CLIENT ALERTS & INSIGHTS

Supreme Court Clarifies Federal Jurisdiction in Arbitration Cases

MAY 20, 2026

Authors: Adam Primm, Tevin Hopkins

Featured Practices: Labor & Employment

Key Takeaways

- The Supreme Court held that if a federal court sends a case to arbitration and stays (instead of dismisses) the case, the court keeps jurisdiction and can later confirm or overturn the arbitration award.
- This decision reduces jurisdictional challenges and additional litigation risk after arbitration-giving employers and litigants more certainty that federal courts can enforce outcomes, avoiding costly procedural fights over whether a court has authority to act.
- Employers should review arbitration agreements and ensure they require courts to *stay* (not dismiss) cases pending arbitration-so the court retains jurisdiction to enforce awards.

On May 14, 2026, the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that when a federal district court enforces an arbitration provision in an employment agreement and sends the dispute to arbitration, the court retains jurisdiction to confirm or vacate any resulting arbitral award.

In *Jules v. Andre Balazs Properties*, No. 25-83, 608 U.S. (2026), Adrian Jules sued his former employer, Andre Balazs Properties ("Andre") in federal district court after Andre apparently terminated his employment because of the COVID-19 pandemic, alleging that his termination violated state and federal employment discrimination laws. After Jules filed suit, the district court enforced the arbitration provision that he signed before beginning work for Andre and stayed the federal case.

The arbitrator ultimately awarded approximately $34,500 in sanctions to Andre based on Jules's and his attorney's misconduct during the arbitral proceedings. Andre then sought enforcement of the arbitrator's award in the district court. Jules opposed the motion, arguing that the district court lacked jurisdiction to confirm the award because Andre's motion did not present federal questions or satisfy the requirements for diversity jurisdiction.

Nevertheless, the district court ruled that it had jurisdiction to enforce the award. In affirming, the Supreme Court reasoned that because the district court had the requisite jurisdiction to enforce the arbitration agreement after Jules initially filed suit (based on federal-question jurisdiction), it retained jurisdiction through the conclusion of the case, including enforcement of the arbitral award.

The Supreme Court also noted that the outcome would be different if Jules had proceeded directly to arbitration rather than filing suit in court. In that scenario, the only action before the district court would have been a motion to confirm or vacate the arbitral award. Because no case had previously been filed, the federal court would lack any preexisting jurisdiction on which to base its authority.

Practical Implications

In light of this ruling, employers should carefully consider the language in their arbitration agreements with employees. Arbitration agreements should require the parties to move the district court to stay, rather than dismiss, the suit while it is adjudicated in arbitration to ensure that the district court maintains jurisdiction throughout the life of the case.

Benesch Labor and Employment attorneys are available for employers seeking counsel on drafting arbitration agreements that align with and leverage this ruling.