

Meyer vs. Sprint Spectrum L.P.

Year: 2008 Court: California Supreme Court Case Number: S153846

Petition for Rehearing urging the Court to revisit its decision holding that the Consumers Legal Remedies Act, Civil Code section 1770 e seg ("CLRA") does not authorize peremptory challenges to provisions in an agreement to foreclose the public civil justice system (e.g., through arbitration) and which are unconscionable under California law. This decision clearly ignores the plain language of the statute and the breadth of all its provisions and should be substantially modified. The Opinion eviscerated the language and scope of the CLRA, despite the statute's plain language and its express command that is provisions be viewed liberally. Joining United Policyholders in urging the Court to grant a rehearing was the Center for Responsible Lending, Consumer Action, Consumer Watchdog, Consumers for Auto Reliability and Safety, The National Association of Consumer Advocates, the National Consumer Law Center, and Public Citizen.

UP's letter was written pro bono by James C. Sturdevant.

The information presented in this publication is for general informational purposes and is not a substitute for legal advice. If you have a specific legal issue or problem, United Policyholders recommends that you consult with an attorney. Guidance on hiring professional help can be found in the "Find Help" section of <u>www.uphelp.org</u>. United Policyholders does not sell insurance or certify, endorse or warrant any of the insurance products, vendors, or professionals identified on our website. Source: https://uphelp.org/amicus-briefs/meyer-vs-sprint-spectrum-l-p/ Date: November 26, 2024