

APPENDIX

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A: Court of appeals opinion,
Dec. 21, 20171a

Appendix B: District court memorandum opinion
and order, Dec. 7, 2016.....18a

Appendix C: Magistrate judge memorandum order,
May 28, 201339a

Appendix D: Court of appeals order,
Dec. 21, 201745a

APPENDIX A

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-41674

ARCHER AND WHITE SALES, INC.,
Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

HENRY SCHEIN, INC., DANAHER CORPORA-
TION, INSTRUMENTARIUM DENTAL INC.,
DENTAL EQUIPMENT LLC, KAVO DENTAL
TECHNOLOGIES LLC, AND DENTAL IMAGING
TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION,
Defendants-Appellants

FILED: December 21, 2017

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, GRAVES, and HIGGIN-
SON, Circuit Judges.

OPINION

PATRICK E. HIGGINBOTHAM, Circuit Judge:

Sued by a competitor for antitrust violations, Defend-
ants-Appellants sought to enforce an arbitration agree-
ment. The magistrate judge granted the motion to compel

arbitration, holding that the gateway question of the arbitrability of the claims belonged to an arbitrator. The district court reversed, holding it had the authority to rule on the question of arbitrability and the claims at issue were not arbitrable. We now affirm.

I.

Five years ago, Plaintiff-Appellee Archer and White Sales, Inc. (“Archer”), a distributor, seller, and servicer for multiple dental equipment manufacturers, brought this suit against Defendant-Appellants Henry Schein, Inc. and Danaher Corporation, allegedly the largest distributor and manufacturer of dental equipment in the United States, and certain wholly-owned subsidiaries of Danaher.

The suit alleges violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Texas Free Enterprise and Antitrust Act, contending that the Defendants’ activities occurred over the preceding four years and are “continuing” violations, and seeking both damages (“estimated to be in the tens of millions of dollars”) and injunctive relief.¹ The district court referred the case to a United States Magistrate Judge.

Defendants moved to compel arbitration pursuant to a clause in a contract between Archer and Pelton & Crane,

¹ Archer alleges that Defendants conspired “to fix prices and refuse to compete with each other” and to “force their common supplier Danaher and its various subsidiaries to terminate and/or reduce the distribution territory of their price-cutting distributor Archer Dental.” It also alleges that the Defendants “carried out their conspiracy through a series of unlawful activities, including, but not limited to agreements not to compete, agreements to fix prices, and boycotts.”

allegedly a Defendant's predecessor-in-interest (the "Dealer Agreement"). The arbitration clause reads as follows:

Disputes. This Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of North Carolina. Any dispute arising under or related to this Agreement (except for actions seeking injunctive relief and disputes related to trademarks, trade secrets, or other intellectual property of Pelton & Crane), shall be resolved by binding arbitration in accordance with the arbitration rules of the American Arbitration Association [(AAA)]. The place of arbitration shall be in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Following a hearing, the magistrate judge issued a Memorandum Order holding that: (1) the incorporation of the AAA Rules in the arbitration clause clearly evinced an intent to have the arbitrator decide questions of arbitrability; (2) there is a reasonable construction of the arbitration clause that would call for arbitration in this dispute; and (3) the *Grigson* equitable estoppel test, which both sides agree is controlling in their dispute, required arbitration against both signatories and non-signatories to the Dealer Agreement.²

The district court vacated the magistrate judge's order and held that the court could decide the question of

² *Archer & White Sales, Inc. v. Henry Schein, Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-572-JRG-RSP, 2013 WL 12155243 (E.D. Tex. May 28, 2013), *vacated*, 2016 WL 7157421 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 7, 2016).

arbitrability, and that the dispute was not arbitrable because the plain language of the arbitration clause expressly excluded suits that involved requests for injunctive relief. The court declined to reach the question of equitable estoppel.³

Defendants appealed.⁴

II.

We review a ruling on a motion to compel arbitration *de novo*.⁵ “Enforcement of an arbitration agreement involves two analytical steps.”⁶ First, a court must decide “whether the parties entered into *any arbitration agreement at all*.”⁷ This inquiry is one of pure contract formation, and it looks only at whether the parties “form[ed] a valid agreement to arbitrate some set of claims.”⁸ The next step is to determine “whether [the dispute at issue]

³ *Archer & White Sales, Inc. v. Henry Schein, Inc.*, No. 2:12-cv-572-JRG, 2016 WL 7157421, at *9 (E.D. Tex. Dec. 7, 2016).

⁴ Defendants filed an interlocutory appeal pursuant to 9 U.S.C. § 16(a)(1)(C). See *Al Rushaid v. Nat’l Oilwell Varco, Inc.*, 757 F.3d 416, 419 (5th Cir. 2014) (“Title 9 U.S.C. section 16(a)(1)(C) provides that a party may seek interlocutory review of an order . . . denying an application . . . to compel arbitration.”) (internal quotation marks omitted).

⁵ *Kubala v. Supreme Prod. Servs., Inc.*, 830 F.3d 199, 201 (5th Cir. 2016) (citing *Carey v. 24 Hour Fitness, USA, Inc.*, 669 F.3d 202, 205 (5th Cir. 2012)).

⁶ *Kubala*, 830 F.3d at 201 (5th Cir. 2016).

⁷ *Id.*

⁸ *IQ Prods. Co. v. WD-40 Co.*, 871 F.3d 344, 348 (5th Cir. 2017).

is covered by the arbitration agreement.”⁹ Before this step, however, the court must answer a third question: “[w]ho should have the primary power to decide’ whether the claim is arbitrable.”¹⁰ This question turns on “whether the agreement contains a valid delegation clause—that is, if it evinces an intent to have the arbitrator decide whether a given claim must be arbitrated.’ ”¹¹

This determination begins the two-step inquiry adopted in *Douglas v. Regions Bank*.¹² First, whether the parties “clearly and unmistakably” intended to delegate the question of arbitrability to an arbitrator.¹³ If so, “the motion to compel arbitration should be granted in almost all cases.”¹⁴ But not “[i]f the argument that the claim at hand is within the scope of the arbitration agreement is ‘wholly groundless.’ ”¹⁵ So *Douglas*’s second step asks whether there is a plausible argument for the arbitrability

⁹ *Kubala*, 830 F.3d at 201.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 202 (quoting *First Options of Chi., Inc. v. Kaplan*, 514 U.S. 938, 942 (1995)).

¹¹ *IQ Prods.*, 871 F.3d at 348 (quoting *Kubala*, 830 F.3d at 202).

¹² 757 F.3d 460, 464 (5th Cir. 2014).

¹³ “[C]ourts should not assume that the parties agreed to arbitrate arbitrability unless there is ‘clea[r] and unmistakabl[e]’ evidence that they did so.” *First Options*, 514 U.S. at 944 (citing *AT&T Technologies, Inc. v. Commc’ns Workers of Am.*, 475 U.S. 643, 649 (1986)).

¹⁴ *Kubala*, 830 F.3d at 202.

¹⁵ *Douglas*, 757 F.3d at 464.

of the dispute. Where there is no such plausible argument, “the district court may decide the ‘gateway’ issue of arbitrability despite a valid delegation clause.”¹⁶

The parties agree that the Dealer Agreement contained an arbitration provision, though not whether the arbitration provision applies here.¹⁷ Specifically, they disagree on whether the court or an arbitrator should decide the gateway question of arbitrability—and relatedly, whether the underlying dispute is arbitrable at all. We turn to the two-step *Douglas* test.

A.

We first ask if the parties “clearly and unmistakably” delegated the issue of arbitrability.¹⁸ Absent a delegation, “the question of whether the parties agreed to arbitrate is to be decided by the court, not the arbitrator.”¹⁹ “Just as the arbitrability of the merits of a dispute depends upon

¹⁶ *IQ Prods.*, 871 F.3d at 349.

