

New Jersey Supreme Court Rules Certain Arbitration Clauses Unenforceable

Authors:

Francis X. "Trip" Riley III

Colleen Fox

SUMMARY

A recent New Jersey Supreme Court decision held that an arbitration clause was not enforceable because it did not inform the consumer that acceptance of the clause operated as a waiver of the right to obtain relief in court. It also reinforced the presumption that courts decide whether a dispute is subject to arbitration.

In *Morgan v. Sanford Brown Institute*, No. A-31-14 (June 14, 2016), the New Jersey Supreme Court held that an arbitration clause is not enforceable when it does not inform the consumer that acceptance of the clause works as a waiver of the right to obtain relief in court. The court made clear that arbitration agreements must clearly explain that arbitration is a substitute for having disputes and legal claims resolved before a judge or jury, in simple and understandable terms. Accordingly, the court rejected the enforceability of Sanford Brown Institute's arbitration clause because, although it said that certain disputes must be submitted to arbitration, it did not explain that by agreeing to arbitration, students waived their right to judicial relief.

The court also reinforced the presumption that unless an arbitration agreement states otherwise, courts decide whether a dispute is subject to arbitration. To overcome that presumption, the agreement must "clearly and unambiguously" state that the parties want an arbitrator, not a court, to decide whether their dispute is arbitrable.

To ensure their arbitration agreements are enforceable, companies should explain to consumers that they can settle disputes only in arbitration and waive their right to bring an action in court before a judge or jury. The agreement should also be clear that only an arbitrator, and not a court, can decide disputes related to the agreement, including the interpretation, applicability, enforceability, or formation of the agreement. Without these additional provisions, in New Jersey, arbitration clauses are subject to being challenged.

This Alert was written by Francis X. "Trip" Riley III, Co-Chair of the firm's Consumer Financial Services Practice, and Colleen Fox, a member of the firm's Commercial Litigation Practice. Trip can be reached at 609.452.3150 or friley@saulewing.com. Colleen can be reached at 609.452.3145 or cfox@saulewing.com. This publication has been prepared by the Consumer Financial Services Practice for information purposes only.

The provision and receipt of the information in this publication (a) should not be considered legal advice, (b) does not create a lawyer-client relationship, and (c) should not be acted on without seeking professional counsel who have been informed of the specific facts. Under the rules of certain jurisdictions, this communication may constitute "Attorney Advertising."

© 2016 Saul Ewing LLP, a Delaware Limited Liability Partnership.
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.

Baltimore, MD
500 East Pratt St.
Charles O. Monk, II
410.332.8668

Boston, MA
131 Dartmouth St.
Richard D. Gass
617.723.3300

Chesterbrook, PA
1200 Liberty
Ridge Dr.
Michael S. Burg
610.251.5750
Nathaniel Metz
610.251.5099

Harrisburg, PA
2 North Second St.
Joel C. Hopkins
717.257.7525

Newark, NJ
One Riverfront Plaza
Stephen B. Genzer
973.286.6712

New York, NY
555 Fifth Ave.
212.980.7200

Philadelphia, PA
1500 Market St.
Bruce D. Armon
215.972.7985

Pittsburgh, PA
One PPG Place
David R. Berk
412.209.2511
Charles Kelly
412.209.2532

Princeton, NJ
650 College Rd. E
Marc A. Citron
609.452.3105

Washington, DC
1919 Pennsylvania
Ave, NW
Mark L. Gruhin
202.342.3444
Andrew F. Palmieri
202.295.6674

Wilmington, DE
222 Delaware Ave.
William E. Manning
302.421.6868
Wendie C. Stabler
302.421.6865