ALM | LAW.COM

New Jersey Law Journal

The Finality Paradox: En Banc Third Circuit Confronts the Limits of Arbitral Authority

By Jose L. Linares and Mark Makhail

September 15, 2026

Alternative dispute resolution thrives on a fundamental premise: a streamlined, private, and definitive end to a commercial conflict. By selecting arbitration over traditional litigation, parties deliberately swap the multi-layered appellate safety nets of federal and state court systems for the speed and finality of a binding arbitral award. However, this foundational premise creates a profound structural paradox when an arbitrator makes an overt error or leaves an essential term unresolved. Unlike a trial court judge, who retains robust procedural mechanisms under the federal or state rules of civil procedure to alter or clarify judgments post-trial, an arbitrator's authority is generally considered extinguished the moment the final award is signed and delivered.

This rigid boundary is governed by the common-law doctrine of functus officio—literally translated as "a task performed." Under this rule, once an arbitral tribunal fulfills its contractual mandate by issuing a final determination, its official authority over the dispute terminates as a matter of law. Yet, as commercial disputes grow increasingly complex, the absolute application of functus officio can force harsh choices between institutional finality and basic equitable fairness.

The United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit is poised to confront this delicate balance head-on. The parties' petition asks the court to review a discrete, high-stakes issue en banc in *Prospect Capital Management v. Stratera Holdings* to determine the precise boundaries of an arbitrator's authority to amend or modify an award after its initial issuance. At the center of the controversy is the scope and predictability of the "ambiguity exception" to the functus officio doctrine. The court's ultimate en banc decision carries sweeping national implications, threatening to redefine the strategic landscape for advocates, corporate entities, and domestic arbitrators alike.

Mark Makhail (L) and Judge Jose L. Linares (R) of McCarter & English.

The Origins and Exceptions of Functus Officio

To understand the magnitude of *Prospect Capital Management*, one must examine the deep historical skepticism that gave rise to functus officio. Historically, courts viewed private arbitration with distrust, worried that an arbitrator, unmoored from strict judicial oversight, might be susceptible to outside influence or ex parte pressure after releasing a ruling. To prevent a losing party from continually lobbying a non-judicial decision maker to alter an adverse outcome, the common law severed the arbitrator's power immediately upon the award's publication.

This restriction stands in stark contrast to the modern judicial arena. In federal court, for instance, Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 59 and 60 provide systematic pathways for judges to correct clerical mistakes, amend findings, or grant relief from a final judgment based on newly discovered evidence or manifest errors of law. Arbitration possesses no natural parallel to those rules because the arbitrator's power is drawn purely from the parties' private contract, not from a permanent legislative grant of authority.

However, in recognition that a immutable barrier can cause, or contribute to, absurd or unjust results, federal jurisprudence gradually carved out three narrow, traditional exceptions to the functus officio doctrine. First, an arbitrator may correct technical or clerical mistakes apparent on the face of the award, such as blatant mathematical miscalculation. Second, if an award fails to adjudicate discrete issues explicitly submitted by the parties, the tribunal may reconvene to decide that remaining issue, as its contractual assignment was never fully executed. Third, where an award is complete but contains an internal contradiction or latent ambiguity such that it leaves doubt as to how the arbitrator's mandate should be executed, the arbitrator retains a narrow entitlement to clarify the ruling.

It is this third pathway—the ambiguity exception—that has transformed from a rare escape valve into a highly litigated battleground. What one party characterizes as a benign "clarification" of an existing ambiguity, the opposing party frequently denounces as an impermissible, substantive rewriting of the merits.

The Dispute in *Prospect Capital Management*

The underlying conflict in *Prospect Capital Management* underscores how easily the line between clarification and modification can blur when millions of dollars are at issue. The litigation arose from a sophisticated joint venture concerning the distribution of administrative fees earned from a co-owned investment fund, the Priority Income Fund. The managing partners clashed sharply over whether a specific category of shares—namely, those issued through a dividend reinvestment program, or "DRIP"—should be included within the asset base used to calculate outstanding administrative fees.

The matter proceeded to private arbitration under the commercial rules of the American Arbitration Association. Ultimately, the arbitration panel issued an initial award that resolved liability, concluding that certain exclusions of share categories violated the governing corporate agreements. However, the precise application of that liability to the full spectrum of disputed share classes remained highly contested. When the parties requested further guidance, the arbitration panel subsequently issued a revised award. This secondary determination clarified that its liability finding encompassed all categories of the disputed shares, effectively expanding the moving party's financial exposure from a few hundred thousand dollars to nearly eleven million dollars in unpaid fees, interest, and costs.

