

*University of Southern California Law
School*

Legal Studies Working Paper Series

Year 2019

Paper 280

Posner and Class Actions

Daniel M. Klerman*

*USC Law School, dklerman@law.usc.edu

This working paper is hosted by The Berkeley Electronic Press (bepress) and may not be commercially reproduced without the permission of the copyright holder.

<http://law.bepress.com/usclwps-lss/280>

Copyright ©2019 by the author.

Posner and Class Actions

Daniel M. Klerman

Abstract

The hallmark of Judge Posner's class action decisions is rigorous review to ensure that aggregate litigation serves the best interests of class members and does not unduly pressure defendants to settle. Although he championed class actions, especially as a way to provide efficient justice in cases involving numerous small claims, Posner also recognized that, because of the agency problems that pervade class action litigation, ordinary adversary procedures were not sufficient to protect class members. As a result, the judge had to act as a fiduciary for the class, especially when approving settlements and fee awards. In addition, the colossal liabilities potentially imposed by a class action meant that a defendant might settle, even if the case had little merit, so judicial scrutiny, in particular interlocutory appellate review of certification decisions, was necessary to protect defendants. The influence of Posner's opinions can be seen in the FRCP, especially the drafting of Rule 26(f), which, following Posner's opinion in *Rhone-Poulenc*, allowed interlocutory review of certification decisions. Citation analysis also confirms Posner's influence on the analysis of class actions, especially outside the Seventh Circuit and in academia.

Posner and Class Actions

Symposium in Honor of Richard Posner

Forthcoming in University of Chicago Law Review

Abstract

The hallmark of Judge Posner’s class action decisions is rigorous review to ensure that aggregate litigation serves the best interests of class members and does not unduly pressure defendants to settle. Although he championed class actions, especially as a way to provide efficient justice in cases involving numerous small claims, Posner also recognized that, because of the agency problems that pervade class action litigation, ordinary adversary procedures were not sufficient to protect class members. As a result, the judge had to act as a fiduciary for the class, especially when approving settlements and fee awards. In addition, the colossal liabilities potentially imposed by a class action meant that a defendant might settle, even if the case had little merit, so judicial scrutiny, in particular interlocutory appellate review of certification decisions, was necessary to protect defendants. The influence of Posner’s opinions can be seen in the FRCP, especially the drafting of Rule 26(f), which, following Posner’s opinion in *Rhone-Poulenc*, allowed interlocutory review of certification decisions. Citation analysis also confirms Posner’s influence on the analysis of class actions, especially outside the Seventh Circuit and in academia.

Daniel Klerman*

The hallmark of Judge Posner’s class action decisions is rigorous review to ensure that aggregate litigation serves the best interests of class members and does not unduly pressure defendants to settle. Although he championed class actions, especially as a way to provide efficient justice in cases involving numerous small claims, Posner also recognized that, because of the agency problems that pervade class action litigation, ordinary adversary procedures were not sufficient to protect class members.¹ As a result, the judge had to act as a fiduciary² for the class, especially when approving settlements and fee awards. In addition, the colossal liabilities

* Edward G. Lewis Professor of Law and History, USC Gould School of Law. dklerman@law.usc.edu. The author thanks Saul Levmore for helpful comments, Haley Tuchman and P.J. Novack for excellent research assistance, Paul Moorman for outstanding library reference support, and Robert Klonoff, John Coffee, and Brian Dean Morales for sharing video of the important “Posner on Class Actions” conference that Columbia Law School hosted on March 2, 2018.

¹ *Creative Montessori Learning Centers v Ashford Gear*, 662 F.3d 913, 917-18 (7th Cir. 2011); *Steinlauf v Continental Illinois*, 962 F. 2d 566, 573 (7th Cir. 1992).

² See, e.g., *Reynolds v Beneficial National Bank*, 288 F.3d 277, 280 (7th Cir. 2002).

potentially imposed by a class action meant that a defendant might settle, even if the case had little merit, so judicial scrutiny, in particular interlocutory appellate review of certification decisions, was necessary to protect defendants.

While Judge Posner's rigorous review of class action litigation is sometimes misconstrued as hostility to class actions generally, this is not correct. It is true that, in his most famous and influential opinion, *Rhone-Poulenc Rorer*,³ Judge Posner refused to certify a class and provided new and powerful tools for defendants to resist class certification. Nevertheless, in numerous other opinions, he extolled the benefits of class action litigation and provided arguments and innovative strategies to facilitate class certification, to provide for effective distribution of awards to class members, and to ensure full compensation to class lawyers.

Economic analysis provided the analytic framework for most of Posner's class action jurisprudence. Class actions were, in Posner's view, particularly important when numerous persons suffered small, but similar injuries. Without class actions, those cases would not be brought, and similar wrongs, potentially large in the aggregate, would not be deterred. As Posner famously quipped, "only a lunatic or a fanatic sues for \$30."⁴ In addition to allowing small-claims suits to be brought, class actions "yield substantial economies in litigation" by eliminating duplicative legal expenses for both plaintiffs and defendants.⁵ These arguments in favor of class actions reflect views that Posner articulated decades earlier in his seminal economic analysis of procedure.⁶

The need for strict scrutiny of class actions also reflects economic considerations, principally agency costs. The lawyer is the client's agent. Even in ordinary litigation, it is difficult for a client to effectively monitor and control the lawyer to ensure that the lawyer acts in the client's best interest. That problem is aggravated in class actions, where the lawyer effectively chooses the clients (the named representatives and the class) and where individual class members, including the named representatives, usually have such small stakes that they have no incentive to monitor and control their lawyers. As a result, class lawyers may be tempted to enter into "sweetheart" deals which provide ample fees to the lawyers, paltry compensation to class members, and minimal deterrence of future wrongdoing. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that there may be competing class actions and/or competing class action lawyers, so defendants may be able to play the lawyers off against each other in a "reverse auction" in order to negotiate an inexpensive settlement that bars concurrent and future litigation. Although the agency problems in class actions were most thoroughly documented by scholars such as John Coffee, Jonathan Macy, and Geoffrey Miller,⁷ whose contributions Posner

³ *In re Rhone-Poulenc Rorer*, 51 F3d 1293 (7th Cir 1995).

⁴ *Carnegie v Household Intl*, 376 F3d 656, 661 (7th Cir 2004)

⁵ *Id.*

⁶ Richard Posner, *Economic Analysis of Law*, 349-50 (1st ed. 1972); Richard Posner, "An Economic Approach to Legal Procedure and Judicial Administration," 2 *J. Leg. Stud* 399, 439-441 (1973).

⁷ See, e.g., John C Coffee, "Class Wars: The Dilemma of the Mass Tort Class Action," 95 *Colum L. Rev* 1343 (1995); Jonathan R. Macey and Geoffrey P. Miller, "The Plaintiff Attorney's Role in Class Action and Derivative Litigation: Economic Analysis and Recommendation for Reform," 58 *U. Chi. L. Rev* 1 (1991);

acknowledged,⁸ recognition of the conflict-of-interest problem inherent in class actions also goes back to Posner's pre-judicial academic writings.⁹

In part because of his reliance on economic analysis, Posner had little use for traditional legal materials, including the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Supreme Court precedents. Posner's opinions dug deeply into the facts to determine whether a class action was the best way to handle the claims and whether settlements reflected the merits of the case. While he did his best to explain how the rules and precedents could be interpreted to support his economic approach, he seldom engaged in careful analysis of the FRCP or case law, but rather structured his opinions around his view of the crucial issues, occasionally tying his analysis back to authoritative legal sources. In his later, more candid years on the bench, which one lawyer called his "late decadent" period,¹⁰ Posner showed disdain for traditional legal reasoning and suggested that judges follow "common sense...forgetting about the law," unless there was a statute or binding precedent blocking the sensible result. Posner advocated this approach explicitly in class actions, flatly admitting, "I don't get a lot out of Rule 23... Actually reading Rule 23, I just get lost in all the detail and the subsections." Instead, he defended a "holistic" approach which asks, "Is this an efficient way to deal with the dispute?" "Is there a real class, a lot of people with a common interest?" "Is their representation competent?" "Are there clearly focused issues?"¹¹

The influence of Posner's opinions on the development of class action case law and scholarship can be measured through citation analysis, but other methods better capture their true impact. A key vehicle of Posner's influence has been, ironically, revisions of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which Posner mocked for its confusing "detail and subsections."¹² When Posner came to the bench in 1981, the class action rules had not been revised since the 1966 amendments, which opened the way for mass tort litigation.¹³ Judge Posner's 1995 decision in *Rhone-Poulenc* was the primary impetus for the 1998 amendments that allowed permissive interlocutory appeals of orders granting or denying class certification. Posner decision was almost certainly also the source for the provision in the notes that justified that review, in part, by "the risk of potentially ruinous liability,"¹⁴ as that danger was a key argument in *Rhone-Poulenc*.¹⁵ The 2003 and 2018 amendments also reflect Posner's influence, this time on the importance of rigorous judicial scrutiny of settlements, competent class counsel, and "active

⁸ See, e.g., *Reynolds v Beneficial National Bank*, 288 F.3d 277, 279, 282 (7th Cir. 2002); *Eubank v. Pella*, 753 F. 3d 718, 719, 725, 728 (7th Cir. 2014).

⁹ Richard Posner, *Economic Analysis of Law*, 350 (1st ed. 1972); Richard Posner, "An Economic Approach to Legal Procedure and Judicial Administration," 2 J. Leg. Stud 399, 440-441 (1973).

¹⁰ Perry Cooper, "Posner: Class Action Rules, Constitution Overrated," *Bloomberg Law* (October 28, 2016) (quoting "plaintiff attorney Benjamin Gould of Keller Rohrbach LLP [on] Twitter [as] saying he is enjoying 'Posner's late decadent period.'" available at <https://www.bna.com/posner-class-action-n57982081985/>).

