

class actions lawflash

January 27, 2014

Five Takeaways from the Supreme Court's *AU Optronics* Decision

Court's decision provides key takeaways for class action defendants, including how the decision limits the use of CAFA's mass action provision to suits that actually name 100 or more persons as plaintiffs.

On January 14, the U.S. Supreme Court issued its decision in *Mississippi ex rel. Hood v. AU Optronics Corp.*,¹ holding that a *parens patriae* action filed by the state of Mississippi on behalf of its citizens was not a "mass action" as defined by the Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA) and thus could not be removed to federal court on that basis. The Court interpreted the definition of "mass action" as requiring 100 or more parties to be actually named as plaintiffs. The Court also rejected arguments that the state's citizens should have been counted as the real unnamed parties in interest for purposes of the 100-person threshold. Instead, Mississippi's *parens patriae* lawsuit included only one plaintiff, the state.

There are five significant takeaways from *AU Optronics* that any potential defendant should understand. First, the decision limits the use of CAFA's mass action provision to suits that actually name 100 or more persons as plaintiffs. Second, the ruling likely enhances the incentive for private contingency-fee counsel to pair with state attorneys general and bring *parens patriae* actions in state court. Third, the opinion underscores the possibility that a defendant may face both class actions and *parens patriae* actions for the same alleged conduct—often in different courts. Fourth, private contingency-fee counsel may be further encouraged to urge state attorneys general to use *parens patriae* actions as an alternative to private class actions that would otherwise be barred, such as when potential class members have signed class action waivers. Finally, despite these possibilities, the *AU Optronics* decision is limited to jurisdiction under CAFA and does not eliminate or restrict the ability of litigants to remove attorney general cases on other grounds.

CAFA's Mass Action Provision

Congress enacted CAFA to expand federal jurisdiction and to provide for jurisdiction over class actions with national importance.² Among its various provisions, CAFA contemplates two types of cases: class actions and mass actions.³ For both types of actions, CAFA loosened federal statutory jurisdictional requirements by only requiring minimal diversity among the parties⁴ as well as an aggregate amount in controversy that exceeds \$5 million.⁵ Mass actions are defined under CAFA as the following:

[A]ny civil action (except a [class action] within the scope of section 1711(2)) in which monetary relief claims of 100 or more persons are proposed to be tried jointly on the ground that the plaintiffs' claims involve common questions of law or fact, except that jurisdiction shall exist only

1. No. 12-1036, (U.S. Jan. 14, 2014), available at http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/13pdf/12-1036_0971.pdf.

2. *Id.*, slip op. at 2.

3. *Id.*

4. Minimal diversity requires only that one member of a class be a citizen of a state different from any defendant. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2)(A); see also 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(11)(A) (providing that "a mass action shall be deemed removable under [§§ 1332(d)(2) through (d)(10)]").

5. 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(d)(2), (d)(6), (d)(11)(a).

over those plaintiffs whose claims in a mass action satisfy the jurisdictional amount requirements under subsection (a).⁶

Of particular note is the limitation in the final clause, providing that, unlike a typical class action under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, federal jurisdiction in a mass action “shall exist only over those plaintiffs’ whose claims individually satisfy the \$75,000 amount in controversy requirement.”⁷ CAFA also provides certain exceptions for mass actions, including actions that involve principally local issues or raise matters of state concern.⁸

Supreme Court Opinion

In *AU Optronics*, the state of Mississippi, represented by private contingency-fee counsel, sued AU Optronics and other manufacturers of liquid crystal displays (LCDs), alleging that they formed an international cartel to restrict competition and raise prices of LCDs.⁹ Mississippi brought a *parens patriae* action in state court on behalf of itself and Mississippi citizens who purchased LCD products at allegedly inflated prices. Defendants removed to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Mississippi. The district court found that the state’s action qualified as a mass action because the state sought to represent the interests of many unnamed citizens, exceeding the “100 or more persons” requirement for a mass action.¹⁰ The district court interpreted the words “persons” and “plaintiffs” in the mass action section of CAFA as including the real parties in interest. The district court remanded, however, finding that the “general public” exception applied.¹¹ The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit agreed that the *AU Optronics* action qualified as a mass action but reversed the district court’s finding that the suit fell within the general public exception.¹²

Justice Sonia Sotomayor, writing for a unanimous Court, disagreed with both the district court and the Fifth Circuit, instead interpreting the phrase “persons” as including only plaintiffs named in the action. Turning first to the statutory text, Justice Sotomayor observed that the “mass action” definition does not include “100 or more named or unnamed real parties in interest,” instead referring to “100 or more persons.”¹³ According to the Court, had Congress intended to include the “unnamed real parties in interest,” it could have drafted language to that effect as it did elsewhere within CAFA.¹⁴ The Court also foresaw administrative complications for district courts if they were required to consider unnamed parties to a mass action, such as determining whether unnamed parties’ claims satisfied the \$75,000 requirement and how to handle claims valued at less than \$75,000.¹⁵

Significantly, the Court observed that the mass action component of CAFA “functions largely as a backstop to ensure that CAFA’s relaxed jurisdictional rules for class actions cannot be evaded by a suit that names a host of plaintiffs rather than using the class device.”¹⁶ In doing so, the Court rejected arguments that federal courts are required under CAFA to look at the substance of actions for jurisdictional purposes in order to determine the real parties in interest. While the Court agreed that analyzing the real parties in interest is a “background principle” for

6. 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(11)(B)(i).