¹⁷ Archer states that, because the Dealer Agreement “unambiguously divides disputes into two categories”—those within the carve-out and all other disputes—there is no valid agreement to arbitrate. This argument misconstrues the very first analytical step in enforcement of an arbitration agreement, which asks “whether the parties entered into *any arbitration agreement at all.*” Archer does not appear to argue that there was no arbitration agreement regarding claims outside the scope of the carve-out. Instead, Archer contends that the Dealer Agreement is “best construed to express the parties’ intent not to arbitrate this action seeking injunctive relief.” Thus, we treat Archer’s arguments to this effect as going to whether the parties agreed to arbitrate this particular dispute.

¹⁸ *AT&T*, 475 U.S. at 649, 1415.

¹⁹ *Id.*

whether the parties agreed to arbitrate that dispute, so the question ‘who has the primary power to decide arbitrability’ turns upon what the parties agreed about *that* matter.’”²⁰

A contract need not contain an express delegation clause to meet this standard. An arbitration agreement that expressly incorporates the AAA Rules “presents clear and unmistakable evidence that the parties agreed to arbitrate arbitrability.”²¹ Under AAA Rule 7(a), “the arbitrator shall have the power to rule on his or her own jurisdiction, including any objections with respect to the existence, scope or validity of the arbitration agreement.”²²

By the Dealer Agreement, “[a]ny dispute arising under or related to this Agreement (except for actions seeking injunctive relief and disputes related to trademarks, trade secrets, or other intellectual property of [the predecessor]), shall be resolved by binding arbitration *in accordance with the arbitration rules of the American Ar-*

²⁰ *First Options*, 514 U.S. at 943 (internal citations omitted). See also *Rent-A-Center, W., Inc. v. Jackson*, 561 U.S. 63, 68–69 (2010) (holding that parties may delegate arbitrability through an express delegation clause).

²¹ *Petrofac, Inc. v. DynMcDermott Petroleum Operations Co.*, 687 F.3d 671, 675 (5th Cir. 2012).

²² This version of Rule 7(a) was in effect when the parties signed their agreement. AM. ARBITRATION ASS’N, COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION RULES AND MEDIATION PROCEDURES (2007), <https://www.adr.org/sites/default/files/Commercial%20Arbitration%20Rules%20and%20Mediation%20Procedures%20Sept.%201%2C%202007.pdf>.

bitration Association.” The parties dispute the relationship between the carve-out clause—“except for actions seeking injunctive relief and [intellectual property] disputes”—and the incorporation of the AAA Rules.

The magistrate judge saw three separate parts to the arbitration provision: (1) a general rule compelling arbitration for any dispute related to the agreement, (2) an exemption from arbitration for actions seeking injunctive relief, and (3) a clause incorporating the AAA Rules.²³ On this reading, the AAA Rules would apply to all disputes arising under the contract, including those eventually found to fall within the Dealer Agreement’s carve-out. The district court disagreed, holding that the carve-out clause removed the disputes from the ambit of both arbitration and the AAA Rules. The district court distinguished *Petrofac*, where the agreement at issue “did not contain any exclusions[;] [r]ather, it was a standard broad arbitration clause.”²⁴

Defendants argue that *Petrofac* controls; that, by holding otherwise, the district court conflated the issue of whether the dispute is arbitrable with the issue of who decides arbitrability; and that, under the plain language of the clause, disputes about arbitrability do not fall within the carve-out and thus belong to the arbitrator. This court has previously applied *Petrofac* to arbitration provisions containing carve-out provisions. In *Crawford*, we examined an agreement that incorporated the AAA Rules and preserved the parties’ ability to seek injunctive relief in

²³ *Archer*, 2013 WL 12155243 at *1.

²⁴ *Archer*, 2016 WL 7157421, at *7.

the courts.²⁵ We held—without directly addressing the relevance of its carve-out provision—that the *Crawford* agreement’s incorporation of the AAA Rules constituted “clear and unmistakable evidence that the parties to the [] Agreement agreed to arbitrate arbitrability, and so . . . whether the Plaintiffs’ claims are subject to arbitration must be decided in the first instance by the arbitrator, not a court.”²⁶

Archer responds that the agreement in *Petrofac* did not include a carve-out provision, and the *Crawford*

²⁵ *Crawford Profl Drugs, Inc. v. CVS Caremark Corp.*, 748 F.3d 249, 256 (5th Cir. 2014). In that case, the Provider Agreement read, in relevant part:

Any and all disputes in connection with or arising out of the Provider Agreement by the parties will be exclusively settled by arbitration before a single arbitrator in accordance with the Rules of the American Arbitration Association. The arbitrator must follow the rule of Law, and may only award remedies provided for in the Provider Agreement Arbitration shall be the exclusive and final remedy for any dispute between the parties in connection with or arising out of the Provider Agreement; provided, however, that nothing in this provision shall prevent either party from seeking injunctive relief for breach of this Provider Agreement in any state or federal court of law. . . .

Id.

²⁶ *Id.* at 263. Defendants also point to Oracle, where the Ninth Circuit addressed an arbitration clause that adopted the UNCITRAL Rules (which also delegate arbitrability issues to the arbitrator) and a carve-out for certain types of claims. The court rejected the argument that the carve-out provision bore on the question of arbitrability, stating that such an argument “conflates the scope of the arbitration clause . . . with the question of who decides arbitrability.” *Oracle Am., Inc. v. Myriad Group A.G.*, 724 F.3d 1069, 1072–76 (9th Cir. 2013)

agreement is distinguishable because it contained separate clauses incorporating the AAA Rules and creating a carve-out excluding claims for injunctive relief—specifically, the agreement stated that the AAA Rules would apply to “[a]ny and all disputes in connection with or arising out of the Provider Agreement,” and contained a carve-out in a subsequent sentence stating that nothing in the agreement would prevent a suit seeking injunctive relief in a court of law.²⁷

Archer argues that, in contrast, the structure of the specific carve-out at issue here leads to the natural reading that the AAA Rules only apply to the category of cases that are subject to binding arbitration under the Dealer Agreement—namely, those outside of the contract’s express carve-out. Archer further notes that Defendants’ predecessor-in-interest drafted the Dealer Agreement, and that North Carolina law requires that “[p]ursuant to well [] settled contract law principles, the language of [an] arbitration clause should be strictly construed against the drafter of the clause.”²⁸

There is a strong argument that the Dealer Agreement’s invocation of the AAA Rules does not apply to cases that fall within the carve-out. It is not the case that any mention in the parties’ contract of the AAA Rules trumps all other contract language. Here, the interaction between the AAA Rules and the carve-out is at best ambiguous. On one reading, the Rules apply to “[a]ny dispute arising under or related to [the] Agreement.” On another, the provision expressly exempts certain disputes and the

²⁷ *Crawford*, 748 F.3d at 256.

²⁸ *T.M.C.S., Inc. v. Marco Contractors, Inc.*, 780 S.E.2d 588, 597 (N.C. Ct. App. 2015).

Rules apply only to the remaining disputes. We need not decide which reading to adopt here because *Douglas* provides us with another avenue to resolve this issue: the “wholly groundless” inquiry.

B.

Regardless of whether an agreement clearly and unmistakably delegates the question of arbitrability, the second step in *Douglas* provides a narrow escape valve. If an “assertion of arbitrability [is] wholly groundless,” the court need not submit the issue of arbitrability to the arbitrator.²⁹

We have cautioned that the “wholly groundless” exception is a narrow one and that it “is not a license for the court to prejudge arbitrability disputes more properly left to the arbitrator pursuant to a valid delegation clause.”³⁰ “An assertion of arbitrability is not ‘wholly groundless’ if ‘there is a legitimate argument that th[e] arbitration clause covers the present dispute, and, on the other hand, that it does not.’ ”³¹ If a court can find “a ‘plausible’ argument that the arbitration agreement requires the merits of the claim to be arbitrated,” the wholly groundless exception will not apply.³²

The magistrate judge issued his order before *Douglas*, and therefore he did not address the “wholly groundless”

²⁹ *Douglas*, 757 F.3d at 463 (quoting *Agere Systems, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 560 F.3d 337, 340 (5th Cir. 2009)).

