

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE,  
LLP,

Petitioner,

v.

ENGAGEPOINT, INC.,

Respondent.

No. 2:17-cv-01163-KJM-KJN

ORDER

Before the court is an unopposed petition to confirm an arbitration award and for entry of judgement under the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 1. Petition, ECF No. 1 (filed June 2, 2017). The parties stipulated to have this petition decided on the papers, without a hearing, as Local Rule 230(c) permits. ECF Nos. 12, 13.

Any party to arbitration may petition a federal district court for an order confirming the final award. 9 U.S.C. § 9. The petition must be filed within one year of entry of an arbitration award and the petition must include the arbitration agreement and the award itself. *Id.* § 13. Once received, “the court must grant” the petition unless the award is vacated, modified, or corrected. *Id.* § 9.

////

1 Here, the parties resolved a dispute about unpaid legal fees through arbitration.  
2 Riddell Decl. ¶ 3, ECF No. 1-2. On June 1, 2017, the presiding Arbitrator entered a final award  
3 for \$1,544,883.68 in petitioner’s favor. *Id.* Ex. A. Petitioner has timely filed all necessary  
4 documents for an order confirming the arbitration award. *See* ECF No 1. The parties also  
5 stipulate that there is no dispute regarding this award. Stipulation, ECF No. 12 (June 7, 2017).  
6 Lastly, respondent’s attorney, James E. Carbine, declares that “Respondent does not seek to have  
7 the Arbitration Award vacated, modified, or corrected[,]” and that “Respondent does not oppose  
8 [this] Petition . . .” Carbine Decl. ¶ 7, ECF No. 1-3.

9 Accordingly, having reviewed all documents, the petition is GRANTED. The  
10 court, as provided by 9 U.S.C. §§ 9 and 13, hereby CONFIRMS the arbitration award and all  
11 terms therein and DIRECTS the Clerk of the Court to enter judgment in favor of Petitioner  
12 Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP in the amount of \$1,544,883.68. The judgment entered  
13 “shall be docketed as if it was rendered in an action,” “shall have the same force and effect . . .  
14 [as] a judgment in an action,” and “may be enforced as if it had been rendered in an action in the  
15 court in which it is entered.” 9 U.S.C. § 13.

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 DATED: August 8, 2017.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE