

1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3
 4 WANDA GREENWOOD; LADELLE
 5 HATFIELD; and DEBORAH MCCLEESE,
 6 on behalf of themselves and
 7 others similarly situated,

8 Plaintiffs,

9 v.

10 COMPUCREDIT CORPORATION; COLUMBUS
 11 BANK AND TRUST, jointly and
 12 individually,

13 Defendants.
 14 _____/

No. 08-04878 CW

ORDER COMPELLING
 ARBITRATION OF
 PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS
 UNDER THE CREDIT
 REPAIR
 ORGANIZATIONS ACT

15 This Court previously denied Defendants CompuCredit
 16 Corporation's and Columbus Bank and Trust Company's motions to
 17 compel arbitration of Plaintiffs Wanda Greenwood's, Ladelle
 18 Hatfield's and Deborah McCleese's first and second causes of
 19 action under the Credit Repair Organizations Act (CROA).¹ Docket
 20 Nos. 17 and 27. Defendants appealed the order and the Ninth
 21 Circuit affirmed. However, on January 10, 2012, the Supreme Court
 22 reversed the judgment of the Ninth Circuit and ruled that the

23 ¹ In addition to Plaintiffs' causes of action under the CROA,
 24 they alleged claims under California's Unfair Competition Law.
 25 Although the proceedings as to Plaintiffs' CROA claims were stayed
 26 pending resolution of Defendants' interlocutory appeal, the
 27 parties continued to litigate the UCL claims. In the course of
 28 doing so, Greenwood's and Hatfield's UCL claims were dismissed.
 Transcript of September 16, 2010 hearing at 3:14-21. On March 5,
 2012, the Court granted Defendants' motion to compel arbitration
 of McCleese's UCL claim, stayed all further proceedings in the
 case and administratively closed the case, although retaining
 jurisdiction to enforce the arbitration award.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Federal Arbitration Act requires the arbitration agreement in this case to be enforced according to its terms as to the CROA claims. The Supreme Court remanded the case for further proceedings consistent with its opinion. On March 27, 2012, the Ninth Circuit vacated this Court's order denying Defendants' motion to compel arbitration and remanded the case for further proceedings consistent with the Supreme Court's opinion. On April 18, 2012, the Ninth Circuit issued its mandate and its judgment took effect.

Accordingly, the stay on Plaintiffs' CROA claim is lifted for the limited purpose of granting Defendants' motion to compel arbitration of the CROA claims. All further proceedings in this action are stayed. The Court has ordered this case administratively closed but retains jurisdiction to enforce the arbitration award.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 5/3/2012


CLAUDIA WILKEN
United States District Judge