³⁰ *Kubala*, 830 F.3d at 202 n.1.

³¹ *IQ Prods.*, 871 F.3d at 350 (quoting *Douglas*, 757 F.3d at 463).

³² *Kubala*, 830 F.3d at 202 n.1.

exception directly. Instead, he found that while “[o]n the most superficial level, this lawsuit is clearly an action seeking injunctive relief since it *does* seek that relief,” there was also “a plausible construction [of the Dealer Agreement] calling for arbitration.”³³ Thus, he concluded that “the question of whether the exception for actions seeking injunctive relief should be limited to actions for an injunction in aid of arbitration or to enforce an arbitrator’s award should properly be left for the arbitrator to decide.”³⁴

The district court, now with *Douglas* at hand, found the Defendants’ arguments for arbitrability wholly groundless. The court first stated that the wholly groundless inquiry “necessarily requires the courts to examine and, to a limited extent, construe the underlying agreement.”³⁵ It then noted that the Dealer Agreement’s carve-out language “differs from the standard arbitration clause suggested by [AAA],”³⁶ and found that “the phrase ‘except actions seeking injunctive relief’ is clear on its face—any

³³ *Archer*, 2013 WL 12155243, at *1–2.

³⁴ *Id.* at *2.

³⁵ *Archer*, 2016 WL 7157421, at *8 (quoting *Douglas*, 757 F.3d at 463) (internal quotation marks omitted). This limited inquiry allows the parties to avoid jumping through hoops to begin arbitration only to be sent directly back to the courthouse. See *Douglas*, 757 F.3d at 464 (“When [plaintiff] signed the arbitration agreement containing a delegation provision, did she intend to go through the rigmaroles of arbitration just so the arbitrator can tell her in the first instance that her claim has nothing whatsoever to do with her arbitration agreement, and she should now feel free to file in federal court? Obviously not.”).

³⁶ The district court claimed that “[s]uch an intentional drafting effort” deserves notice. *Archer*, 2016 WL 7157421.

action seeking injunctive relief is excluded from mandatory arbitration.”³⁷ Thus, the provision’s plain language includes all actions seeking injunctive relief, not a more limited category of cases. The court declined to “re-write the terms of the Parties’ agreement to accommodate a party—notably the party that drafted the agreement—that could have negotiated for more precise language,”³⁸ and held that the arguments for arbitrability were “wholly without merit based on the plain language of the arbitration clause itself” and fell squarely within the *Douglas* exception.³⁹

Defendants suggest a limited reading of the “wholly groundless” exception that would only apply when the contract containing the arbitration provision has “nothing to do with” the dispute before the court.⁴⁰ In *Douglas*, the plaintiff had signed an agreement with an arbitration provision when she opened a checking account with Regions Bank that closed less than one year later. Years later, the plaintiff was involved in an automobile accident,

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ *Id.* at *6.

³⁹ *Archer*, 2016 WL 7157421, at *9. The district court also rejected arguments from Defendants that Archer failed to “plead” a claim for injunctive relief based on the fact that Archer had not made any showing on the factors articulated by the Supreme Court in *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388, 394 (2006). The court held first that the *eBay* factors are not pleading requirements, and that in any event, the proper vehicle to argue the plaintiff is not entitled to relief would be a motion to dismiss under Rule 12. We do not address the underlying merits of Archer’s claim here because, as Defendants concede, “the issue here is not whether Archer’s injunctive relief claim fails on the merits.”

⁴⁰ *Douglas*, 757 F.3d at 461.

and she received a \$500,000 settlement in subsequent litigation. She then alleged that her attorney, who banked with Regions, had embezzled that money, and she brought suit against the bank for negligence and conversion on the theory that the bank had notice of the embezzlement and failed to report it. Regions moved to compel arbitration pursuant to the agreement that the plaintiff signed when she opened the now-closed checking account. This court held that “[t]he mere existence of a delegation provision in the checking account’s arbitration agreement . . . cannot possibly bind [the plaintiff] to arbitrate gateway questions of arbitrability in *all* future disputes with the other party, no matter their origin.”⁴¹

Defendants argue that applying the “wholly groundless” exception here would allow the court to construe the bounds of an arbitration clause before an arbitrator can do so—effectively obviating the entire purpose of delegating the gateway question to the arbitrator in the first place; that their arbitrability arguments are not wholly groundless, pointing to the magistrate judge’s finding of plausible readings of the arbitration clause that would not exclude the suit from arbitration; and that doubts about the arbitrability of a claim should be resolved in favor of arbitration, pursuant to settled federal law.

Defendants urge that “[t]he correct reading of this arbitration clause is that the parties may come to court seeking injunctive relief at any time . . . but still must arbitrate any claim for damages.” Defendants further urge the court should send the damages clause to arbitration, even if it results in “piecemeal litigation.” In their view, “[t]he

⁴¹ *Id.* at 462, 464.

correct reading of this arbitration clause is that the parties may come to court seeking injunctive relief at any time . . . but still must arbitrate any claim for damages.”

Archer counters that the plain language of the clause makes clear that the parties did not agree to arbitrate *actions* that involve a request for injunctive relief, and that any argument to the contrary is wholly groundless. Archer emphasizes that arbitration agreements are “as enforceable as other contracts, but not more so,”⁴² and states that under North Carolina law, “when the terms of a contract are plain and unambiguous, there is no room for construction. The contract is to be interpreted as written and enforced as the parties have made it.”⁴³ Archer says the Dealer Agreement clearly contemplates two categories of disputes—those involving “actions seeking injunctive relief” and certain intellectual property disputes, and all other disputes—and that only the latter category must be subject to arbitration. Archer contends that the clause’s incorporation of “action” prohibits any piecemeal litigation because “action,” as distinct from “claim,” pertains to all of the claims in a given case.⁴⁴

While *Douglas* is a recent case, with contours of the “wholly groundless” exception not yet fully developed, if the doctrine is to have any teeth, it must apply where, as here, an arbitration clause expressly excludes certain

⁴² See *Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood & Conklin Mfg. Co.*, 388 U.S. 395, 404 n.12, 87 (1967).

⁴³ *State v. Philip Morris USA Inc.*, 363 N.C. 623, 685 (2009) (internal quotation marks omitted) (internal citations omitted).

⁴⁴ An action is “[a] civil or criminal judicial proceeding,” which is “nearly if not quite synonymous” with suit. BLACK’S LAW DICTIONARY 28–29 (7th ed. 1999).

types of disputes. The arbitration clause creates a carve-out for “actions seeking injunctive relief.” It does not limit the exclusion to “actions seeking *only* injunctive relief,” nor “actions for injunction in aid of an arbitrator’s award.” Nor does it limit itself to only *claims* for injunctive relief. Such readings find no footing within the four corners of the contract. “When the language of a contract is clear and unambiguous, effect must be given to its terms, and the court, under the guise of construction, cannot reject what the parties inserted or insert what the parties elected to omit.”⁴⁵ We see no plausible argument that the arbitration clause applies here to an “action seeking injunctive relief.” The mere fact that the arbitration clause allows Archer to avoid arbitration by adding a claim for injunctive relief does not change the clause’s plain meaning. “While ambiguities in the language of the agreement should be resolved in favor of arbitration, we do not override the clear intent of the parties, *or reach a result inconsistent with the plain text of the contract*, simply because the policy favoring arbitration is implicated.”⁴⁶

III.

Defendants argue in the alternative that, even if the district court was correct to decide the issue of arbitrability, it erred in determining that the complaint was not subject to the arbitration clause. Because we find that Defendants’ arguments for arbitrability are wholly groundless, we affirm the district court’s holding that the

⁴⁵ *Procar II, Inc. v. Dennis*, 721 S.E.2d 369, 371 (N.C. Ct. App. 2012).

⁴⁶ *E.E.O.C. v. Waffle House*, 534 U.S. 279, 294 (2002) (emphasis added).

claims are not arbitrable. Having concluded that this action is not subject to mandatory arbitration, we need not reach the question of whether the third parties to the arbitration clause in this case can enforce such an arbitration clause.

