amount assessed against NUHW under "Diversion of Resources" equaled the exact combined amount of the other defendants, the jury did not follow the same pattern when awarding damages under "Lost Dues." There, the combined amount of the individual defendants equaled \$12,000; yet the jury only assessed \$4,000 against NUHW. These facts plausibly support the district court's inference from the special verdict that the jury intended to reject joint-and-several liability and instead embraced several liability.

The defendants also gloss over the most significant column on the verdict form: the final one, in which the jury entered discrete amounts for each defendant. Ultimately, the district court did no more than impose the exact liability for each defendant that the jury had entered on the special verdict form.

The defendants contend that SEIU has failed to reconcile the mathematical coincidences they have raised, but that burden does not fall on SEIU. The defendants cannot meet their burden by merely proving there may be other plausible interpretations of the verdict form. They must show that the district court's interpretation was implausible. Because we believe the defendants have not met that burden, we uphold the district court's interpretation of the verdict form and its denial of the defendants' motion to alter or amend the judgment.

# VI

The judgment of liability was properly entered when a correctly instructed jury, on a sufficient factual record, found the defendants in breach of their fiduciary duties under § 501 of the LMRDA and California state law. There was no abuse of discretion in the district court's ruling on the challenge to the special verdict the jury returned.

# AFFIRMED.

Matthew C. KILGORE, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; William Bruce Fuller, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; Plaintiffs-Appellees,

#### v.

- KEYBANK, NATIONAL ASSOCIA-TION, successor in interest to Key-Bank USA, N.A.; Key Education Resources, a division of KeyBank National Association; Great Lakes Education Loan Services, Inc., a Wisconsin corporation, Defendants-Appellants,
- Matthew C. Kilgore, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated; William Bruce Fuller, individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs-Appellants,
  - v.
- KeyBank, National Association, successor in interest to KeyBank USA, N.A.; Key Education Resources, a division of KeyBank National Association; Great Lakes Education Loan Services, Inc., a Wisconsin corporation, Defendants-Appellees.

Nos. 09-16703, 10-15934.

United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit.

Argued and Submitted En Banc Dec. 11, 2012. Filed April 11, 2013.

**Background:** Students who had obtained loans from bank to attend a now-defunct

flight school brought putative class action for injunctive relief based on alleged violations of the Holder Rule. Cause of action was removed to federal court, and defendants, the bank that originated student loans and loan servicer, moved to compel arbitration. The United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Thelton E. Henderson, Senior District Judge, 2009 WL 1975271, denied motion, and students appealed. A three-judge panel of the Court of Appeals, 673 F.3d 947, reversed, prior to rehearing en banc.

Holdings: On rehearing, the Court of Appeals, Hurwitz, Circuit Judge, held that:

- (1) arbitration clause in promissory notes that students signed to obtain loans from bank to attend a now-defunct flight school was neither substantively nor procedurally unconscionable under California law, and
- (2) even assuming continued viability of the *Broughton–Cruz* rule, under which suits for public injunctive relief are exempted from arbitration, this *Broughton–Cruz* rule did not apply to students' putative class action, brought to vindicate private rights of the approximately 120 putative class members.

Vacated, reversed, and remanded.

Pregerson, Circuit Judge, dissented and filed opinion.

# 1. Alternative Dispute Resolution ∞213(5)

On appeal, the Court of Appeals would review de novo whether district court had erred in declining to enforce arbitration clause and to compel arbitration.

# 2. Alternative Dispute Resolution @178

Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) mandates that district courts shall direct parties to proceed to arbitration on issues as to which arbitration agreement has been signed. 9 U.S.C.A. § 2.

# 3. Alternative Dispute Resolution ☞199, 200

Basic role for courts under the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) is to determine: (1) whether valid agreement to arbitrate exists and, if it does, (2) whether agreement encompasses the dispute at issue. 9 U.S.C.A. § 1 et seq.

# 4. Alternative Dispute Resolution ⊗≂134(1)

Federal Arbitration Act's (FAA's) savings clause, that arbitration agreements are enforceable "save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract," serves to preserve generally applicable contract defenses. 9 U.S.C.A. § 2.

### 5. Federal Courts @=403

Under the Federal Arbitration Act's (FAA's) savings clause, state law that arose to govern issues concerning the validity, revocability and enforceability of contracts generally, remains applicable to arbitration agreements, and generally applicable contract defenses, such as fraud, duress or unconscionability, may be applied to invalidate arbitration agreements. 9 U.S.C.A. § 2.

#### 6. Contracts ∞1

Under California law, contractual provision is unenforceable if it is both procedurally and substantively unconscionable.

### 7. Contracts 🖙 1

Under California law, the more substantively oppressive the contract term, the less evidence of procedural unconscionability is required for court to come to conclusion that term is unenforceable, and vice versa.

#### 8. Contracts ∞1

Under California law, "substantive unconscionability" focuses on one-sidedness or overly harsh effect of contract term or clause.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

#### 9. Alternative Dispute Resolution ⊗=134(6)

Arbitration clause in promissory notes that students signed to obtain loans from bank to attend a now-defunct flight school was not "substantively unconscionable" under California law, either in foreclosing possibility of class action by students against bank or based upon speculative possibility that students would incur arbitration fees in excess of their ability to pay, so that students could not rely on unconscionability doctrine to invalidate clause under the Federal Arbitration Act's (FAA's) savings clause. 9 U.S.C.A. § 2.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

#### 10. Contracts ∞¬1

Under California law, "procedural unconscionability" focuses on factors of surprise and oppression.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

#### 11. Alternative Dispute Resolution ⊗¬134(6)

Not only was arbitration clause in promissory notes that students signed to obtain loans from bank to attend a nowdefunct flight school not "substantively unconscionable" under California law, but it was also not "procedurally unconscionable," where clause was not buried in fine print in note, but was clearly labeled, in boldface, in separate section, and where clause allowed students to reject arbitration as form of dispute resolution within 60 days of signing note. 9 U.S.C.A. § 2.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

### 12. Alternative Dispute Resolution ©=120

Even assuming continued viability of the Broughton-Cruz rule, under which suits for public injunctive relief, that do not seek to resolve private dispute but to benefit the general public by remedying some public wrong, are exempted from arbitration, the Broughton-Cruz rule did not apply to putative class action brought by students that obtained loans from bank to attend a now-defunct flight school both to enjoin bank from reporting class members' nonpayment of their notes to credit agencies and to enjoin bank from enforcing notes or disbursing loan proceeds to any seller of consumer goods or services whose contract did not include the Holder Rule language; except for injunction against disbursal of loan proceeds, suit plainly sought relief that would benefit only the approximately 120 putative class members, and since plaintiffs acknowledged that bank had completely withdrawn from private school loan business and did not allege that bank was engaging in other comparable transactions, even the injunction enforcing the Holder Rule, for all practical purposes, related only to past harms suffered by members of this limited putative class. 9 U.S.C.A. § 2.

Andrew A. August and Kevin F. Rooney, Pinnacle Law Group, LLP; James C. Sturdevant (argued) and Whitney Huston, The Sturdevant Law Firm, San Francisco, CA, for Plaintiffs–Appellees/Appellants.

W. Scott O'Connell (argued) and W. Daniel Deane, Nixon Peabody LLP, Manchester, NH; and Sarah Andre and Matthew A. Richards, Nixon Peabody LLP, San Francisco, CA, for Defendants–Appellants/Appellees.

David Horton, Davis, CA; Hiro N. Aragaki, Los Angeles, CA, for Amici Curiae Law Professors.

Hiro N. Aragaki and David Doeling, Los Angeles, CA, for Amici Curiae Arbitration Professors.

Donald M. Falk, Mayer Brown LLP, Palo Alto, CA; Andrew J. Pincus (argued), Evan M. Tager, Archis A. Parasharami, and Scott M. Noveck, Mayer Brown LLP; Robin S. Conrad and Kate Comerford Todd, National Chamber Litigation Center, Inc., Washington, D.C., for Amicus Curiae The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America.

Steve Bullock and Kelley L. Hubbard, Office of the Montana Attorney General, Helena, MT, for Amicus Curiae State of Montana.

Arthur D. Levy; Nancy Barron, Kemnitzer, Barron & Krieg LLP, San Francisco, CA, for Amicus Curiae The National Association of Consumer Advocates and The National Consumer Law Center.

Ellen Lake, Oakland, CA; Terisa E. Chaw, The Employee Rights Advocacy Institute for Law & Policy; Rebecca M. Hamburg, National Employment Lawyers Association; Cliff Palefsky, McGuinn, Hillsman & Palefsky, San Francisco, CA, for Amici Curiae National Employment Lawyers Association, The Employee Rights Advocacy Institute for Law & Policy, and California Employment Lawyers Association.

Mark A. Chavez, Chavez & Gertler LLP, Mill Valley, CA, for Amicus Curiae The National Consumer Law Center, National Association of Consumer Advocates, Public Citizen and National Consumers League.

C. Dawn Causey and Gregory F. Taylor, American Bankers Association, Washington, D.C., for Amici Curiae American Bankers Association, Consumer Bankers Association, and the Clearing House Association, L.L.C.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Thelton E. Henderson, Senior District Judge, Presiding. D.C. No. 3:08-cv-02958-TEH.

Before: ALEX KOZINSKI, Chief Judge, HARRY PREGERSON, M. MARGARET McKEOWN, WILLIAM A. FLETCHER, RICHARD C. TALLMAN, CONSUELO M. CALLAHAN, MILAN D. SMITH, JR., MARY H. MURGUIA, MORGAN CHRISTEN, PAUL J. WATFORD, and ANDREW D. HURWITZ, Circuit Judges.

