



raised in this proceeding, retaining jurisdiction and staying this action would seem to serve no purpose. "Any post-arbitration remedies sought by the parties will not entail renewed consideration and adjudication of the merits of the controversy but would be circumscribed to a judicial review of the arbitrator's award in the limited manner prescribed by law. See 9 U.S.C. §§ 9-12." Alford v. Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc., 975 F.2d 1161, 1164 (5th Cir. 1992) (quoting Sea-Land Service, Inc. v. Sea-Land of Puerto Rico, Inc., 636 F.Supp. 750, 757 (D.P.R. 1986)).

Accordingly, the parties' Joint Motion to Refer Case to Arbitration (document no. 13) is granted to the extent it seeks an order of the court referring this matter to arbitration (or approving their agreement to arbitrate their dispute). It is, however, denied to the extent it moves the court to retain jurisdiction over this matter. The case is dismissed under Section 3 of the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 3, without prejudice. Of course, the parties are free to seek appropriate review of any award eventually entered by the arbitrator(s). The Clerk of the Court is directed to close the case.

SO ORDERED.

---

Steven J. McAuliffe  
United States District Judge

April 18, 1996

cc: James F. Raymond, Esq.  
Richard F. Johnston, Esq.