



STATE OF MINNESOTA

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

LORI SWANSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL

102 STATE CAPITOL
ST. PAUL, MN 55155
TELEPHONE: (651) 296-6196

For Immediate Release
July 19, 2009

Contact: Ben Wogsland at: (651) 296-2069
(612) 818-0965 (pager)

NATIONAL ARBITRATION FORUM BARRED FROM CREDIT CARD AND CONSUMER ARBITRATIONS UNDER AGREEMENT WITH ATTORNEY GENERAL SWANSON

Swanson Also Wants Congress to Ban "Fine Print" Forced Arbitration Clauses

Minnesota Attorney General Lori Swanson and the National Arbitration Forum—the country's largest administrator of credit card and consumer collections arbitrations—have reached an agreement that the company would get out of the business of arbitrating credit card and other consumer collection disputes.

"I am very pleased with the settlement. To consumers, the company said it was impartial, but behind the scenes, it worked alongside credit card companies to get them to put unfair arbitration clauses in the fine print of their contracts and to appoint the Forum as the arbitrator. Now the company is out of this business," said Swanson.

Swanson sued the National Arbitration Forum on Tuesday, alleging that the company—which is named as the arbitrator of consumer disputes in tens of millions of credit card agreements—hid from the public its extensive ties to the collection industry. The lawsuit alleged that the Forum told consumers and the public that it is independent and neutral, operates like an impartial court system, and is not affiliated with and does not take sides between the parties. The lawsuit alleged that the Forum worked behind the scenes, however, to convince credit card companies and other creditors to insert arbitration provisions in their customer agreements and then appoint the Forum to decide the disputes. The suit also alleged that the Forum has financial ties to the collection industry. The suit alleged that the company arbitrated 214,000 consumer arbitration claims in 2006, nearly 60 percent of which were filed by laws firms with which the Forum is linked through ties to a New York hedge fund.

Under the settlement, the National Arbitration Forum will, by the end of the week, stop accepting any new consumer arbitrations or in any manner participate in the processing or administering of new consumer arbitrations. The company will permanently stop administering arbitrations involving consumer debt, including credit cards, consumer loans, telecommunications, utilities, health care, and consumer leases.

Credit card companies, banks, retail lenders, and cell phone companies increasingly place—in the fine print of their consumer agreements—what are known as "mandatory predispute arbitration clauses." Through these clauses, the consumers waive, in advance, their



right to have their day in court if a dispute arises. Instead, the consumer agrees—usually without knowing it—that any dispute will be resolved by an arbitrator selected by the credit card company or other creditor. Credit card companies are among the most prolific users of mandatory arbitration clauses. Just by keeping a credit card, the consumer agrees to the terms and conditions of the card, even if the arbitration provision was sent to the consumer after the card was issued. As a result of mandatory arbitration clauses, which appear in tens of millions of consumer agreements, hundreds of thousands of consumer disputes are resolved each year not by a judge or jury, but by a private arbitration system.

Swanson said that late this week she accepted an invitation from Congressman Dennis Kucinich, Chairman of the Congressional Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, to testify before the Committee this coming Wednesday in Washington, D.C. She said she will ask Congress to prohibit the use of mandatory pre-dispute arbitration clauses in consumer contracts.

“The playing field is tilted against the ordinary consumer when credit card companies bury unfair terms like forced arbitration clauses in fine print contracts. Congress should change that,” said Swanson.

Swanson also announced that she sent a letter to the American Arbitration Association asking it to play a leadership role by ceasing to accept arbitration filings on consumer credit and collection matters arising out of mandatory pre-dispute arbitration clauses.

Swanson noted that the City of San Francisco is in litigation with the Forum and that other state Attorneys General have contacted her about these issues since the announcement of the lawsuit. “I am very pleased with the results of our lawsuit. It is good for consumers that this company will no longer be able to administer credit card and consumer debt collection arbitrations. I hope other jurisdictions will use whatever authority they have to look at other possible remedial relief in this area,” said Swanson.

The settlement allows the Company to continue to arbitrate internet domain name disputes (which the company handles under an appointment from the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN)), personal injury protection claims (which the company performs under appointment and supervision under the New Jersey state government), and cargo disputes (which the company performs under rules established by the U.S. Department of Transportation). These areas were not part of the lawsuit, and the company performs the work under the supervision of government or non-government organizations (NGOs). Accordingly, the settlement does not affect this very limited activity.