Opinion by Judge HURWITZ; Dissent by Judge PREGERSON.

# **OPINION**

#### HURWITZ, Circuit Judge:

This appeal involves a putative class action by former students of a failed flighttraining school who seek broad injunctive relief against the bank that originated their student loans and the loan servicer. The central issue is whether the district court should have compelled arbitration. We hold that this case does not fall under the narrow "public injunction" exception to the Federal Arbitration Act we recognized in *Davis v. O'Melveny & Myers*, 485 F.3d 1066, 1082–84 (9th Cir.2007), and remand with instructions to compel arbitration.

# I.

### A.

Silver State Helicopters, LLC ("SSH") operated a flight-training school in Oakland, California. SSH referred to Key-Bank, N.A. ("KeyBank") as a "preferred lender" in marketing materials and encouraged prospective students to borrow from KeyBank. KeyBank financed virtually all SSH student tuition; Great Lakes Educational Loan Services ("Great Lakes") serviced the loans.

Every SSH student borrowing from KeyBank executed a promissory note ("Note"). The Note contained an arbitration clause, located in a section entitled "ARBITRATION," which provided, in relevant part:

IF ARBITRATION IS CHOSEN BY ANY PARTY WITH RESPECT TO A CLAIM, NEITHER YOU NOR I WILL HAVE THE RIGHT TO LITI-GATE THAT CLAIM IN COURT OR HAVE A JURY TRIAL ON THAT CLAIM.... FURTHER, I WILL NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO PARTICI-PATE AS A REPRESENTATIVE OR MEMBER OF ANY CLASS OF CLAIMANTS PERTAINING TO ANY CLAIM SUBJECT TO ARBITRA-TION.... I UNDERSTAND THAT OTHER RIGHTS I WOULD HAVE IF I WENT TO COURT MAY ALSO NOT BE AVAILABLE IN ARBITRA-TION . . .

There shall be no authority for any Claims to be arbitrated on a class action basis. Furthermore, an arbitration can

- 1. The Note contained a choice-of-law clause providing that disputes would be governed by Ohio law and a forum-selection provision requiring disputes to be contested in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, KeyBank's principal place of business.
- **2.** Plaintiffs amended the complaint in state court to add a third representative plaintiff, Kevin Wilhelmy, and two defendants, Student Loan Xpress and American Education Services. These parties eventually settled and are no longer involved in this litigation.
- **3.** The Federal Trade Commission promulgated the Holder Rule in 1975 in response to concerns that sellers of goods and services were increasingly separating "the consumer's duty to pay from the seller's duty to perform" either by selling loan instruments to a third party after execution or by acting as a conduit

only decide your or my Claim(s) and may not consolidate or join the claims of other persons that may have similar claims.

The Note further provided that "[t]his Arbitration Provision will apply to my Note ... unless I notify you in writing that I reject the arbitration provisions within 60 days of signing my Note." <sup>1</sup>

#### В.

Matthew Kilgore and William Fuller ("Plaintiffs") were SSH students, who each borrowed over \$50,000 from KeyBank. The Oakland school failed before they could graduate. After the school's demise, Plaintiffs brought this putative class action suit against KeyBank and Great Lakes (collectively, "Defendants") in California Superior Court, seeking to enjoin Defendants from reporting loan defaults to credit agencies and from enforcing Notes against former students.<sup>2</sup> The gravamen of the complaint was that Defendants had violated the California Unfair Competition Law ("UCL"), Cal. Bus. & Prof.Code §§ 17200-17210, because the Note and SSH's contracts with students failed to include language specified in the Federal Trade Commission's "Holder Rule." <sup>3</sup>

between purchasers and third-party lenders. Promulgation of Trade Regulation Rule and Statement of Basis and Purpose, 40 Fed.Reg. 53,506, 53,507 (Nov. 18, 1975) (emphasis omitted) (codified at 16 C.F.R. pt. 433). The Rule requires consumer credit contracts to include the following language: "ANY HOLD-ER OF THIS CONSUMER CREDIT CON-TRACT IS SUBJECT TO ALL CLAIMS AND DEFENSES WHICH THE DEBTOR COULD ASSERT AGAINST THE SELLER OF GOODS OR SERVICES OBTAINED PURSU-ANT HERETO OR WITH THE PROCEEDS HEREOF." 16 C.F.R. § 433.2(a).

Plaintiffs do not assert that the Holder Rule gives rise to a private cause of action, but instead seek to vindicate this right through their state law claim. *See Holloway v. Bristol–Myers Corp.*, 485 F.2d 986, 988–89 (D.C.Cir.1973) (holding that private actions to vindicate rights asserted under the Federal Defendants timely removed the case to the District Court for the Northern District of California,<sup>4</sup> and filed a motion to compel arbitration. After the district court denied the motion, *Kilgore v. Keybank*, *Nat'l Ass'n*, No. C 08–2958 TEH, 2009 WL 1975271, at \*1 (N.D.Cal. July 8, 2009),<sup>5</sup> Defendants appealed. We have jurisdiction over Defendants' appeal under 9 U.S.C. § 16(a)(1)(C).

After Defendants filed their notice of appeal, the district court allowed Plaintiffs to file a third amended complaint. The court then granted Defendants' motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. *Kilgore v. KeyBank*, 712 F.Supp.2d 939, 947–58 (N.D.Cal.2010).<sup>6</sup> Plaintiffs appealed, and we have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291.<sup>7</sup>

#### II.

[1] Plaintiffs argue that the district court erred by dismissing their third amended complaint, and Defendants argue that the district court erred by refusing to compel arbitration. Under the Federal Arbitration Act, if Defendants are correct, the district court should never have reached the merits of Plaintiffs' claims. *See* 9 U.S.C. § 3 (requiring stay of civil action during arbitration). Therefore, we

Trade Commission Act may not be main-tained).

- 4. The notice of removal invoked federal jurisdiction based on a federal question, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1331; complete diversity of citizenship, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a); and minimal diversity under the Class Action Fairness Act, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d)(2). After removal, Plaintiffs dropped their federal question claims.
- 5. In denying the motion to compel arbitration, the district court applied California law, notwithstanding the Ohio choice-of-law provision in the Note. *Kilgore*, 2009 WL 1975271, at \*5–8 (citing *Hoffman v. Citibank (S.D.)*, *N.A.*, 546 F.3d 1078, 1082 (9th Cir.2008) (per

begin with whether the district court erred in declining to compel arbitration, a decision we review *de novo*. *Chalk v. T– Mobile USA, Inc.*, 560 F.3d 1087, 1092 (9th Cir.2009).

#### A.

The Federal Arbitration Act ("FAA") makes an agreement to arbitrate "valid, irrevocable, and enforceable." 9 U.S.C. § 2. The FAA was intended to "overcome an anachronistic judicial hostility to agreements to arbitrate, which American courts had borrowed from English common law," Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc., 473 U.S. 614, 625 n. 14, 105 S.Ct. 3346, 87 L.Ed.2d 444 (1985), that resulted in "courts' refusals to enforce agreements to arbitrate," Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson, 513 U.S. 265, 270, 115 S.Ct. 834, 130 L.Ed.2d 753 (1995). Recent opinions of the Supreme Court have given broad effect to arbitration agreements. See, e.g., Marmet Health Care Ctr., Inc. v. Brown, ---- U.S. ---132 S.Ct. 1201, 1203-04, 182 L.Ed.2d 42 (2012) (per curiam) (upholding arbitration provision despite state law prohibiting predispute agreements to arbitrate personal injury and wrongful death claims); AT&TMobility LLC v. Concepcion, — U.S.

curiam) (applying California conflict-of-law analysis to choice-of-law provision in credit card contract)). We need not consider which law is applicable as the result would be the same in light of our decision that the district court should have compelled arbitration. *See* note 11, *infra*.

- **6.** The district court held that the various counts in the third amended complaint either failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted, *Kilgore*, 712 F.Supp.2d at 947–53, or were preempted by federal law, *id*. at 953–58.
- 7. We consolidated the two appeals. Order, *Kilgore v. KeyBank, Nat'l Ass'n,* 673 F.3d 947 (9th Cir.2010).

—, 131 S.Ct. 1740, 1753, 179 L.Ed.2d 742 (2011) (holding that the FAA preempted a California rule that made class action waivers unconscionable); *Circuit City Stores, Inc. v. Adams*, 532 U.S. 105, 109, 121 S.Ct. 1302, 149 L.Ed.2d 234 (2001) (confining FAA exemption for workers engaged in interstate commerce to transportation workers).

[2, 3] The FAA "mandates that district courts *shall* direct the parties to proceed to arbitration on issues as to which an arbitration agreement has been signed." *Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc. v. Byrd,* 470 U.S. 213, 218, 105 S.Ct. 1238, 84 L.Ed.2d 158 (1985). The basic role for courts under the FAA is to determine "(1) whether a valid agreement to arbitrate exists and, if it does, (2) whether the agreement encompasses the dispute at issue." *Chiron Corp. v. Ortho Diagnostic Sys., Inc.,* 207 F.3d 1126, 1130 (9th Cir.2000).

#### B.

[4] Section 2 of the FAA contains a savings clause, which provides that arbitration agreements are "enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract." 9 U.S.C. § 2. This savings clause "preserves generally applicable contract defenses." *Concepcion*, 131 S.Ct. at 1748. Plaintiffs advance two theories as to why the FAA savings clause defeats the arbitration clause in the Note. We find neither availing.

