.

For several years, served as one of the ABA Labor & Employment Law Section's liaisons to the National Alliance for Education in Dispute Resolution, and spoke at several sessions around the country or in Canada. Their aim was to train labor arbitrators to mediate employment discrimination disputes.

Has also participated as an advocate in mediations of class actions, collective actions, and individual cases.

Alternative Dispute Resolution Training

AAA Arbitrator Subpoenas: Are They Worth the Paper They're Printed On?, 2015; AAA Administered vs. Ad Hoc Arbitration: Which Should You Choose?, 2015; AAA Imposing Sanctions in Arbitration: Just How Far Can You Go?, 2015; AAA Top Techniques for Improving Arbitration Case Management Efficiency, 2015; AAA Fair Hearings: Avoiding the Pitfalls 2014; AAA Protocols, Processes and Protecting the Award 2014; AAA Conducting Research & Investigations: The Arbitrator's Authority (ACE9) 2014; AAA Guided Choice: Innovations in Mediation to Get Better Settlements at Less Cost 2014; AAA Maximizing Efficiency & Economy in Arbitration: Challenges at the Preliminary Hearing, 2012; AAA Managing the Arbitration Process for Efficiency & Economy Following the Preliminary Hearing, 2012; AAA Webinar, The Labor Arbitrator's Code of Professional Responsibility - What Every Effective Advocate Should Know, 2011; AAA Webinar, Electronic Discovery in Arbitration: What You Need to Know, 2009; AAA Webinar, Arbitrator Boundaries: What are the Limits of Arbitrator Authority?, 2009; AAA Webinar, Will Traditional Litigation Strategies Work in Employment Arbitration - Ask the Experts, 2009; AAA Webinar, Will Traditional Litigation Strategies Work in Employment Arbitration, 2009; AAA Webinar, Generational Divides: Old and New Issues in the New Workplace, 2009; AAA Webinar, Resolution of Employment Disputes Pre-Arbitration, 2009; AAA Arbitration Fundamentals and Best Practices for New AAA Arbitrators, 2007; ABA Section of Dispute Resolution, Commercial Arbitration, 2007.

Professional Licenses

Admitted to the Bar, Washington, D.C., 1968; Maryland, 2008; U.S. District Court: District of Columbia; Southern District of Texas; Northern District of New York; Northern District of Mississippi; Eastern District of Michigan; District of Maryland; U.S. Court of Appeals: District of Columbia; Second; Third; Fourth; Fifth; Sixth; Ninth; Tenth; Eleventh Circuits; U.S. Supreme Court.

Professional Associations

American Bar Association (Dispute Resolution Section; Trial Torts and Insurance Practice Section; Past Chair of Labor & Employment Law Section; Past ABA Governance Liaison Past Council Member; Center for Professional Responsibility); American Association for Justice (Section & Litigation Group Coordination Committee, Past Chair; Section Leaders Council, Past Chair; Employment Rights Section, Past Chair); National Employment Lawyers' Association; Metropolitan Washington Employment Lawyers' Association (Board member); Trial Lawyers Association of D.C.; College of Labor and Employment Lawyers (Fellow; Past Governor); International Network of Boutique Law Firms (National and

Richard T. Seymour, Esq.
Neutral ID : 155323

The AAA provides arbitrators to parties on cases administered by the AAA under its various Rules, which delegate authority to the AAA on various issues, including arbitrator appointment and challenges, general oversight, and billing. Arbitrations that proceed without AAA administration are not considered "AAA arbitrations," even if the parties were to select an arbitrator who is on the AAA's Roster.

Washington Chapter).

Education

Aquinas College (BA, English Literature and German Literature-1965); Harvard Law School (LLB-1968).

Publications and Speaking Engagements

Co-author, Equal Employment Law Update," Bureau of National Affairs, 15 published editions, copyright ABA, 1996-2007; chapter author, "Mediating Class Actions - A Plaintiff Lawyer's View," chapter 24, HOW ADR WORKS, Bureau of National Affairs, copyright ABA, 2002; co-drafted chapter on monetary relief in Grossman & Lindemann, Employment Discrimination Law, 3d edition (BNA, 1976) (ABA Section of Labor and Employment Law); "The Use of Proof of Claim Forms and Gag Orders in Employment Discrimination Class Actions," 10 CONN.L.REV. 920 (1978); "Strategic Effects of the Weber Decision on Employers," published in EMPLOYMENT & BENEFIT PRACTICES AFTER WEBER -- AFFIRMATIVE ACTION, AGE & SEX (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1979), reprinted in FEDERAL BAR ASSOCIATION, EQUAL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE GUIDE, vol. I, chapter III (1980); (c) "Post-Certification Problems in Class Actions," published in the PRACTICING LAW INSTITUTE HANDBOOK, FEDERAL CIVIL RIGHTS LITIGATION (1982); "Why Plaintiffs' Counsel Challenge Tests, and How They Can Successfully Challenge the Theory of >Validity Generalization," 33 JOURNAL OF VOCATIONAL BEHAVIOR 331 (1988); "Predictability in EEO Litigation," in PROMOTING MINORITIES AND WOMEN: A PRACTICAL GUIDE TO AFFIRMATIVE ACTION FOR THE 1990S, A BNA SPECIAL REPORT (Bureau of National Affairs, 1989); "The Loss of Predictability in EEO Litigation, and Further Questions to Be Resolved," in EMPLOYMENT DISCRIMINATION AFTER THE 1989 U.S. SUPREME COURT RULINGS (Prentice Hall, 1989); "Pursuing Punitive Damages in Job Bias Cases," TRIAL, July 2002, p. 64; "The Shrinking Door to Discovery," TRIAL, May 2001, p. 48; and "16 Summary Judgment Commandments," TRIAL, Dec. 2000, p. 28. In addition, I have numerous CLE papers, some on arbitration. Many but not all of my papers are on web site at www.rickseymourlaw.com. Others may be obtained from by request.

SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS:

Speaks frequently, including at ABA programs sponsored by the Sections of Business Law, Dispute Resolution, Labor and Employment Law, Litigation, and Tort Trial and Insurance Practice. Speaker at training program for Federal judges put on by Federal Judicial Center and New York University Law School in 2005; speaker at various times for ABA entities, AAJ (formerly ATLA), ALI-ABA, NELA, and State or City Bars of Atlanta, Arizona, Chicago, DC, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Houston, King County (Washington), Minnesota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Wisconsin. Spoke to the Employment Lawyers Association of England in 2013, and will speak there again in 2015. Testified at a public hearing of the Federal courts' Advisory Committee on the Civil Rules in 2008, and provided comments on proposed amendments to the Civil Rules in 2014. The testimony and comments may be obtained by request.

Awards and Honors

Chair, American Bar Association Section of Labor and Employment Law, 2011-2012; Board of Directors, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law

Richard T. Seymour, Esq.
Neutral ID : 155323

The AAA provides arbitrators to parties on cases administered by the AAA under its various Rules, which delegate authority to the AAA on various issues, including arbitrator appointment and challenges, general oversight, and billing. Arbitrations that proceed without AAA administration are not considered "AAA arbitrations," even if the parties were to select an arbitrator who is on the AAA's Roster.

(present); College of Labor and Employment Lawyers (Fellow, past Governor); "Lawyer of the Year" award, Metropolitan Washington Employment Lawyers Association, 2007; Edwin D. Wolf Award, Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, 1995; Pro Bono Award, NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 1987.

Willing to serve without travel cost No charge for local travel of an hour or less.

Citizenship United States of America
Languages English
Locale Washington, District of Columbia, United States of America

Compensation

Hearing: \$485.00/Hr
Study: \$485.00/Hr
Travel: \$485.00/Hr
Cancellation: \$2425.00/Day
Cancellation Period: 7 Days
Comment: No charge for local travel of less than an hour. Full rate for all time if travel of more than an hour is by car, or if travel is by public transportation or taxi. Half rate if travel is by air and not studying or drafting in the matter en route (full rate for that time if studying), but no charge for time spent working on other matters. Travel time is based on shortest available regular times, but includes travel delays not caused by attorney (i.e., no charge when delay is due to misreading of a map). Travel time is capped at five hours per day for travel in the continental United States.

No charge for cancellations with seven days' notice. No charge for cancellations because a multi-day hearing ended without using all the days. Otherwise, a cancellation fee of one five-hour day (\$2,425) for each hearing day scheduled, capped at two days.

Fees are based on the nearest tenth of an hour, rounded up at 3 or more minutes. Fees are applicable to all time spent, including pre-hearing and post-hearing matters.

Richard T. Seymour, Esq.
Neutral ID : 155323

The AAA provides arbitrators to parties on cases administered by the AAA under its various Rules, which delegate authority to the AAA on various issues, including arbitrator appointment and challenges, general oversight, and billing. Arbitrations that proceed without AAA administration are not considered "AAA arbitrations," even if the parties were to select an arbitrator who is on the AAA's Roster.

Normal office and travel expenses are charged, including WestLaw or LEXIS research charges. Travel tickets are obtained on a refundable basis for coach class, unless the parties agree otherwise.

Richard T. Seymour, Esq.
Neutral ID : 155323

The AAA provides arbitrators to parties on cases administered by the AAA under its various Rules, which delegate authority to the AAA on various issues, including arbitrator appointment and challenges, general oversight, and billing. Arbitrations that proceed without AAA administration are not considered "AAA arbitrations," even if the parties were to select an arbitrator who is on the AAA's Roster.



AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION®

[Click here to go to the Commercial Arbitration Rules](#)

[Click here to go to the Commercial Arbitration Rules](#)
Effective 10/1/13

[Click here to go to the Construction Arbitration Rules](#)

[Click here to go to the Employment Arbitration Rules](#)

[Click here to go to the Labor Arbitration Rules](#)