We affirm the district court's order denying the motions to compel arbitration.

APPENDIX B

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

ARCHER AND WHITE SALES, INC.,
Plaintiff,

v.

HENRY SCHEIN, INC. ET AL.,
Defendants.

Civil Action No. 2:12-cv-572-JRG

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (Dkt. No. 45) of the Magistrate Judge's Memorandum Order (Dkt. No. 44). Having fully considered the briefing and the Parties' arguments at the hearing on November 9, 2016, the Court finds that Plaintiff's Motion should be and hereby is **GRANTED**.

I. BACKGROUND

a. Factual Background

According to the Complaint, Plaintiff Archer and White Sales ("Plaintiff") is a distributor of dental equipment that competes directly against Defendant Henry Schein, Inc. ("Schein") and Company X

(not named as a defendant in this action). Plaintiff is allegedly known nationally among dental professionals for its low prices and high-quality service. (Compl. at 7.) Schein is alleged to be the largest distributor of dental equipment in the United States. (Compl. at 5.) Defendant Danaher Corporation (“Danaher”) is allegedly the largest manufacturer of dental equipment in the United States. (Compl. at 4.) The remaining defendants—Instrumentarium, Dental Equipment LLC d/b/a Pelton & Crane, Dental Equipment LLC d/b/a DCI Equipment, KaVo, and Gendex—are alleged to be wholly-owned subsidiaries of Danaher, which were acquired by Danaher since 2004. (Compl. at 4-7.) Danaher and these subsidiaries are sometimes referred to herein as the “Manufacturer Defendants.”

Plaintiff alleges that Schein and Company X have conspired to fix prices and to refuse to compete with each other in the sale of dental equipment to dental professionals. (Compl. at 1–2.) Moreover, Plaintiff alleges that Schein and Company X have conspired with the Manufacturer Defendants to terminate and/or reduce Plaintiff’s distribution territory in response to Plaintiff’s low prices. (Compl. at 2.) Plaintiff claims that this termination constitutes an illegal boycott, orchestrated by the Defendants to perpetuate the price-fixing agreement and the agreement not to compete between Schein and Company X. (Compl. at 2.) Plaintiff further claims that Danaher, as the common supplier to all three horizontal competitors, knowingly participated in this illegal boycott. (Compl. at 2.)

b. Procedural Background

On August 31, 2012, Plaintiff filed suit against Defendant Schein and the Manufacturer Defendants

alleging violations of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, violations of Section 16 of the Clayton Act, and violations of the Texas Free Enterprise and Antitrust Act. Soon after, on September 26, 2012, the Manufacturer Defendants filed a Motion to Compel Arbitration and Stay All Proceedings (Dkt. No. 10). A few days later, Defendant Schein also filed a Motion to Compel Plaintiff to Arbitrate and to Stay Proceedings (Dkt. No. 14). After holding a hearing on these the Motions, the Magistrate Judge on May 28, 2013, issued an Order granting both Motions, staying the action pending arbitration of the asserted claims, and directing the Parties to notify the Court upon completion or abandonment of the arbitration process (Dkt. No. 44)

On June 10, 2013, Plaintiff filed this Motion for Reconsideration of the Magistrate Judge's Order (Dkt. No. 45). Although Plaintiff styled its filing as a "Motion for Reconsideration," the first sentence of the Motion reads: "Plaintiff Archer and White Sales, Inc. ('Archer') objects to and moves for reconsideration of the May 28, 2013, Memorandum Order." (Dkt. No. 45 at 1.) As such, it was unclear whether Plaintiff intended to have the Magistrate Judge reconsider his Order or whether Plaintiff intended to file objections to the Order under Rule 72(a). Having reviewed the Motion in full, and noting that Plaintiff filed its Motion within fourteen days of the Magistrate Judge's Order, the Court finds that Plaintiff intended its Motion to be considered as objections to the Magistrate Judge's Order, rather than as a Motion for the Magistrate Judge to reconsider that Order. The Court now reviews the Motion accordingly.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A party may file objections to a magistrate judge's order regarding a nondispositive matter within fourteen days of the order. Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 72(a).¹ A district judge may modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *Id.*

III. LEGAL STANDARD

Under the Federal Arbitration Act (“FAA”), an arbitration agreement that involves interstate commerce is “valid, irrevocable, and enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract.” 9 U.S.C. § 2 (2012). Section 3 of the FAA requires courts to stay court proceedings pending arbitration for any issue covered by an arbitration

¹ The Fifth Circuit has yet to determine the appropriate standard for reviewing a magistrate judge's ruling on motions to compel arbitration. *Lee v. Plantation of Louisiana, L.L.C.*, 454 F. App'x 358, 360 (5th Cir. 2011) (“[W]e need not reach the question of whether a motion to compel arbitration is a dispositive or non-dispositive motion for purposes of the standard of review by the district judge of the magistrate judge's order.”) Other courts, however, have concluded that a ruling on a motion to compel arbitration is a non-dispositive ruling. *See PowerShare, Inc. v. Syntel, Inc.*, 597 F.3d 10, 13–15 (1st Cir. 2010); *Virgin Islands Water & Power Auth. v. Gen. Elec. Int'l Inc.*, 561 F. App'x 131, 134–35 (3d Cir. 2014); *Tige Boats, Inc. v. Interplastic Corp.*, No. 1:15-CV-0114-P-BL, 2015 WL 9268423, at *1–3 (N.D. Tex. Dec. 21, 2015) (holding that the magistrate judge's ruling compelling arbitration was non-dispositive where the ruling stayed the case rather than dismissing the case pending arbitration). Moreover, when “review of a non-dispositive motion by a district judge turns on a pure question of law, that review is plenary under the ‘contrary to law’ branch of the Rule 72(a) standard,” and thus “there is no practical difference between review under Rule 72(a)'s ‘contrary to law’ standard and review under Rule 72(b)'s de novo standard.” *PowerShare*, 597 F.3d at 15.

agreement. 9 U.S.C. § 3. *See also Hornbeck Offshore Corp. v. Coastal Carriers Corp.*, 981 F.2d 752, 754 (5th Cir. 1993).

At a high level, courts perform a two-step inquiry to determine whether to compel a party to arbitrate. *Dealer Computer Servs. v. Old Colony Motors, Inc.*, 588 F.3d 884, 886 (5th Cir. 2009). First, a court must determine whether the parties agreed to arbitrate the particular dispute at issue. *Id.* *See also Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 614, 626 (1985). If so, the court must next determine whether any applicable federal statute or policy renders the claims nonarbitrable. *Dealer Computer Servs.*, 588 F.3d at 886. In other words, the court must determine “whether legal constraints external to the parties’ agreement foreclosed the arbitration of those claims.” *Mitsubishi Motors*, 473 U.S. at 628. With respect to the first inquiry, there are two separate considerations: whether a valid agreement to arbitrate *some* claims exists (contract formation) and whether the dispute at hand falls within the terms of that valid agreement (contract interpretation). *Dealer Computer Servs.*, 588 F.3d at 886. In this case, the Parties do not dispute that a valid agreement to arbitrate *some* set of claims exists. However, the Parties dispute whether that agreement covers the Plaintiff’s claims in this case.

