

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

MORRIS CM ENTERPRISES, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

WINGSTOP FRANCHISING, LLC,

Defendants.

WINGSTOP FRANCHISING LLC,

Counter-Claimant,

v.

MORRIS CM ENTERPRISE, LLC and  
MICHAEL MORRIS,

Counter-Defendants.

No. 2:19-cv-02306-KJM-CKD

ORDER

On January 17, 2020, the court heard argument on the motion to stay the case pending arbitration brought by defendant and counterclaimant Wingstop Franchising LLC. Timothy Moppin appeared for Morris CM Enterprises LLC and specially appeared for Michael Morris, and Sean Newland appeared for Wingstop Franchising LLC. Having considered the arguments of the parties and the applicable law, the court GRANTS the motion.

1 I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

2 This case arises from a dispute between Wingstop Franchising LLC (“Wingstop”),  
3 the eponymous franchisor of Wingstop restaurants, and its franchisee, Morris CM Enterprises,  
4 LLC (“Morris CM”). Morris CM sued Wingstop in Sacramento County Superior Court on  
5 October 19, 2019, for wrongful termination of its franchise, breach of the covenant of good faith  
6 and fair dealing and interference with economic relations. *Morris CM Enterprises LLC v.*  
7 *Wingstop Franchising LLC*, Sac. Cty. Sup. Ct. Case No. 34-2019-00267448; Not. Removal, ECF  
8 No. 1. On November 15, 2019, Wingstop removed the suit to the Eastern District. Not.  
9 Removal. The same day, Wingstop counterclaimed for violations of the Lanham Act and breach  
10 of contract, adding Michael Morris, the principal officer of Morris CM as a counterdefendant.  
11 ECF No. 5. On November 19, 2019, Wingstop moved for a preliminary injunction requiring  
12 Morris CM and Michael Morris to immediately discontinue use of Wingstop’s brand and  
13 intellectual property. Mot. Prelim. Inj., ECF No. 8. On January 3, 2020, the court granted the  
14 motion and enjoined Morris CM and Michael Morris (collectively, “the Morris parties”) from  
15 using Wingstop’s intellectual property or brand identification at the restaurant at issue. Order for  
16 Prelim. Inj., ECF No. 17.

17 Wingstop now moves to stay the action, or in the alternative dismiss it on the basis  
18 that the parties’ franchise agreement makes their dispute subject to arbitration. Mot. Stay, ECF  
19 No. 9. The franchise agreement contains an arbitration clause, which provides:

20 Franchisee and Company agree that, except as provided below in this  
21 section 24(b), all controversies, disputes, or claims between Company and  
22 its Affiliates, and their respective owners, officers, directors, agents and/or  
employees, and Franchisee (and/or its owners, guarantors, Affiliates and/or  
employees) arising out of or related to:

- 23 (1) this Agreement or any other agreement between Franchisee and  
24 Company;
- 25 (2) Company’s relationship with Franchisee;
- 26 (3) the scope or validity of this Agreement or any other agreement between  
27 Franchisee and Company (including the validity and scope of the  
28 arbitration obligation under this Section, which Company and  
Franchisee acknowledge is to be determined by an arbitrator and not by  
a court); or

1 (4) any standard, specification, operation procedure, or rule;

2 must be submitted for binding arbitration, on demand of either party, to the  
3 AAA.

4 Franchise Agreement, ECF No. 9-3 at § 24(b).

5 There is an express exemption in the agreement for Wingstop to seek injunctive  
6 relief from a court to enjoin the use of its intellectual property and branding:

7  
8 Despite Franchisee's and Company's agreement to arbitrate provided  
9 above, Company and Franchisee agree that Company has no obligation  
10 whatsoever to arbitrate the following disputes: (i) disputes that arise under  
11 or are related to the Lanham Act, as now or later amended; (ii) disputes that  
12 otherwise relate to the ownership or validity of any of the Marks;  
13 (iii) disputes that involve enforcement of Company's intellectual property  
14 rights, including, but not limited to, Company's Confidential Information,  
15 Trade Secrets, and Copyrighted Materials; or (iv) disputes related to  
16 Company's enforcement of the covenants not to compete in Section 19.  
17 Company may enforce its rights in the disputes described in clauses (i)  
18 through (iv) exclusively in court.