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

¹³ Amendment in 1987 were "technical. No substantive change [was] intended." See Committee Notes to 1987 Amendment.

¹⁴ FRCP 26(f) and Committee Notes to 1998 Amendments.

¹⁵ See *infra*.

judicial involvement in measuring fee awards.”¹⁶ While the Committee Notes are written in an arid style which conceals what influenced committee deliberations, Posner’s impact is clear both in the hearings¹⁷ and in the unofficial comments of committee and subcommittee members. Judge Scirica, for example, in discussing the 1998 amendment that allowed discretionary interlocutory appeals, noted.

Judge Posner’s jurisprudence, and the *Rhone-Poulenc* case in particular, was of great interest to the rules makers and was a defining moment in the way we looked at mass claims... No case had articulated the problems to the same degree of detail and persuasiveness as Judge Posner.¹⁸

Similarly, Judge Dow stated that Judge Posner was a “looming presence” in deliberations regarding the 2018 amendments, because “many of the issues ... came out of his opinions.”¹⁹

Judge Posner influenced not only the rules, but also class action lawyers. Elizabeth Cabraser, a leading class action lawyer whose offices are in San Francisco, far from the direct supervision of the Seventh Circuit, confessed:

I did not read all of these [Posner class action] decisions in preparation for the [symposium] panel today, but I can tell you that I read every single one of them in real time when they came out, beginning with actually the second one, *Rhone Poulenc*, because throughout my class actions practice, Judge Posner, more than any single jurist, has been the boss of me.... We ask, “what would Richard Posner do?” Or, more to the point, “how would Richard Posner rule?” That has been salutary.²⁰

It is hard to imagine any other appellate judge whom a lawyer based in another circuit would have paid such close attention to, reading his class action opinions as they were handed down and asking, in internal deliberations, how would he rule. In addition, the fact that she, as a plaintiff’s lawyer, considers his influence overall to have been “salutary” confirms that Posner was concerned at least as much with ensuring that injured class members were competently represented as with protecting defendants from coercive settlements, if not more.

¹⁶ FRCP 23(e), (g) and Committee notes to 2003 and 2018 Amendments.

¹⁷See, e.g., Judicial Conference Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, Public Hearing on Proposed Amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, (Nov 2016 DRI testimony p. 3, Sweeny testimony p. 7), Jan 2017 (Public Counsel testimony, p. 3) (Feb 2017, pp. 4, 12, 13, 16).

¹⁸ Columbia Law School, “Posner on Class Actions,” First Panel, at minutes 7 and 18 available at [https://cdnapisec.kaltura.com/html5/html5lib/v2.53/mwEmbedFrame.php/p/1758691/uiconf_id/38497331/entry_id/0_p09uk61t?wid=_1758691&iframeembed=true&playerId=kaltura_player&entry_id=0_p09uk61t&flashvars\[streamerType\]=auto](https://cdnapisec.kaltura.com/html5/html5lib/v2.53/mwEmbedFrame.php/p/1758691/uiconf_id/38497331/entry_id/0_p09uk61t?wid=_1758691&iframeembed=true&playerId=kaltura_player&entry_id=0_p09uk61t&flashvars[streamerType]=auto)

¹⁹ Columbia Law School, “Posner on Class Actions,” Second Panel, at 1:00, available at [https://cdnapisec.kaltura.com/p/1758691/sp/175869100/embedIframeJs/uiconf_id/38497331/partner_id/1758691?iframeembed=true&playerId=kaltura_player&entry_id=0_qtydlwlt&flashvars\[streamerType\]=auto](https://cdnapisec.kaltura.com/p/1758691/sp/175869100/embedIframeJs/uiconf_id/38497331/partner_id/1758691?iframeembed=true&playerId=kaltura_player&entry_id=0_qtydlwlt&flashvars[streamerType]=auto)

²⁰ Id at 1:05.

The rest of this essay will amplify some of the themes touched upon by this introduction. Section I will discuss Posner's certification decisions, with special emphasis on *Rhone-Poulenc*. Section II will analyze decisions on settlements and related issues (such as lawyer fees). Posner's influence will be analyzed through citation analysis in Section III. Other themes in the introduction – such as Posner use of economics, his disdain for traditional legal reasoning, and his influence on the FRCP and lawyers – will be touched upon only tangentially, as there is little to add to what is already written in this introduction.

I. Certification Decisions

Rhone-Poulenc merits separate analysis. It is Posner's most cited class-action decision. It was the primary influence on the 1998 FRCP Amendment allowing discretionary interlocutory appeals of certification decisions. It was cited extensively in the hearings on the Class Action Fairness Act, and it provoked spirited academic debate.

