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1. **Introduction**

Since the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hall Street Assocs. L.L.C. v. Mattel, Inc.*[[1]](#footnote-1) courts, commentators, and practitioners have questioned the continuing viability, and even the existence, of the doctrine of manifest disregard of the law (“manifest disregard,” “doctrine,” or “standard”). Some argue that *Hall Street* effectively abrogated manifest disregard.[[2]](#footnote-2) Others claim that the doctrine survived *Hall Street* as either a judicial gloss or a shorthand for the grounds enumerated in Section 10 of the Federal Arbitration Act.[[3]](#footnote-3) Still others, though a minority, assert that *Hall Street* did not eliminate the traditional, pre-*Hall Street* understanding of manifest disregard as a common-law, non-statutory, ground for vacating arbitral awards.[[4]](#footnote-4) In light of these differing and diverging interpretations, it seems appropriate for the United States Supreme Court to step in and resolve the controversy; however, the Court has yet to explicitly hold what the correct interpretation is, though the opportunity to do so has been presented.[[5]](#footnote-5) The lack of direction regarding the viability of manifest disregard, coupled with confusion surrounding the doctrine’s “correct” interpretation and application (if still viable), has caused many to question the fate of manifest disregard as a ground for vacating arbitral awards.

This paper examines this puzzling predicament, and attempts to provide guidance regarding the future of the manifest disregard standard. Part II briefly reviews the generally understood meaning of “manifest disregard of the law.” Part III investigates the origins and development of the doctrine by examining (a) the Supreme Court’s decision in *Wilko v. Swan*, (b) approaches to applying manifest disregard following *Wilko*, and (c) the Court’s 2008 decision in *Hall Street*. Part IV examines how the Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, and Eleventh Circuits interpreted *Hall Street*, and how these interpretations have influenced each circuits’ position regarding how the manifest disregard standard should be understood. Part V examines the future of manifest disregard, and takes the position that the doctrine remains viable, if not as common-law, as a shorthand/judicial gloss for the grounds set forth in FAA § 10. Part VI suggests that the most effective way to resolve the circuit split would be for the Supreme Court to issue an opinion explicitly setting forth the “correct” interpretation and application of *Hall Street* and the doctrine of manifest disregard. Part VII contains concluding remarks and recapitulates this papers findings.

1. **What is “Manifest Disregard of The Law”?**

Section 10 of the Federal Arbitration Act[[6]](#footnote-6) (“FAA”) provides the statutory bases for vacating an arbitral award, including “where the award was procured by ‘corruption,’ ‘fraud,’ or ‘undue means,’ and where the arbitrators were ‘guilty of misconduct,’ or ‘exceeded their powers.’”[[7]](#footnote-7) In addition to the statutory grounds contained in FAA § 10, there are also various non-statutory, judicially created, grounds for vacatur.[[8]](#footnote-8) Manifest disregard of the law is generally understood to be one of these judicially created grounds for vacating an award,[[9]](#footnote-9) though it “has not consistently or exclusively been viewed as a common-law expansion of the FAA” (discussed in greater detail below).[[10]](#footnote-10) Although debate exists regarding the origins of the manifest disregard standard and its status as a common-law means for vacating an arbitral award, according to Stephen Huber, the standard approach to manifest disregard requires “a showing that the arbitrator knowingly failed to apply clearly applicable law.”[[11]](#footnote-11) An arbitrators mere ignorance of the law is not enough;[[12]](#footnote-12) rather, the moving party must affirmatively show “that the arbitrator: [1] knew about the existence of relevant law; [2] knew that the law was controlling; and [3] intentionally refused to apply the law.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

1. **Origins & Development of “Manifest Disregard”**

The exact origin of “manifest disregard of the law” is a topic of debate, with no clearly discernable answer. This section examines the origins and development of the doctrine of manifest disregard, starting with the generally accepted view that the doctrine originated from dicta in the United States Supreme Court’s decision in *Wilko v. Swan*. After discussing *Wilko*, this paper examines various approaches to applying the doctrine of manifest disregard following *Wilko* (but before *Hall Street*). With these approaches in mind, this paper then discusses the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hall Street*, and the implications that decision has had on the continuing viability of the doctrine of manifest disregard.