19 Franchise Agreement at 43.

20 Morris CM contends the arbitration clause is unconscionable. Opp'n, ECF No. 16  
21 at 4. It asserts the arbitration provision is a contract of adhesion, claiming Morris CM and Mr.  
22 Morris<sup>1</sup> "felt pressure to sign any agreements or documents that Defendant presented to them,"  
23 and therefore the contract is procedurally unconscionable. *Id.* at 5. Morris CM alleges it "had no  
24 opportunity to review the documents, including the arbitration provision, or to consult with an  
25 attorney prior to signing them," and that the terms were "buried in pre-printed, standard forms."  
26 *Id.* Morris CM alleges Wingstop's failure to provide a copy of the American Arbitration  
27 Association (AAA) rules at the signing of the franchise agreement makes the agreement  
28 procedurally unconscionable. *Id.* at 5-6.

29 Morris CM alleges the clause is also substantively unconscionable in that it  
30 restricts Morris CM's right to discovery. *Id.* at 6. The clause restricts discovery in that it does not

---

31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

<sup>1</sup> Michael Morris has not yet appeared in the action. As noted above, counsel for Morris CM Enterprises, Timothy Moppin, represented he was specially appearing for Michael Morris at hearing. The Opposition recites facts applicable to a natural person and do not specify any agent or representative other than Michael Morris acting on behalf of Morris CM.

1 provide an express provision for discovery; it only incorporates by reference the AAA rules. *Id.*  
2 at 7.

3 Morris CM asserts as a second claimed ground for substantive unconscionability  
4 the silence of the clause and the AAA rules regarding who bears the cost of arbitration. *Id.*  
5 Morris CM contends it is substantively unconscionable that the AAA rules “say nothing explicitly  
6 about the exact amount of fees: instead parties, like Plaintiff, are left to their own devices to figure  
7 out what their payment obligations would be if they are forced to fight their dispute in a forum to  
8 which they never agreed.” *Id.*

9 Wingstop’s reply asserts that in any event, the agreement expressly delegates  
10 questions of validity and enforceability, including the issue of the enforceability of the arbitration  
11 clause itself, to the arbitrator. Reply at 1, ECF No. 19; *see also* Franchise Agreement § 24(b)(3).

12 Wingstop moves to stay the case under 9 U.S.C. § 3 pending arbitration of the  
13 dispute. Mot. to Stay, ECF No. 9. Morris CM opposes, Opp’n, and Wingstop replied. No  
14 motion to compel arbitration is currently pending. On March 12, 2020, Wingstop moved for a  
15 default judgment against Morris CM for its intellectual property counterclaims. Mot. for Default  
16 J., ECF No. 30. Magistrate Judge Carolyn K. Delaney recommended granting the motion for  
17 default judgment on June 1, 2020. F&Rs, ECF No. 38.

18 II. LEGAL STANDARD

19 Under the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA), written agreements to arbitrate are  
20 “valid, irrevocable, and enforceable.” 9 U.S.C. § 2. Under 9 U.S.C. § 3, the court must stay the  
21 action on application of a party “upon being satisfied that the issue involved in such suit or  
22 proceeding is referable to arbitration under” a written agreement to arbitrate between the parties.  
23 9 U.S.C. § 3; *see also Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Byrd*, 470 U.S. 213, 218 (1985) (holding  
24 “shall” in statute makes stay mandatory on satisfaction of court). To determine a dispute is  
25 referable to arbitration under the parties’ agreement, the court must determine “(1) whether a  
26 valid agreement to arbitrate exists and, if it does, (2) whether the agreement encompasses the  
27 dispute at issue.” *Kilgore v. KeyBank Nat. Ass’n*, 718 F. 3d 1052, 1058 (9th Cir. 2013) (quoting  
28 *Chiron Corp. v. Ortho Diagnostic Sys. Inc.*, 207 F. 3d 1126, 1130 (9th Cir. 2000)).