The plaintiffs in *Rhone-Poulenc* were hemophiliacs infected by the AIDS virus as a consequence of blood solids manufactured by the defendants. The district judge had certified a class with respect to certain issues. The defendants filed a petition for mandamus requesting appellate review. An ordinary appeal was not possible, because certification of a class is not an appealable final order, and the Supreme Court had already decided, in *Coopers & Lybrand*, that the collateral order doctrine, which carves out exceptions to the final order rule, does not apply. Mandamus is an extraordinary remedy, which, as Posner recognized, is only supposed to be granted when the district court “so far exceed[ed] the proper bounds of judicial discretion as to be legitimately considered usurpative in character, or in violation of a clear and indisputable right, or at the very least, patently erroneous.”²¹ The district court judge's decision may well have been erroneous and ill-advised, but it is hard to characterize as “usurpative” or “patently erroneous.” It was not like the Eastern District of Texas's patent venue decisions, which tried to attract and keep as many infringement cases as possible in that district and which were thus properly the subject of repeated mandamus decisions by the Federal Circuit.²² Nor was the district court judge in *Rhone-Poulenc* so incompetent that his decision was patently erroneous. Posner had to advance several novel theories in order to demonstrate the trial judge's error, and, as discussed in detail below, all have been subject to substantial academic critique. Rather, Posner clearly thought it would be better for certification decisions to be subject to more frequent and careful appellate review, and he was willing to bend mandamus doctrine to make that possible.

History has largely vindicated Posner's view. Several other appellate courts soon followed Posner's lead, and, as noted above, three years later, the Rules Committee amended the FRCP to allow discretionary appellate review without recourse to a writ of mandamus. Allowing appellate review of certification decisions has had a profound influence on class-action jurisprudence, as certification decisions had previously been practically unreviewable. Because most class actions settle, the final judgment rule meant that very few certification decision would

²¹ 51 F.3d at 1295.

²² Klerman and Reilly, “Forum Selling,” 89 S. Cal. L. Rev 241, 260-61 (2016).

ever be subject to appellate review. While 28 USC 1292(b) allows appellate review of interlocutory decisions when both the trial judge and appellate court desire it, most trial judges are reluctant to voluntarily subject themselves to appellate review that could be otherwise avoided. By allowing appellate review of certification decisions, *Rhone-Poulenc* and the 1998 FRCP Amendment made possible the sort of rigorous review of class action decisions that Posner himself advocated. Without interlocutory review, Posner and other appellate judges would simply have been unable to examine the merits of the certification decision in the vast majority of cases.

Posner based his decision on three main arguments. The first, which is clearly where Posner's heart lay, involved the danger that certification would coerce the defendants into settling a case that Posner thought was very weak. The danger of such a coercive settlement both provided a reason for interlocutory review – because if the case settled, no appeal could later be taken on the certification issue – and showed why injustice would result if certification were not reversed.

Posner's second argument was that *Rhone-Poulenc* was a class action based on state law, but state laws vary on relevant legal issues. A key issue, for example, was whether it was negligence for the defendants not to heat their blood or screen donors to avoid contamination with Hepatitis B, and whether this negligence with respect to Hepatitis B also made the defendant negligent with respect to plaintiffs in this case. That was an issue that different state courts might decide differently, because the plaintiffs in this case were not infected with Hepatitis B, but the same precautions that would have been effective against Hepatitis B would “serendipitously” have protected them against HIV. So, Posner argued, to resolve the case, the trial judge would have to give a “kind of Esperanto instruction, merging the negligence standard of the 50 states and the District of Columbia,” thus violating the command of *Erie* for federal courts to apply state law rather than a specially created federal common law.²³

Posner's third argument is that the division of issues between the class action and later individual cases would violate the Seventh Amendment, because subsequent juries, who would have to decide issues such as comparative negligence and proximate causation, would implicitly be reexamining the class action jury's determination of the defendant's negligence.

Each of these arguments has been subject to critique. The argument that certification would coerce settlements has received the most attention from law and economics scholars. Some scholars disputed whether liability in the *Rhone-Poulenc* case itself was likely to be so ruinous as to lead the defendant to settle on unfavorable terms.²⁴ Similarly, one can argue that ruinous liability is appropriate, because the case against the defendants was much stronger than Posner assumed. Posner inferred that the class action was weak, in part, from the fact that defendants had won twelve of thirteen individual cases (92.3 percent) that had gone to judgment. The importance Posner attributed to this statistic can be gleaned from the fact that he repeated it three times²⁵ Yet, as Charles Silver pointed out,²⁶ Posner's inference from the litigated cases is itself

²³ *Id.* at 1300.

²⁴ Charles Silver, “‘We’re Scared to Death’: Class Certification and Blackmail,” 78 NYU L Rev 1357, 1376-78 (2003).

²⁵ *Rhone-Poulenc* at 1296, 1298, 1300.