* 1. *Wilko v. Swan*: The Debate Begins

The origin of the doctrine of manifest disregard is a contested issue; however, most commentators agree that the manifest disregard standard originated from dicta in the United States Supreme Court’s 1953 decision in *Wilko v. Swan*,[[14]](#footnote-14) where the Court stated that “the interpretation of the law by … arbitrators in contrast to manifest disregard are not subject, in the federal courts, to judicial review for error in interpretation.”[[15]](#footnote-15) Although *Wilko* was subsequently overruled on other grounds, this statement has been understood to indicate, as Ashley Sundquist and Michael LeRoy suggest, that manifest disregard of the law may be a permissible ground for vacating an arbitral award, but arbitrators mistaken interpretation of the law, or a judge’s disagreement regarding how the law was interpreted, does not provide “a justifiable reason for vacature.” [[16]](#footnote-16) However, the extent of the *Wilko* Court’s discussion on the topic of manifest disregard is limited; no attempt is made to elaborate on the meaning of manifest disregard,[[17]](#footnote-17) making it difficult for courts to determine the meaning of, and the amount of weight that should be afforded to, *Wilko’s* ambiguous statement.[[18]](#footnote-18)

Further complicating the issue is the fact that *Wilko* did not directly concern the scope of judicial review with regards to arbitral awards.[[19]](#footnote-19) Rather, the issue confronted by the Court “was whether anti-fraud claims brought under § 12(2) of the Securities Act of 1933 could be arbitrated, or whether public policy required that such claims be litigated in state or federal court.”[[20]](#footnote-20) The Court’s statement regarding “manifest disregard” was merely a byproduct of this analysis;[[21]](#footnote-21) as Kenneth Davis notes, after addressing the main issue, the Supreme Court “lapsed into muddled dicta, which has cast the issue of the scope of judicial review of arbitration awards into uncertainty for over half a century.”[[22]](#footnote-22) This uncertainty resulted in confusion amongst courts, as acknowledged by Fifth Circuit in *Citigroup Global Mkts. Inc. v. Bacon*, where the court stated that it was unsurprising that “lower courts initially grappled with the uncertain implications” of the *Wilko* Court’s ambiguous statement.[[23]](#footnote-23)

Despite the confusion and lack of direction regarding the meaning and application of the manifest disregard standard following the decision in *Wilko*, all circuit courts[[24]](#footnote-24) eventually adopted/recognized the doctrine (though some courts have since repudiated their acceptance[[25]](#footnote-25)).[[26]](#footnote-26) This was partially due, at least for certain circuits, to the Supreme Court’s opinion in *First Option of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplen*,where the Court cited *Wilko* with approval and stated that a party can still “ask a court to review the arbitrator's decision, but the court will set that decision aside only in very unusual circumstances.”[[27]](#footnote-27) Other than *First Option*, however, the Supreme Court seldom addressed the doctrine of manifest disregard,[[28]](#footnote-28) and as Burch references in relation to *Hall Street*, “only recently did the Court give it any substantive analysis.”[[29]](#footnote-29) As a result, lower courts were left to apply the doctrine absents clear direction or constraint, resulting in differing articulation and application of the standard.[[30]](#footnote-30)

* 1. Approaches to Applying the Doctrine of Manifest Disregard Following *Wilko* (but before *Hall Street*)

Following *Wilko*, various approaches to and applications of the doctrine of manifest disregard surfaced, “some very broad, some extremely narrow, but all attempting to balance arbitration’s competing goals of efficiency and accuracy.”[[31]](#footnote-31) Thomas Burch, referencing Stephan Hayford,[[32]](#footnote-32) divides these varying applications into three possible approaches: (1) the “futility-acknowledge”[[33]](#footnote-33)approach; (2) the “big error”[[34]](#footnote-34) approach; and (3) “presumption-based”[[35]](#footnote-35) approach.[[36]](#footnote-36)

The “futility-acknowledge” approach is the narrowest approach and is “based on the level of difficulty involved in determining whether an arbitrator has consciously decided to ignore known, applicable law, especially if the arbitrator did not issue a reasoned award.”[[37]](#footnote-37) Courts following this approach only apply the doctrine of manifest disregard when “direct evidence exists that the arbitrator consciously disregarded the law.”[[38]](#footnote-38) This approach can be seen in *Advest, Inc. v. McCarthy*. There, the First Circuit stated that, in order for an arbitration award to be vacated for manifest disregard of the law, “‘there must be some showing in the record, other than the result obtained, that the arbitrators knew the law and expressly disregarded it.’”[[39]](#footnote-39) The court went on to state that “disregard” in this context “implies that the arbitrators appreciated the existence of a governing legal rule but [willfully] decided not to apply it.”[[40]](#footnote-40) As the *Advest* court’s articulation implies,[[41]](#footnote-41) this approach is severely limited. This is because a court utilizing this approach most likely will not overturn an award absent a reasoned award,[[42]](#footnote-42) “or a transcript of the proceedings showing that the arbitrator explicitly refused to follow the law….”[[43]](#footnote-43) This, Burch asserts, essentially renders the doctrine a nullity.[[44]](#footnote-44) Nonetheless, it appears that “[m]ost courts that recognize manifest disregard as a ground for overturning awards … use this approach.”[[45]](#footnote-45)

