

United States Court of Appeals,

Fifth Circuit.

No. 92-1341.

M.K. PETERSON, Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

RAUSCHER PIERCE REFSNES, INC., et al., Defendants,

Rauscher Pierce Refsnes, Inc., and Richard F. Juba, Defendants-Appellees.

Jan. 14, 1993.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas.

Before GOLDBERG, JOLLY, and WIENER, Circuit Judges.

E. GRADY JOLLY, Circuit Judge:

After our study of the briefs in this case and after hearing oral arguments of counsel, we are convinced that the award of the arbitration panel should not be vacated. The circumstances under which an arbitration award will be set aside are extremely narrow. Judicial review of arbitration awards is extremely limited, and the standard of review applied by the district court is a very deferential one. *Anderman/Smith Co. v. Tennessee Gas Pipeline Co.*, 918 F.2d 1215, 1218 (5th Cir.1990). The district court denied Peterson's motion to vacate the arbitration award. We review *de novo* the district court's order. *Id.* at 1218 n. 2.

Peterson argues that the panel's award should be vacated because of the evident partiality of the arbitrators, because he was denied due process, because of the panel's manifest disregard for the law, and because of procedural irregularities that prejudiced his rights. Peterson, however, has failed to convince us with any of these arguments that the arbitration panel's award should be set aside. Although Peterson has pointed out several procedural irregularities, we are not convinced that the fundamental fairness of the proceeding was undermined; in short, none are serious enough to warrant vacating the award. In concluding, we must observe that the basis for many of the claims raised in this appeal were provided by Peterson and his counsel. And, finally, we would note as an aside that we have been unimpressed with the merits of the claims asserted in the arbitration proceeding. The

judgment of the district court is

**AFFIRMED.**