The losing enterprise immediately sought vacatur in federal court under Section 10 of the Federal Arbitration Act, asserting that the arbitrators had exceeded their powers by expanding an award after their authority had supposedly lapsed. The federal district court confirmed the revised award, holding that the panel's subsequent action fell within the protective umbrella of the ambiguity exception. A three-judge panel of the Third Circuit initially affirmed that ruling, noting that the initial decision left legitimate doubt regarding the scope of the remedy. However, the full circuit's decision to vacate that panel opinion and rehear it en banc signals a desire to establish a definitive, predictable standard for the circuit.

A Philosophical Tussle: Finality Versus Fairness

The core of the en banc argument exposes a fundamental tension between two competing policy goals embedded within alternative dispute resolution.

Advocates for a strict application of functus officio argue that finality is the paramount virtue of the arbitral forum. If an award can be easily reopened under the guise of correcting an ambiguity, the process risks degenerating into the very type of protracted, expensive, multi-stage litigation that corporate entities pay to avoid. Under this view, once an award is delivered, the arbitrator's pen is out of ink. If an award is truly flawed or irreconcilably vague, the remedy should lie within the rigorous statutory vacatur standards of the Federal Arbitration Act, rather than permitting an ad hoc reopening of the merits by a private tribunal that has already completed its contractual assignment. Allowing arbitrators broad latitude to "clarify" their work invites second thoughts, post-hoc rationalizations, and endless re-argument.

Conversely, proponents of a robust ambiguity exception contend that absolute finality must occasionally yield to basic commercial fairness and systemic accuracy. An ambiguous award is, by definition, unenforceable; it cannot be cleanly confirmed or executed by a reviewing court if its literal terms are susceptible to contradictory interpretations. Forcing parties to vacate an entire arbitration and restart a multi-year dispute from scratch simply because a panel phrased a remedy ambiguously is an incredibly inefficient outcome. From this perspective, allowing the original arbitrators to explain exactly what they meant provides practical, common-sense resolutions that honors the parties' original intent to have their dispute fully resolved by specialized private tribunals.

Strategic Consequences for Advocates and Arbitrators

The Third Circuit's en banc ruling will reverberate far beyond the immediate parties in *Prospect Capital Management*. Since New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware serve as corporate hubs for thousands of national businesses, the court's positioning on functus officio will dictate how future commercial agreements are drafted, and how arbitrations and arbitration awards are handled nationwide.

If the en banc court severely restricts the ambiguity exception, corporate practitioners will face much narrower margins for error. Advocates and arbitrators will need to exercise extreme precision throughout the arbitration process, ensuring that every calculation, share category, and transactional time horizon, et cetera are articulated with absolute clarity before the award becomes finalized. Furthermore, a restrictive ruling may drive parties to rely more heavily on specific institutional rules, such as those of the AAA or the JAMS framework, which often contain explicit rules allowing panels a brief window to correct typographical or technical errors.

If, on the other hand, the Third Circuit expands or relaxes the standard on what constitutes an actionable ambiguity, or who decides whether actionable ambiguity exists, it could open the floodgates to strategic post-award motions. Losing parties will undoubtedly recharacterize substantive legal disappointments as "ambiguities" requiring clarification, effectively transforming the close of an arbitration into a springboard for secondary briefing and prolonged post-award disputes—potentially in two different forums.

Ultimately, the *Prospect Capital Management* en banc review forces the judiciary to declare what arbitration truly represents in the modern commercial economy. Is it an immutable contractual pact where speed and absolute finality trump all else, or is it a flexible, quasi-judicial ecosystem where the pursuit of an accurate and fair, yet fully realized resolution, remains the ultimate goal? Those questions remain unanswered—for now. What we do know is that arbitrators and arbitration practitioners across the region will be watching the Third Circuit closely as it attempts to resolve this long-standing procedural divide.

Jose L. Linares *is the former Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey. He is currently the chair of the alternative dispute resolution practice at McCarter & English and a neutral with FedArb. He frequently arbitrates matters involving patent license agreements and other intellectual property disputes.* ***Learn more about his practice.***

Mark Makhail *is a partner at McCarter & English, focusing on complex commercial and business-related litigation in federal court. Makhail has extensive experience in patent litigation, regularly practicing in federal court, and often represents clients in various alternative dispute resolution forums. He can be reached at makhail@mccarter.com*