²⁶ Silver at 1378-79.

undermined by the economic analysis of litigation upon which he otherwise relied heavily. As Priest and Klein famously argued, litigated cases are not a random sample of all cases.²⁷ While Priest and Klein argued that selection effects would ordinarily mean that only close cases would be litigated (resulting in a fifty-percent plaintiff trial win rate), they also pointed out that, when the defendant had more at stake -- as in *Rhone-Poulenc*, where an adverse judgment could have collateral estoppel effects against the defendants (but not the plaintiffs) -- defendants would selectively settle cases they were likely to lose and take their chances litigating only the cases they were confident they would win.²⁸ Modern asymmetric information theories of litigation likewise predict that informed defendants (like those in *Rhone-Poulenc*) will disproportionately settle the cases they are likely to lose and litigate only cases they think they can win.²⁹ As a result, the defendant's 92.3 percent trial win rate may reflect the defendant's strategic settlement decisions rather than the underlying merit of the class action.³⁰ This speculation is confirmed by conversations with lawyers for hemophiliac patients, who assert that a number of cases were, in fact, settled before Posner's decision in *Rhone-Poulenc* and that defendants had been strategic in settling the cases plaintiffs were more likely to win, such as those involving favorable state law, young children (who are more sympathetic), persons able to identify the transfusion lot they received (obviating issues relating to market-share liability), and those with later sero-conversion (for whom the statute of limitations would present fewer difficulties).³¹

While these arguments may suggest that *Rhone Poulenc* itself was wrongly decided, they do not undermine the correctness of the precedent set by the case. *Rhone-Poulenc* may provide the correct framework for other cases, even if its holding was applied improperly in *Rhone-Poulenc* itself. A broader critique is that the problem of coercive settlements only exists if the defendant is risk averse.³² If the defendant were risk neutral, the expected value of a class settlement and numerous individual suits would be roughly the same (differing only account of litigation costs). In fact, the defendant would likely underpay if potential liability exceeded the defendant's assets, as the settlement would reflect the expected value of likely payments, not the expected value of judgments it could not possibly pay. On the other hand, while diversified shareholders are plausibly risk neutral, the managers who actually make settlement decisions are likely to be risk averse, so pointing out that Posner's argument presumes risk aversion does not really undermine its validity.

²⁷ Priest, George and Benjamin Klein. 1984. The Selection of Disputes for Litigation. *Journal of Legal Studies* 13:1-55.

²⁸ Id; Lee, Yoon-Ho Alex and Daniel Klerman. 2016. The Priest-Klein Hypotheses: Proofs and Generality. *International Review of Law & Economics* 48:59-76.

²⁹ Abraham Wickelgren, Law and Economics of Settlement, in Jennifer Arlen, ed. *Research Handbook on the Economics of Torts* (Elgar 2013), p. 344

³⁰ The 92.3 percent win rate may, however, also reflect the underlying merit of the class action, because selection effects are partial. Klerman, Daniel and Yoon-Ho Alex Lee. 2014. Inferences from Litigated Cases. *Journal of Legal Studies* 43:209-248.

³¹ Conversations between the author and Roy Spece, January 22, 1997 and July 27, 2018. See also Jay Tidmarsh, *Mass Tort Class Actions: Five Case Studies* (1998).

³² Id at 1374; Warren Schwartz, Long-Shot Class Actions: Toward a Normative Theory of Legal Uncertainty, 8 *Legal Theory* 297, 298-99.

Warren Schwartz mounted a broader critique, arguing that there is nothing wrong with large settlements induced by defendant risk aversion, because settlements are just transfers from the defendant to the plaintiff, and there is no reason to prefer a larger or smaller transfer.³³ Schwartz concedes that “the incentive effect on the behavior of the parties” could provide a basis for discouraging larger payments reflecting risk aversion, but he then asserts that “there is ... no systematic relationship between the amount of the transfer and any of the choices made by the parties in the events out of which the dispute arose.”³⁴ While Schwartz is correct that the magnitude of settlement cannot affect the incentives of the defendant *in the particular case which is settled*, he ignores the effect of settlements on the future actions of those similarly situated. If class actions mean that settlements are generally larger than expected liability, that could induce defendants to be inefficiently cautious, to charge higher prices for products, to remove some products from the market, or to reduce other activities that are, on net, beneficial to society. That is, settlements that are too high, like damages that are too high, could result in inefficiency by inducing excessive precautions or by depressing activity levels.

Luke McCloud and David Rosenberg take on Posner’s second argument, that class certification is improper because it would require resolution of the case under “a law that is merely an amalgam, an averaging, of the nonidentical negligence laws of 51 jurisdictions.”³⁵ McCloud and Rosenberg argue that averaging is actually desirable, because defendants who sell the same product in multiple states (as defendants in *Rhone-Poulenc* presumably did) must adjust their behavior and safety precautions to the law of all affected jurisdictions anyway. In doing so, the rational defendant will not try to satisfy the law of the most stringent jurisdiction, but will take into account expected liability as averaged across all states where it might be sued. Thus, defendant actions implicitly reflect “average law,” so it is appropriate that such amalgamated, synthetic law be applied in class actions and other multi-state litigation.