# 1.

[5] Under the FAA savings clause, state law that "arose to govern issues concerning the validity, revocability, and enforceability of contracts generally" remains

 In holding that California law rendered the class arbitration waiver unconscionable, the district court relied on *Discover Bank v. Superior Court*, 36 Cal.4th 148, 30 Cal.Rptr.3d 76, 113 P.3d 1100 (2005), *abrogated by Concep*- applicable to arbitration agreements. Doctor's Assocs., Inc. v. Casarotto, 517 U.S. 681, 685–87, 116 S.Ct. 1652, 134 L.Ed.2d 902 (1996) (quoting Perry v. Thomas, 482 U.S. 483, 492 n. 9, 107 S.Ct. 2520, 96 L.Ed.2d 426 (1987)). "Thus, generally applicable contract defenses, such as fraud, duress, or unconscionability, may be applied to invalidate arbitration agreements without contravening § 2." Casarotto, 517 U.S. at 687, 116 S.Ct. 1652.

[6,7] Under California law, a contractual provision is unenforceable if it is both procedurally and substantively unconscionable. Armendariz v. Found. Health Psychcare Servs., Inc., 24 Cal.4th 83, 99 Cal.Rptr.2d 745, 6 P.3d 669, 690 (2000). "[T]he more substantively oppressive the contract term, the less evidence of procedural unconscionability is required to come to the conclusion that the term is unenforceable, and vice versa." Id.

[8,9] "Substantive unconscionability focuses on the one-sidedness or overly harsh effect of the contract term or clause." Harper v. Ultimo, 113 Cal. App.4th 1402, 7 Cal.Rptr.3d 418, 423 (2003). Plaintiffs claimed below that the Note's ban on class arbitration is unconscionable under California law, but that argument is now expressly foreclosed by Concepcion, 131 S.Ct. at 1753.<sup>8</sup> Plaintiffs' assertion that students may not be able to afford arbitration fees fares no better. See Green Tree Fin. Corp.-Ala. v. Randolph, 531 U.S. 79, 90-91, 121 S.Ct. 513, 148 L.Ed.2d 373 (2000) ("The 'risk' that [a plaintiff] will be saddled with prohibitive costs is too speculative to justify the invalidation of an arbitration agreement."). And nothing else in the arbitration clause

*cion*, 131 S.Ct. at 1753. In addressing the issue, the district court did not have the benefit of the Supreme Court's later *Concepcion* opinion. in the Note suggests substantive unconscionability.<sup>9</sup> *Cf. Armendariz*, 99 Cal. Rptr.2d 745, 6 P.3d at 690–94 (holding unilateral arbitration provision substantively unconscionable); *Harper*, 7 Cal. Rptr.3d at 423 (explaining substantive unconscionability of arbitration damages limit).

[10, 11] Nor is the arbitration provision procedurally unconscionable. "Procedural unconscionability focuses on the factors of surprise and oppression...." Harper, 7 Cal.Rptr.3d at 422. The arbitration clause allows students to reject arbitration within sixty days of signing the Note. This provision is more forgiving than the one in Circuit City Stores, Inc. v. Ahmed, where we found thirty days a sufficient period in which to consider whether to opt out of arbitration. 283 F.3d 1198, 1199-1200 (9th Cir.2002). Nor was the arbitration clause buried in fine print in the Note, but was instead in its own section, clearly labeled, in boldface. Cf. A & M Produce Co. v. FMC Corp., 135 Cal. App.3d 473, 186 Cal.Rptr. 114, 124-25 (1982) (finding procedural unconscionability of consequential damage provision contained in middle of last page of an agreement in inconspicuous font).

# 2. a.

The UCL authorizes broad injunctive relief to protect the public from unfair business practices. Cal. Bus. & Prof.Code § 17203. The Supreme Court has suggested that claims arising from a statute

**9.** The Note also includes a clause preventing disclosure of any arbitration award. Although we have found confidentiality provisions to be substantively unconscionable when applied to a large class of customers, *Ting v. AT&T*, 319 F.3d 1126, 1151–52 (9th Cir.2003), the small number of putative class members in this case (approximately 120) mitigates such concerns. In any event, the enforceability of the confidentiality clause is a

whose underlying purpose creates an "inherent conflict" with the federal policy favoring arbitration may be exempt from the FAA.<sup>10</sup> Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp., 500 U.S. 20, 26, 111 S.Ct. 1647, 114 L.Ed.2d 26 (1991). Relying on Gilmer, the California Supreme Court has found an inherent conflict between the FAA policy favoring arbitration and California statutes authorizing "public" injunctive relief. Broughton v. Cigna Health-plans of Cal., 21 Cal.4th 1066, 90 Cal. Rptr.2d 334, 988 P.2d 67, 73, 78 (1999).

The *Broughton* plaintiffs "were covered by Medi-Cal, which had negotiated a contract with Cigna ... for health care coverage." Id. at 71. They sued Cigna under California's Consumer Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA"), Cal. Civ.Code §§ 1750-85, seeking damages for medical malpractice and injunctive relief against Cigna's allegedly deceptive advertising. Broughton, 90 Cal.Rptr.2d 334, 988 P.2d at 71. The California Supreme Court held the damages claim subject to the arbitration clause in the Cigna policy because "[s]uch an action is primarily for the benefit of a party to the arbitration, even if the action incidentally vindicates important public interests." Id. at 79. But the Court also found that because the plaintiffs were "functioning as a private attorney general, enjoining future deceptive practices on behalf of the general public," id. at 76, their injunction claims were not arbitrable, id. at 75-78.

The California Supreme Court expanded upon *Broughton* in *Cruz v. PacifiCare* 

matter distinct from the enforceability of the arbitration clause in general. Plaintiffs are free to argue during arbitration that the confidentiality clause is not enforceable.

**10.** The parties dispute whether the "inherent conflict" exemption is limited to federal statutes or applies to both federal and state statutes. For the reasons discussed below, we need not resolve this issue.

Health Systems, Inc., 30 Cal.4th 303, 133 Cal.Rptr.2d 58, 66 P.3d 1157 (2003). Plaintiff there alleged that PacifiCare had fraudulently induced its customers to enroll in health care programs while at the same time discouraging primary care physicians from providing services to enrollees. Id. at 1159. The complaint sought injunctive and monetary relief under the UCL, Cal. Bus. & Prof.Code § 17200, which prohibits unfair business practices, and under section 17500 of the same, which prohibits untrue or misleading statements designed to mislead the public. Cruz, 133 Cal.Rptr.2d 58, 66 P.3d at 1164-PacifiCare invoked the arbitration 65. clause in its contract with enrollees. Id. at 1160.

As in *Broughton*, the California Supreme Court in *Cruz* held that the plaintiff's claims for monetary relief were subject to arbitration, because any public benefit from such relief would be "incidental to the private benefits obtained from those bringing the restitutionary or damages action." *Id.* at 1166. Extending the reasoning of *Broughton* to claims brought under the UCL and Business and Professions Code, the *Cruz* court found "the request for injunctive relief is clearly for the benefit of health care consumers and the general public" and therefore not subject to arbitration. *Id.* at 1164.

We applied the *Broughton-Cruz* framework in *Davis*, 485 F.3d at 1081-84. There, an employer "adopted and distributed to its employees a new Dispute Resolution Program (DRP) that culminated in final and binding arbitration of most employment-related claims by and against its employees." *Id.* at 1070. The DRP prohibited the filing of both judicial and administrative actions. *Id.* at 1081-82. Citing the *Gilmer* dictum, we noted that "employment rights under the [Fair Labor Standards Act] and California's Labor Code" were analogous to substantive "statutory rights established for a public reason." *Id.* at 1082 (internal quotations and citations omitted). Because the *Davis* plaintiffs sought to vindicate these statutory rights through public injunctions, we found the DRP unenforceable to the extent that it barred claims for public injunctive relief. *Id.* 

#### b.

[12] Defendants argue that *Davis* was vitiated by *Concepcion*, and the *Broughton-Cruz* rule no longer exempts a public injunction claim from arbitration. We need not reach that broad argument. Even assuming the continued viability of the *Broughton-Cruz* rule, Plaintiffs' claims do not fall within its purview.

Public injunctive relief "is for the benefit of the general public rather than the party bringing the action." *Broughton*, 90 Cal. Rptr.2d 334, 988 P.2d at 78. A claim for public injunctive relief therefore does not seek "to resolve a private dispute but to remedy a public wrong." *Id.* at 76. Whatever the subjective motivation behind a party's purported public injunction suit, the *Broughton* rule applies only when "the benefits of granting injunctive relief by and large do not accrue to that party, but to the general public in danger of being victimized by the same deceptive practices as the plaintiff suffered." *Id.* 

The claim for injunctive relief here does not fall within the "narrow exception to the rule that the FAA requires state courts to honor arbitration agreements." *Cruz*, 133 Cal.Rptr.2d 58, 66 P.3d at 1162. The third amended complaint seeks an injunction prohibiting Defendants from reporting non-payment of a Note by putative class members to credit agencies, from enforcing a Note against any class member, and from disbursing the proceeds of any loans to a seller whose consumer credit contract did not include Holder Rule language.

The requested prohibitions against reporting defaults on the Note and seeking enforcement of the Note plainly would benefit only the approximately 120 putative class members. The requested injunction against disbursing loans to sellers who do not include Holder Rule language in their contracts, while ostensibly implicating third parties, also falls outside the Broughton-Cruz rule. The third amended complaint expressly notes that KeyBank had completely withdrawn from the private school loan business and does not allege that the bank is engaging in other comparable transactions. The injunctive relief sought thus, for all practical purposes, relates only to past harms suffered by the members of the limited putative class.