1           The FAA makes agreements to arbitrate valid and enforceable, “save upon such  
2 grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract.” 9 U.S.C. § 3. This  
3 savings clause was intended to preserve generally applicable state law contract defenses such as  
4 unconscionability. *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, 563 U.S. 333, 339 (2011). State law  
5 doctrines may not be applied in a way that disfavors or discriminates against arbitration  
6 provisions. *Id.* at 341.

7           III.    DISCUSSION

8           Morris CM’s sole argument is that the arbitration clause as a whole is  
9 unconscionable and thus unenforceable. *See* Opp’n at 2–8. Morris CM cites *Armendariz v.*  
10 *Foundation Health Psychcare Servs., Inc.*, 24 Cal. 4th 83 (2000), for the proposition that  
11 unconscionable provisions of the arbitration agreement render it entirely unenforceable. At  
12 hearing, Morris CM stood on its assertion that *Armendariz* controls the outcome here, even where  
13 Morris CM has not specifically challenged the agreement’s delegation provision. While it is true  
14 that state law contract defenses such as unconscionability may render an arbitration agreement  
15 unenforceable under the FAA, *Concepcion*, 563 U.S. at 339, Wingstop correctly notes the  
16 Supreme Court has substantially narrowed the application of the unconscionability defense, as  
17 explained in *Armendariz* itself.

18           Wingstop responds that the arbitration clause expressly delegates the question of  
19 enforceability of the clause to the arbitrator, including the resolution of defenses such as  
20 unconscionability. Reply at 1–3. Wingstop specifically contends that under *Rent-A-Center,*  
21 *West, Inc. v. Jackson*, 561 U.S. 63 (2010), Morris CM’s failure to specifically challenge the  
22 enforceability of the delegation provision leaves the decision of whether the arbitration provision  
23 is unconscionable for the arbitrator to decide.

24           In *Rent-A-Center*, an employee opposed a motion to compel arbitration, arguing  
25 the arbitration agreement he had signed was procedurally and substantively unconscionable. *Id.*  
26 at 66. The employee’s challenges rested on grounds the provision limited the number of  
27 depositions, had a cost-sharing arrangement, and was one-sided in the claims subject to  
28 arbitration. *Id.* at 73–74. The arbitration agreement the employee had signed provided that “[t]he

1 Arbitrator, and not any federal, state, or local court or agency, shall have exclusive authority to  
2 resolve any dispute relating to the interpretation, applicability, enforceability, or formation of this  
3 Agreement including, but not limited to any claim that all or any part of this Agreement is void or  
4 voidable.” *Id.* at 66. The Ninth Circuit below had held that where “a party challenges an  
5 arbitration agreement as unconscionable, and thus asserts that he could not meaningfully assent to  
6 the agreement, the threshold question of unconscionability is for the court.” *Id.* at 67 (*quoting*  
7 *Rent-A-Center, West, Inc. v. Jackson*, 581 F. 3d 912 (2009)).

8 The Supreme Court reversed. Examining the filings, the Court concluded the  
9 employee had never challenged the delegation provision specifically, only other portions of the  
10 arbitration agreement. *Id.* at 73–74. The employee argued the challenged provisions rendered the  
11 entire agreement to arbitrate invalid, including the delegation provision. *Id.* at 74. The Supreme  
12 Court rejected this line of reasoning. The Court held where there is “clear and unmistakable”  
13 evidence of intent to arbitrate arbitrability, “unless [the employee] challenged the delegation  
14 provision specifically, we must treat it as valid under § 2, and must enforce it under §§ 3 and 4,  
15 leaving any challenge to the validity of the Agreement as a whole for the arbitrator.” *Id.* at 70  
16 n.1, 72.

