



1 **FOR APPELLEES:** John Martin O'Connor (Helen J.  
2 Williamson, on the brief), Anderson Kill  
3 & Olick, P.C., New York, New York.  
4

5 **UPON DUE CONSIDERATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED**  
6 **AND DECREED** that the amended judgment of the district court  
7 be **AFFIRMED**.  
8

9 Respondents-Appellants Suchodolski Associates, Inc. and  
10 Consultora Worldstar S.A. appeal from an amended judgment of  
11 the United States District Court for the Southern District  
12 of New York (Marrero, J.) confirming an arbitration award  
13 and injunctive relief in favor of Petitioners-Appellees  
14 Cardell Financial Corp. and Deltec Holdings, Inc. We assume  
15 the parties' familiarity with the underlying facts, the  
16 procedural history, and the issues presented for review.  
17

18 "In reviewing a district court's decision to confirm an  
19 arbitral award, we review findings of fact for clear error  
20 and conclusions of law de novo." Idea Nuova, Inc. v. GM  
21 Licensing Group, Inc., 617 F.3d 177, 180 (2d Cir. 2010).  
22 "It is well established that courts must grant an  
23 arbitration panel's decision great deference." Duferco  
24 Int'l Steel Trading v. T. Klaveness Shipping A/S, 333 F.3d  
25 383, 388 (2d Cir. 2003). Manifest disregard of the law is  
26 evidenced only in "those exceedingly rare instances where  
27 some egregious impropriety on the part of the arbitrators is  
28 apparent." Stolt-Nielsen S.A. v. AnimalFeeds Int'l Corp.,  
29 548 F.3d 85, 91-92 (2d Cir. 2008), rev'd on other grounds,  
30 130 S. Ct. 1758 (2010) (internal quotation marks omitted).  
31 The doctrine is "a mechanism to enforce the parties'  
32 agreements to arbitrate rather than as judicial review of  
33 the arbitrators' decision." Id. at 95.  
34

35 In order to find manifest disregard of the law: (1) we  
36 first "consider whether the law that was allegedly ignored  
37 was clear, and in fact explicitly applicable to the matter  
38 before the arbitrators," Duferco, 333 F.3d at 390; (2) we  
39 must then find that "the law was in fact improperly applied  
40 [by the Arbitrator], leading to an erroneous outcome," id.;  
41 and finally (3) we determine whether "the arbitrator must  
42 have known of [the applicable law's] existence, and its  
43 applicability to the problem before him," id. With respect  
44 to the last element, "we impute only knowledge of governing  
45 law identified by the parties to the arbitration." Id.; see  
46 also Stolt-Nielsen, 548 F.3d at 93 (quoting the Duferco  
47 three-part test in its entirety).

1           After having reviewed Appellants' contentions on appeal  
2 and the record of the proceedings below, we affirm for  
3 substantially the same reasons stated by the district court  
4 in its thorough opinion.

5  
6           We have considered all of Appellants' remaining  
7 arguments and find them to be without merit. For the  
8 foregoing reasons, the amended judgment of the district  
9 court is hereby **AFFIRMED**.

10  
11  
12   FOR THE COURT:  
13   CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE, CLERK  
14