



CARDOZO

Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law

LARC @ Cardozo Law

---

CJCR Blog

Journal Blogs

---

5-7-2023

## California's Proposed Ban on Mandatory Arbitration Agreements as a Condition of Employment

Samuel Silverman

*Cardozo Journal of Conflict Resolution*, [sasilve4@law.cardozo.yu.edu](mailto:sasilve4@law.cardozo.yu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://larc.cardozo.yu.edu/cjcr-blog>



Part of the [Dispute Resolution and Arbitration Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Silverman, Samuel, "California's Proposed Ban on Mandatory Arbitration Agreements as a Condition of Employment" (2023). *CJCR Blog*. 65.

<https://larc.cardozo.yu.edu/cjcr-blog/65>

This Blog Post is brought to you for free and open access by the Journal Blogs at LARC @ Cardozo Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in CJCR Blog by an authorized administrator of LARC @ Cardozo Law. For more information, please contact [larc@yu.edu](mailto:larc@yu.edu).

CALIFORNIA'S PROPOSED BAN ON MANDATORY ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS AS A  
CONDITION OF EMPLOYMENT

*Samuel Silverman*

California is casting uncertainty on the employer's ability to implement mandatory arbitration agreements on employees.<sup>1</sup> In October 2019, Governor Newsom signed Assembly Bill No. 51,<sup>2</sup> which would apply to employment contracts entered, modified, or extended on or after January 1, 2020.<sup>3</sup> This bill created Labor Code Section 432.6, banning mandatory arbitration agreements as a condition of employment in California.<sup>4</sup> This would work around the Federal Arbitration Act, which requires courts to enforce arbitration agreements, preempting the state laws that stood in its way.<sup>5</sup> Critics argue that the process favors employers and discourages prospective employees from bringing legal claims.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, proponents of the FAA have said it provides an efficient and cheaper alternative, benefiting both workers and employers.<sup>7</sup> The Eastern District Court issued a restraining order,<sup>8</sup> and preliminary injunction, finding it violated the FAA.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Beth Graham, *California Bans Mandatory Arbitration Agreements as a Condition of Employment*, ADR TOOLBOX (Nov. 19, 2019) <http://www.adrtoolbox.com/2019/11/california-bans-mandatory-arbitration-agreements-as-a-condition-of-employment/> [<https://perma.cc/M5ZM-JLRQ>].

<sup>2</sup> Cal. Ass. Bill No. 51.

<sup>3</sup> Spencer C. Skeen ET AL., *Ninth Circuit Blocks California's Ban on Mandatory Arbitration in Employment*, OGLETREE DEAKINS (Feb. 16, 2023) <https://ogletree.com/insights/ninth-circuit-blocks-californias-ban-on-mandatory-arbitration-in-employment/> [<https://perma.cc/6GWK-UMLP>].

<sup>4</sup> Cal. Lab. Code § 432.6.; *Id.*

<sup>5</sup> *See, e.g.*, *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 352 (holding the FAA preempted a California rule finding contract provisions disallowing classwide arbitration are unconscionable); *Preston v. Ferrer*, 552 U.S. 346, 349–50 (2008) (holding the FAA preempted a California law giving a state agency primary jurisdiction over a dispute involving the California Talent Agency Act despite the parties' agreement to arbitrate such disputes); *Perry v. Thomas*, 482 U.S. 483, 484, 491 (1987) (holding the FAA preempted a statute permitting collection actions, despite a valid arbitration agreement).

<sup>6</sup> Brendan Pierson, *Appeals court blocks California ban on mandatory arbitration for workers*, REUTERS (Feb. 15, 2023, 5:05 PM EST) <https://www.reuters.com/legal/appeals-court-blocks-california-bar-mandatory-arbitration-workers-2023-02-15/> [<https://perma.cc/R89F-NVWR>].

<sup>7</sup> *Id.*

<sup>8</sup> Jack S. Sholkoff, et al., *Ninth Circuit Upholds Portions of California Law Prohibiting Use of Mandatory Arbitration Agreements*, OGLETREE DEAKINS (Sep. 16, 2021) <https://ogletree.com/insights/ninth-circuit-upholds-portions-of-california-law-prohibiting-use-of-mandatory-arbitration-agreements/> [<https://perma.cc/NH64-JSMC>].

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*; 9 U.S.C.A. § 2.