17 This case is analogous to *Rent-A-Center*. The arbitration provision at issue here  
18 contains an express delegation to the arbitrator to determine “the validity and scope of the  
19 arbitration obligation under this Section, which [Wingstop] and [Morris CM] acknowledge is to  
20 be determined by an arbitrator and not by a court[.]” Franchise Agreement at 42. Morris CM  
21 challenges the arbitration agreement as procedurally unconscionable on the grounds that (1) the  
22 arbitration provision is a contract of adhesion and (2) the provision incorporates the AAA rules by  
23 reference without providing the rules themselves to Morris CM, which made Morris CM unable  
24 to determine its rights and obligations under arbitration at the time the agreement was signed.  
25 Opp’n at 4–6. Morris CM specifically claims the arbitration agreement is substantively  
26 unconscionable in that it (1) restricts the right to discovery and (2) is unclear about which party is  
27 obligated to pay the costs of arbitration. *Id.* at 6–8. As a result, it argues, “the arbitration

28 /////

1 provision is irreparably tainted, cannot be reformed by severing the numerous unconscionable  
2 provisions, and is therefore unenforceable.” *Id.* at 8.

3           Just as in *Rent-A-Center*, the delegation provision in this case is “clear and  
4 unmistakable” evidence of the parties’ intent to arbitrate arbitrability. The provision declares  
5 expressly that the question of the validity of the agreement, including the arbitration provision  
6 itself, is for the arbitrator. Morris CM’s opposition is silent as to the delegation provision. At  
7 hearing, Morris CM confirmed it did not challenge the delegation provision specifically. It  
8 argues, as the plaintiff employee did in *Rent-A-Center*, that other aspects of the arbitration clause  
9 are unconscionable, rendering the arbitration clause entirely unenforceable. But given the  
10 similarity of facts, *Rent-A-Center* controls the outcome here to Morris CM’s detriment.

11           A review of cases distinguishing or refusing to extend *Rent-A-Center* further  
12 supports the application of its rule. Courts have refused to apply *Rent-A-Center* in situations  
13 where there was no delegation provision, *Lopez v. American Express Bank, FSB*, No. CV 09-  
14 07335 SJO (MANx), 2010 WL 3637755 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2010); where the parties agreed  
15 California law controlled instead of the FAA, *Chin v. Advanced Fresh Concepts Franchise Corp.*,  
16 194 Cal. App. 4th 704, 708–709 (2011); and where the arbitration agreement incorporated the  
17 AAA rules governing delegation into the agreement by reference, *Fuqua v. Kenan Advantage*  
18 *Group, Inc.*, No. 3:11-cv-01463-ST, 2012 WL 2861613, at \*9 (D. Ore. April 13, 2012). In one  
19 instance, another judge of this court considered a plaintiff’s argument that her agreement with  
20 AT&T to market wireless products and services to customers through her cell phone store, which  
21 included an arbitration provision, was unconscionable. *Madgrigal v. AT&T Wireless Servs., Inc.*,  
22 No. 1:09-cv-0033-OWW-MJS, 2010 WL 5343299, at \*3 (E.D. Cal. 2010). The plaintiff in that  
23 case attempted to distinguish *Rent-A-Center* by pointing out the arbitration provision at issue was  
24 part of a larger contract, not a stand-alone arbitration agreement. *Id.* The plaintiff argued that by  
25 challenging the enforceability of the arbitration provision in the larger contract, she had satisfied  
26 the requirement to attack the delegation provision with specificity. *Id.* The court rejected that  
27 argument, observing “*Jackson* did not turn on the fact that the agreement was a ‘stand-alone’  
28 arbitration agreement.” *Id.*