The Consent Decree and amendatory letter are attached.

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF HENNEPIN

DISTRICT COURT
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Case Type: Other Civil
(Consumer Protection)

State of Minnesota by its Attorney General,
Lori Swanson,

Court File No. 27-CV-09-18550
Judge John L. Holahan

Plaintiff,

vs.

CONSENT JUDGMENT

National Arbitration Forum, Inc.,
National Arbitration Forum, LLC, and
Dispute Management Services, LLC, d/b/a
Forthright,

Defendants.

WHEREAS, Plaintiff State of Minnesota, by and through its Attorney General, Lori Swanson ("State"), filed a Complaint in this matter on July 14, 2009 ("Complaint") against National Arbitration Forum, Inc., National Arbitration Forum, LLC, and Dispute Management Services, LLC, d/b/a Forthright (hereinafter, collectively, the "NAF Entities") (the State, and the NAF entities are hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Parties");

WHEREAS, this Consent Judgment shall not be construed as an admission of wrongdoing or liability by the NAF Entities;

NOW, THEREFORE, in the interest of resolving this action, the State and the NAF Entities hereby stipulate and consent to entry of this Consent Judgment, as set forth below:

1. The purpose of this Consent Judgment is to require the complete divestiture by the NAF Entities of any business related to the arbitration of consumer disputes.

2. The term “Consumer Arbitration” means any arbitration involving a dispute between a business entity and a private individual which relates to goods, services, or property of any kind allegedly provided by any business entity to the individual, or payment for such goods, services, or property. The term includes any claim by a third party debt buyer against a private individual. It does not include, however, the arbitration of internet domain name disputes on behalf of the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers (ICANN), the processing of personal injury protection (PIP) disputes, the processing of shipping or storage disputes under 49 CFR § 375.211, or arbitrations where a NAF Entity is appointed and supervised by a government entity.

3. On or after July 24, 2009, no NAF Entity shall:

- a. Accept any fee for processing any new Consumer Arbitration.
- b. Administer or process any new Consumer Arbitration.
- c. In any manner participate in any new Consumer Arbitration.
- d. Attempt to influence the outcome of any arbitration proceeding currently pending before it.

4. The NAF Entities shall not engage in any deceptive practices, or make any false or misleading statements, in violation of Minn. Stat. §§ 325F.69, subd. 1; 325D.44, subd. 1; and 325F.67.

5. The NAF Entities shall pay investigative costs to the State of Minnesota within ten days of the date this Consent Judgment is signed. Notwithstanding this payment, the NAF Entities shall also pay the State of Minnesota an amount equal to any amount paid to the City of San Francisco over the next six months, in excess of the City’s actual investigative expenses and attorneys’ fees.

6. The Parties have read this Consent Judgment and voluntarily agree to its entry.

7. In consideration of the stipulated relief, the sufficiency of which is acknowledged, the Office of the Attorney General, by execution of this Consent Judgment, hereby fully and completely releases the NAF Entities, including all of their past and present agents, employees, officers, directors, subsidiaries, shareholders, and affiliates, of any and all claims of the Attorney General connected with or arising out of the allegations in the State's Complaint in the above-captioned action, up to and including the date of this Consent Judgment.

8. Promptly after receiving notice that the Court executes this Consent Judgment, the State shall voluntarily dismiss the above-captioned action pursuant to Minnesota Rule of Civil Procedure 41.01(a).

9. The Parties shall cooperate to implement and facilitate this Consent Judgment, including the exchange of information reasonably necessary for that purpose or to confirm the NAF Entities' compliance with this Consent Judgment.

10. Any failure by any Party to this Consent Judgment to insist on performance by any other Party of any provision of this Consent Judgment shall not be deemed a waiver of any of the provisions included herein.

11. The Parties agree to bear their own costs and fees in this matter.

12. Each Party participated in the drafting of this Consent Judgment, and each agrees that the Consent Judgment's terms may not be construed against or in favor of any Party by virtue of draftsmanship. Each signatory further agrees they have authority to enter into this Consent Judgment.

13. This Consent Judgment, including any issues relating to interpretation or enforcement, shall be governed by the laws of Minnesota. The Court shall retain jurisdiction over this matter to enforce the terms of this Consent Judgment.

