ALSTON&BIRD LLP

WWW.ALSTON.COM



Class Action Litigation ADVISORY •

SEPTEMBER 5, 2013

In Rodriguez, the Ninth Circuit Made It Easier to Remove Under CAFA

Last week, in *Rodriguez v. AT&T Mobility Services LLC*, No. 13-56149 (9th Cir. Aug. 27, 2013), the Ninth Circuit made it a little easier for defendants to remove cases under the Class Action Fairness Act (CAFA). Taking its cues from the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Standard Fire*, the Ninth Circuit held that a defendant seeking to remove a case under CAFA needs to prove the amount in controversy only by a preponderance of the evidence, not by a legal certainty.

Rodriguez is good news for defendants.

The Ninth Circuit: *Standard Fire* calls for a relaxed standard to proving the amount in controversy under CAFA.

Robert Rodriguez brought a putative class action against AT&T on behalf of retail sales managers in AT&T wireless stores in the Los Angeles area. After AT&T removed the case to federal court, Rodriguez moved to remand the case based on his allegations that the "aggregate amount in controversy is less than" \$5 million. In response, AT&T submitted declarations showing that the amount in controversy "could not be less than roughly \$5.5 million and was likely double that amount." The district court rejected AT&T's evidence and remanded the case to state court, concluding that AT&T had not demonstrated with a "legal certainty" that the case met CAFA's amount in controversy.

That was before *Standard Fire*. In *Standard Fire*, the Supreme Court held that a named plaintiff cannot stipulate away CAFA jurisdiction by disavowing aggregate classwide damages over \$5 million. Although a named plaintiff can bind himself, he cannot bind putative class members. In light of *Standard Fire*, the Ninth Circuit vacated the district court's remand order.

The Ninth Circuit also concluded that *Standard Fire* required a change to the circuit's standards for CAFA removal. As noted, before *Standard Fire*, defendants in the Ninth Circuit had to prove the amount in controversy by a legal certainty. The *Rodriguez* court concluded that *Standard Fire* "effectively overruled" the legal-certainty standard. In its place, the Ninth Circuit adopted a preponderance-of-the-evidence standard.

The trend toward a more liberal removal policy continues.

Rodriguez is the latest in a steady stream of decisions (and the second recent decision from the Ninth Circuit) relaxing the standards for removal under CAFA. Those decisions suggest that **Standard Fire** has caused a shift back toward interpreting CAFA in a manner consistent with Congress's intent to provide a federal forum for large class actions.

For defendants, that is a welcome trend.

This advisory is published by Alston & Bird LLP to provide a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

To receive similar advisories in the future, please go to **Class Action Litigation Advisories**. Be sure to put "subscribe" in the subject line.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact your Alston & Bird attorney or any of the following:

Randall L. Allen randall.allen@alston.com 404.881.7196

Joshua L. Becker joshua.becker@alston.com 404.881.4732

Debra D. Bernstein debra.bernstein@alston.com 404.881.4476

Adam J. Biegel adam.biegel@alston.com 404.881.4692

Teresa T. Bonder teresa.bonder@alston.com 404.881.7369

Brian D. Boone brian.boone@alston.com 704.444.1106

Kristine McAlister Brown kristy.brown@alston.com 404.881.7584

Lisa R. Bugni lisa.bugni@alston.com 404.881.4959

Gidon M. Caine gidon.caine@alston.com 650.838.2060 Stephanie D. Clouston stephanie.clouston@alston.com 214.922.3403

Charles W. Cox charles.cox@alston.com 213.576.1048

John R. Crews john.crews@alston.com 214.922.3408

Cari K. Dawson cari.dawson@alston.com 404.881.7766

Derin B. Dickerson derin.dickerson@alston.com 404.881.7454

Daniel F. Diffley dan.diffley@alston.com 404.881.4703

Michael J. Hartley michael.hartley@alston.com 213.576.1004

Frank A. Hirsch, Jr. frank.hirsch@alston.com 919.862.2278

Susan E. Hurd susan.hurd@alston.com 404.881.7572 John A. Jordak, Jr. john.jordak@alston.com 404.881.7868

William H. Jordan bill.jordan@alston.com 404.881.7850

Michael P. Kenny mike.kenny@alston.com 404.881.7179

J. Thomas Kilpatrick tom.kilpatrick@alston.com 404.881.7819

Peter Kontio peter.kontio@alston.com 404.881.7172

Peter E. Masaitis peter.masaitis@alston.com 213.576.1094

Matthew P. McGuire matt.mcguire@alston.com 919.862.2279

Andrew E. Paris drew.paris@alston.com 213.576.1119

Michele A. Powers michele.powers@alston.com 213.576.1030 Tiffany L. Powers tiffany.powers@alston.com 404.881.4249

Matthew D. Richardson matt.richardson@alston.com 404.881.4478

Jon G. Shepherd jon.shepherd@alston.com 214.922.3418

Brian Stimson brian.stimson@alston.com 404.881.4972

Kyle G.A. Wallace kyle.wallace@alston.com 404.881.7808

Jonathan E. Wells jonathan.wells@alston.com 404.881.7472

Amber C. Wessels amber.wessels@alston.com 212.210.9594

ALSTON&BIRD LLP _

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2013