The third argument about the Seventh Amendment, has been thoroughly examined by Patrick Wooley, who concluded that, contrary to Posner’s opinion:

The [Reexamination] Clause requires only that later juries respect the formal findings of the first jury. Within these broad parameters, the Clause does not prohibit later juries from independently evaluating evidence on a previously decided issue in order to decide a related issue. For that reason, the Clause allows a jury charged with deciding the issue of comparative negligence to rehear evidence presented to an earlier jury on the defendant’s negligence, provided the later jury understands that the formal findings of the earlier jury are binding.³⁶

³³ Schwartz at 308.

³⁴ Id at 309.

³⁵ *Rhone-Poulenc* at 1302.

³⁶ Patrick Wooley, “Mass Tort Litigation and the Seventh Amendment Reexamination Clause,” 83 Iowa L Rev 499, 542 (1998).

Most other commentators and several courts have also rejected Posner's Seventh Amendment arguments.³⁷

Perhaps the strongest argument in favor of Posner's approach, albeit one that he did not explicitly make because it does not fit within the doctrinal framework, is that appellate review of certification decisions is necessary to ensure the development of body of case law on the subject. As noted above, because of the final order doctrine, certification decisions would hardly ever reach appellate courts without expansion of mandamus or some other mechanism overriding the final order doctrine. Appellate review is necessary not only to correct errors and prevent injustice (as Posner argued), but also to generate a body of precedents that could guide district courts in the future.

Those who are familiar only with *Rhone-Poulenc* could get the mistaken impression that Posner was generally hostile to class actions and was interested primarily in protecting defendants. That would ignore the many cases where Posner pushed the law to facilitate class actions. He did so primarily in controversies involving a multitude of small claims, which otherwise would never result in suit. For Posner, *Rhone-Poulenc* was a different and unusual case because it involved plaintiffs whose claims were large enough that each could sue individually.³⁸ The class action device was therefore unnecessary, although it might still economize on costs.

Carnegie v. Household International is illustrative of the many cases in which Posner upheld class certification.³⁹ After *Rhone-Poulenc*, *Carnegie* is Posner's second most-cited certification decision. The plaintiffs were recipients of tax-refund anticipation loans who claimed that they had been fraudulently induced into taking on these high-interest debts. A global settlement had been negotiated and then rejected by the Posner and his Seventh Circuit colleagues in the *Reynolds* decision, discussed below. The court was concerned that "the settlement might have been the product of collusion between the defendants, eager to minimize their liability, and the class lawyers, eager to maximize their fees." On remand, the judge to whom the case had been assigned then certified a very similar class action, albeit with different class action lawyers, and the defendants appealed. Posner used the case as a vehicle for explaining the benefits of small-claim class actions. In response to defendants' argument that the class would be unmanageable because it involved millions of class members, Posner asserted:

That is no argument at all. The more claimants there are, the more likely a class is to yield substantial economies in litigation. It would hardly be an improvement to have in lieu of this single class action 17 million suits each seeking damages of \$15 to \$30.... The *realistic* alternative to a class action is not 17 million individual suits, but zero

³⁷Simon v. Philip Morris, Inc., 200 F.R.D. 21 (E.D.N.Y. 2001) (Weinstein, J); D. McNamara, B. Boghossian, L. Aminpour, "Reexamining the Seventh Amendment Argument Against Issue Certification," 34 Pace L. Rev. 1041 (2014); John C. Coffee, Jr., Class Wars: The Dilemma of the Mass Tort Class Action, 95 COLUM. L. REV. 1343, 1440 (1995) ("This Seventh Amendment objection seems a weak argument"); Elizabeth Cabraser, Your Products Liability Hit Parade: A Class Torts 'Top 20,' 37 Tort and Insurance L. J 169 at n. 110 (citing cases and articles disagreeing with Posner's analysis).

³⁸ *Rhone-Poulenc* at 1299.

³⁹ 376 F.3d 656, 659 (7th Cir. 2004).

individual suits, as only a lunatic or a fanatic sues for \$30. But a class action has to be unwieldy indeed before it can be pronounced an inferior alternative – no matter how massive the fraud or other wrongdoing that will go unpunished if class treatment is denied – to no litigation at all.⁴⁰

That is, Posner was willing to tolerate an “unwieldy” and difficult-to-manage class action if the alternative was that “massive... fraud or other wrongdoing” would go “unpunished.” Posner then went on to list the many “imaginative solutions” that a district court judge could employ to render the case more manageable:

(1) bifurcating liability and damage trials with the same or different juries; (2) appointing a magistrate judge or special master to preside over individual damages proceedings; (3) decertifying the class after the liability trial and providing notice to class members concerning how they may proceed to prove damages, (4) creating subclasses, or (5) altering or amending the class.⁴¹

If the class action would economize on litigation costs and allow possibly meritorious claims to be resolved, Posner encouraged the district court to be creative in administering the litigation rather than using management difficulties as an excuse not to certify.