The broadest approach, the “big error” approach, focuses on “whether the arbitrator made an egregious mistake[,]”[[46]](#footnote-46) and unlike the “futility-acknowledge” approach, does not require direct evidence indicating that the arbitrators consciously disregarded the law.[[47]](#footnote-47) Instead, courts are allowed to “overturn an arbitration award by *assuming* that the arbitrator consciously disregarded known, applicable law based simply on the law’s clarity and the arbitrator’s failure to apply it.” [[48]](#footnote-48) This approach is illustrated by the Second Circuit’s language in *Willemijn Houdstermaatschappij, BV v Std. Microsystems Corp*.[[49]](#footnote-49) There, the court agreed that manifest disregard of the law can be found where an arbitrator “‘understood and correctly stated the law but proceeded to ignore it.’”[[50]](#footnote-50) However, the court determinedthat “a court may infer that [an arbitrator] manifestly disregarded the law if it finds that the error made … is so obvious that it would be instantly perceived by the average person qualified to serve as an arbitrator.”[[51]](#footnote-51) As this statement indicates, a court applying this approach may infer from the facts of the case that an arbitrator knew applicable law, and assume he/she ignored it based on the law’s clarity. This, Burch asserts, is in contrast to the *Wilko* court’s statement “that awards should not be reviewed for ‘error in interpretation,’”[[52]](#footnote-52) which may indicate why this approach is the least frequently used.[[53]](#footnote-53)

The third approach, the “presumption-based” approach, falls between the first two approaches, and can be understood as somewhat of a middle ground. Under this approach, courts review “the record of the arbitration proceedings and will overturn the award if something in that record creates a presumption that the arbitrator ignored known, applicable law.”[[54]](#footnote-54) For example, in *Montes v. Shearson Lehman Bros., Inc.*,[[55]](#footnote-55) the Eleventh Circuit overturned an arbitral award on the ground that the arbitrator manifestly disregarded the law.[[56]](#footnote-56) In making this determination, the court examined the arbitral award (there was no written opinion), and noted that the panel was “flagrantly and blatantly urged” by the prevailing party to ignore known applicable law.[[57]](#footnote-57) According to Hayford, during arbitration the prevailing party asserted “that the controlling law was ‘not right,’” and repeatedly exhorted “to the arbitration panel that they should do what was right, even if it produced an outcome inconsistent with the pertinent law.”[[58]](#footnote-58) The court found that this, coupled with the fact that “nothing in the award or elsewhere in the record” suggested that the arbitrator “did not heed” the prevailing party’s plea,[[59]](#footnote-59) indicated that the arbitrator knew the law but consciously ignored it. As the Eleventh Circuit’s decision illustrates, the “presumption-based” approach does require a degree proof that the arbitrator knew the law and ignored it, but “direct proof that the arbitrator made a conscious decision to ignore the law” is not a necessary prerequisite for vacatur.[[60]](#footnote-60)

As the above illustrates, the precise standard utilized by Circuit Courts following *Wilko* varied from circuit to circuit.[[61]](#footnote-61) According to Weathers Bolt, however, most circuits generally agreed (with the exception of the Seventh Circuit[[62]](#footnote-62)) that successful use of manifest disregard as a ground for judicial review and vacatur after *Wilko* (but before *Hall Street*) required:[[63]](#footnote-63) “[1] the arbitrator or arbitrators knew the law and [2] deliberately failed to apply the applicable law.”[[64]](#footnote-64) Bolt also notes, and Jill Gross confirms,[[65]](#footnote-65) that many circuits “also required that the law be clearly applicable to the situation at bar.”[[66]](#footnote-66)