7. *AU Optronics*, No. 12-1036, slip op. at 3 (quoting 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(11)(B)(i)). Although framed in terms of jurisdiction over “plaintiffs,” the limitation refers to subject matter jurisdiction over claims that do not meet the amount in controversy requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a).

8. *Id.* at 3 n.1; see also 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(3)-(5).

9. *AU Optronics*, No. 12-1036, slip op. at 3.

10. *Mississippi ex rel. Hood v. AU Optronics Corp.*, 876 F. Supp. 2d 758 (S.D. Miss. 2012).

11. The general public exception excludes from the “mass action” definition “any civil action in which . . . all of the claims in the action are asserted on behalf of the general public (and not on behalf of individual claimants or members of a purported class) pursuant to a State statute specifically authorizing such action.” 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(11)(B)(ii)(III).

12. *Mississippi ex rel. Hood v. AU Optronics Corp.*, 701 F.3d 796 (5th Cir. 2012). Although remand orders are not generally appealable, CAFA creates an exception to that principle.

13. *AU Optronics*, No. 12-1036, slip op. at 6.

14. *Id.*

15. *Id.* at 8–9.

16. *Id.* at 11.

determining diversity, the justices disagreed with the conclusion that Congress intended that principle to apply to CAFA's mass action provision.¹⁷

Five Takeaways

AU Optronics creates a significant limitation for parties seeking to remove certain actions under CAFA's mass action provision generally and for attorney general actions specifically. There are five key takeaways for any potential class action party:

1. The Court limited use of CAFA's mass action provision to those actions that actually name "100 or more persons" as plaintiffs. In addition, although not expressly held by the Court, each plaintiff must have a claim in excess of \$75,000 for the claim to remain in federal court. As the Court reasoned, the mass action provision serves as a "backstop" to CAFA's relaxed jurisdictional rules and ensures that plaintiffs cannot evade federal jurisdiction by naming "a host of plaintiffs rather than using the class device."¹⁸
2. As a practical matter, the Court's ruling enhances the incentive for private contingency-fee counsel to pair with state attorneys general and bring *parens patriae* actions in state court on behalf of state citizens in tandem with or immediately following private class actions. Thus, there is an increased possibility of follow-up actions after the settlement of a class action, possibly brought by the same private counsel under the authority of a state attorney general.
3. Such multiple cases for essentially the same conduct are likely to proceed in different courts. Chief Justice John Roberts homed in on this problem during oral argument in *AU Optronics*, questioning whether an attorney general could file a *parens patriae* action immediately following a class action settlement for the same alleged conduct.¹⁹ Counsel for Mississippi responded by pointing out (among other things) that the state's interest in *parens patriae* actions is broader than those of a class seeking damages to individual consumers as it includes, for example, indirect harms. The concern about multiple actions, also reflected in questions by Justices Antonin Scalia and Anthony Kennedy, is an area of significant debate. Although the underlying issues are more substantive than jurisdictional, the Court may have the opportunity to address such concerns in the future.
4. The *AU Optronics* decision leaves open the possibility that private contingency-fee counsel may bring *parens patriae* actions on behalf of a state's citizens in state court where a class action would otherwise be impossible. For example, a *parens patriae* action may be a viable alternative to claims involving consumer products or services where a class action waiver has been signed.²⁰ In this way, *AU Optronics* presents a potential end run around other Supreme Court class action jurisprudence.
5. The holding in *AU Optronics*, although significant for attorney general actions, is limited to addressing jurisdiction over attorney general *parens patriae* actions under CAFA. The decision does not eliminate or restrict the ability of litigants to remove attorney general cases on other grounds, such as where state-law claims implicate significant federal issues, nor does it speak to situations where a single, diverse, private plaintiff invokes state law to attempt to recover more than \$75,000 based on conduct harmful to other citizens.²¹

Removing a path to federal court under CAFA's mass action provision paves the way for attorney general actions to remain in state court and underscores the incentive for states and private contingency-fee counsel to pursue

17. *Id.* at 12.

18. *Id.* at 11.

19. Oral Argument Transcript at 17–22, *AU Optronics*, No. 12-1036 (Nov. 6, 2013), available at http://www.supremecourt.gov/oral_arguments/argument_transcripts/12-1036_hqci.pdf.

20. See *American Express Co. v. Italian Colors Restaurant*, 133 S. Ct. 2304 (2013) (upholding use of class action waiver).

