



## **Kevin S. Ranlett**

Partner

**Washington D.C.**

**T:** 202.263.3217

**F:** 202.263.5217

kranlett@mayerbrown.com

Kevin Ranlett is a partner in the firm's Supreme Court & Appellate and Consumer Litigation & Class Actions practices. He focuses on the defense of consumer class actions, and he regularly advises clients regarding consumer and employee arbitration agreements. In addition to maintaining a substantial appellate practice, he also has litigated cases in state and federal trial courts across the country and before the American Arbitration Association.

Kevin is co-editor of the firm's class action blog, Class Defense, and has taught advanced appellate advocacy at The George Washington University Law School.

Before joining the firm, Kevin clerked for Judge Richard A. Posner of the US Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

### **SELECTED EXPERIENCE**

#### **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.

#### **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.

#### **Dillon v. BMO Harris Bank, N.A. (Fourth Circuit)**

The Federal Arbitration Act allows a party to renew a request for arbitration in order to address evidentiary disputes over the existence or authenticity of an arbitration agreement.

#### **Grayson v. AT&T Corp. (District of Columbia en banc)**

We filed an amicus brief successfully arguing that standing to sue under D.C. consumer-protection laws must be limited to plaintiffs who have suffered a personal injury.

#### **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.

#### **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.