* 1. *Hall Street*

After more than fifty years since the Court’s decision in *Wilko*, the Supreme Court decided the case of *Hall Street Assocs. L.L.C. v. Mattel, Inc.*,[[67]](#footnote-67)which has raised many questions and concerns regarding the continuing viability of the doctrine of manifest disregard.[[68]](#footnote-68) In *Hall Street*, the Supreme Court addressed (in dicta) the ambiguities associated with *Wilko’s* comments regarding the scope of judicial review of arbitral awards. The issue before the Court was “whether the parties to an arbitration agreement could validly agree to expand the grounds prescribed in § 10 and § 11 of the FAA for vacating or correcting an arbitration award.”[[69]](#footnote-69) The Court answered this question in the negative, holding that the grounds for vacating and modifying an award under the FAA are exclusive.[[70]](#footnote-70)

In arguing that grounds set forth in FAA §10 and § 11 were not exclusive (*i.e.*, the parties had a right to contractually expand the scope of review of an arbitration award), Hall Street “pointed out that courts have been permitted to expand review beyond section 10 and 11 of the FAA since *Wilko* created manifest disregard.”[[71]](#footnote-71) Hall Street asserted that the Court’s statement in *Wilko* “meant that manifest disregard was a further ground for vacatur in addition to the grounds listed in section 10,” and therefore Supreme Court precedent “allowed for nonstatutory vacatur.”[[72]](#footnote-72) In response, the Court acknowledged that a number of Circuit Courts had recognized manifest disregard as an additional ground for vacating an award beyond § 10 of the FAA,[[73]](#footnote-73) but the Court disagreed with Hall Street’s argument, in part, because *Wilko* expressly rejected what Hall Street was asking for: “general review for an arbitrator’s” legal errors.[[74]](#footnote-74) The Court, however, did not stop there. Instead, the Court attempted to explain the meaning of its earlier statement in *Wilko*, writing:

Maybe the term ‘manifest disregard’ was meant to name a new ground for review, but maybe it merely referred to the § 10 grounds collectively, rather than adding to them …. Or, as some courts have thought, ‘manifest disregard’ may have been shorthand for § 10(a)(3) or § 10(a)(4), the paragraphs authorizing vacatur when the arbitrators were ‘guilty of misconduct’ or ‘exceeded their powers.’ We, when speaking as a Court, have merely taken the *Wilko* language as we found it, with out embellishment, see *First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan*, 514 U.S. 938, 942, 115 S. Ct. 1920, 131 L. Ed. 2d 985 (1995), and now that its meaning is implicated, we see no reason to accord it the significance that Hall Street urges.[[75]](#footnote-75)

This statement has caused many courts and scholars to question the viability, and possibly the existence, of the doctrine of manifest disregard (at least in federal courts).[[76]](#footnote-76) Although the Court “did not expressly reject ‘manifest disregard’ as a valid ground for review,” according to Jill Gross, “it did not embrace it either.”[[77]](#footnote-77) This uncertainty has lead a number of Circuit Courts to construct differing interpretations of the Court’s decision in *Hall Street*, prompting divergence among courts and disagreement regarding the future of the doctrine.

1. **Manifest Disregard After *Hall Street***

Sincethe Supreme Court’s decision in *Hall Street*, Federal Circuit Courts have grappled with the issue of whether manifest disregard remains a valid ground for vacating arbitral awards. This has resulted in varying views and responses regarding the current viability and application of the doctrine of manifest disregard. Each Circuits’ view, Jonas Cullemark suggests, relates to the meaning attributed to the word “exclusive” in *Hall Street*,[[78]](#footnote-78) and each Circuits’ response tends to depended, according to Davis, “on whether the circuit viewed the manifest disregard standard as statutory or nonstatutory.”[[79]](#footnote-79) As discussed below, the Circuits that have definitively addressed the issue have taken three positions regarding the doctrine of manifest disregard.[[80]](#footnote-80) The first position, which I have labeled the “abandonment” group, holds that manifest disregard is no longer a viable basis for vacatur. The second position, the “non-statutory” group, believes that manifest disregard as a non-statutory basis for vacatur survived *Hall Street*. The third position, labeled the “shorthand or judicial gloss” group, holds that manifest disregard remains viable as a judicial gloss on the grounds listed in FAA § 10, or as a shorthand for FAA §§ 10(a)(3) and 10(a)(4). In addition to these three positions, some courts have acknowledged the continuing viability of manifest disregard, but have not definitively set forth whether the doctrine remains valid as a non-statutory, common-law, ground or as a shorthand/judicial gloss for the grounds enumerated in FAA § 10.

