

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

*IN RE BROILER CHICKEN ANTITRUST
LITIGATION*

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

All Commercial and Institutional Indirect
Purchaser Plaintiff Actions

Case: 1:16-cv-08637

Honorable Thomas M. Durkin

[PUBLIC, REDACTED]

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO COMMERCIAL AND INSTITUTIONAL
INDIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS 5

I. CIPPS IGNORE COMPLEXITY AND VARIATION IN CHICKEN DISTRIBUTION AND PURCHASING. 5

A. CIPPs Are Links In Complex Chicken Distribution Chains. 5

B. There Is Widespread Price Variation Within These Distribution Chains..... 7

C. These Distribution-Side Dynamics Mean That There Could Be No Common Pass-Through Of Alleged Overcharges. 13

II. CIPPS’ ALLEGATIONS OF COORDINATED “PRODUCTION CUTS” IGNORE THE REALITIES OF CHICKEN PRODUCTION..... 15

A. The So-Called Production Cuts Involved Defendants Selling More Chicken, Not Less..... 15

B. Some Defendants Reduced Production In Some Areas To Weather Historic Economic Turmoil, But Reductions Were Neither Uniform Nor Coordinated..... 17

C. CIPPs’ Use Of The Term “Broilers” Misleadingly Collapses And Simplifies Different Industry Segments, Cuts, and Products. 20

D. CIPPs Also Ignore The Real-World Chicken Production Process..... 23

LEGAL STANDARD..... 24

ARGUMENT..... 25

I. CIPPS CANNOT ESTABLISH PREDOMINANCE..... 26

A. Dr. Mangum’s Flawed Models Cannot Conceal The Fact That Individualized Inquiries Will Overwhelm Any Common Proof Of Antitrust Injury..... 28

1. Dr. Mangum’s Model Makes Improper Assumptions, Masks The Variation In The Chicken Industry, And Shows No Impact to Many Indirect Purchasers..... 30

2. CIPPs’ Unfounded Georgia Dock Claims Further Exemplify The Individualized Inquiries That Preclude Class Certification Here. 40

B. CIPPs Cannot Show Class-Wide Damages Using Common Proof..... 42

C. In Addition, CIPPs Cannot Show Predominance Or Superiority Because Of Substantive Variations In The Many State Laws Governing Their Claims. 45

1. Material Variations Exist Between The Antitrust Laws Of The Twenty-Four Jurisdictions Relied Upon By CIPPs. 46

2.	<i>There Are Substantive Differences Between The Relevant States' Consumer Protection Laws.</i>	48
3.	<i>CIIPPs Compound The Variability Problem By Bringing Unjust Enrichment Claims Under The Laws of Four Jurisdictions.</i>	50
4.	<i>CIIPPs' Proposals To Address Differences In State Laws Are Unmanageable And Inadequate.</i>	51
II.	CIIPPS' CLASS DEFINITIONS ARE FATALLY OVERBROAD.	52
III.	CIIPPS FAIL TO ESTABLISH TYPICALITY.	56
IV.	FIGARETTI'S AND SARGENT'S ARE NOT ADEQUATE CLASS REPRESENTATIVES.	57
	CONCLUSION.	59

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.</i> , 336 F.R.D. 5 (S.D.N.Y. 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Am. Exp. Co. v. Italian Colors Rest.</i> , 570 U.S. 228 (2013).....	24
<i>Anziulewicz v. Bluefield Cmty. Hosp., Inc.</i> , 531 F.Supp. 49 (S.D.W. Va. 1981).....	58
<i>In re Aqua Dots Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 270 F.R.D. 377 (N.D. Ill. 2010).....	50
<i>Arthur v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 267 Neb. 586 (2004)	46
<i>In re Asacol Antitrust Litig.</i> , 907 F.3d 42 (1st Cir. 2018).....	53, 55
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. AT&T Corp.</i> , 339 F.3d 294 (5th Cir. 2003)	47
<i>Bergstrom v. Noah</i> , 266 Kan. 829 (1999)	51
<i>In re Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc.</i> , 288 F.3d 1012 (7th Cir. 2002)	38, 45, 48
<i>Bunker’s Glass Co. v. Pilkington PLC</i> , 75 P.3d 99 (Ariz. 2003).....	51
<i>Cal v. Infineon Techs. AG</i> , No. C 06-4333 PJH, 2008 WL 4155665 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2008).....	25
<i>CE Design Ltd. v. King Architectural Metals, Inc.</i> , 637 F.3d 721 (7th Cir. 2011)	53, 55
<i>Clark v. Bumbo Int’l Trust</i> , No. 15 C 2725, 2017 WL 3704825 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 28, 2017).....	53, 55
<i>Clay v. Am. Tobacco Co.</i> , 188 F.R.D. 483 (S.D. Ill. 1999)	50

...

Clayworth v. Pfizer,
233 P.3d 1066 (Cal. 2010)47

In re Cmty. Bank of N. Va.,
622 F.3d 275 (3d Cir. 2010).....47

Comcast Corp. v. Behrend,
569 U.S. 27 (2013)..... *passim*

Comes v. Microsoft Corp.,
646 N.W.2d 440 (Iowa 2002)51

Dailey v. Groupon, Inc.,
No. 11 C 05685, 2014 WL 4379232 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 27, 2014).....43

In re Dairy Farmers of Am., Inc. Cheese Antitrust Litig.,
No. 09-cv-3690, 2013 WL 4506000 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 23, 2013)59

Dancel v. Groupon, Inc.,
949 F.3d 999 (7th Cir. 2019)24

Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell,
803 F.2d 1473 (9th Cir. 1986)51

Doster Lighting, Inc. v. E-Conolight, LLC,
No. 12–C–0023, 2015 WL 3776491 (E.D. Wis. June 17, 2015).....45

In re Epipen Antitrust Litig.,
No. 17-md-2785-DDC-TJJ, 2020 WL 1180550 (D. Kan. Mar. 10, 2020).....48, 49

Espenscheid v. DirectSat USA, LLC,
No. 12–1943, 2013 WL 407446 (7th Cir. Feb. 4, 2013).....44

Exhaust Unlimited, Inc. v. Cintas Corp.,
223 F.R.D. 506 (S.D. Ill. 2004)31, 32, 36

In re Fla. Cement & Concrete Antitrust Litig.,
278 F.R.D. 674 (S.D. Fla. 2012).....25, 36, 37

In re Fla. Cement & Concrete Antitrust Litig.,
No. 09-CV-23187, 2012 WL 27668 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 3, 2012).....34

In re Fluidmaster Inc., Prods. Liab. Litig.,
No. 14-cv-5696, 2017 WL 1196990 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 31, 2017) *passim*

In re Ford Motor Co. Ignition Switch Prods. Liab. Litig.,
174 F.R.D. 332 (D. N.J. 1997).....51

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.