“Arbitration is a matter of contract between the parties, and a court cannot compel a party to arbitrate unless the court determines the parties agreed to arbitrate the dispute in question.” *Pennzoil Exploration & Prod. Co. v. Ramco Energy Ltd.*, 139 F.3d 1061, 1064 (5th Cir. 1998). The FAA “does not require parties to arbitrate when they have not agreed to do so, nor does it prevent parties who do agree to arbitrate from excluding

certain claims from the scope of their arbitration agreement.” *Volt Info. Scis., Inc. v. Bd. of Trustees of Leland Stanford Junior Univ.*, 489 U.S. 468, 478 (1989) (internal citation omitted).

a. The Question of Arbitrability

Although in most circumstances the Supreme Court has recognized a liberal policy in favor of arbitration, the Court has “made clear that there is an exception to this policy: The question whether the parties have submitted a particular dispute to arbitration, *i.e.*, the ‘*question of arbitrability*,’ is ‘an issue for judicial determination [u]nless the parties clearly and unmistakably provide otherwise.’ ” *Howsam v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc.*, 537 U.S. 79, 83 (2002) (first quoting *AT&T Technologies*, 475 U.S. at 649 (emphasis added); then quoting *First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan*, 514 U.S. 938, 944 (1995)). Although the Court’s definition of “question of arbitrability” is narrow, it includes “a disagreement about whether an arbitration clause in a concededly binding contract applies to a particular type of controversy.” *Howsam*, 537 U.S. at 84 (citing *AT&T Technologies*, 475 U.S. at 651-52).

The Court has also explained that “[j]ust as the arbitrability of the merits of a dispute depends upon whether the parties agreed to arbitrate that dispute, so the question ‘who has the primary power to decide arbitrability’ turns upon what the parties agreed about *that matter*.” *First Options*, 514 U.S. at 943 (internal citations omitted). As to questions of arbitrability, the Court applies a “strong pro-court presumption as to the parties’ likely intent.” *Howsam*, 537 U.S. at 86. *See also Oxford Health Plans LLC v. Sutter*, 133 S. Ct. 2064, 2068

n.2 (2013) (noting that questions of arbitrability are “presumptively for courts to decide”); *Houston Ref., L.P. v. United Steel, Paper & Forestry, Rubber, Mfg.*, 765 F.3d 396, 408 (5th Cir. 2014) (“[T]he law presumes that courts have plenary power to decide the gateway question of a dispute’s ‘arbitrability’—*i.e.*, ‘whether [the parties] agreed to arbitrate the merits.’”) (quoting *First Options*, 514 U.S. at 942). Thus, the Court has held that “[u]nless the parties *clearly and unmistakably* provide otherwise, the question of whether the parties agreed to arbitrate is to be decided by the court, not the arbitrator.” *Howsam*, 537 U.S. at 86. *See also First Options*, 514 U.S. at 944 (“Courts should not assume that the parties agreed to arbitrate arbitrability unless there is ‘clea[r] and unmistakabl[e]’ evidence that they did so.”) (quoting *AT&T Technologies*, 475 U.S. at 649).

IV. ANALYSIS

The arbitration clause at issue in this case is found in a Dealer Agreement between Pelton & Crane² and Archer and White Sales, dated October 4, 2007, which established Archer and White Sales as a distributor of Pelton & Crane products. (Dkt. No. 46-1, Ex. C.) The arbitration clause states:

Disputes. This Agreement shall be governed by the laws of the State of North Carolina. Any dispute arising under or related to this Agreement (except for

² The same arbitration clause is found in Addendum 2 to the Marus Dealer Agreement (with the name “Marus Dental” substituted for “Pelton & Crane”) (Dkt. No. 46-1, Ex. D) and Addendum 2 to the DCI Equipment Dealer Agreement (with the name “DCI Equipment” substituted for “Pelton & Crane”) (Dkt. No. 46-1, Ex. E).

actions seeking injunctive relief and disputes related to trademarks, trade secrets or other intellectual property of Pelton & Crane) shall be resolved by binding arbitration in accordance with the arbitration rules of the American Arbitration Association. The place of arbitration shall be in Charlotte, North Carolina.

Here, the Parties dispute whether they agreed to arbitrate antitrust claims. Additionally, the Parties disagree as to who should make that determination—the arbitrator or this Court.

Plaintiff argues that this action is unambiguously excluded from the arbitration clause because the clause expressly excludes “actions seeking injunctive relief”—and it is not disputed that Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief. (Dkt. No. 45, at 3-9.) Defendant responds by contending that a claim for injunctive relief can be added to most lawsuits, and Plaintiff should not be able to evade arbitration by merely asking for injunctive relief in addition to Plaintiff’s claim for damages. (Dkt. No. 46, at 7.) According to Plaintiff, however, the fact that a plaintiff may put forth a claim for damages in addition to a claim for injunctive relief is simply irrelevant, and the Court must give the contract its plain and unambiguous meaning. (Dkt. No. 45, at 4.) As such, Plaintiff objects to the Magistrate Judge’s ruling on the grounds that it is contrary to the plain language of the arbitration clause. (Dkt. No. 45, at 4.) Further, both sets of Defendants argue that the Magistrate Judge correctly held that the question of arbitrability should be determined by the arbitrator rather than this Court.

c. Scope of Arbitration Clause

“[A] valid agreement to arbitrate applies ‘unless it can be said with positive assurance that [the] arbitration clause is not susceptible of an interpretation which would cover the dispute at issue.’ ” *Pers. Sec. & Safety Sys. Inc. v. Motorola Inc.*, 297 F.3d 388, 392 (5th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Neal v. Hardee’s Food Sys., Inc.*, 918 F.2d 34, 37 (5th Cir. 1990)). However, to determine the scope of an arbitration agreement, “we look first to whether the parties agreed to arbitrate a dispute, not to general policy goals.” *E.E.O.C. v. Waffle House, Inc.*, 534 U.S. 279, 294 (2002). As such, “[w]hile ambiguities in the language of the agreement should be resolved in favor of arbitration, we do not override the clear intent of the parties, or reach a result inconsistent with the plain text of the contract, simply because the policy favoring arbitration is implicated.” *Waffle House*, 534 U.S. at 294 (internal citation omitted). The FAA “simply requires courts to enforce privately negotiated agreements to arbitrate, like other contracts, in accordance with their terms.” *Volt Info. Scis., Inc.*, 489 U.S. at 478.

The Manufacturer Defendants argue that the only “sensible” construction of the arbitration clause would require arbitration of the present action. (Dkt. No. 46, at 6.) Specifically, the Manufacturer Defendants argue that this dispute is “related to” the parties’ agreement because the rights Plaintiff seeks to vindicate were created by the Dealer Agreement. (Dkt. No. 46, at 6.) As to the express exclusion of actions seeking injunctive relief, the Manufacturer Defendants argue that Plaintiff’s interpretation of the clause would significantly weaken the arbitration clause and thus cannot be correct. (Dkt. No. 46, at 7.) According to the Manufacturer Defendants,

a party's "mere inclusion of a boilerplate request for injunctive relief in a complaint otherwise seeking a jury trial for a damages claim" would suffice to remove an action from arbitration. (Dkt. No. 46, at 7.) As such, the Manufacturer Defendants propose another interpretation of that express exclusion: that the exclusion is intended to "allow[] a party to seek injunctive relief in court, particularly where the issue in dispute involves 'trademarks, trade secrets or other intellectual property,' or to seek an injunction in aid of arbitration or to enforce an arbitrator's award." (Dkt. No. 46, at 7.) However, these Defendants fail to provide any substantive basis for reading into the Parties' agreement such significant limitations.

Defendant Schein adopts the Manufacturer Defendants' arguments. (Dkt. No. 47, at 13.) Schein also argues that Plaintiff's complaint fails to allege facts to support a claim for injunctive relief. (Dkt. No. 47, at 13.) Specifically, Schein lists the four *eBay* factors and argues that Plaintiff failed to plead the "elements" of a claim for a preliminary or permanent injunction. (Dkt. No. 47, at 13–14.) The Court will address each of the Defendants' arguments in turn.

First, the Court need not affirmatively decide whether the present action falls within the clause which indicates that any disputes "related to" the agreement must be arbitrated, as the ultimate question turns on the clause's express exclusion, which excludes from arbitration "actions seeking injunctive relief."

Second, the phrase "except actions seeking injunctive relief" is clear on its face—any action seeking injunctive relief is excluded from mandatory arbitration. Plaintiff's action seeks injunctive relief. Applying the plain meaning

of the clause, Plaintiff's action is excluded from mandatory arbitration.

