

The Supreme Court Update - May 14, 2026

by Andrew Brantingham, Ian Blodger, Jessica M. Leano, and Brock Huebner

On May 14, 2026, the Supreme Court of the United States issued two decisions:

Montgomery v. Caribe Transport II, LLC, No. 24-1238: This case addresses the Federal Aviation Administration Authorization Act's ("FAAAA") provision that preempts state laws related to the trucking industry's prices, routes, and services. 49 U.S.C. § 14501(c)(1). After Shawn Montgomery was hit by a truck, he sued the driver and the companies that coordinated the shipment, asserting, among other claims, a state law negligent hiring claim. The federal district court dismissed the negligent hiring claim after determining it was preempted by the FAAAA. The Seventh Circuit affirmed. In a unanimous decision by Justice Barrett, the Court reversed, determining that the negligent hiring claim was subject to the FAAAA's safety exception, which states the law "shall not restrict the safety regulatory authority of a State with respect to motor vehicles." 49 U.S.C. § 14501(c)(2)(A). Justice Kavanaugh (joined by Justice Alito) filed a concurrence, questioning whether the FAAAA's safety exception should be analyzed in the same way when the defendant is a broker intermediating between shippers and trucking companies.

View the Court's [decision](#).

Jules v. Andre Balazs Properties, No. 25-83: This case clarifies federal courts' jurisdiction over cases after the court stays a claim under Section 3 of the Federal Arbitration Act ("FAA"). In this case, a federal district court ruled that a former employee's unlawful discrimination lawsuit against his employer was subject to an arbitration clause in the employment contract. Accordingly, the court stayed the case under § 3 of the FAA, and the parties proceeded to arbitration. After the arbitrator ruled for the employer and awarded sanctions against the employee, the employer asked the district court to confirm the award under § 9 of the FAA. The employee opposed, sought to vacate the award under § 10 of the FAA, and argued that the district court lacked jurisdiction to confirm the award after it issued its stay. The district court determined it retained jurisdiction and confirmed the award, a holding that was affirmed by the Second Circuit. In a unanimous

Related People

- Andrew Brantingham
- Ian Blodger
- Jessica M. Leano
- Brock Huebner

Related Capabilities

- Appellate

opinion written by Justice Sotomayor, the Court affirmed. Because the district court had original jurisdiction over the lawsuit before it issued the stay under the FAA, it retained jurisdiction to rule on the post-arbitration motions under Sections 9 and 10 of the FAA.

View the Court's [decision](#).