21. *E.g., Grable & Sons Metal Products, Inc. v. Darue Engineering & Mfg.*, 545 U.S. 308, 314–16 (2005) (finding federal jurisdiction appropriate in quiet title action where the only contested legal and factual issues involved interpretations of federal law).

Morgan Lewis

these actions. In fact, 46 states filed as *amici curiae* in support of Mississippi, suggesting that federal jurisdiction over *parens patriae* actions improperly places state actions in federal courts.²²

The full impact of *AU Optronics* will be revealed as new claims are pursued by or in the name of state attorneys general. The universe of potential defendants is broad and could include all producers or sellers of goods or services within a state. Potential defendants should be aware of this important development, as it increases the potential for class-like litigation in state courts and underscores the risk of multiple lawsuits involving the same conduct.

Contacts

If you have any questions or would like more information on the issues discussed in this LawFlash, please contact any of the following Morgan Lewis lawyers:

Boston

Todd S. Holbrook	617.341.7888	tholbrook@morganlewis.com
------------------	--------------	--

Chicago

Kenneth M. Kliebard	312.324.1774	kkliebard@morganlewis.com
Scott T. Schutte	312.324.1773	schutte@morganlewis.com

Dallas

Allyson N. Ho	214.466.4180	aho@morganlewis.com
---------------	--------------	--

Houston

Hugh E. Tanner	713.890.5180	htanner@morganlewis.com
----------------	--------------	--

Los Angeles

Joseph Duffy	213.612.7378	jduffy@morganlewis.com
--------------	--------------	--

New York

John M. Vassos	212.309.6158	jvassos@morganlewis.com
----------------	--------------	--

Philadelphia

J. Gordon Cooney, Jr.	215.963.4806	jgcooney@morganlewis.com
Joseph B.G. Fay	215.963.5509	jfay@morganlewis.com
Kristofor T. Henning	215.963.5882	khenning@morganlewis.com
Timothy D. Katsiff	215.963.4857	tkatsiff@morganlewis.com
Brian W. Shaffer	215.963.5103	bshaffer@morganlewis.com
Thomas J. Sullivan	215.963.5146	tsullivan@morganlewis.com

San Francisco

Molly Moriarty Lane	415.442.1333	mlane@morganlewis.com
Diane L. Webb	415.442.1353	dwebb@morganlewis.com

Washington, D.C.

Patrick D. Conner	202.739.5594	pconner@morganlewis.com
J. Clayton Everett, Jr.	202.739.5860	jeverett@morganlewis.com

About Morgan Lewis's Class Action Practice

Morgan Lewis's Class Action Practice represents companies facing potential or existing class action litigation brought by plaintiffs across all industries, with a focus on the life sciences, financial services, healthcare, retail,

22. Brief of *Amici Curiae* State of Illinois and 45 Other States in Support of Petitioner at 19-20, *AU Optronics*, No. 12-1036 (July 29, 2013), available at http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/publications/supreme_court_preview/briefs-v2/12-1036_pet_amcu_soi-states.authcheckdam.pdf.

Morgan Lewis

technology, automotive, energy, and consumer products sectors. The firm's class action lawyers are thought leaders and leading trial lawyers who handle class litigation of all sizes and complexity in virtually every jurisdiction in the United States. Our clients frequently call upon us to help solve problems and to act as national and international trial and coordinating counsel in the multidisciplinary civil, criminal, and regulatory matters that often include class-action litigation. BTI's 2014 Litigation Outlook ranked Morgan Lewis as one of four "Powerhouse" firms for class actions and mass torts; the group was also named a *Law360* 2013 Practice Group of the Year, one of five recognized for the significance, size, and complexity of their class action matters.

About Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

With 25 offices across the United States, Europe, Asia, and the Middle East, Morgan Lewis provides comprehensive litigation, corporate, transactional, regulatory, intellectual property, and labor and employment legal services to clients of all sizes—from globally established industry leaders to just-conceived start-ups. Our international team of lawyers, patent agents, benefits advisers, regulatory scientists, and other specialists—more than 1,600 legal professionals total—serves clients from locations in Almaty, Beijing, Boston, Brussels, Chicago, Dallas, Dubai,* Frankfurt, Harrisburg, Houston, Irvine, London, Los Angeles, Miami, Moscow, New York, Palo Alto, Paris, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Princeton, San Francisco, Tokyo, Washington, D.C., and Wilmington. For more information about Morgan Lewis or its practices, please visit us online at www.morganlewis.com.

*In association with Mohammed Buhashem Advocates & Legal Consultants

This LawFlash is provided as a general informational service to clients and friends of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. It should not be construed as, and does not constitute, legal advice on any specific matter, nor does this message create an attorney-client relationship. These materials may be considered **Attorney Advertising** in some states. Please note that the prior results discussed in the material do not guarantee similar outcomes. Links provided from outside sources are subject to expiration or change. © 2014 Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP. All Rights Reserved.