Posner also swatted away defendants’ numerous procedural objections – that the district court judge improperly put the burden of proof regarding certification on the defendants, that certification was barred by collateral estoppel, and that the district court had made no findings on three of the four certification criteria set out FRCP 23(a): numerosity, commonality, and typicality.⁴² When Posner thought justice would be served by class action treatment, he would not allow procedural technicalities to stand in the way.

The most plausible explanation for Posner’s anti-class action ruling in *Rhone-Poulenc* and his pro-class action decision in *Carnegie* is differences between the underlying facts. The high stakes in *Rhone-Poulenc* meant both that plaintiffs could sue individually and that liability might bankrupt the defendants, whereas the small stakes in *Carnegie* meant that only the class action device could punish and deter fraud. Nevertheless, it is also possible to see the cases as reflecting a change in Posner’s thinking about class actions. There is some quantitative support for that hypothesis. In his first two decades on the bench, the 1980s and 1990s, Posner’s decisions overwhelmingly resulted in non-certification. Less than twenty percent (2/11) affirmed a district court’s certification decision or reversed a decision not to certify. In contrast, in the 2000’s, that percentage rose to more than forty percent (6/14), and in the 2010s, the percentage rose to fifty percent (7/14). Thus, over his career, the percentage of pro-certification decisions more than doubled. Nevertheless, such numbers need to be interpreted with caution. They would mean that Posner views “evolved” only if the quality of cases reaching him remained the same. An alternative hypothesis is that, because of decisions like *Rhone-Poulenc*, class counsel became

⁴⁰ Id at 660-61.

⁴¹ Id at 661.

⁴² Id at 661-664.

more careful about the class actions they brought, so those that reached appeal were more likely to merit certification.

II. Settlement Approvals and Related Issues

Judge Posner was exceptional in the degree of scrutiny with which he examined class settlements and related issues, such as fees to counsel and the distribution of settlement proceeds to the class. *Reynolds v. Beneficial Bank*,⁴³ is illustrative of such cases, and is, deservedly, Posner's most highly cited opinion relating to the approval of class action settlements.

As already mentioned, *Reynolds* involved tax refund anticipation loans that allegedly reflected self-dealing contrary to statements that might have led customers to believe that the defendants were fiduciaries.⁴⁴ The lawyers for the class and the defendants entered into a \$25 million settlement, which, even after modest revisions required by the district court judge, contained a number of problematic features. Relief was limited to \$15 per loan and \$30 per plaintiff, which meant that plaintiffs who took out more than two loans would receive no additional compensation for the additional loans. There was scant evidence to support the idea that \$25 million was reasonable amount, especially in light of the fact that one of defendants faced up to \$2 billion in exposure in a Texas class action, which the settlement would enjoin. Furthermore, the lawyers in the Texas class action were forbidden from notifying members of the class about the status of the Texas litigation, thus denying the class members information that might have led them to opt-out of the settlement.

Posner began his opinion by referring to "lawyers for the class who may, in derogation of their professional and fiduciary obligations, place their pecuniary self-interest ahead of that of the class." He also reminded judges to "exercise the highest degree of vigilance in scrutinizing proposed settlements of class actions" calling the district court judge "a fiduciary of the class, who is subject therefore to the high duty of care that the law requires of fiduciaries."⁴⁵ In the middle of the opinion, Posner referred to John Coffee's "reverse auction" theory, "the practice whereby the defendant in a series of class actions picks the most ineffectual class lawyers to negotiate a settlement with in the hope that the district court will approve a weak settlement that will preclude other claims against the defendant."⁴⁶ While acknowledging that there was "no proof that the settlement [in the *Reynolds* case] was actually collusive in the reverse auction sense," Posner insisted that "the circumstances demanded closer scrutiny."⁴⁷

Judges, Posner argued, should make an effort to "quantify the net expected value" of the case so that they can evaluate whether the settlement is reasonable. Judge Posner proceeded to do that and suggested that the case was worth at least double the amount of the proposed settlement.⁴⁸ Posner also excoriated the settlement and district court judge for including in the

⁴³ 288 F.3d 277 (2002).

⁴⁴ Id at 280.

⁴⁵ Id at 279-80.

⁴⁶ Id at 282.

⁴⁷ Id at 283.

⁴⁸ Id at 285.

scope of the release two other class actions making different, unrelated claims.⁴⁹ Posner concluded the opinion by considering whether lawyers who made objections at the fairness hearing are entitled to a fee for having conferred a benefit on the class. Although the issue was moot, because “the claim for attorneys’ fees falls with the settlement,”⁵⁰ Posner devoted several paragraphs to the issue “for the sake of guidance for the future.”⁵¹ Such objectors are desirable, because “of the risk of collusion over attorneys’ fees and the terms of settlement generally,”⁵² so they should be incentivized through the award of attorneys’ fees.