The central premise of Broughton-Cruz is that "the judicial forum has significant institutional advantages over arbitration in administering a public injunctive remedy, which as a consequence will likely lead to the diminution or frustration of the public benefit if the remedy is entrusted to arbitrators." Broughton, 90 Cal.Rptr.2d 334, 988 P.2d at 78. That concern is absent here, where Defendants' alleged statutory violations have, by Plaintiffs' own admission, already ceased, where the class affected by the alleged practices is small, and where class affected by the alleged practices is small, and where there is no real prospective benefit to the public at large from the relief sought.<sup>11</sup>

#### III.

For the reasons above, we VACATE the district court's dismissal of Plaintiffs' claims, **REVERSE** the denial of Defendants' motion to compel arbitration, and **REMAND** with instructions to the district court to compel arbitration.

11. Because we hold that arbitration is required under California law, we need not address Defendants' contention that Ohio law (which apparently has no *Broughton–Cruz* rule, *see Eagle v. Fred Martin Motor Co.*, 157 PREGERSON, Circuit Judge, dissenting:

# I. Hustled by the school; hustled by the bank.

Silver State Helicopter School did not do a good job training helicopter pilots, placing them in jobs, or managing its own finances. But it did make a convincing sales pitch. Silver State promised its students that they would get the training required to get good paying jobs as commercial helicopter pilots.

At flashy career fairs around California, Silver State worked hard to sign up prospective students for its helicopter pilot training program. Former Silver State student, Mathew Kilgore, declared under penalty of perjury:

The seminar was very impressive and glitzy. There were numerous helicopters onsite and the school appeared to be very professional. [Silver State's CEO, Jerry Airola] was very convincing and portrayed Silver State as a top flight school. The presentation made clear that Silver State was very selective about which students would be chosen to attend the school ... Mr. Airola emphasized that all of the tuition to fund the entire Silver State education could be obtained through Silver State's partner lender, KeyBank. Mr. Airola also emphasized that ... the loans would only cost the students about [a] hundred dollars a week at 4% interest.

Airola's claims were not true. Silver State accepted almost all applicants who could get their loans approved. Silver State lacked sufficient equipment or instructors to properly train its students. The variable rate interest on the loans would rise far above four percent.<sup>1</sup> Matthew Kilgore,

Ohio App.3d 150, 809 N.E.2d 1161, 1170 (2004)) should apply.

1. See Appendix at 9.

William Fuller, and the other 120 putative class members believed what Airola told them and signed up. They took out \$55,950 loans, which KeyBank promptly forked over to Silver State before students took a single class.

But Silver State knew it was headed for a crash landing. By 2008, Silver State had racked up ten million dollars in debt against fifty thousand dollars in assets. Moreover, despite Silver State's alluring promises, there was no significant demand for helicopter pilots with a Silver State degree. And it wasn't just the school that knew it. Defendant KeyBank knew it, too.

KeyBank, an Ohio-based lending giant, participated in the fraud that Silver State perpetrated on unwitting students. From 2003 to 2005 KeyBank financed ninety-five percent of the tuition students paid to Silver State. KeyBank printed up lengthy loan papers that lacked the Federal Trade Commission's Holder Rule Notice. 16 C.F.R. § 433.2 The Holder Rule required the loan contracts to notify students that KeyBank was subject to the same claims and defenses as Silver State. Id. The Holder Rule protects borrowers, such as the students, from being legally obligated to pay a creditor like KeyBank "despite breach of warranty, misrepresentation, or even fraud on the part of the seller." 40 Fed.Reg. 53,506, 53,507 (Nov. 18, 1975). By omitting that notice from its printed loan contracts, KeyBank may have sought to insulate itself from liability for Silver State's misleading promises. Silver State then presented those faulty loan contracts to prospective students and "pressure[d] the students to sign the [master promissory notes] as soon as possible," according to an affidavit of Silver State's former student finance manager Jody Pidruzny. And sign up they did.

Once a student signed the promissory note, KeyBank immediately transferred the full amount of the loans to Silver State. KeyBank then turned a profit by selling the students' loans on the securities market to investors. Defendant Great Lakes Educational Loan Services, Inc. continues to service those loans by collecting payments from students, and notifying credit reporting agencies when students fail to pay.

KeyBank loaned students tuition money to attend Silver State knowing that Silver State was financially volatile. A 2004 email between KeyBank Vice Presidents Paul McDermott and Rodney Landrum predicted that Silver State "could be the next 'big one' to go under." Nevertheless, KeyBank made more than ten million dollars in loans to Silver State students over the following two years. In 2008, Silver State filed for bankruptcy and closed its doors. Students could not recoup the amount of their unused tuition because Silver State sought protection under Chapter 7 bankruptcy proceedings.

Kilgore, Fuller, and their classmates were left holding the bag with no degree, no helicopter piloting career, and no opportunity to train. The students' failed attempts to launch flight careers saddled them with huge private loans that are collecting interest and weighing them down.

The private loans students incurred to pay for Silver State helicopter pilot training were not subsidized or insured by the federal government. Private student loans are generally more expensive than federal loans, especially for students with lower credit scores or limited credit histories. Students could borrow larger amounts because there are no loan limits for private loans. Moreover, students who hold private loans are not eligible for federal programs that allow them to reduce their monthly payments based on their income, or have their loans forgiven after working for ten years in public service jobs.<sup>2</sup>

my, N.Y. Times, March 10, 2013, at SR 10

Unlike federally guaranteed loans, private student loans are not discharged should the school go out of business. The students themselves cannot discharge these loans in bankruptcy proceedings unless they can prove that "excepting such [student] debt from discharge ... would impose an undue hardship." 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(8).

#### II. Ignored by the courts.

To make matters worse, the majority opinion strips Kilgore, Fuller, and their classmates of the ability to find recourse in state or federal court. The majority holds that we must compel arbitration in the students' case, a holding at odds with the district court's decision. According to the majority, the arbitration clause was not unconscionable. I disagree.

A contract provision is unenforceable under California law if it is both procedurally and substantively unconscionable. See Pokorny v. Quixtar, Inc., 601 F.3d 987, 996 (9th Cir.2010). California applies a sliding scale to determine if a contract is unenforceable due to unconscionability. Armendariz v. Found. Health Psychcare Servs., 24 Cal.4th 83, 99 Cal.Rptr.2d 745, 6 P.3d 669, 690 (2000). The more substantively unconscionable the contract, the less procedurally unconscionable it must be to be found unconscionable, and vice versa. Id. Here, the arbitration clause is highly procedurally and substantively unconscionable.

#### A. Procedurally Unconscionable

If both parties agree to give up the protections of the courts, arbitration can be a just and efficient way to resolve disputes. But Kilgore, Fuller, and their classmates signed contracts under unconscionable "take it or leave it" conditions. Pokorny v. Quixtar, Inc., 601 F.3d 987, 996 (9th Cir.2010). This means that they did not agree to arbitration. Without such an agreement, it is wholly inappropriate to stop them from having their claims decided by a court.

Under California law: "A contract is procedurally unconscionable if it is a contract of adhesion, *i.e.*, a standardized contract, drafted by the party of superior bargaining strength, that relegates to the subscribing party only the opportunity to adhere to the contract or reject it." *Ting* v. AT&T, 319 F.3d 1126, 1148 (9th Cir. 2003). Procedural unconscionability focuses on the "the factors of surprise and oppression in the contracting process." *Pokorny*, 601 F.3d at 996.

There can be no doubt that the promissory notes were contracts of adhesion, and that surprise and oppression dominated the contracting process. I have attached as an Appendix the dense, small print, and blurry nine-page contract that Silver State thrust on the students at career fairs and open houses. The arbitration clause at issue was buried in the middle of the contract, split over two pages, and surrounded by language that was difficult to read and understand. See Appendix at 3-4; see also Ingle v. Circuit City Stores, Inc., 328 F.3d 1165, 1171 (2003) ("Surprise involves the extent to which the supposedly agreedupon terms of the bargain are hidden in the prolix printed form drafted by the party seeking to enforce the disputed terms." (internal quotations and citations omitted)). KeyBank officials never discussed the loans with students or mentioned the arbitration clause to them. KeyBank left those jobs to Silver State's financial aid staff-employees who, according to the record, did not know that the

<sup>(&</sup>quot;Because private loans offer little flexibility, borrowers in bad straits have few options except default, which makes it difficult for

them to get jobs or credit, or even to rent apartments.").

loans contained arbitration clauses. Silver State staff pressured students to sign the loans immediately or else risk losing their spots in the school. Pidruzny, the school's Student Finance Manager, explained the strategy in her sworn declaration:

At the direction of my superiors I conveyed KeyBank's and Silver State's directives to expedite the loan application process and pressure the students to sign the [Master Promissory Notes] as soon as possible ... I did not discuss the terms of the [Master Promissory Notes] with Silver State students. Specifically, I did not discuss the Arbitration Provision with any Silver State Student...

In light of these facts, it is unsurprising that students felt pressured to sign the contract without knowing it contained an arbitration clause. Moreover, the sixty day opt-out provision was meaningless because students did not know the arbitration clause existed in the first place. As Kilgore declared, "I did not know that the Promissory Note contained an arbitration provision (nor did I know that I could opt out of the arbitration provision) ... I believed that the Promissory Note had to be signed immediately and I felt pressured to do so. I believed that if I did not sign the Promissory Note I would lose my spot at Silver State." Surprise? Yes. Oppression? Yes. Procedural unconscionability? Definitely.