* 1. Abandonment

The Fifth, Eighth, and Eleventh Circuits have interpreted *Hall Street* as effectively eradicating the doctrine of manifest disregard—*i.e.*, the doctrine no longer remains a viable basis for vacating arbitral awards post-*Hall Street*.[[81]](#footnote-81) This section briefly examines decisions in each circuit denying the continuing validity of the doctrine of manifest disregard.

* + 1. *Fifth Circuit*

The Fifth Circuit in *Citigroup Global Markets, Inc. v. Bacon* addressed the issue of “whether manifest disregard of the law remains a valid ground for vacatur of an arbitration award in light of the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *Hall Street*….”[[82]](#footnote-82) Relying on the history of the law of vacatur and the development of FAA,[[83]](#footnote-83) the court rejected manifest disregard as an independent, non-statutory ground for vacating arbitral awards.[[84]](#footnote-84) In so holding, the court determined that the Supreme Court’s language in *Hall Street* made clear that the grounds for vacatur set forth in Section 10 of the FAA were exclusive.[[85]](#footnote-85) As a result, the court concluded that “manifest disregard of the law as an independent, nonstatutory ground for setting aside an award must be abandoned and rejected.”[[86]](#footnote-86)

* + 1. *Eighth* *Circuit*

In *Med. Shoppe Int'l, Inc. v. Turner Invs., Inc.*, the Eighth Circuit confirmed its view that the bases for vacating an arbitral award are limited to the express grounds set forth in the FAA.[[87]](#footnote-87) According to Stanley Leasure, the court further confirmed “its understanding that *Hall Street’s* practical effect was to establish the grounds specifically enumerated in the FAA as the exclusive grounds for vacatur.”[[88]](#footnote-88) Accordingly, the court concluded that appellant’s claim that the arbitrator manifestly disregarded the law was “not cognizable” since such ground was “not included among those specifically enumerated in §10….”[[89]](#footnote-89) The court reaffirmed its position in *Air Line Pilots v. Trans State*, where the court described manifest disregard as a “defunct vacatur standard.”[[90]](#footnote-90) The court’s reasoning, John and Ari Diaconis suggest, was “that manifest disregard is a non-statutory ground for vacatur and thus impermissible under *Hall Street’s* pronouncement that FAA Section 10 is to be read exclusively.”[[91]](#footnote-91)

* + 1. *Eleventh Circuit*

In *Frazier v. CitiFinancial Corp.* the Eleventh Circuit adopted the Fifth Circuit’s position regarding the viability of manifest disregard.[[92]](#footnote-92) The court held that manifest disregard, as a “judicially-created” basis for vacatur, was “no longer valid in light of” the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hall Street*.[[93]](#footnote-93) In so holding, the court agreed with the Fifth Circuit “that the categorical language of [*Hall Street*] compels such a conclusion.”[[94]](#footnote-94) The Eleventh Circuit reconfirmed this position in *Campbell’s Foliage, Inc., v. Federal Corp Insurance Corp.*, where that court determined that “the only viable ground for vacatur in [the Eleventh Circuit] were those enumerated in the FAA.”[[95]](#footnote-95)

* 1. Non-Statutory

The Sixth Circuit is the only circuit to maintain its pre-*Hall Street* position that the doctrine of manifest disregard exists as a non-statutory, common-law, ground for vacating arbitral awards. This section examines Sixth Circuit decisions illustrating the circuit’s view that manifest disregard remains a viable non-statutory means for vacatur.

* + 1. *Sixth Circuit*

In *Grain v. Trinity Health*,the Sixth Circuit determined “that manifest disregard of the law is no longer a ground for modify an award;” [[96]](#footnote-96) however, the court did not determine whether or not the doctrine remains a viable means for vacatur. According to John and Ari Diaconis, “[d]istrict courts within the Sixth Circuit seem to agree that manifest disregard has survived *Hall Street*.”[[97]](#footnote-97) In support of this conclusion, the district courts cite the Sixth Circuit’s unpublished opinion in *Coffee Beanery v. WW*.[[98]](#footnote-98) There, the court held that application of *Hall Street* is limited to circumstances involving contractual expansion of the grounds for review.[[99]](#footnote-99) In so holding, the court acknowledged that *Hall Street* “significantly reduced the ability of federal courts to vacate arbitration awards for reasons other than those specified in 9 U.S.C. § 10,” however, the court found that “it did not foreclose federal courts’ review for an arbitrator's manifest disregard of the law.”[[100]](#footnote-100) Consistent with this statement, the court found that, although its “ability to vacate an arbitration award is almost exclusively limited to these grounds … it may also vacate an award found to be in manifest disregard of the law.”[[101]](#footnote-101) The court then endorsed the pre-*Hall Street* view that the doctrine of manifest disregard applies if “(1) the applicable legal principle is clearly defined and not subject to reasonable debate; and (2) the arbitrators refused to heed that legal principle.”[[102]](#footnote-102) This indicates, as John and Ari Diaconis suggest, that the Sixth Circuit “recognizes manifest disregard as an independent ground for vacatur, separate and apart from FAA Section 10.”[[103]](#footnote-103)

