

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

IN RE BROILER CHICKEN ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

No. 1:16-cv-08637

Honorable Thomas M. Durkin
Magistrate Judge Jeffrey T. Gilbert

This Document Relates To:

All End-User Consumer Plaintiff Actions

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
FOR PRELIMINARY APPROVAL OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS
BETWEEN END-USER CONSUMER PLAINTIFFS
AND TYSON, FIELDALE, PECO FOODS AND GEORGE'S DEFENDANTS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF LITIGATION	1
III.	SUMMARY OF SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS AND TERMS	2
	A. Fieldale Settlement.....	3
	B. Peco and George’s Settlements.....	4
	C. Tyson Settlement	5
IV.	THE SETTLEMENTS FALL WITHIN THE RANGE OF POSSIBLE APPROVAL	7
V.	THE COURT SHOULD CERTIFY THE PROPOSED SETTLEMENT CLASS.....	9
	A. The Proposed Settlement Class Satisfies Rule 23(a)	9
	1. Numerosity.....	9
	2. Commonality.....	9
	3. Typicality	10
	4. Adequacy	10
	B. The Proposed Settlement Class Satisfies Rule 23(b)(3)	11
VI.	EUCPS PROPOSE TO SEND NOTICE AFTER THE CERTIFICATION OF A LITIGATION CLASS, OR AFTER THEY HAVE COLLECTED SUFFICIENT CONTACT INFORMATION.....	12
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

FEDERAL CASES

Am. Int’l Grp., Inc. v. ACE INA Holdings, Inc.,
2012 WL 651727 (N.D.Ill. Feb.28, 2012)8

Armstrong v. Bd. of Sch. Dirs.,
616 F.2d 305 (7th Cir. 1980)7

Burns v. Elrod,
757 F.2d 151 (7th Cir. 1985)13

City of Greenville v. Syngenta Crop Protection, Inc.,
2012 WL 1948153 (S.D. Ill. May 30, 2012).....13

De La Fuente v. Stokely-Van Camp, Inc.,
713 F.2d 225 (7th Cir. 1983)10

Gautreaux v. Pierce,
690 F.2d 616 (7th Cir. 1982)7

Kleen Prods. LLC v. Int’l Paper Co.,
831 F.3d 919 (7th Cir. 2016)11

Messner v. Northshore Univ. HealthSystem,
669 F.3d 802 (7th Cir. 2012)11

Mullins v. Direct Digital, LLC,
795 F.3d 654 (7th Cir. 2015)11

Prac. Mgmt. Support Servs., Inc. v. Cirque du Soleil, Inc.,
301 F. Supp. 3d 840 (N.D. Ill. 2018)9, 12

Retired Chicago Police Ass’n v. City of Chicago,
7 F.3d 584 (7th Cir. 1993)10

In re Rubber Chems. Antitrust Litig.,
232 F.R.D. 346 (N.D. Cal. 2005).....10

Saltzman v. Pella Corp.,
257 F.R.D. 471 (N.D. Ill. 2009).....10

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes,
564 U.S. 338 (2011).....10

FEDERAL STATUTES

Sherman Act.....1, 12

FEDERAL RULES

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 *passim*

I. INTRODUCTION

End-User Consumer Plaintiffs respectfully move for preliminary approval of settlements with Defendants Fieldale (\$1.7 million),¹ Peco (\$1.9 million),² George’s (\$1.9 million),³ and Tyson (\$99 million)⁴ (collectively, “Settling Defendants”). These icebreaker settlements – negotiated at arm’s length – provide \$104 million in total relief to the EUCPs. Settling Defendants’ agreement to provide cooperation will also strengthen EUCPs’ case against the remaining Defendants.

In addition, , the settlements fall within the range of possible approval under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(e), the proposed settlement class satisfies the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a) and (b), and the proposed notice plan is reasonable. EUCPs therefore request that the Court schedule a preliminary approval hearing.

II. SUMMARY OF LITIGATION

EUCPs have been litigating this case diligently for over four years. On December 14, 2016, the Court appointed Hagens Berman Sobol Shapiro LLP as lead counsel supported by Cohen Milstein Sellers & Toll, PLLC as additional counsel for the putative EUCP class. ECF No. 248. Two days later, EUCPs filed a Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint alleging that defendants conspired to suppress chicken output and raise chicken prices, in violation of the Sherman Act and many state antitrust and consumer protection laws. ECF No. 255.⁵ On November

¹ In this memorandum, “Fieldale” refers to the Defendant Fieldale Farms Corporation.

² “Peco” refers to Defendant Peco Foods, Inc.

³ “George’s” refers to Defendants George’s Inc. and George’s Farms, Inc.

⁴ “Tyson” refers to Defendants Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Tyson Breeders, Inc., and Tyson Poultry, Inc.

⁵ EUCPs’ initial Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint alleged that fourteen chicken processors maintained a *per se* unlawful conspiracy to suppress chicken output and raise prices.

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.