#### B. Substantively Unconscionable

A contract provision is substantively unconscionable if it is "one-sided and will have an overly harsh effect on the disadvantaged party. Thus, mutuality is the paramount consideration when assessing substantive unconscionability." *Pokorny*, 601 F.3d at 997 (internal quotations and citations omitted). To make that determination, courts must "look beyond facial neutrality and examine the actual effects of the challenged provision." *Ting*, 319 F.3d at 1149. KeyBank's contract fails the mutuality test in three respects:

1. The confidentiality provision requires both parties to maintain the confidentiality of any claim they arbitrate. While facially neutral, this claim overwhelmingly favors KeyBank. A student who wins in arbitration against KeyBank cannot alert other students or arbitrators to KeyBank's predatory practices that led to the win. But KeyBank is a repeat player in these arbitrations; it knows the outcome of each arbitration and can use that knowledge to its advantage. Id. at 1152 (Defendant "has placed itself in a far superior legal posture by ensuring that none of its potential opponents have access to precedent while, at the same time, defendant accumulates a wealth of knowledge on how to negotiate the terms of its own unilaterally crafted contract.").

2. The high cost of arbitration imposes another unequal burden, creating further substantive unconscionability. Filing a civil case in California Superior Court costs less than five hundred dollars. Filing the same claim before an arbitrator, runs more than four thousand dollars. The high cost of arbitration will prevent many students from vindicating their rights, but will not limit KeyBank's ability to defend itself. This asymmetry makes arbitration all the more unconscionable. See Ting, 319 F.3d at 1151 (finding a feesplitting arbitration clause unconscionable "because it imposes on some consumers costs greater than those a complainant would bear if he or she would file the same complaint in court.").

3. The arbitration process itself greatly favors banks over consumers. One study found that the National Arbitration Forum, one of the two arbitrators named in the contract, ruled for banks and credit card companies, and against consumers ninety-four percent of the time.<sup>3</sup> This further gives KeyBank an unfair advantage in resolving any claims.

KeyBank foisted loans on students who staked their financial well-being on the shaky promises of Silver State Helicopter school. When Silver State went down, so

**3.** Public Citizen, *The Arbitration Trap: How Credit Card Companies Ensnare Consumers* 2 (2007), available at http://www.citizen.org/

did the students. The students deserve, and I submit the law requires, that their claims be heard and adjudicated by a court. The provision in the promissory note relegating students to arbitration is unconscionable and thus unenforceable. Therefore, I dissent.

documents/ArbitrationTrap.pdf.

#### APPENDIX

#### REDACTED\*

#### Key Alternative Loan Program

Date: October 21, 2004

Borrower Name: Matt C. Kilgore

Borrower Social Security Number:

Cosigner Name:

Cosigner Social Security Number:

#### MASTER STUDENT LOAN PROMISSORY NOTE outs or seratch-outs of terms will be accepted on this Promiss No white-outs or ory Note.

MATTER STUDENT LOAN PROMISSORY NOTE The value area or extract-and a formational production of the structure of the struc

under the Loan Program on or after the date of this Note and before the date of my subsequent master student loss promission protectising te loans obtained under the Loan Program that I have signed. I also onderstand and agree that, at your origin, whether or not my Lean(s) subject to the terms of this Note or any bans that I have in effect under the Loan Program before the date of this Note are any bans that I have in effect under the Loan Program before the date of this Note have been consolidated, you may aggregate the total outstanding balance of each such Loan and loan prior to repayment zero. In this event, you will determining my monthly payment amount and repayment term hand on the terms of my most recease. Loan made under he Loan Program. C. GENERAL PROVISIONS; AUTHORNY NOT TO MAKE LOANS OR DISBUESKUMENTS; WITTINGS, NIGANTURES I. When you receive my signed Note, you are not agreeing to lend me ranney and there will be noted agreement utill to time you make the first duburstmetter of have a part of your review of my Application or at any time during the term of any Loan(s) that I obtain subject to the terms of this Note, you have the right not 6 make a part of your review of my application or at any time during the term of any Loan(s) that I obtain subject to the terms of this Note, you have the right not 6 make a part of your provise of my application or at any time during the term of any Loan(s) that I obtain subject to the terms of this Note, are used and the relation to make a part of your Loan subject to the terms of this Note are incorporated in and made a part of the Note. 2. All Applications, Diskekanes Statements, and agenete Cospers Notices; of any relating to any Loan subject to the terms of this Note are incorporated in and made a part of the Note: 3. If, under this Note, an a cor agreements, must be "writter," an I making," as act or agreement performed or provided by means of electronic communication will be considered to be "writtim," or a loan in the case of the lander; a pro-affized for

Page 1 of 7

c on the period of repayment under application frend it subject to binitizions on the period of repayment under applicable law.
E. INTEREST
1. Accurat - Interest on this Note will accure at an interest rate equal to the Variable Rate. Interest begins to accure on the initial Disburstment Date and will continue to accure on the initial Disburstment Date and will accurs on the ingoing briefpal balance and all other answers using in fall. Interest will accure on the ingoing briefpal balance and all other answers are paid in the balance in a Caphistical Interest and any disc falls accurs on the ingoing briefpal balance. In the cites are provide the sector tip disp is the year and the acrus period balance and disps is the year and the acrus and the acturate provide the cites and the disps is the year and the acrus law the cites and the acrus and

3.1 will review my Disclowine Statement upon receiving it and will contact yos if applicable law. Inversity openations 6. Untess: I choose to have my insufility payments automatically debited, 1 will Rate ("LIIDR") published in the "Money Rates" section of *The Wall Street Journal* KA. NOIL ONLY ON KENA

\*On every page of the master student loan promissory note, I redacted the signer and co-signer's social security number, and the co-signer's name.

#### KILGORE v. KEYBANK, NAT. ASS'N Cite as 718 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2013)

#### REDACTED

#### Date: October 21, 2004

#### Borrower Name: Matt C. Kilgore

Cosigner Name:

Cosigner Name: on the 20th day of the month preceding the applicable "Change Date" (cg., December, Manch, June, and September), subject to the timitations herein. You will use the three-month. LHOR published on the 20th day of the preceding mends without regrup to the two-stay dedayed effective tase. If the 20th day of the romoth is not a business day, the preceding business uay will be used to determine the Current Index. For propress of first Penagraph E.3, "Meaniness day" means any day the banks in New York and Lendon are open for the remasting of business. You may round the "Current budie" higher to two decimal places. For example, 6487151 will be rounded to 64974. (This is an example and may not be reflective of the actual LHOR). HORS is the Rhink and a it on the researably the lowest interest fact infor-tests for dollar deparits in the London market based on quotations at 16 ming/ basks. LHOR is needly a pricing induces and is not necessarily the lowest interest fact infor-a compatible index.

R. TERMS OF REPAYMENT 1. Interim Penod. 1 may, but an not required to, make payments of interest or principal during the Interim Period. You may add accrede angulat Interest that J do not pay during the Interim Period to the principal balance as set forth in Paragraphs E.1 and E.4. Repayment Period - During the Parameters

principal daming the interiors Period. You may add accreated unpaid inferent link 10 only pay during the interiors Period is the principal balance as a click final in Paragraphia E.1 and E.4. 2. Repayment Pariod - During the Repayment Pariod, I will make consecutive monthly payment is all of the principal and interest and any other charges that I may once until I have paid all of the principal and interest and any other charges that I may once until Rev paid all of the principal and interest and any other charges that I may once until Rev paid all of the principal and interest. If my Variable Rate increases or decreases, not mathly installments of principal and interest. If my Variable Rate increases or decreases, my monthly payment will be the monthly installments of the monthly installed in the principal and interest. If my Variable Rate increases or decreases, my monthly payment will be the required. My then they note the month in the monthly installed in the principal and interest. If my Variable Rate increases of the principal state is the individual of the principal payment with a weakly whether Rate increases of the monthly installed the principal of the minimum permissible Repayment Heriod. In that case, my monthly payment with the payment amount in the bine increase of an other pays or you increase of the minimum permissible repayment that will do so. If this should happen, you will notify me of my new monthly payment amount. I tadenta that I may increase my monthly payment and mount at any ione. A ranoma Owing at the End of the Repayment Period - Since interest for the approximation of my new monthly payment and the interest is the since of the local of the Repayment Period. If make payments after my to case in the limbol of the Repayment Period - Since interest cases state the mouth the cases of the since interest payment due dates, newy one additional interest and returned check/NSF fees. In such case, you will notes the therges a will be observed to a sole discretion.

G. LATE CILARGES ANNAOR RETURNED PAYMENT/RSP PEES On any Loan dual 1 obtain ability of the line of this Note: 1. Late Charges - I agree to pay a late charge if I fail to make any part of an instillment payment within fifter(15) days after it becomes due. I will pay only one late charge for an installment payment, regardless of the number of days it is late. The late charge may not exceed the lease of \$5.00 or 5.00% of the unpaid amount of the installiment. 2. Returned Payment/NSF Pees - I agree to pay a returned payment/NSF fee of \$2.000 on the net payment if on back returns my payment or if any check or other instrument given for my payment is disbonared for any reason, in addition to the fees then my bank way assess.

