

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	C.A. No. 20-1744-CFC
	)	
WALMART INC. AND WAL-MART	)	
STORES EAST, LP,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	

**OPENING BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO  
DISMISS THE COMPLAINT**

OF COUNSEL:

Michael A. Carvin  
Benjamin C. Mizer  
Yaakov M. Roth  
William G. Laxton, Jr.  
JONES DAY  
51 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-2113  
(202) 879-3939  
macarvin@jonesday.com  
bmizer@jonesday.com  
yroth@jonesday.com  
wglaxton@jonesday.com

Robert W. Whetzel (#2288)  
Kelly E. Farnan (#4395)  
RICHARDS, LAYTON & FINGER, P.A.  
920 North King Street  
Wilmington, Delaware 19801  
(302) 651-7700  
whetzel@rlf.com  
farnan@rlf.com

*Attorneys for Walmart Inc. and  
Wal-Mart Stores East, LP*

Karen P. Hewitt  
JONES DAY  
4655 Executive Drive, Suite 1500  
San Diego, CA 92121-3134  
(858) 314-1200  
kphewitt@jonesday.com

Jason S. Varnado  
Laura Jane Durfee  
Andrew J. Junker  
JONES DAY  
717 Texas, Suite 3300  
Houston, TX 77002-2172  
(832) 239-3939  
jvarnado@jonesday.com  
ldurfee@jonesday.com  
ajunker@jonesday.com

David W. Ogden  
Charles C. Speth  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 663-6000  
David.Ogden@wilmerhale.com  
Charles.Speth@wilmerhale.com

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
NATURE AND STAGE OF PROCEEDINGS.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	4
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. THE COMPLAINT DOES NOT PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE THAT ANY WALMART PHARMACIST KNOWINGLY FILLED AN INVALID PRESCRIPTION (COUNT I).....	5
A. The Government Cannot Establish a Violation by Aggregating Knowledge from Employees Not Involved in the Dispensing.....	6
1. A corporation acts with scienter only if a particular agent acts with the relevant state of mind .....	7
2. The Government never alleges that any particular Walmart employee knew these prescriptions were invalid .....	10
B. The Complaint’s Categorical Approach Provides No Basis To Infer That Walmart Knowingly Filled Invalid Prescriptions .....	13
II. THE COMPLAINT DOES NOT STATE VIABLE CLAIMS FOR RELIEF UNDER 21 C.F.R. § 1306.06 (COUNT II).....	18
A. Violations of § 1306.06 Cannot Give Rise to Civil Penalties or an Action for Injunctive Relief .....	19
B. Section 1306.06 Does Not Prohibit Every Deviation from Standards of Professional Conduct.....	23
III. THE GOVERNMENT CANNOT RECOVER CIVIL PENALTIES FOR ALLEGED HISTORICAL FAILURES TO “DETECT AND REPORT” SUSPICIOUS ORDERS.....	28
A. Before October 2018, the CSA Did Not Authorize Civil Monetary Penalties for Failing To Report Suspicious Orders .....	29

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

	<b>Page</b>
B. In Any Case, the CSA Did Not Authorize Monetary Penalties for Suspicious Orders That Escaped Detection.....	31
CONCLUSION .....	33

..

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<i>Ardestani v. INS</i> , 502 U.S. 129 (1991).....	30
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	13
<i>Chaney v. Dreyfus Serv. Corp.</i> , 595 F.3d 219 (5th Cir. 2010) .....	8
<i>City of Roseville Emps. ' Ret. Sys. v. Horizon Lines, Inc.</i> , 713 F. Supp. 2d 378 (D. Del. 2010).....	9
<i>First Equity Corp. v. Standard &amp; Poor's Corp.</i> , 690 F. Supp. 256 (S.D.N.Y. 1988) .....	9
<i>George v. Rehiel</i> , 738 F.3d 562 (3d Cir. 2013) .....	13, 15, 17
<i>Gonzales v. Oregon</i> , 546 U.S. 243 (2006).....	26
<i>Gutter v. E.I. Dupont de Nemours</i> , 124 F. Supp. 2d 1291 (S.D. Fla. 2000).....	10
<i>In re Cable &amp; Wireless, PLC</i> , 321 F. Supp. 2d 749 (E.D. Va. 2004) .....	10
<i>In re Cognizant Tech. Sols. Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 16-cv-6509, 2018 WL 3772675 (D.N.J. Aug. 8, 2018).....	10
<i>In re Tyson Foods, Inc.</i> , No. 01-cv-0425, 2004 WL 1396269 (D. Del. June 17, 2004).....	9
<i>ING Bank v. PNC Fin. Servs. Grp.</i> , 629 F. Supp. 2d 351 (D. Del. 2009).....	9
<i>Intel Corp. Inv. Pol'y Comm. v. Sulyma</i> , 140 S. Ct. 768 (2020).....	31
<i>Kucana v. Holder</i> , 558 U.S. 233 (2010).....	30
<i>Leocal v. Ashcroft</i> , 543 U.S. 1 (2004).....	26

# 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.