



Archis A. Parasharami

Partner

Washington D.C.

T: 202.263.3328

F: 202.263.5328

aparasharami@mayerbrown.com

Archis is a partner in the firm’s Supreme Court & Appellate practice and co-chair of the firm’s Class Actions practice. He represents clients in the U.S. Supreme Court, federal and state appellate courts, and trial courts around the country, with a focus on class action, class certification, and arbitration issues.

Archis is a leader in the field of drafting arbitration agreements and in litigating the enforceability of those agreements. Most notably, Archis was one of the Mayer Brown lawyers who represented AT&T in *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion*, a blockbuster U.S. Supreme Court decision declaring that the Federal Arbitration Act generally requires enforcing arbitration agreements that waive class actions.

Archis is the co-editor of Mayer Brown’s Class Defense blog. He has received several awards recognizing his work on behalf of defendants. In 2014, *The National Law Journal* identified Archis as a “D.C. Rising Star,” one of “40 game-changing lawyers age 40 and under,” and the same publication named him one of the “Minority 40 Under 40” under 2011. *Law360* also selected Archis as a “Rising Star” in the field of class action litigation—one of five lawyers to receive that recognition.

SELECTED EXPERIENCE

Adams v. AT&T Mobility, LLC (Ninth Circuit)

The named plaintiffs filed this putative nationwide class action claiming that AT&T violated the federal Telephone Consumer Protection Act by sending text-message advertisements to its wireless customers about upgrading their cellular telephones after AT&T acquired their former wireless provider.

American Express Co. v. Italian Colors Restaurant (U.S. Supreme Court)

We filed an amicus brief successfully arguing that the Federal Arbitration Act does not permit courts to refuse to enforce arbitration agreements based on an ad hoc assessment that individual arbitration might not be cost-effective.

AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion (U.S. Supreme Court)

AT&T Mobility’s customer agreements require disputes to be resolved on an individual basis in arbitration.

Citigroup Global Markets Inc. v. StoneMor Operating LLC (U.S. Supreme Court)

Section 2 of the Federal Arbitration Act prohibits courts from imposing prerequisites to enforcement of an arbitration agreement that are not applicable to contracts generally, and the Supreme Court has repeatedly made clear that arbitration agreements must stand on equal footing with all other agreements.

Coneff v. AT&T Corp. (Ninth Circuit)

The plaintiffs in this case brought several putative nationwide class actions alleging that, after acquiring their wireless carrier, AT&T Mobility degraded their service in order to force them to switch to its network.

Epic Systems Corp. v. Lewis; Ernst & Young LLP v. Morris; NLRB v. Murphy Oil USA, Inc. (U.S. Supreme Court)

We drafted an *amicus* brief for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in a Supreme Court case involving a National Labor Relations Board rule prohibiting agreements to arbitrate employment disputes on an individual basis.

Ferguson v. Corinthian Colleges, Inc. (Ninth Circuit)

Former students at for-profit colleges brought a putative class action against the colleges, claiming that they were misled into enrolling and taking out student loans (which they could not repay) by assurances about their job prospects after completing their studies.

First National Bank of Wahoo v. Charvat (U.S. Supreme Court)

Jarek Charvat used the defendant banks' automatic teller machines after accepting an on-screen notice that he would be charged a fee before being allowed to complete his transaction.

Hancock v. AT&T Co. (Tenth Circuit)

The plaintiffs in this case brought a multistate class action in federal court in Oklahoma on behalf of customers of AT&T, alleging that they were dissatisfied with AT&T's U-Verse service (which provides television, voice, and Internet services).

Hopkins v. BCI Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Los Angeles (Ninth Circuit)

We filed an *amicus* brief arguing that representative actions under California's Private Attorney General Act of 2004 are subject to individual arbitration under the Federal Arbitration Act.

Johnmohammadi v. Bloomingdale's, Inc. (Ninth Circuit)

Plaintiff Fatemeh Johnmohammadi brought a putative class action against Bloomingdales under California law, seeking to recover unpaid overtime wages.

Kindred Nursing Centers Limited Partnership v. Clark (U.S. Supreme Court)

The U.S. Supreme Court granted our petition for certiorari to decide whether the Federal Arbitration Act preempts a state-law rule that singles out arbitration for disfavored treatment.

Marmet Health Care Center v. Brown (U.S. Supreme Court)

We represented one of the petitioners in its efforts to seek review of the West Virginia Supreme Court of Appeals' holding that, as a categorical matter, agreements to arbitrate personal injury or wrongful death claims against nursing homes are unenforceable under West Virginia law.

McArdle v. AT&T Mobility LLC (Ninth Circuit)

An AT&T customer sued AT&T on behalf of a putative class, claiming that the company violated consumer protection statutes by failing to adequately disclose certain charges.

Morgan v. AT&T Wireless Services, Inc. (California)

Customers of AT&T Mobility agreed that any disputes between the parties would be resolved by arbitration on an individual basis, thus barring class actions.

Scott v. Cricket Communications LLC (Fourth Circuit)

We prevailed on appeal of a district court decision that had remanded a class action to state court based on purportedly insufficient evidence of the amount in controversy.

Shorts v. AT&T Corp. (West Virginia)

In this case, the plaintiff brought a class action challenging the early termination fees charged by one of AT&T Mobility's predecessors.

Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins (U.S. Supreme Court)

Under Article III of the U.S. Constitution, a plaintiff must allege that he or she has suffered an "injury-in-fact" to establish standing to sue in federal court.

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes (U.S. Supreme Court)

Several female employees of Wal-Mart brought a putative class action against their employer, alleging that they were the victims of sex discrimination and seeking back-pay.