



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

June 8, 2015

Media Contact: Alex Booze | [abooze@wlf.org](mailto:abooze@wlf.org) | 202-588-0302

## In Win for WLF, High Court Will Decide Whether Class-Action Defendants May Raise All Defenses

*(Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Bouaphakeo)*

**“Class actions allow courts to increase procedural efficiency by deciding claims in one fell swoop. They should not be used, as here, to deprive a defendant of its substantive right to defend against individual claims.”—Richard Samp, WLF Chief Counsel**

**WASHINGTON, DC**—The U.S. Supreme Court today agreed to review an appeals court decision that authorized plaintiffs’ attorneys to conduct a class-wide “trial by formula”—that is, a class-action trial at which the defendant was not permitted to litigate its statutory defenses to individual claims. The decision to hear *Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Bouaphakeo* marked a victory for Washington Legal Foundation (WLF), which filed a brief urging review.

WLF argued that preventing a class-action defendant from raising otherwise available defenses to the claims of individual class members violates class-action rules and that it conflicts with the Court’s *Wal-Mart v. Dukes* decision. The Court will hear oral argument in *Tyson Foods* this fall and will issue what could be a far-reaching class-action decision by this time next year.

The lawsuit involves 3,300 employees who claim the defendant paid them insufficient overtime wages. The plaintiffs’ attorneys introduced evidence purporting to show how many minutes of off-production-line work (i.e., putting on protective gear and later taking it off) the “average” employee undertook in a typical week. A jury awarded the plaintiff class \$2.9 million on the basis of that testimony. The appeals court affirmed, even though the defendant was denied the right to demonstrate that a significant percentage of the individual members of the plaintiff class worked no overtime at all.

WLF’s brief urging review noted that federal appeals courts have reached sharply conflicting conclusions regarding the meaning of the *Dukes* decision and the extent to which it precludes use of statistical techniques that presume all class members are identical to the average observed in a sample. WLF also noted a sharp conflict among the appeals courts regarding whether it is proper to certify a class when, as here, a significant percentage of class members are uninjured and thus would lack standing to sue on their own behalf.

In response to the Court’s action, WLF issued the following statement by Chief Counsel Richard Samp: “Class actions allow courts to increase procedural efficiency by deciding identical claims in one fell swoop. They should not be used, as here, to deprive a defendant of its substantive right to defend against individual claims. The Supreme Court’s 2011 *Dukes* decision barred class certification under these circumstances, but some appeals courts have yet to get the message.”

*WLF is a national, public interest law firm and policy center that regularly litigates in support of civil justice reform, to ensure that unwarranted lawsuits do not drive up costs for all consumers.*