Dated: 7/17/09

National Arbitration Forum, Inc.
By: [Signature]
Its CHAIRMAN

Dated: 7/17/09

National Arbitration Forum, LLC
By: [Signature]
Its Vice President

Dated: 7/17/09

Dispute Management Services, LLC, d/b/a
Forthright
By: [Signature]
Its CEO

Dated: 7/17/09

LORI SWANSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL
STATE OF MINNESOTA
[Signature]
Lori Swanson

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: _____

BY THE COURT:

John L. Holahan
Hennepin County District Court Judge

LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.



OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL
State of Minnesota
ST. PAUL, MN 55155

LORI SWANSON
ATTORNEY GENERAL

July 19, 2009

President
American Arbitration Association
Corporate Headquarters
1633 Broadway
10th Floor
New York, New York 10019

Dear President:

This office recently concluded a year long investigation of National Arbitration Forum (“NAF”). The investigation concluded with an agreement by NAF that it would no longer arbitrate consumer debt disputes. I enclose a copy of the Consent Order and the amendatory letter. While the lawsuit focused on conflict of interest issues, our investigators and attorneys also interviewed over one hundred consumers who complained about the arbitration process. Based on our investigation, it is my conclusion that pre-dispute mandatory arbitration provisions are fundamentally unfair to the consumer. This is particularly the case with credit card contracts and other consumer contracts—such as cell phone, utility, loan, and hospital agreements—where the mandatory arbitration provisions are hidden in the fine print. Our findings include the following:

First, pre-dispute mandatory arbitration agreements are nearly always the product of unequal bargaining power between the consumer and the business. In almost every interview we found that the consumer was not aware of the arbitration provision. In many cases the consumer never saw the provision, because it was simply mailed with a monthly statement. The consumer is given virtually no opportunity to reject the provision. Yet, through these provisions, the consumer gives up their important right to have his or her day in court.

Second, because the consumer is unaware of the mandatory arbitration provision, in many cases the consumer ignored the notice of arbitration served on them. Since they did not know that they agreed to arbitration, and were unfamiliar with the arbitration process, they didn’t believe they were obligated to respond to an arbitration notice from an office in Minnesota. It is part of our democracy that we have a right to redress in a court of law, and that includes the notion that the court should be easily accessible to the consumer. Through pre-dispute mandatory arbitration clauses, consumers forfeit this important right without even knowing it.

July 19, 2009

Page 2

Third, it is apparent, based on many interviews with consumers, arbitrators and employees of NAF, that arbitrators have a powerful incentive to favor the dominant party in an arbitration; namely, the corporation. Indeed, there is a term commonly used in the arbitration industry called "repeat player bias," describing a phenomena describing where an arbitrator is more likely to favor the party that is likely to send future cases. This bias does not exist in a court, where the judge is not reliant on a dominant player for his or her future income. In the case of NAF, arbitrators and employees claimed that arbitrators who issued an award against the corporation, or who failed to award attorney's fees against the consumer, were simply "deselected" and not appointed to future proceedings.

Fourth, consumers are not aware they can submit exhibits, and many are not aware that there will only be a "document hearing" with no opportunity to be heard. For instance, victims of identity theft were not told to submit a copy of a police report, even though arbitrators were advised that, absent such documentation, the claim of identity theft should be ignored.

Fifth, the arbitration process is fundamentally unfair for holding corporations responsible for any wrongdoing. In some cases, consumers forfeited important rights in the fine print of contracts they had never seen. Consumers who we interviewed in the NAF investigation were told that, when they initiated a claim against the corporation, the claim could be delayed for up to one year before there was any review of the matter.

There are many other defects in the process. The fundamental problem with consumer arbitrations under "fine print" contracts is that the arbitration company draws its income from the dominant participant--namely the credit card company, telecommunications company, the hospital, etc.--and personnel have a financial incentive to make sure that the corporation is pleased with the outcome. Otherwise, the corporation will undoubtedly look to other arbitration administrators. As noted above, this "repeat player" bias does not occur in court, since judges rely on taxpayers—not litigants—for their income.

In short, for the above reasons and many others, I ask that your organization take the initiative to announce that it will not accept the arbitration of credit card and other consumer debt claims based on pre-dispute mandatory arbitration clauses. Because the AAA and NAF are the largest arbitration companies, I believe such a proclamation by AAA would be a powerful signal to Congress that reform is desperately needed in this area.

Sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lori Swanson", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

LORI SWANSON
Attorney General

Enclosure