H. RUGHT TO PREPAY I have the right to propay all or any part of my Lonn(t) at any time without penalty. Propayment of less than all of the outstanding belonce of my Lann(s) will not roduce the amount of monthly payments or postpone the due due for controlly payment, but will reduce the number of payments I must make. In any event, I will not be entitled to a retinud of my part of the interest or finance charge alrendy paid. J. FORTEXANCE (I can used to prove any of the lowes to experiment with the terms perchicited to a retinud of the prove any of the lowes to experiment.

to a relind of any peri of the interest or number sharps means period. If I am usable to repay any of my Loans in accordance with the terms established inder this Note. I may request that you modify these terms. I understand that such modifications would be at your option. I understand that I will remain responsible for affi interest securiting during any period of forbearance. J. DEFAULT: WHOLE LOAN DUB Subject to the initiations of applicable law, i will be in default under this Note and you have the right to (i) give me notice that the whole outstanding principal balance, accrude interest, and all other amounts payable to you under the terms of this Note, are due and payable at once (subject to any applicable law that may give me a right

Cosigner Social Security Number:

Borrower Social Security Number:

Cosigner Social Socurity Number: to cure my defaulty and (ii) cease to make further disbursements to me if: 1. 1 fail to make any monthly payment to you when due; or 2. 1 die; or 3. 1 break any of my other promises in this Note; or 4. Any bankrupicy proceeding is hegun by or against me, ne 1 assign any of my assets for the benefits of my vertifors; or 5. 1 provide any false writtem statement in applying for any Loan gubject to the terms of this Note or at any time during the term of my such Lever, or 6. 1 become insolvent; or 7. In your judgement, there is a significant lessening of my ability to repay any Loan subject to the terms of this Note; or 8. 1 arin in default on any Loan subject to the terms of the Note 1 may already have writh you, or on any such Loan 1 may have with you in the future. My failure to receive a statement or coupon hook does not releve me of my responsibility and obligation of making the required gayments for any Loan secontaice with the terms and ordination of this Note. I't min in default, I will be required to pay interest on any Loan according and the future. Writable Rate aller default will be subject to aljustment in the same manner as before default. K. COLLECTION COSTS

K. COLLECTION COSTS When and a permitted by applicable law, I agree to pay you reasonable amounts, including reasonable altorney's feas for any attorney who is not your regularly salaried employee and cnort and other collection costs, that you incur in enforcing the terms of the Note if I am in default.
L. Vollaund written notice to you, or any subsequent holder of this Note, within tea (1) days after any change in my name, address, kelephone number, or Institution confluence than an.

L. NOTICES
1. I veil and written notice to you, or any subsequent balder of this Nate, within tea (10) days after any change in my name, address, telephone number, or Institution enrollment status.
2. Any notice required to be given to me by you will be effective (1) when mailed by first class mails to the latest address you have for set. (10) if a gree to receive notices and other communications claceronically, when transmitted by fast class mails to the latest address you have for set. (10) if a gree to receive notices and other communications claceronically, when transmitted by first class will be inflict at a required by have for me. (10) is a present of the set o

any other notice of this Note. NOTICE TO COSIGNER: You are being acted to guarantee this debt Think carefully before you do. If the borrower doesn't pay the debt, you will have to. He sure you can afford in pay if you have to, and that you want to accept this responsibility. You may have to pay up to the full amount of the debt if the borrower does not pay. You may have to pay tate fees or collection costs, which increase this amount. The bark can culter this debt from you without first trying to collect from the borrower. The bank can use the same collection methods against you that

Page 2 of 7

#### Appendix Page 2

1067

1068

#### REDACTED

Date: October 21, 2004

Borrower Name: Matt C. Kilgore

Cosigner Name:

Cosigner Name: on the asol against the borrower, such as sting you, garnsthing your wages, rie. If this doth is even in default, has fast may bacene a part of your craftl record. This notice is not the construct that makes you lable for the dot. ILLINGIS AND MICHICGAN RESIDENTS: Noise is Cosigner. You are being added to guarantee this doth. Think carefully before you do. If the borrower doesn' may the doth, you will have to the same you can afford to pay if you have in, and that you want to accept this responsibility. You may have to pay up to be full amount of the dot if the borrower does not pay. You may also have to pay hus for all or and that you want to accept this responsibility. You may have to pay up to be full amount of the dot if the borrower does not pay. You may also have to pay hus for all constructions costs, which increase this ancored. The bank can use the same collection rechois gainent you bar can be used gainst the borrower, such as suing you, parnishing your wages, ets. If this doth is ever in default, that fast may boome a part of your receils NEW YORK RESIDENTS: NOTICE: You gave to pay list doth identified below through you may not presonally receive say property, services, or moany. You may be used for payment although the person who receives the property, services, the notecol for payment although the person who receives the property, services, the notecol for payment although the person which receives the property, services, the notecol on contract. You will also have to pay some or all of these soutt and dramger if the note or contract. We arking which have to pay some or all of these soutts and before the ord on contract. We will also have to pay some or all of these soutts the borrower to pay such costs and charges. This notice is not the note, contract, and other wring the obligate you to pay the dott. Read thus writing for the cast terms of your obligation. DENTIFICATION OF DENT(5) YOU MAY HAVE TO PAY

of your obligation. IDENTIFICATION OF DERT(5) YOU MAY HAVE TO PAY Name of Deblor: The person(s) identified as the borrower and co-borrower at fic

Name of Debtor: The person(k) identified as the borrower and co-commers at the time of Application. Name of Crediber: KoyBank National Association, and its successors or assigns. Date: The Date of this Note. Kind of Debtr: Education Lear Total of Payments: The "Lean Amount Requested" identified at the time of Application plus inserve as sol forth in Paragraph E of dis Note. You acknowledge by your signature on this Note that you have been given a completed copy of this notice and of each writing that obligates you or the Debtur on this debt.

completer on this do

The skinowing of this noise and of ack writing that oblights you or the Debut on fills debt. VERMONT RESIDENTS: NOTICE TO COSIGNER: YOUR SIGNATURE ON THIS NOTIC MEANS THAT YOU ARE FOUALLY LIABLE FOR REPAYMENT OF THIS LOAN. IF THE BORROWER DOES NOT PAY, THE LENDER HAS A LEGAL RIGHT TO COLLECT FROM YOU. N. COSIGNER OBLIGATIONS 11 signed this Note as a crimiting, I hereby unconditionally guarantee payment of the and in accordance with the terms of this Note. I waiter noisile of accurate hereof and write all noises to which I might other with the terms of the there with the single of the terms of the terms of the terms of the Note when the and in accordance with the terms of the Note. I waiter noise of a second and the terms of the noise of the terms contribution, subsequence on the terms of the Note. I waiter noise of accurate the terms of the secondare with the terms of the terms of the terms of the secondare with the terms of the terms of the terms of the terms of the secondare with the terms of the terms of the terms of the terms of the secondare with the terms of the terms o

Provide an entry you are uncervise permitted to share by law willout our content. P. DISCLOSURE OF ACCOUNT INFORMATION TO CONSUMER REPORTING AGENCIESE INACCURATE INFORMATION You are committed to furnishing somplete and accurate information about credit secontris, including any Loans subject to the terms of this Note, the consumer reporting agencies. If the information you report about any of my Loants is inaccurate, I will write to: Grant Lakes Higher Education Servicing Corporation, PO. Nov. 7860, Madison, WI 53707-7860. In my correspondence I should include the following information: my social security number, Loan account number(s), a copy of my credit hunsas reporting reflecting the insecurate information, and my name, address, vity, state and zip cnde.

Borrower Social Security Number:

Cosigner Social Security Number:

<text><text><section-header><text><text><text><text><text>

Page 3 of 7

#### KILGORE v. KEYBANK, NAT. ASS'N Cite as 718 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2013)

#### REDACTED

Date: October 21, 2004

Borrower Name: Matt C. Kilgore

Cosigner Name:

LOSIGNET NAME: IF ARBITRATION IS CHOSEN BY ANY PARTY WITH RESPECT TO A CLAIM, NRTHER YOU NOR I WILL HAVE THE RIGHT TO LITIGATE THAT CLAIM IN COURT OR HAVE A JURY TRIAL ON THAT CLAIM OR TO ENCAGE IN THE ARBITRATION DISCOVERY EXCEPT AS PROVIDED FOR IN THE APPLICABLE ARBITRATION RULES. FURTHER, I WILL NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO FARTCHATE AS A REPRESENTATIVE OR MEMBER OF ANY CLASS OF CLAIMANTS PRETAINING TO ANY CLAIM SUBJECT TO ARBITRATION EXCEPT AS 35T FORTH BYLOW, THE ARBITRATOR'S DECISION WILL BE FINAL AND BINDING, I UNDERSTAND THAT OTHER RIGHTS THAT I WOULD HAVE IF I WENT TO COURT MAY AISO NOT BE AVAILABLE IN ARBITRATION. THE FEES CLARGED BY THE ARBITRATION ADMINISTRATOR MAY BE GREATER THAN THE FEES CHARGED BY A COURT.