* 1. Statutory: Shorthand / Judicial Gloss

Though many circuits no longer advocate for the non-statutory, common-law, understanding of manifest disregard, a number of Circuit Courts still believe the doctrine survived *Hall Street* as a shorthand for, or a judicial gloss on, the grounds enumerated in FAA § 10. As Jack Rephan notes, “[a] number of Federal Circuits … have interpreted [*Hall Street*] as not rejecting *in toto* manifest disregard as basis for seeking to vacate an award, but that it has survived as being merely shorthand for the statutory grounds under §10(a)(3) and § 10(a)(4), or as a judicial gloss on the statutory grounds.”[[104]](#footnote-104) The courts that have definitively maintained this position following *Hall Street* include the Second Circuit and the Ninth Circuit.[[105]](#footnote-105)

* + 1. Second Circuit

In *Stolt-Nielsen SA v. AnimalFeeds International Corp.* (overruled on other grounds), the Second Circuit confirmed its view that *Hall Street* did not “abrogate the ‘manifest disregard’ doctrine.”[[106]](#footnote-106) The court conceded, Jack Jarrret notes, that the Second Circuit “had previously indicated that the judicially named grounds were separate from the grounds specified in the FAA.”[[107]](#footnote-107) However, in *Stolt-Nielsen* the court stated that it “reconceptualized” their understanding of the doctrine of manifest disregard “as a judicial gloss on the specific grounds for vacatur enumerated in section 10 of the FAA….”[[108]](#footnote-108) The Second Circuit recently reconfirmed this positionin *Sutherland Global Services v. Adam Technologies*. There, the court first noted that “the specific grounds for vacatur provided in the FAA are generally exclusive,”[[109]](#footnote-109) but then stated that manifest disregard “‘remains a valid ground for vacating arbitration awards’” as “‘judicial gloss on the specific grounds for vacatur…’” set forth in FAA § 10. [[110]](#footnote-110) Thus, it appears that the Second Circuit has adopted the view that manifest disregard remains viable as a judicial gloss.

* + 1. Ninth Circuit

In *Comedy Club, Inc. v. Improv W. Assocs.*, the Ninth Circuit read the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hall Street* as merely identifying several possible interpretations of the doctrine of manifest disregard.[[111]](#footnote-111) These “possible readings of the doctrine”[[112]](#footnote-112) included the understanding that manifest disregard was a shorthand for the statuary grounds enumerated under Section 10 of the FAA,[[113]](#footnote-113) which the court acknowledged was the accepted view in the Ninth Circuit.[[114]](#footnote-114) Thus, the court concluded “*Hall Street Associates* did not undermine the manifest disregard of law ground for vacatur, as understood in the [Ninth Circuit]….”[[115]](#footnote-115) The Ninth Circuits reaffirmed its position in *Wetzel's Pretzels, LLC v. Johnson*, where the court stated that “[i]n order for us to vacate the award on the ground that the arbitrator exceeded his powers under § 10(a)(4),” the moving party must “show that the award was ‘completely irrational, or exhibit[ed] a manifest disregard of law….’”[[116]](#footnote-116) In order to vacate an arbitration award for manifest disregard of the law, the court noted, “‘it must be clear from the record that the arbitrators recognized the applicable law and then ignored it.’”[[117]](#footnote-117) Thus, it is clear that that the Ninth Circuit has adopted the view that manifest disregard remains a viable means for vacatur as a shorthand for the statutory grounds set forth in FAA § 10.

* 1. Surviving, But Unsure

The doctrine of manifest disregard has survived in both the Fourth and Tenth Circuits; however, both circuits have not taken a definitive position on whether or not the doctrine survives as a judicial gloss/shorthand or an independent, non-statutory, ground for vacatur.