Altogether, the opinion stands as a stunning rebuke to a district court judge and a stern admonition to all district court judges to scrutinize settlements rigorously, with attention to conflicts of interests. District court judges are urged to expend significant effort to estimate the expected value of litigation so as to ascertain whether a settlement is, in fact, reasonable rather than a sweetheart deal that benefits primarily class lawyers (through fees) and defendants (by barring related concurrent and future litigation). The opinion also evinces distrust, if not contempt, for class action lawyers, who are presumed to act in their own interest rather than in the interest of the class.

Although Posner was often suspicious of class action lawyers, he also believed that good ones were entitled to appropriate compensation. In fact, a decision he wrote on that subject is even more heavily cited than the *Reynolds* decision just discussed. In *Steinlauf v. Continental Illinois*,⁵³ Posner reversed and remanded a case in which the district judge had cut the lawyer’s fee request in half. As Posner noted, “Having employed their professional skills to create a cornucopia for the class, the lawyers for the class were entitled ... to suitable compensation for their efforts.”⁵⁴ The district court judge, Posner ruled, had arbitrarily placed a \$175 ceiling on the lawyers’ hourly rates, in spite of the fact that defense counsel were paid much more and that market rates, more generally, were much higher. Class lawyers were also entitled to market rates for paralegals and computerized research, to prejudgment interest, and to a risk multiplier that reflected the chance that they might be paid nothing at all. The district court judge had “cut legal research time by 40 percent on the ground that experienced securities counsel don’t need to do much research,” an argument Posner dismissed as “clearly incorrect,” as “no one carries the whole of federal securities law ... around in his head, and a lawyer who tries to respond to a motion or brief without conducting fresh research is courting sanctions or a malpractice suit.”⁵⁵ Recognizing that some judges may be unwilling or unable to conduct the calculations necessary to determine an appropriate fee, Posner suggested “appointment of a special master to advise the court.”⁵⁶

In sum, Posner’s class action jurisprudence required district court judges to conduct economically informed scrutiny of the terms of settlements including fee awards. While such

⁴⁹ Id at 285-6.

⁵⁰ Id at 288.

⁵¹ Id.

⁵² Id.

⁵³ 962 F. 2d 566 (7th Cir. 1992)

⁵⁴ Id at 568.

⁵⁵ Id at 570.

⁵⁶ Id at 573.

scrutiny was often conducted based on suspicion that class counsel had acted in self-interested fashion, it could also be used to ensure that class counsel received market rates for work on behalf of the class.

III. Citation Analysis

The table below provides some quantitative evidence of Posner’s influence by comparing citation of Posner’s class action decisions to those of other Seventh Circuit judges during the period when Posner was a judge.

Table 1. Citation Analysis

	7 th Circuit Cases (including district court cases)	Cases Outside the 7 th Circuit	Law Reviews	All citations
Posner Average	46	40	31	445
Posner Total	3830	3308	2552	36,950
7 th Circuit Average (excluding Posner)	70	27	15	365
7 th Circuit Total (excluding Posner)	23,559	6618	3735	88,641

The table looks only at cases involving class action issues, such as certification, settlement approval, and attorneys’ fees. The figures for the 7th Circuit (excluding Posner) are based on a one-third systematic sample.⁵⁷ The first column shows citations in the 7th Circuit, including cases from district courts in Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin. Surprisingly, Posner’s opinions are cited, on average, less often than those of other Seventh Circuit appellate judges (46 versus 70 times). In contrast, if one looks at citations outside the Seventh Circuit, where precedent is persuasive rather than binding, Posner’s average citations are fifty percent higher than his colleagues (40 versus 27). Similarly, when looking at citations in law reviews, Posner’s average is more than twice that of his colleagues. Posner’s lead in all citations – which includes citations in non-law review secondary sources and in trial briefs – is also significant, although not as dramatic. In considering the figures in the table, it is important to note that the Seventh Circuit, for most of the time Posner was on the bench, also included several other distinguished jurists, including Frank Easterbrook.

As discussed in the introduction, citation analysis provides only one measure of Posner’s influence. Other, less quantitative measures, such as his influence on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and on practitioners, may be more persuasive.

⁵⁷ All 7th Circuit appellate decisions using the phrase “class action” were sorted by Westlaw’s “Most Cited” function. The 2nd, 5th, 8th and every 3rd opinion thereafter were examined to see if it contained resolution of a class action issue, and, if it did, it was analyzed. To calculate total citations, the citation in the one-third sample was multiplied by three.

IV. Conclusion

Posner's class action jurisprudence had a profound effect, especially through its influence on the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Posner pushed the federal courts to examine certification decisions and the approval of settlements more rigorously so as to ensure that class actions served both justice and class members and to prevent both coercive and collusive settlements. He encouraged district court judges to act as fiduciaries for the class, because he thought agency problems inherent in class action litigation made normal adversary procedures an inadequate safeguard for plaintiffs' interest. Although his opinions are sometimes misinterpreted as evincing hostility toward class action lawyers and class actions generally, he recognized that class actions and the lawyers who bring them serve an important function in improving access to justice, especially when many persons are injured in ways that result in claims that are individually small, but large in aggregate.