As Plaintiff noted in its Response to the Manufacturer Defendants' Motion to Compel, the arbitration clause in the Dealer Agreement differs from the standard arbitration clause suggested by the American Arbitration Association ("AAA"). (Dkt. No. 21, at 6 (citing Dkt. No. 10-3, Ex. B).) Specifically, the clause's exclusion of actions seeking injunctive relief (and trademark disputes) is not part of the AAA's suggested language. The arbitration clause in this case is unique. Such an intentional drafting effort as opposed to dropping in standard language is worthy of the Court's notice.

Third, the Manufacturer Defendants' proposed interpretation of the exclusion clause fails based on the plain language of the clause itself. Those Defendants argue that the exclusion covers only intellectual property disputes or actions seeking injunctions in aid of arbitration. However, no textual basis exists for reading the phrase "actions seeking injunctive relief" as "actions seeking injunctive relief if such injunctions are in aid of arbitration." Further, the clause does not limit the exclusion to actions seeking "only" injunctive relief, and the Court also declines to read that limitation into the document.

A very similar clause was recently addressed by the Southern District of New York in *Frydman v. Diamond*, No. 1:14-CV-8741-GHW, 2015 WL 5294790 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 10, 2015). The clause that excluded actions from arbitration in that case stated:

Should any dispute arise between the Parties which gives rise to injunctive or

equitable relief pursuant to the terms of this Agreement, the Operating Agreements or the Settlement Agreements, then notwithstanding anything else contained in such agreements, *the party initiating an action seeking injunctive or equitable relief may at his/her/its election bring such action in a court of competent jurisdiction*, and each of the other Parties hereby consent to same and shall not seek to dismiss or move such action to arbitration or other adjudication. *Id.* at *2 (emphasis added).

The parties' arguments in that case mirror the arguments presented to this Court. There, the plaintiff argued that the exception allowed the plaintiff to choose the forum in which to bring any action seeking injunctive relief. *Id.* at *2. Meanwhile, the defendants argued that the clause "was intended to be a narrow exception to the parties' broad agreement to arbitrate, and that the plaintiff's interpretation of [the clause] would render the parties' agreement to arbitrate meaningless because any party could avoid arbitration by simply including any type of claim of injunctive or equitable relief in his complaint." *Id.* at *6. There the defendants also argued that the exclusion should be interpreted as "a standard 'aid of arbitration' provision of the sort that allows a party to an arbitration agreement to seek equitable or injunctive relief either to enforce an arbitral award or to maintain the status quo pending arbitration." *Id.* at *6. The court in that case held that the plain language excluded the plaintiff's action from arbitration because the plaintiff's action sought equitable relief. In reaching the same conclusion, this Court finds persuasive the *Frydman*

Court's emphasis on the plain language chosen and agreed to by the parties.³

The Manufacturer Defendants' argument that this reading of the clause would substantially weaken the arbitration clause simply cannot override the plain meaning of the words chosen by the parties in their agreement. To put it concisely, the Court will not re-write the terms of the Parties' agreement to accommodate a party—notably, the party that drafted the agreement⁴—that could have negotiated for more precise language. It is the duty of the courts to “enforce privately negotiated agreements to arbitrate, like other contracts, in accordance with their terms.” *Volt Info. Scis., Inc.*, 489 U.S. at 478. *See also Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood & Conklin Mfg. Co.*, 388 U.S. 395, 404 n.12 (1967) (noting that the purpose of the Federal Arbitration Act was “to make arbitration agreements as enforceable as other contracts, *but not more so*”) (emphasis added).

³ Although the court in *Frydman* relied on New York state law principles of contract interpretation to underscore the supremacy of the plain language, North Carolina law places the same emphasis on the plain meaning of words in contract interpretation. Under North Carolina law, “when the terms of a contract ‘are plain and unambiguous, there is no room for construction. The contract is to be interpreted as written,’ . . . and ‘enforce[d] . . . as the parties have made it.’ ” *State v. Philip Morris USA Inc.*, 363 N.C. 623, 632, 685 S.E.2d 85, 91 (2009) (first quoting *Jones v. Casstevens*, 222 N.C. 411, 413, 23 S.E.2d 303, 305 (1942); then quoting *Wachovia Bank & Tr. Co. v. Westchester Fire Ins. Co.*, 276 N.C. 348, 354, 172 S.E.2d 518, 522 (1970)) (internal citations omitted).

⁴ As Plaintiff noted in its Sur-reply to the Manufacturer Defendants' Motion to Compel, the clause at issue was drafted by Pelton & Crane. (Dkt. No. 33, at 2.)

Finally, Defendant Schein’s argument that Plaintiff failed to “plead” a claim for injunctive relief also fails. First, any argument that Plaintiff failed to state a claim for relief should be raised under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12. There is no such motion before the Court. Further, the factors articulated by the Supreme Court in *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388, 394 (2006), are not pleading requirements—rather, they are factors that are to be considered and carefully weighed by a court before an injunction should issue. To put it simply, injunctive relief is a remedy, not a cause of action. *See Prompt Med. Sys., L.P. v. Allscriptsmisys Healthcare Sols., Inc.*, No. 6:10-CV-71, 2011 WL 12863577, at *1 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 11, 2011) (noting that the defendants in that case failed to provide any authority that an injunction must be pleaded with more specific facts). *See also AT&T Techs., Inc. v. Commc’ns Workers of Am.*, 475 U.S. 643, 649 (1986) (“[I]n deciding whether the parties have agreed to submit a particular grievance to arbitration, a court is not to rule on the potential merits of the underlying claims.”).

Given the plain meaning of the language chosen by the Parties, and there being no basis for reading significant limitations into the express exclusion, the Court concludes that there is, in this case, a “positive assurance” that no reasonable interpretation of the arbitration clause would force this action into arbitration. *See Pers. Sec. & Safety Sys.*, 297 F.3d at 392 (“[A] valid agreement to arbitrate applies ‘unless it can be said with positive assurance that [the] arbitration clause is not susceptible of an interpretation which would cover the dispute at issue.’ ”) (quoting *Neal v. Hardee’s Food Sys., Inc.*, 918 F.2d 34, 37 (5th Cir. 1990)).

b. The Question of Arbitrability

The Parties disagree as to who should determine the scope of the arbitration clause in this case—the arbitrator or this Court. A general presumption exists in favor of arbitrability being decided by the Court, as “the law presumes that courts have plenary power to decide the gateway question of a dispute’s ‘arbitrability’—*i.e.*, ‘whether [the parties] agreed to arbitrate the merits.’ ” *Houston Ref., L.P. v. United Steel, Paper & Forestry, Rubber, Mfg.*, 765 F.3d 396, 408 (5th Cir. 2014) (quoting *First Options*, 514 U.S. at 942). Thus, the Court concludes that the question of arbitrability should not be sent to the arbitrator in these narrow circumstances for two reasons: (1) the Parties did not clearly and unmistakably agree to arbitrate the arbitrability of actions seeking injunctive relief; and (2) Defendants’ argument that Plaintiff’s claims fall within the scope of the arbitration clause is wholly groundless. The Court will address these two independent rationales in turn

i. Clear and Unmistakable Evidence

Courts often find clear and unmistakable evidence of an agreement to arbitrate arbitrability when an agreement includes an express delegation provision. *See, e.g., Aviles v. Russell Stover Candies, Inc.*, 559 F. App’x 413, 415 (5th Cir. 2014) (holding that the delegation clause provided clear and unmistakable evidence that the parties intended to arbitrate arbitrability). “A delegation provision is an ‘agree[ment] to arbitrate “gateway” questions of “arbitrability,” such as . . . whether [the parties] agreement covers a particular controversy.” *Douglas v. Regions Bank*, 757 F.3d 460, 462 (5th Cir. 2014). There is no *express* delegation clause in the

agreement before this Court. Nonetheless, as Schein and the Manufacturer Defendants correctly note, the Fifth Circuit has held that the adoption of the AAA rules to govern arbitration proceedings “presents clear and unmistakable evidence that the parties agreed to arbitrate arbitrability.” *Cooper v. WestEnd Capital Mgmt., L.L.C.*, 832 F.3d 534, 546 (5th Cir. 2016) (quoting *Petrofac, Inc. v. DynMcDermott Petroleum Operations, Co.*, 687 F.3d 671, 675 (5th Cir. 2012)). As such, Defendants rely on *Petrofac* to argue that the Magistrate Judge correctly decided to refer the case to an arbitrator to determine arbitrability based on the Parties incorporation of the AAA rules. (Dkt. No. 46, at 1; Dkt. No. 47, at 13.)