* + 1. Fourth & Tenth Circuits

In *Wachovia Securities v. Brand*, the Fourth Circuit determined that its pre-*Hall Street* understanding of manifest disregard[[118]](#footnote-118) remained controlling.[[119]](#footnote-119) However, the court did not affirmatively determine the status of the doctrine; rather, the court found that “manifest disregard continues to exist as either an independent ground for review or as a judicial gloss, we need not decide which of the two….”[[120]](#footnote-120) This position was confirmed in a footnote in *Dewan v. Walia*, where the court noted that the Fourth Circuit has “recognized that ‘manifest disregard continues to exist’ as a basis for vacating an arbitration award, either as ‘an independent ground for review or as a judicial gloss’ on the enumerated grounds for vacatur set forth in the FAA.”[[121]](#footnote-121)

In *Adviser Dealer Servs. v. Icon Advisers, Inc.*, the Tenth Circuit acknowledged that manifest disregard remains a viable means for vacating an arbitral award:

A district court may vacate an arbitration award only “for the reasons enumerated in the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 10, or for ‘a handful of judicially created reasons.’” These judicially created reasons ‘include violations of public policy, manifest disregard of the law, and denial of a fundamentally fair hearing.”[[122]](#footnote-122)

However, the court does not elaborated on whether or not the doctrine is seen as a shorthand/judicial gloss or an independent ground for vacatur. Guidance as to the Tenth Circuit’s position in this regard may be found in the unpublished opinion *Abbot v. Law Office of Patrick K. Milligan*.[[123]](#footnote-123) There, the court “expressed the opinion that a willful decision of an arbitrator to apply controlling law might fall within §10 even though the claimed ground for vacatur is expressed in terms of manifest disregard of the law.”[[124]](#footnote-124) Thus, it appears that the Tenth Circuit may be leaning towards the view that manifest disregard remains viable as a judicial gloss/shorthand for FAA § 10.

1. **Future of Manifest Disregard**

The future of manifest disregarded is far from certain. Some speculate that the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hall Street* effectively abrogated the doctrine (at least as a common-law ground for vacatur), while others maintain that the doctrine has survived post-*Hall Street* as common-law or a shorthand/judicial gloss for the grounds listed in FAA § 10. In this author’s opinion, the doctrine survived *Hall Street* and remains a viable and valid means for vacating arbitral awards, possibly as common-law, but more likely as a shorthand/judicial gloss for FAA § 10. Below this section takes the position that the doctrine remains viable for two primary reasons: (1) the Supreme Court’s decision in *Hall Street* did not abandon the doctrine; rather, the Court’s opinion indicates that manifest disregard remains valid, possibly as common-law, but most likely as a judicial gloss or shorthand for the grounds enumerated in FAA § 10, and (2) the majority of Circuit Courts continue to recognize the viability of manifest disregard, in one form or another, despite *Hall Street*.

First of all, it must be noted that the language in *Hall Street* used to support the position that the doctrine of manifest disregard is dead post-*Hall Street* (at least as a non-statutory ground for vacatur) is conclusory dicta[[125]](#footnote-125) with only persuasive value (though some argue that dictum can become binding[[126]](#footnote-126)).[[127]](#footnote-127) In addition, the language in *Hall Street* used to support this position states that it is possible that the Court’s reference to manifest disregard in *Wilko* indicated that “the term … was meant to name a new ground for review….”[[128]](#footnote-128) This suggests that it is possible, though unlikely, that the doctrine can survive *Hall Street* as a common-law, non-statutory, ground for vacatur.

Even if the language in *Hall Street* effectively eradicated manifest disregard as a common-law means for vacatur, it did not preclude or abandon its use in entirety. As Gross asserts, “the strict constructionist majority [in *Hall Street*] merely interpreted the FAA to precluded parties seeking vacatur from asserting grounds other than those identified in FAA section 10, and suggested that lower courts could construe the bases provided by section 10 as including ‘manifest disregard.’”[[129]](#footnote-129) As Gross’ statement suggests, the Court did not abandon the doctrine; rather, the Court delegated to the courts the task of determining how “manifest disregard” fits into one of the four categories set forth in FAA § 10.[[130]](#footnote-130) In accordance with this understanding, parties are not prohibited from asserting manifest disregard; however, in order to successfully challenge an award, the parties will have to expressly articulate (in some circuits, but not all) their manifest disregard claim in a manner so as to incorporate the language and/or grounds set forth in FAA § 10. Gross agrees with this position, and asserts that “parties can continue to challenge arbitration awards on the FAA ground that arbitrators committed misconduct under [FAA § 10(a)(3)] by manifestly disregarding the law or exceeded the scope of its power under [FAA § 10(a)(4)] by manifestly disregarding the law.”[[131]](#footnote-131)

