## A Comparison of the Hallmarks of Litigation, Arbitration and Mediation

In a civilized society, if parties cannot work things out between themselves (i.e., private negotiation), then they will need to have a third party intervener step in and either facilitate a negotiation (mediation) or hear and decide the matters in dispute (litigation or arbitration). The following is a comparison of the hallmarks of each.

## Hallmarks of Litigation

- Involuntary one party can initiate without the other's consent
- Proceedings and record open to the public
- Formal with strict rules and procedures defined by governing bodies and case precedent
- Decisions based on law / remedies defined by law
- Requires "notice" and opportunity to be heard / due process driven
- Parties communicate with each other and with the court indirectly through counsel
- Scheduling based on the court's calendar and needs not the parties'
- Outcome is binding and imposed by a judgment but there is a right to appellate review for error
- Time-consuming / requires multiple proceedings to get to trial
- Not particularly efficient
- Protracted end because of right to appeal



## Hallmarks of Arbitration

- Voluntary both sides agree via pre-dispute arb clause in business contract OR via submission after dispute arises
- Proceedings are private but not confidential unless contracted for
- Formal, but parties pick their rules and define their procedures
- Decisions are not required to conform to law; no case precedent or stare decisis
- Outcome is binding-but need to confirm award as a judgment to enforce
- No appellate review unless contracted for and then may be limited to arbitral appellate review process if the provider has such a thing
- Parties tend to communicate with each other and with the arbitrator indirectly through counsel
- Scope of hearing and arbitrator's power is defined by contract
- Scheduling is based on the parties' / counsel's calendars and needs of the case



- May invite "process litigation" re scope of arbitrator power, contract defenses re enforceability of arbitration clause, emergency or provisional relief, availability and enforcement of third-party discovery
- May invite a protracted "end" because of right to appeal trial court's decision on confirmation or vacatur of award.

## Hallmarks of Mediation

- Voluntary both/all sides must agree to sit down at the bargaining table
- Proceedings are private no "record" of what is said
- Informal / no mandatory procedures
- Parties define the "rules of engagement"
- Decisions based on party needs, interests, objectives
- Parties communicate directly even when attorneys are involved
- Third party neutral is at the table to help the parties <u>talk</u> about the problem, <u>explore</u> possible solutions, <u>negotiate</u> a deal, and <u>close</u> with a firm agreement (negotiated resolution)
- Scheduling when to sit down is based on the parties' calendars
- Outcome is "decided" by the parties
- Outcome is binding via private contract - but legal action may be necessary to enforce in the face of breach
- No decision-maker other than the parties
- Efficient and economical in terms of party and attorney time



- Process moves as quickly as the parties are able to meet, make decisions and reach agreement on terms and conditions of deal
- Only works if decision makers and sometimes other stakeholders (e.g., insurers, guarantors, spouses) are at the table
- Tends to move more quickly than private negotiation because a day (or more) is reserved to talk through the issues and try to negotiate a deal then and there
- Intense focus on the problem and reality factors that influence what is possible re a negotiated agreement
- Outcome is not mandated by law; parties can agree to things not available or recognized as "relief" under the law
- Broad and strict confidentiality protections for what is said during and in connection with the mediation - Cal. Evid. Code §1119