In XLRBITRATION THE YESS CLLARGED BY THE ARBITRATION ADDUST TRATOR MAY BE GREATER THAN THE FRESCHARGED BY ACOURT. There shall be no authoring for any Claims to be urbitrated on a class action basis. Furthermare, an arbitration can only deside your of try Claim(3) and may not consolidate or join the claims of olice present bein my how summing claims. There abilit be no pro-submitted in this how you get that is the design have place in the follow of the pro-submitted in this how you get that is the design have place in the follow of the pro-submitted in this how you get that is the design have place in the follow of the pro-submitted in the submitted have have place in the follow of the place in the place in the place in the following successful by me in the provide for any contrastic distribution of the following successful by me in the provide in the submitted main the place in the following successful by me in the provide of the submitted main and the submitted have have place in the following interfollowing successful by me in the following successful by me in the provide of the submitted main and the submitted have the place in the following is required to prop that a anyonic required to pay with foss in recense of 5100.00 to the arbitration administration flees. The arbitrator suscess are avaid in your flows, I will pat be required to required to rary of the foss you have provided by due to due to administrator for dwitching which the submitter (submitted when the you are lowed in your flow, I will pat be required to raringhume you fin any of the fees you have provides have of the arbitration of the witching which is hold gives a party the right to recover any of these fors front the other party. This Arbitration Provision is made partawas to a memory due to which party provide in the mithinghene Provision is made partawas to a memory due to avoid a view to FAA and anglicable statutor of finitations and that be ore claims of privilege recoverises of the low of the avaid. I nondecing the arbitration parcelin

cancenter et me appent, nou une tanan scep commentant app detection of an albeitable reade with respect to any Clambia) arbitertol under this Arbitration Provision and, with the exception of disclosure to your or my attorneys, accountants, and there legal en financial advisors, stall too disclose stand bectinos to any Orber Thus Arbitration Provision shall survive termination of this Note or any Prior Provision is detected to the repayment of all announly payable to you under the terms of this Note or any Prior Promissory Note. If any partient of this Arbitration Provision is detected framed or unsaficocable under any law or statute cursuitor with the PAA, it shall not involved the reasoning partices of this Arbitration Rules and this Arbitration Provision, this Arbitration Provision and the Note. In the event of a conflict or unconsistency bowere the applicable Arbitration Rules and this Arbitration Provision, this Arbitration Provision and If I have a quastion about the arbitration administration more than a built and provision is double the own justice administration and the Arbitration If I have a quastion about the arbitration administration from the Arbitration If I have a quastion about the arbitration administration from the Arbitration 150, Chicago, IL 60060, www.jamus-endpaytes, c22 Soan Ryberst, Primarcia Services Arbitration Administration Arbitration Forum, P.O. Boas S019, Minacepolis, MN 25065, www.arbitration-forum.com, (800) 474-2371, Code of Procedare.

S0191). Minicapotis, Mrt. 30000, encoded and a subject to the terms Code of Procedure: R. ADDITIONAL ACREEMENTS 1. Use of Lean Proceeds -1 will not the prosecols of any Lean subject to the terms of this Note only for my oducational expenses (i) at an eligible Institution or (ii) relating to the Lean Program. The co-hornover (unless 1 an subdet for whose charational expenses the Lean is obtained) and/or cosigner, if any, will not receive any of the Lean proceeds. 1 autorizations and/or a cosigner, if any, will not receive any Lean directly to the Institution that I designate or to me in periodic diskursements. The build and intervent of the purpose of receiving the proceeds so that Lean Page

Borrower Social Security Number.

Cosigner Social Security Number:

Borrower Social Security Number:
Cosigner Social Socurity Number:
Fire purposes of paragraph R.J. "T, "we", and "my" refer only to herrower.
Concellation of Dubarsenemts - H I and statisfied with the terms of each disbursenent. I will team the disbursenent beck not cashed to you within thirty (D) days after the Dibbursenent Date. If the disbursenent beck not cashed to you within thirty (D) days after the Dibbursenent Date. If the disbursenent due to you within this tirry (D) days after the Dibbursenent Date. If the disbursenent due you within this tirry (D) days after the Dibbursenent Date. If the disbursenent due you within this tirry (D) days after the Dibbursenent Date. If the disbursenent and the disbursenent was sent to the Isolution or other thing in a due's the tirrus of this Note: 1 will each the through the disbursenent and use disbursenent and use the tirrus of this Note: I moleculate of a disbursenent will not terminate my obligations under this Note in Socie.
Obligations of Mirners - I understand that I must repay this Note though I may be undre eighter. No Wiewer of Rights - My responsibility for paraging my Lamanghett to the terms of this Note: is signed.
Partial Payments: No Wiewer of Rights - My responsibility for paraging my Lamanghet to the terms of this Note: Note is signed.
Bortower Dy our right and the Note, you may accept late or partial psyncents. I agree not to a rend payments marked for parajit in full, "without recoarse," or with other termschant unless they are martial for appeal handling and to head the other to be and a signed to have the distribution of the diabated on the correst of more and the diabated on any costant or constant. You will not be diabated to have the diabated on any costant or a collect on this Note if an in a baker any damated upon me, such an any future recoarse. We want the existent me to any future receasion. You will not be challpated to have the paratid frampsment is me before axing to collect t

and release any security without notifying me or reteating me intering regime in the Noie. en this Noie. 11. Lean Charges - If the charges up any Lean subject to the terms of this Noie charges will be reduced to be charged by the law that gowing the Noie. The such charges will be applied as partial prepayment of principal. 12. Incharmelogie that by signing this Noie. I am requesting that you will disturb the fund to any beak of the version of principal. 13. Incharmelogie that by signing this Noie. I am requesting that you will disturb the fund, so my black of other directly to the Institution of the whether make may representations concerning any lensitution, including that not limited to the quality of the Institution. 14. Institution is also in the Any bay endorse, promotile or make any representationse concerning any lensitution, including that not limited to the quality of the Institution. 5. MY CERTIFICATION I declare under penalty of perpiry under the laws of the United States of America that the Institution is not penalty of the Institution.

gaining in the instrument of the laws of the United States of America ten-I declineated prevails of complex under the laws of the United States of America ten-I declineated prevails of complex U. Lecrity flust the information contained or unchlode in one y Applies for any Lecrity and states the information contained or unchlode in one y Applies for any Lecrity and any state tenters of this hore is true, complex-ion of the instruction of the states of the states of the states of the states confit that and proceeds of any such Learn will be used to bely for educational expensions and/or other expension relating to the Lean Program. If authorize any totalization will be instructed to the student, the student has student to relates to the lender, subsequent holders, or their agents, any requesting information perturent to any Lean subject to the terms of this Note (e.g., employment, effective) functional structures and to make whatever inquiries you consider necessary and appropriate (including requesting and obliving a entistumer report from consource reporting again-circlin in

Page 4 of 7

REDACTED

Date: October 21, 2004

Borrower Name Matt C. Kilgore

Cosigner Name:

Cosigner Name: considering graning such Laan or dishursements under such Laan and for the purpose of any updates, renewals, or extensions of such Laan, reviewing or collection of my Laan, se for any other lawful purpose. I also authores the lender, subsequent holder or their agents to check my credit and employment history and to areswer opesitions about their credit experience with me. I also authores the lender, subsequent holder, limitation, or their agent() to make inquires or to repond to much their sources with respect to this Note and related idocurrents. For the purpose of learning my current address and tricphone number, I authorize the course histogenet holder, or their agents to relate information and make inquiries to the individuale I have listed on my Application to reforence. I authorize the check subsequent holder, or their agents to chase my institution of the status of my Application or of any such Laan. I may asky ou or a subsequent holder to change the due of distancement if the Educational Institution requires differen payments. I further authorize any lender or any holder of my outstanding educational laans to any other lender, subsequent holder, or any other chasanional loans. I understand that I must immediately repay any funds that I receive that ennot reasonably he attributed to any other

Borrower Social Security Number: "

Cosigner Social Security Number:

Cosigner Social Security Number: meeting my elocational expension related to attendance at an eligible Institution and/or other expenses relating to the Lean Program. At my loader's uption, I understaut first my leader many electromescilly transmit finds to the finalitation to be applied to my (ex, if I am and the student, the student's account. I anthorace uption leader to issue a check made payable to me (or, if I am not the student, the student, re jointly payable to the fundation and me (nr, if I am not the student, the student, and send it to the lossification. Cercity that I and (and that, if it um not the student, the student, student is) clipible for participation in the Lean Program and that I understand the student is) clipible for participation in the Loan Program and that I understand the Laan Program. I also earlify that I have not filed for bankniptcy in the past seven years.

	THAT I THOROUGHLY READ THE CONTRACT BEFORE I SIGN IT.
NOTICE TO CONSUMER/C	
	AGREEMENT/NOTE BEFORE 1 READ IT (EVEN IF OTHERWISE ADVISED).
	AGREEMENTINØTE IF IT CONTAINS ANY ULANK SPACES.
(r) I AM ENTITLED TO AN	EXACT COPY OF ANY AGREEMENT I SIGN.
(d) I BAVE THE RIGHT AT	INY TIME TO PAY IN ADVANCE THE UNPAID BALANCE DUE UNDER THIS AGREEMENT/NOTE WITHOUT PENALTY
UNDER WHICH CERTA PARTIES WILL BE RES ARBITRATED, THE PAI SUBSTANTIALLY LIMI	HE MASTER STUDENT LOAN PROMISSORY NOTE COVENING MY LOAN CONTAINS AN ARITERATION PROVISION O DISPUTES AN DESCRIBEU IN THE ARBITRATION REVOISION) BIETWEEN ME AND YOU ANDOR CERTAIN OTHER LAVED BY DINDING ARBITRATION, IF ELECTED BY ME OR YOU OR CERTAIN OTHER PARTIES. IF A DISPUTE IS LISE WILL, NOT HAVE THE OPPORTUNITY TO HAVE A JUGGE OR JURY RESOLVE IT AND OTHER RIGHTS MAY BE ED.
I acknowledge that,I ha	e received a copy of this Note, Notices and all Cosigner Notices.
	ALL 2 DOCK
Borowcy's Signature	Nov. 2, 2004 - Statul Security Number

YOU MUST RETURN ALL PAGES OF THIS SIGNED PROMISSORY NOTE

Page 5 of /

#### KILGORE v. KEYBANK, NAT. ASS'N Cite as 718 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2013)

#### REDACTED

Date: October 21, 2004 Borrower Name: Matt C. Kilgore Cosigner Name:

Borrower Social Security Number: Cosigner Social Security Number:

#### CALIFORNIA RESIDENTS COSIGNER NOTICE

NOTICE TO COSIGNER (Traducción en Inglés Se Requiere Por La Ley)

You are being asked to guarantee this debt. Think carefully before you do. If the borrower doesn't pay the debt, you will have to. Be sure you can afford to pay if you have to, and that you want to accept this responsibility.

