

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

Case No.: 9:21-cv-82017

JIMMY JOHN'S BUYING GROUP SPV, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

AGRI STATS, INC., CLEMENS FOOD
GROUP, LLC, THE CLEMENS FAMILY
CORPORATION, HORMEL FOODS
CORPORATION, HORMEL FOODS, LLC,
JBS USA FOOD COMPANY, SEABOARD
FOODS LLC, SMITHFIELD FOODS, INC.,
TRIUMPH FOODS, LLC, TYSON FOODS,
INC., TYSON PREPARED FOODS, INC., AND
TYSON FRESH MEATS, INC.,

Defendants.

JURY DEMAND

COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Table of Contents

I. NATURE OF ACTION..... 1

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE..... 4

III. PARTIES..... 5

A. Plaintiff 5

B. Defendants 6

 (i) Agri Stats..... 6

 (ii) Clemens..... 7

 (iii) Hormel..... 7

 (iv) JBS..... 8

 (v) Seaboard 8

 (vi) Smithfield 9

 (vii) Triumph..... 9

 (viii) Tyson..... 9

C. Co-Conspirators 10

IV. FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS..... 11

A. Agri Stats’ central role in collusion in the Broiler industry..... 11

B. Agri Stats markets its collusive scheme to Defendants. 13

C. Agri Stats provided the Other Defendants the unique ability to monitor pricing and production and discipline co-conspirators that did not comply with the anticompetitive agreement..... 16

D. Defendants controlled the supply and production of pork in the United States, which allowed the scheme to succeed. 25

E. The level of concentration in the pork industry was optimal for Defendants’ collusive scheme..... 30

F. The inelastic demand for, and homogeneity of, pork products facilitated collusion. 35

G. Defendants took advantage of numerous opportunities to collude. 36

H. Defendants implemented capacity and supply restraints during the Relevant Period. 44

I. Abnormal pricing during the Relevant Period demonstrates the success of the collusive scheme..... 64

J. Overcharges due to the cartel were reflected in higher pork prices than what they would have been absent the conspiratorial activity. 68

K. The results of the DOJ’s criminal investigation in the Broilers industry support an inference of the existence of a similar conspiracy in the pork industry..... 72

L. Plaintiff's claims are timely..... 73

V. ANTITRUST IMPACT..... 78

VI. COUNT I: VIOLATION OF SECTION 1 OF THE SHERMAN ACT 80

VII. REQUEST FOR RELIEF..... 81

VIII. JURY TRIAL DEMANDED 82

Plaintiff¹ Jimmy John’s Buying Group SPV, LLC brings this action against the Defendants identified below, for their illegal conspiracy, which increased the prices of pork sold in the United States beginning at least as early as 2009 and continuing through the present. Plaintiff brings this action for treble damages and injunctive relief under Section 1 of the Sherman Act.

I. NATURE OF ACTION

1. Defendants—other than Agri Stats—are the leading suppliers of pork in an industry with more than \$20 billion in annual sales. The United States pork industry is highly concentrated, with a small number of large companies controlling supply. Together with their co-conspirators, Defendants collectively control approximately 80% of the wholesale pork market.

2. Defendant Agri Stats, Inc. (“Agri Stats”) is a specialized information-sharing service that, among other things, obtains data from participating industry producers and develops comprehensive reports based on that data. Agri Stats provides its reports and findings to the participating industry producers.

3. Defendants Clemens Food Group, LLC, The Clemens Family Corporation (“Clemens”); Hormel Foods Corporation and Hormel Foods, LLC (“Hormel”); JBS USA Food Company (“JBS”); Seaboard Foods LLC (“Seaboard”); Smithfield Foods, Inc. (“Smithfield”); Triumph Foods, LLC (“Triumph”); and Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Prepared Foods, Inc., and Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc. (“Tyson”) (collectively referred to at times as “pork integrator Defendants”) and Agri Stats entered into a conspiracy from at least 2009 through the present (the “Relevant Period”) to fix, raise, maintain, and stabilize the price of pork.² Defendants implemented their conspiracy

¹ “Plaintiff”, as used herein, shall include assignors identified in Paragraph 15 where appropriate.

² For purposes of this complaint, “pork” includes all pork products, regardless of the form in which they are sold, and all products containing pig meat, whether purchased fresh or frozen, including but not limited to smoked ham, sausage, and bacon. In this complaint, “pork” and “swine” are often used interchangeably.

by, among other things, coordinating with each other to restrict output and limit production, with the intended purpose and expected result of increasing and stabilizing pork prices in the United States. In furtherance of the conspiracy, Defendants exchanged detailed, competitively sensitive, and closely guarded non-public information about prices, capacity, sales volume, and demand, including through their co-conspirator, Defendant Agri Stats.

4. Beginning at least as early as 2009 through the present, Agri Stats began providing highly sensitive benchmarking reports to the pork integrator Defendants. Benchmarking allows competitors to compare their profits or performance against that of other companies. However, Agri Stats reports are unlike those of other lawful industry reports. Agri Stats gathers detailed financial and production data from each of the pork integrator Defendants and their Co-Conspirator Indiana Packers, standardizes this information, and produces customized reports and graphs for the conspirators. The type of information available in these reports is not the type of information that competitors would provide to one another in a normal, competitive market.

5. Agri Stats collected the pork integrator Defendants' competitively sensitive supply and pricing data and intentionally shared that information through the detailed reports it provided them. On at least a monthly basis, and often far more frequently (*e.g.*, weekly or every other week), Agri Stats provides the pork integrator Defendants with current and forward-looking sensitive information (such as profits, costs, prices, and slaughter information), and regularly provides the keys to deciphering which data belongs to which participant. The effect of this information exchange allowed Defendants to coordinate their anticompetitive conduct, monitor each other's production, and thereby control pork supply and price in furtherance of their anticompetitive scheme.

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.