As Plaintiff noted during its oral argument, the arbitration clause in *Petrofac* did not contain any exclusions. Rather, it was a standard broad arbitration clause. Plaintiff also argues that unlike the arbitration clause in *Petrofac*, the arbitration clause here “cabins application of the AAA rules to disputes ‘arising under or related to’ the Agreement that are *not* ‘actions seeking injunctive relief’ or ‘disputes relating to trademarks, trade secrets or other intellectual property of Pelton & Crane.’ ” (Dkt. No. 48, at 1 (emphasis added).) In other words, according to Plaintiff, the clause represents an agreement that the AAA rules would govern only when the dispute did *not* fall within the expressly excluded categories. This Court finds such argument to have merit.

Although Plaintiff’s argument at first blush appears circular, the logic of Plaintiff’s argument holds true given the exclusion expressly set forth by the Parties. For example, if the present action fell *outside* of the clause’s express exclusion, any questions as to arbitrability (*e.g.*,

whether a particular cause of action “arises out of or relates to” the agreement) would be sent promptly to the arbitrator. That is not the case here, where the present action falls squarely within the terms of an express carve-out. Indeed, it would be senseless to have the AAA rules apply to proceedings that are not subject to arbitration. As such, there is no reason to believe that incorporation of the AAA rules, including the AAA rule that delegates the question of arbitrability to the arbitrator, should indicate a clear and unmistakable intention that the parties agreed to arbitrate the question of arbitrability in these circumstances—when an action falls squarely within the clause excluding actions like this from arbitration. *See James & Jackson, LLC v. Willie Gary, LLC*, 906 A.2d 76, 81 (Del. 2006) (addressing a broad arbitration clause that contained a clause allowing injunctive relief to be pursued in court and holding that “[s]ince this arbitration clause does not generally refer *all* controversies to arbitration, the federal majority rule does not apply, and something other than the incorporation of the AAA rules would be needed to establish that the parties intended to submit arbitrability questions to an arbitrator”) (emphasis added).

ii. The “Wholly Groundless” Exception

Even if this Court were to find that the adoption of the AAA rules constituted clear and unmistakable evidence that the Parties agreed to arbitrate the question of arbitrability in these unique circumstances, recent guidance from the Fifth Circuit indicates that in narrow circumstances, a court should nonetheless determine arbitrability where a defendant’s argument in favor of arbitrability is “wholly groundless.” *Douglas*, 757 F.3d at 463–64. In *Douglas*, the Fifth Circuit addressed whether

the question of arbitrability should be sent to the arbitrator. *Id.* at 462. The arbitration clause at issue in that case defined the “disputes” that would be subject to arbitration as including “the validity, enforceability, or scope of this Arbitration provision.” *Id.* at 462. Despite the existence of an express delegation clause in the arbitration agreement (which does not exist here), the Fifth Circuit held that the question of arbitrability need not be sent to arbitration. *Id.* at 462–63.

The Circuit held that “[t]he law of this circuit does not require all claims to be sent to gateway arbitration merely because there is a delegation provision.” *Id.* at 463. In its analysis, the Fifth Circuit relied on a test established by the Federal Circuit, a test that “most accurately reflects the law—that what must be arbitrated is a matter of the parties’ intent.” *Id.* at 464.⁵ The Federal Circuit’s test involves two steps: “(1) did the parties ‘unmistakably intend to delegate the power to decide arbitrability to an arbitrator,’ and if so, (2) is the assertion of arbitrability ‘wholly groundless.’ ” *Agere Sys., Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.*, 560 F.3d 337, 340 (5th Cir. 2009) (quoting *Qualcomm Inc. v. Nokia Corp.*, 466 F.3d 1366, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2006)). As applied, “the ‘wholly groundless’ inquiry ‘necessarily requires the courts to examine and, to a limited extent, construe the underlying agreement.’ ”

⁵ Though cited with approval, it is unclear whether the Fifth Circuit has expressly adopted the Federal Circuit’s “wholly groundless” test. Regardless, even if that test has not been adopted by the Fifth Circuit, as discussed in Section IV.b.i above the Court finds that there is not clear and unmistakable evidence that the Parties intended to send the question of arbitrability to an arbitrator because the adoption of the AAA rules in this case applies only to matters subject to arbitration—not to those that are expressly excluded from arbitration.

Douglas, 757 F.3d at 463 (quoting *InterDigital Commc'ns, LLC v. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 718 F.3d 1336, 1346–47 (Fed. Cir. 2013), vacated on other grounds, 134 S.Ct. 1876 (2014) (vacating on mootness grounds)).

In so holding, the Fifth Circuit emphasized that to hold otherwise would require the plaintiff to go to an arbitrator merely to have the arbitrator “flatly” explain that the claim did not fall within the scope of the agreement and promptly send plaintiff back to court. *Douglas*, 757 F.3d at 463. The Circuit noted the absurdity of such a process:

When [plaintiff] signed the arbitration agreement containing a delegation provision, did she intend to go through the rigmaroles of arbitration just so the arbitrator can tell her in the first instance that her claim has nothing whatsoever to do with her arbitration agreement, and she should now feel free to file in federal court? Obviously not. *Id.* at 464.

The same unequivocal response from the arbitrator would just as readily occur here, where the plain language of the clause carves out and excludes the action brought by this Plaintiff. As discussed above in Section IV.a, Defendants’ argument that this action seeking injunctive relief should be referred to arbitration is wholly without merit based on the plain language of the arbitration clause itself. As a result, the Court finds that even if the inclusion of the AAA rules for disputes not carved out by the Parties’ own language is held to be clear and unmistakable evidence that the parties generally agreed to arbitrate the question of arbitrability, Defendants’ assertion that this

particular action should be arbitrated is “wholly groundless.” Additionally, given the clarity of the arbitration provision discussed above, it would be senseless to refer the issue of arbitrability to the arbitrator, only to have the arbitrator read the plain language of the clause and then send the Parties back to this Court.

The Court recognizes that the “wholly groundless” exception in *Douglas* should be used only in “exceptional” circumstances, and the Court does not seek to expand that narrow exception by applying it in this case. *See Kubala v. Supreme Prod. Servs., Inc.*, 830 F.3d 199, 202 n.1 (5th Cir. 2016) (“Such cases are exceptional, and the rule in *Douglas* is not a license for the court to prejudge arbitrability disputes more properly left to the arbitrator pursuant to a valid delegation clause. So long as there is a ‘plausible’ argument that the arbitration agreement requires the merits of the claim to be arbitrated, a delegation clause is effective to divest the court of its ordinary power to decide arbitrability.”). However, given the precise facts of this case—that there is no express delegation of arbitrability, but simply the adoption of the AAA rules for disputes not excluded from arbitration—and given that the plain meaning of the language at issue leaves Schein and the Manufacturer Defendants with no plausible argument that this action falls within the narrowed parameters of those disputes subject to arbitration, application of the *Douglas* exception is appropriate in this particular case.

c. Equitable Estoppel

Having concluded that this action falls within the express exclusion contained in the parties’ arbitration clause and that this action is not subject to mandatory arbitration, the Court need not decide, and does not reach, the

question of whether the third parties to the arbitration clause in this case can enforce such arbitration clause.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Magistrate Judge's Order should be and hereby is **REVERSED**. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Order (Dkt. No. 44) is hereby **VACATED**. Accordingly, the Motions to Compel Arbitration filed by Defendant Schein and the Manufacturer Defendants are **DENIED**, and the stay previously entered in this case is hereby **LIFTED**.

