

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Shaver Foods LLC

Court No. 20-03210

Plaintiffs,

v.

The United States of America; Office of the United States Trade Representative; Robert E. Lighthizer, U.S. Trade Representative; U.S. Customs and Border Protection; and Mark A. Morgan, U.S. Customs and Border Protection Acting Commissioner,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiffs, Shaver Food LLC (hereafter “plaintiffs”) by and through their attorneys, allege and state the following:

1. This action concerns Defendants’ prosecution of an unprecedented, unbounded, and unlimited trade war impacting over \$500 billion in imports from the People’s Republic of China. This complaint focuses on Defendants’ unlawful escalation of that trade war through the imposition of a third round of tariffs on products covered by so-called “List 3.” *Notice of*

Modification of Section 301 Action: China's Acts, Policies, and Practices Related to Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property, and Innovation, 83 Fed. Reg. 47,974 (Sept. 21, 2018) and a fourth round of tariffs on products covered by so-called "List 4." *Notice of Modification of Section 301 Action: China's Acts, Policies, and Practices Related to Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property, and Innovation*, 84 Fed. Reg. 43,304 (Aug. 20, 2019)

2. The Trade Act of 1974 ("Trade Act") does not confer authority on Defendants to engage in a vast trade war for however long, and by whatever means, they choose. The Office of the United States Trade Representative ("USTR") conducted an investigation into China's unfair intellectual property policies and practices pursuant to Section 301 of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. § 2411). Section 304 of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. § 2414) required USTR to determine what action to take, if any, within 12 months after initiation of that investigation. USTR failed to issue List 3 and List 4 within that window. USTR may not fall back on its "modification" authority under Section 307 of the Trade Act (19 U.S.C. § 2417) to salvage List 3 and List 4. Section 307 of the Trade Act does not permit USTR to expand the imposition of tariffs to other imports from China for reasons untethered to the unfair intellectual property policies and practices it originally investigated under Section 301 of the Trade Act. Yet that is exactly what Defendants did here when they promulgated the List 3 and List 4 duties in response to China's retaliatory duties and other unrelated issues. Even if USTR deems the existing tariffs "no longer appropriate," as it also did here, the Trade Act permits USTR only to delay, taper, or terminate—not ratchet up—the actions it has already taken.
3. The arbitrary manner in which Defendants implemented the List 3 tariff action also violates

the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”). USTR (1) failed to provide sufficient opportunity for comment, e.g., requiring interested parties to submit affirmative *and* rebuttal comments *on the same day*, (2) failed to consider relevant factors when making its decision, e.g., undertaking no analysis of the supposed “increased burden” imposed on U.S. commerce from the unfair policies and practices that it originally investigated; and (3) failed to connect the record facts to the choices it made. Indeed, despite receiving over 6,000 comments, USTR said absolutely nothing about how those comments shaped its final promulgation of List 3. USTR’s preordained decision-making bears no resemblance to the standards that the APA demands.

4. The arbitrary manner in which Defendants implemented the List 4 tariff action also violates the Administrative Procedure Act (“APA”). USTR (1) failed to provide sufficient opportunity for comment, only providing for written comments and limited rebuttal comments only to post-hearing comments on testimony provided at the hearing, (2) failed to consider relevant factors when making its decision, e.g., undertaking no analysis of the supposed “increased burden” imposed on U.S. commerce from the unfair policies and practices that it originally investigated; and (3) failed to connect the record facts to the choices it made. Indeed, despite receiving over 2800 comments, USTR said nothing about how those comments shaped its final promulgation of List 4. USTR’s preordained decision-making bears no resemblance to the standards that the APA demands.
5. The Court should set aside Defendants’ actions as *ultra vires* and otherwise contrary to law, as well as order Defendants to refund (with interest) any duties paid by Plaintiffs pursuant to Lists 3 and 4.

JURISDICTION

6. The Court possesses subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1581(i)(1)(B), which confers “exclusive jurisdiction” to the Court over “any civil action commenced against the United States, its agencies, or its officers, that arises out of any law of the United States providing for . . . tariffs, duties, fees, or other taxes on the importation of merchandise for reasons other than the raising of revenue.” 28 U.S.C. § 1581(i)(1)(B)

PARTIES

7. Plaintiffs are corporations and other juridical persons. Plaintiffs imported and sold various products subject to enhanced duties under Lists 3 and/or 4A.
8. Defendant United States of America received the disputed tariffs and is the statutory defendant under 5 U.S.C. § 702 and 28 U.S.C. § 1581(i)(1)(B).
9. The Office of the USTR is an executive agency of the United States charged with investigating a foreign country’s trade practices under Section 301 of the Trade Act and implementing “appropriate” responses, subject to the direction of the President. USTR conducted the Section 301 investigation at issue and made numerous decisions regarding Lists 3 and 4.
10. Ambassador Robert Lighthizer currently holds the position of USTR and serves as the director of the Office of the USTR. In these capacities, he made numerous decisions regarding Lists 3 and 4.
11. Defendant U.S. Customs & Border Protection (“CBP”) is the agency that collects duties on imports. CBP collected payments made by Plaintiffs to account for the tariffs imposed by USTR under Lists 3 and 4.
12. Defendant Mark A. Morgan is the Acting Commissioner of CBP. In this capacity, he oversees CBP’s collection of duties paid by Plaintiffs under Lists 3 and 4.

STANDING

13. Plaintiffs have standing to sue because they are “adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action within the meaning of” the APA. 5 U.S.C. § 702; *see* 28 U.S.C. § 263 1(i) (“Any civil action of which the Court of International Trade has jurisdiction . . . may be commenced in the court by any person adversely affected or aggrieved by agency action within the meaning of Section 702 of title 5.”). Tariffs imposed by Defendants pursuant to List 3 and 4 adversely affected and aggrieved plaintiffs because they were required to pay these unlawful duties.

TIMELINESS OF THE ACTION

14. A plaintiff must commence an action under 28 U.S.C. § 1581(i)(1)(B) “within two years after the cause of action first accrues.” 28 U.S.C. § 2636(i).
15. The instant action contests action taken by Defendants that resulted in List 3 and 4. *Notice of Modification of Section 301 Action: China’s Acts, Policies, and Practices Related to Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property, and Innovation*, 83 Fed. Reg. 47,974 (Sept. 21, 2018) and *Notice of Modification of Section 301 Action: China’s Acts, Policies, and Practices Related to Technology Transfer, Intellectual Property, and Innovation*, 84 Fed. Reg. 43,304 (Aug. 20, 2019).
16. Plaintiffs’ claims accrued at the earliest on September 21, 2018, when USTR published notice of List 3 in the *Federal Register*. *Id.* Plaintiffs have therefore timely filed this action.

RELEVANT LAW

17. Section 301 of the Trade Act authorizes USTR to investigate a foreign country’s trade practices. 19 U.S.C. § 2411(b). If the investigation reveals an “unreasonable or discriminatory” practice, USTR may take “appropriate” action, such as imposing tariffs on imports from the country that administered the unfair practice. *Id.* § 2411(b), (c)(1)(B).

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.