Furthermore, as the preceding section indicates, manifest disregard has survived post-*Hall Street* in many circuits. However, the doctrine no longer maintains the status, or original understandings, set forth by the Circuit Courts following *Wilko*. That is, most circuits that recognize the doctrine despite the Court’s language in *Hall Street* no longer see it as a common-law, non-statutory, ground for vacatur (though some circuits have not affirmatively decided this).[[132]](#footnote-132) This indicates that the doctrine’s foundation has been weakened following *Hall Street*.[[133]](#footnote-133) However, it is this author’s contention that the doctrine *is not* dead. On the contrary, the doctrine remains a viable means for vacating arbitral awards, as evidenced by the various circuits recognizing its continuing viability and applicability.[[134]](#footnote-134) This is not to say that practitioners attempting to use the doctrine, even in the circuits that recognize it, will be successful. Establishing the elements of manifest disregard still remains a difficult task, regardless of whether or not the doctrine is seen as non-statutory or a judicial gloss/shorthand. Still, the Circuit Courts retention and acceptance of the doctrine, though modified, signals that most circuits view manifest disregard as a valid and viable means for challenging an arbitral award, and should the “right” case present itself, these circuits will vacate the award.

As the preceding illustrates, the doctrine of manifest disregard is not dead. *Hall Street* may havecaused a reformulation of the doctrine’s understandings regarding the authority from which the doctrine derives support—*i.e.,* whether the doctrine should be conceptualized as a separate non-statutory ground for vacatur, or as a judicial gloss/shorthand for FAA § 10; however, *Hall Street* did not completely abrogate the doctrine, for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, it is this author contention that the doctrine survived *Hall Street*, and remains a viable means for vacating arbitral awards in many circuits.

1. **Suggestion: Supreme Court Review**

In order to set forth and/or clarify the “correct” interpretation of *Hall Street* andresolve the split among the Circuit Courts, the Supreme Court ought to lay down an explicit holding accepting or rejecting the doctrine and the prevailing Circuit Court interpretations. Absent such an explicit ruling, lower courts are left to divine their own meanings. The likelihood this will occur, however, is debatable. This is because the Supreme Court has been provided multiple opportunities to decide how “manifest disregard” ought to be interpreted and applied, but has declined to specifically address the issue.[[135]](#footnote-135) Thus, the possibility that the Court will lay down an explicit holding that resolves the split among Circuit Courts is uncertain, and probably unlikely given the Court’s inclination to avoid the issue. Nevertheless, it does appear that the doctrine of manifest disregard did survive *Hall Street*, though modified, and it is this author’s contention that the doctrine will remain viable in the circuits that have accepted it, unless and until the Supreme Court rules otherwise.

1. **Conclusion**

This paper has examined the origin of the doctrine of manifest disregard, the standard’s development following the Supreme Court’s decisions in *Wilko* and *Hall Street*, and its future viability as a means for vacating arbitration awards. It was found that most, if not all, Circuit Courts following *Wilko* accepted manifest disregard as a common-law, non-statutory, means for vacating arbitral awards, though some circuits maintained differing positions regarding the correct articulation and application of the doctrine. Following this, it was determine that the Court’s decision in *Hall Street* caused (almost all) the Circuit Courts to alter their understanding of manifest disregard. However, after surveying decisions in eight different Circuit Courts, it was found that only three circuits (of the eight surveyed) have definitively taken the position that *Hall Street* completely abrogated the doctrine of manifest disregard.With the preceding in mind, it was then argued that manifest disregard remains a valid avenue for challenging arbitral awards (in most circuits), despite *Hall Street*. After discussing the Court’s language in *Hall Street* and the doctrine’s continuing validity in a number of Circuit Courts, it was determine that the doctrine is not dead; but rather still exists, possibly as common-law, but most likely as a judicial gloss/shorthand for the grounds enumerated in FAA § 10. It was then suggested that the most efficient means for resolving the circuit split would be for the Supreme Court to issue an explicit holding that would guide lower courts regarding the correct interpretation and application of manifest disregard. However, the likelihood this will occur in the near future is questionable at best. As a result, the fate of the doctrine of manifest disregard remains uncertain, and will remain uncertain, despite its arguably continuing viability, unless and until an opinion is issued by the Supreme Court resolving the issue.
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