The trial date for this action is hereby set for February 5, 2018, and the pre-trial hearing date is set for January 8, 2018. Accordingly, the Parties are **ORDERED** to meet and confer and thereafter jointly submit a proposed Docket Control Order to the Court within 14 days of this Order based on the above trial and pre-trial dates.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this 7th day of December, 2016.

/s/ Rodney Gilstrap
Rodney Gilstrap
United States District Judge

APPENDIX C

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

ARCHER AND WHITE SALES, INC.

v.

HENRY SCHEIN, INC., et al.

Case No. 2:12-CV-572-JRG-RSP

05/28/2013

MEMORANDUM ORDER

ROY S. PAYNE, United States Magistrate Judge.

Currently before the Court are the two motions to compel arbitration, filed by Defendant Henry Schein, Inc. (Dkt. No. 14) and by Defendants Danaher Corporation, Dental Equipment LLC, Dental Imaging Technologies Corporation, Instrumentarium Dental Inc., and KaVo Dental Technologies, LLC (hereinafter “the Manufacturer Defendants”) (Dkt. No. 10). For the reasons that follow, the motions are **GRANTED**.

Plaintiff (“Archer”) is a distributor of dental equipment and competes directly against Defendant Henry

Schein, Inc. (“Schein”), which is alleged to be the biggest distributor in the country. Defendant Danaher Corporation (“Danaher”), which is alleged to be the biggest manufacturer of dental equipment, has over the last decade acquired all of the other named defendants, formerly its smaller competitors in the dental equipment manufacturing field. Archer alleges that Schein conspired with Danaher and its subsidiaries, and one unnamed large distributor, to restrict Archer’s access to the market because Archer was attempting to sell the equipment to dentists at discounted prices. In these motions, the Defendants assert that Archer is bound by arbitration clauses in its distributor agreements with some of the Manufacturer Defendants. Defendants also assert that the doctrine of equitable estoppel allows even the Defendants who are not parties to any contract with Archer containing an arbitration clause to demand arbitration.

The starting point for this case is the arbitration clause itself. However, it must be read against the background of the strong public policy in favor of arbitration expressed in the Federal Arbitration Act. 9 U.S.C. § 1, et seq. The clause provides: “Any dispute arising under or related to this Agreement (except for actions seeking injunctive relief and disputes relating to trademarks, trade secrets or other intellectual property of Pelton & Crane¹) shall be resolved by binding arbitration in accordance with the arbitration rules of the American Arbitration Association.” Three parts of this clause bear upon the outcome of the dispute. First, the opening clause is a broad one, referring as it does to *any* dispute *related* to the agreement. Second, that broad clause has an exception for

¹ Pelton & Crane was the predecessor of one of the Danaher subsidiaries.

actions seeking injunctive relief. Third, the clause incorporates the rules of the AAA.

The Court has no hesitation in concluding that this lawsuit is a dispute “related” to the distributor agreement. After all, the very rights that Archer claims the Defendants conspired to defeat were created by the distributor agreement and others like it that the record suggests have similar arbitration clauses. *E.g.*, Dkt. No. 24 at 11. The fact that Archer was an authorized dealer for the equipment at issue is essential to its claims. However, the exception carved out for actions seeking injunctive relief is problematic to the motions to compel arbitration. On the most superficial level, this lawsuit is clearly an action seeking injunctive relief since it *does* seek that relief. On the other hand, it does not seek *only* injunctive relief, and the Court is persuaded that damages (described in Paragraph 1 of the Complaint as “in the tens of millions of dollars”) are the predominant relief sought. The incorporation of the rules of the AAA provides the answer to this problem, as those rules very clearly state that the question of the arbitrability of a dispute is referred to the arbitrator under the AAA rules.

In *Petrofac, Inc. v. DynMcDermott Petrol Operations, Co.*, 687 F.3d 671, 675 (5th Cir. 2012), the Court held that “We agree with most of our sister circuits that the express adoption of these [AAA] rules presents clear and unmistakable evidence that the parties agreed to arbitrate arbitrability.” If there were no reasonable construction of the contract that allowed for arbitration, there would be nothing for an arbitrator to decide. However, there is in this case a plausible construction calling for arbitration. Thus, the question of whether the exception for actions seeking injunctive relief should be limited

to actions for an injunction in aid of arbitration or to enforce an arbitrator's award, should properly be left for the arbitrator to decide.

The case relied upon by Archer actually supports this analysis. In *State of New York v. Oneida Indian Nation of New York*, 90 F.3d 58, 62 (2nd Cir. 1996), the Court held that “While it is true that exclusionary clauses should not be given expansive readings, here the language excluding a certain class of disputes from arbitration was *clear and unambiguous*.” (emphasis supplied). As shown above, that standard has not been met here.

The next question is whether non-signatory defendants can avail themselves of the arbitration clause. Both sides agree that *Grigson v. Creative Artists Agency L.L.C.*, 210 F.3d 524 (5th Cir. 2000), is the controlling authority on the application of the doctrine of equitable estoppel in this circumstance, namely whether Archer is estopped from asserting the lack of privity against the non-signatory defendants who seek to compel arbitration.² In *Grigson*, the Fifth Circuit expressly adopted the Eleventh Circuit's test applying equitable estoppel to non-signatory parties seeking to compel arbitration of “intertwined” claims. That test provides:

“Existing case law demonstrates that equitable estoppel allows a nonsignatory to compel arbitration in two different circumstances. *First, equitable estoppel applies when the signatory to a written agreement*

² Because both sides agree that *Grigson* is controlling, the Court need not consider whether *Arthur Andersen LLP v. Carlisle*, 556 U.S. 624 (U.S., 2009) would call for further analysis under state law.

containing an arbitration clause must rely on the terms of the written agreement in asserting its claims against the nonsignatory. When each of a signatory's claims against a nonsignatory makes reference to or presumes the existence of the written agreement, the signatory's claims arise out of and relate directly to the written agreement, and arbitration is appropriate. Second, application of equitable estoppel is warranted when the signatory to the contract containing an arbitration clause raises allegations of substantially interdependent and concerted misconduct by both the nonsignatory and one or more of the signatories to the contract. Otherwise the arbitration proceedings between the two signatories would be rendered meaningless and the federal policy in favor of arbitration effectively thwarted."

Id. at 527. (emphasis original). Both branches of the test appear to apply here. First, Archer has to rely on its written distributorship agreement with Pelton & Crane in order to allege that it was wrongfully excluded from the market (e.g., Complaint ¶ 32, Dkt. No. 1 at 10). Second, the conspiracy alleged between Schein and the Manufacturer Defendants alleges "substantially interdependent and concerted misconduct by both the nonsignatory and one or more of the signatories to the contract." Finally, the Court cannot presume that the defendants did act wrongfully, which would be necessary in order for equity or fairness to override the application of the doctrine in this instance.

Accordingly, the Motions to Compel Arbitration are granted and this action is stayed pending arbitration of the claims asserted herein. All parties are directed to notify the Court when the arbitration process is complete or if it has been abandoned.

SIGNED this 28th day of May, 2013.

/s/ Roy S. Payne

Roy S. Payne

United States Bankruptcy Judge

APPENDIX D

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-41674

ARCHER AND WHITE SALES, INC.,

Plaintiff-Appellee

v.

HENRY SCHEIN, INC., DANAHER CORPORA-
TION, INSTRUMENTARIUM DENTAL INC., DEN-
TAL EQUIPMENT LLC, KAVO DENTAL TECH-
NOLOGIES LLC, AND DENTAL IMAGING TECH-
NOLOGIES CORPORATION,

Defendants-Appellants

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Eastern District of Texas

Before HIGGINBOTHAM, GRAVES, and HIGGIN-
SON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

IT IS ORDERED that Defendants-Appellants' mo-
tion for stay pending appeal is **DENIED**.