The court upheld the bill.<sup>10</sup> The court reasoned that the FAA protects enforcement of arbitration agreements but not involuntary and mandatory arbitrate agreements.<sup>11</sup> Previously signed agreements may not be invalidated by the bill.<sup>12</sup> Instead, Section 432.6 focuses on “pre-agreement” conduct, which is not subject to FAA law.<sup>13</sup> Additionally, the bill regulates “employer conduct,” not agreement formations, and therefore does not conflict with the FAA.<sup>14</sup> The outcome is that mandatory arbitration agreements are banned yet enforceable.<sup>15</sup>

August 2022 brought Judge Fletcher to withdraw his majority decision and join Judge Ikuta in voting to withdraw the opinion and rehear the case.<sup>16</sup> Ikuta argued that the FAA prohibits states from enacting laws that burden the formation and enforcement of arbitration agreements.<sup>17</sup> Therefore, they reasoned that Section 432.6 violates the FAA.<sup>18</sup>

February 15, 2023, brought an the end of this saga. Ikuta, joined by Fletcher, upheld the FAA preemption over Section 432.6 because the law discourages the formation of arbitration agreements.<sup>19</sup> The argument that the FAA only required enforcement of arbitration agreements and not the pre-agreement conduct fell flat when it was ruled that policies impeding a party’s ability to form arbitration agreements hinder the broad national policy favoring arbitration.<sup>20</sup> The Ninth Circuit found that the FAA preempts state law if it interferes with the fundamental attributes

---

<sup>10</sup> Chamber of Commerce of the United States v. Bonta, 2023 U.S. App. LEXIS 3586.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*

<sup>13</sup> *Id.*; *Supra* note 4.; Sholkoff, *supra* note 8.; *Supra* note 9.

<sup>14</sup> Laura Devane ET AL., *Ninth Circuit Eliminates Obstacles to Enforcement of Employment Arbitration Agreements in California*, LITTLER (Feb. 17, 2023) <https://www.littler.com/publication-press/publication/ninth-circuit-eliminates-obstacles-enforcement-employment-arbitration> [<https://perma.cc/3BY4-UHJV>]; *Supra* note 4.

<sup>15</sup> Spencer C. Skeen & Zachary V. Zagger, *Ninth Circuit Panel to Reconsider Decision Upholding California Mandatory Arbitration Ban*, OGLETREE DEAKINS (Aug. 26, 2022) <https://ogletree.com/insights/ninth-circuit-panel-to-reconsider-decision-upholding-california-mandatory-arbitration-ban/> [<https://perma.cc/9SMJ-K5C3>].

<sup>16</sup> Skeen, *supra* note 3.

<sup>17</sup> *Id.*

<sup>18</sup> *Id.*

<sup>19</sup> Chamber of Commerce v. Bonta, *supra* note 10.

<sup>20</sup> Skeen, *supra* note 3.

of arbitration” or has a “disproportionate impact on arbitration.”<sup>21</sup> If a state law interferes with arbitration on its face or covertly, such a rule cannot stand in harmony with the purposes of the FAA.<sup>22</sup> Because the FAA’s purpose is to encourage arbitration, and Section 432.6 is an obstacle to that purpose, (AB)-51 is preempted.<sup>23</sup> The 9th Circuit joined the 1st Circuit and the 4th Circuit in finding that “the FAA preempts a state rule that discriminates against arbitration by discouraging or prohibiting the formation of an arbitration agreement.”<sup>24</sup>

Additionally, the appeals court declined to sever certain parts and upheld others<sup>25</sup> because all of (AB)-51’s provisions work together, and it, therefore, still impedes the ability of employers to enter into arbitration agreements.<sup>26</sup> Although the reimposed preliminary injunction only temporarily blocks the law, this ruling signals that the final outcome does not appear hopeful for (AB)-51.<sup>27</sup>

The main takeaway is that the Federal Courts still favor arbitration and will strike down state laws that discriminate against arbitration.<sup>28</sup> Courts will protect arbitration at all costs.<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Devane, *supra* note 14.

<sup>22</sup> *Id.*

<sup>23</sup> Michael W. McTigue Jr. ET AL, *Ninth Circuit Blocks California’s Ban on Mandatory Arbitration Agreements*, SKADDEN (Feb. 16, 2023), <https://www.skadden.com/insights/publications/2023/02/ninth-circuit-blocks-californias-ban-on-mandatory-arbitration-agreements> [<https://perma.cc/DXW2-CT8Z>].

<sup>24</sup> Anet Drapalski ET AL, *Federal Appeals Court Blocks California’s Ban on Mandatory Arbitration Agreements: 7 Key Takeaways for Employers*, FISHER PHILIPS (Feb. 16, 2023) <https://www.fisherphillips.com/news-insights/federal-appeals-court-blocks-californias-ban-mandatory-arbitration-agreements.html> [<https://perma.cc/4XGF-8KJS>].

<sup>25</sup> *Id.*

<sup>26</sup> Devane, *supra* note 14.

<sup>27</sup> Drapalski, *supra* note 24.

<sup>28</sup> *Id.*

<sup>29</sup> *Id.*