You may have to pay up to the full amount of the debt if the borrower does not pay. You may also have to pay late fees or collection costs, which increase this amount.

The creditor can collect this debt from you without first trying to collect from the borrower. The creditor can use the same collection methods against you that can be used against the borrower, such as suing you, garnishing your wages, etc. If this debt is ever in default, that fact may become a part of *your* credit record.

This notice is not the contract that makes you liable for the debt.

AVISO PARA EL FIADOR (Spanish Translation Required By Law)

Se le está pidiendo que garantice esta deuda. Piénselo con cuidado antes de ponerse de acuerdo. Si la persona que ha pedido este préstamo no paga la deuda, usted tendrá que pagarla. Esté seguro de que usted podrá pagar si sea obligado a pagarla y de que usted desea aceptar la responsabilidad.

Si la persona que ha pedido el préstamo no paga la deuda, es posible que usted tenga que pagar la suma total de la deuda, mas los cargos por tardarse en el pago o el costo de cobranza, lo cual aumenta el total de esta suma.

El acreedor (financiero) puede cobrarle a usted sin, primeramente, tratar de cobrarle al deudor. Los mismos metodos de cobranza que pueden usarse contra el deudor, podran usarse contra usted, tales como presentar una demanda en corte, quitar parte de su sueldo, etc. Si alguna vez no se cumpla con la obligación de pagar esta deuda, se puede incluir esa información en la historia de credito de usted.

Este aviso no es el contrato misipo en que se le echa a usted la responsabilidad de la deuda.

11-2-04 (Date)

(Cosigner Signature)

Page 6 of 7

		P.4
CT-1-2004 15:24 FROM:		
Applicant's Name: (First & Last)	Matt Kilgere	
- (Physi	rr, all must have COMPLETE Addresses, with City, Stat caladdress only, P.O. Box NOT acceptable.)	
To Qualify as a Personal Reference the and	persons listed must have known the applicant for at lead d cannot reside at the same address.	ist one (1) year
eme:	Address:	
and the summer	Street:	
me Phone#	City:Stale	_ Zip Code
sme:	Address: Street:	
one Phonot	City:Slate	Zip Code
1710:	Address: Streel:	
me Phone #	City:State	.Code
ime:	Address: Street:	
ma Phone #	City:State	_Zip Code_

If you have any personal accomplishments, special skills or training that you Would like us to know prior to an interview please list on a <u>separate</u> sheet of paper.

З.

\*I redacted the names and contact information of the references.

#### KILGORE v. KEYBANK, NAT. ASS'N Cite as 718 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2013)

REDACTED

### Federal Truth in Lending Disclosure Key Alternative Loan

MATT C KILGORE

Creditor: KeyBank National Association Please direct all questions or correspondence to: Great Lakes Educational Loen Services, Inc. 2401 Internetional Lone Madison, WI 53704-3192 (800) 236-4300

SILVER STATE MELICOPTERS LLC

ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE The cost of your credit as a yearly rate. 5.16 <sup>2</sup>	FINANCE CHARGE The dollar amount the credit will cost you. \$44,098.80	Amount Financed The amount of credit provided to you or on your behalf. \$55,950.00	Total of Payments The amount you will have paid after you have made al payments as scheduled. \$100,048.80
our payment schedule will be	::		
Number of Payments	Amount of Payments	Payments are Due Monthly Commencing	
240 e	\$416.87 e	05/01/2007 <sup>c</sup>	

<u>Variable Rate</u>: The Variable Rate on this loan may increase or decrease and is equal to the "Current Index", plus a margin as defined below. The "Current Index" is the three-month London Interbank Offered Rate ("LiBOR") published in the "Money Rates" section of *The Wall Street Journal* on the 20th day of the month preceding the applicable "Change Date" (e.g., December, March, June and September). During the Interim Period, the Variable Rate is equal to the "Current Index" plus 3.30% per annum. During the Repayment Period, the Variable Rate is equal to the "Current Index" plus 3.30% per annum. During the Repayment Period, the Variable Rate is equal to the "Current Index" plus 3.30% per annum. During the Repayment Period, the Variable Rate is equal to the "Current Index" plus 3.30% per annum. The Variable Rate will change quarterly on the first day of each Jannary, April, July and October (the "Change Date"). Under no circumstances will the Variable Rate exceed the maximum rate allowable under applicable Jaw. Increases in the Variable Rate may result in a increase in the number of payments while decreases in the Variable Rate may result in Sec. 700 for 240 months with a monthly payment of \$564.13 and an initial interest rate of 9.00% and on the first Change Date the interest rate increases to 9.50% immediately after your first monthly payment, your repayment period would increase by 34 months. The repayment term is the aggrogate of the omstanding principal balance of all your hoans in the program as outlined in your Promissory Note. The most current Federal Truth in Leading Disclosare will provide the repayment term.

Late Charge: If a payment is more than 15 days late, you may be charged the lesser of \$5 or 5% of the unpaid amount of the payment.

Prepayment: If you pay off your loan early, you will not be entitled to a refund of any part of the Loan Fee. If you pay off your loan early, you will not have to pay a penalty.

See your appropriate contract documents for any additional information about nonpayment, default, prepayment penalties and any required repayment in full before the scheduled date. All numerical disclosures except the late payment disclosure are estimates based on your 10/01/2006 anticipated graduation date.

(c) means an estimate

Itemization of the Arnount Financed of: Loan Amount given to you directly: Amount paid to others on your behalf: Total Loan Fee:

\$55,950.00 N/A \$55,950.00 \$0.00

#### Schedule of Advances of Amount Financed

Scheduled Date of Advances	Amount of Advances	Loan Fee
11/15/2004	\$16,000.00	\$0.00
01/05/2005	\$13,369.00	\$0.00
04/05/2005	\$13,369.00	\$0.00
07/05/2005	\$13,212.00	\$0.00

21451 (09/04) Full.97A

REDACTED

#### Federal Truth in Lending Disclosure - Revised Disclosure Key Alternative Loan

07/01/2005 MATT C KILGORE Creditor: KeyBank National Association Please direct all questions or correspondence to: Great Lakes Educational Loan Services, Inc. 2401 International Lane Madison, WI 53704-3192 SILVER STATE HELICOPTERS LLC (800) 236-4300 ANNUAL PERCENTAGE FINANCE Amount Financed Total of Payments RATE CHARGE The amount of credit The amount you will have The cost of your credit as a The dollar amount the credit provided to you or on your paid after you have made all will cost you. behalf. payments as scheduled. early rate. 6.62%<sup>e</sup> \$60,157.20<sup>e</sup> \$55,950.00 \$116,107,20 Your payment schedule will be: Number of Payments Amount of Payments Payments are Due Monthly Commencing 240<sup>C</sup> \$483.78° 05/01/2007<sup>e</sup> Variable Rate: The Variable Rate on this loan may increase or decrease and is equal to the "Current Index", plus a margin as defined below. The "Current Index" is the three-month London Interbank Offered Rate ("LIBOR") published in the "Money Rates" section of The Wall Street Journal on the 20th day of the month preceding the applicable "Change Date" (e.g., December, March, June and September). During the Interim Period, the Variable Rate is equal to the "Current Index" plus 3.30% per annum. During the Repayment Period, the Variable Rate is equal to the "Current Index" plus 3.30% per annum. change quarterly on the first day of each January, April, July and October (the "Change Date"). Under no circumstances will the Variable Rate exceed the maximum rate allowable under applicable law. Increases in the Variable Rate may result in an increase in the number of payments while decreases in the Variable Rate may result in a decrease in the number of payments. In cases where the monthly payment will not repay the loan in full within the maximum permissible Repayment Period, an increase in the interest rate may result in higher payments. For example, if your repayment amount is \$62,700 for 240 months with a monthly payment of \$564.13 and an initial interest rate of 9.00% and on the first Change Date the interest rate increases to 9.50% immediately after your first monthly payment, your repayment period would increase by 34 months. The repayment term is the aggregate of the outstanding principal balance of all your loans in the program as outlined in your Promissory Note. The most current Federal Truth in Lending Disclosure will provide the repayment term. Late Charge: If a payment is more than 15 days late, you may be charged the lesser of \$5 or 5% of the unpaid amount of the payment. Prepayment: If you pay off your loan early, you will not be entitled to a refund of any part of the Loan Fee. If you pay off your loan early, you will not have to pay a penalty. See your appropriate contract documents for any additional information about nonpayment, default, prepayment penalties and any required repayment in full before the scheduled date. All numerical disclosures except the late payment disclosure are estimates based on your 10/01/2006 anticipated graduation date. (c) means an estimate nization of the Amount Einanced of \$55 950 00

Remization of the Amount Pinance		\$33,930.00	
Loan Amount given to you directly	y:	\$13,212.00	
Amount paid to others on your beh	alf:	\$42,738.00	
Total Loan Fee:		\$0,00	
	Schedule of /	Advances of Amount Financed	
Scheduled D	ate of Advances	Amount of Advances	Loan Fee
11/1	5/2004	\$16,000.00	\$0.00
01/0	5/2005	\$13,369.00	\$0.00
04/0	5/2005	\$13,369.00	\$0.00
07/0	5/2005	\$13,212.00	\$0.00
JD (05/05)			