

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

FIC RESTAURANTS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

TYSON FOODS, INC.; TYSON CHICKEN, INC.; TYSON BREEDERS, INC.; TYSON POULTRY, INC.; PILGRIM'S PRIDE CORPORATION; KOCH FOODS, INC.; JCG FOODS OF ALABAMA, LLC; JCG FOODS OF GEORGIA, LLC; KOCH MEAT CO., INC.; SANDERSON FARMS, INC.; SANDERSON FARMS, INC. (FOOD DIVISION); SANDERSON FARMS, INC. (PRODUCTION DIVISION); SANDERSON FARMS, INC. (PROCESSING DIVISION); HOUSE OF RAEFORD FARMS, INC.; MAR-JAC POULTRY, INC.; PERDUE FARMS INC.; PERDUE FOODS LLC; WAYNE FARMS, LLC; FIELDALE FARMS CORPORATION; GEORGE'S, INC.; GEORGE'S FARMS, INC.; SIMMONS FOODS, INC.; SIMMONS PREPARED FOODS, INC.; O.K. FOODS, INC.; O.K. FARMS, INC.; O.K. INDUSTRIES, INC.; PECO FOODS, INC.; HARRISON POULTRY, INC.; FOSTER FARMS, LLC; FOSTER POULTRY FARMS; NORMAN W. FRIES, INC. d/b/a CLAXTON POULTRY FARMS, INC.; MOUNTAIRE FARMS, INC.; MOUNTAIRE FARMS, LLC; MOUNTAIRE FARMS OF DELAWARE, INC.; AMICK FARMS, LCC; THE AMICK COMPANY, INC., AMICK-OSI BROILERS, LLC; AMICK-OSI PROCESSING, LLC; CASE FOODS, INC.; CASE FARMS, LLC; CASE FARMS PROCESSING, INC.; and AGRI STATS, INC,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Jury Trial Demanded

Plaintiff FIC Restaurants, Inc. (“Friendly’s”), brings this action for damages under the antitrust laws of the United States against Tyson Foods, Inc.; Tyson Chicken, Inc.; Tyson Breeders, Inc.; Tyson Poultry, Inc.; Pilgrim’s Pride Corporation; Koch Foods, Inc.; JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC; JCG Foods of Georgia, LLC; Koch Meat Co., Inc.; Sanderson Farms, Inc.; Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Food Division); Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Production Division); Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Processing Division); House of Raeford Farms, Inc.; Mar-Jac Poultry, Inc.; Perdue Farms Inc.; Perdue Foods LLC; Wayne Farms, LLC; Fieldale Farms Corporation; George’s, Inc.; George’s Farms, Inc.; Simmons Prepared Foods, Inc.; O.K. Foods, Inc.; O.K. Farms, Inc.; O.K. Industries, Inc.; Peco Foods, Inc.; Harrison Poultry, Inc.; Foster Farms, LLC; Foster Poultry Farms; Norman W. Fries, Inc. d/b/a Claxton Poultry Farms, Inc.; Mountaire Farms, Inc.; Mountaire Farms, LLC; Mountaire Farms of Delaware, Inc.; Amick Farms, LLC; The Amick Company, Inc.; Amick-OSI Broilers, LLC; Amick-OSI Processing, LLC; Case Foods, Inc.; Case Farms, LLC; Case Farms Processing, Inc.; and Agri Stats, Inc. (collectively, the “Defendants”), and alleges:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Defendants are horizontal competitors in the United States chicken market. Defendants and their co-conspirators conducted a long-running conspiracy (the “Conspiracy”) extending from at least January 2008 through at least 2017 (the “Conspiracy Period”) to restrain production, manipulate price indices, fix prices and rig bids, the purpose and effect of which was to fix, raise, stabilize and maintain prices of chicken meat throughout the United States.

2. Chickens raised for meat consumption (“Broilers” or “Broiler”)¹ constitute

¹ Broiler chickens specifically refer to chickens raised for meat consumption to be slaughtered before the age of 10–13 weeks. Broilers can be sold fresh or frozen, raw or cooked, or whole or in parts, or as a meat ingredient in a value added product. As used in this Complaint the term “Broilers” excludes chicken grown, processed, and sold according to halal, kosher, free-range, or organic standards.

approximately 98% of all chicken meat sold in the United States. Defendants are the leading suppliers of Broilers and control approximately 90% of the wholesale Broiler market. The Broiler industry is a highly concentrated market with over \$30 billion in annual wholesale revenue.

3. The commoditized nature of Broilers, in conjunction with the (a) significantly high barriers to entry, (b) access to competitors' commercially sensitive data, (c) highly concentrated market dominated by vertically-integrated producers, (d) inelastic demand for the product, and (e) opportunities to conspire at trade association meetings, investor conferences, competitor plant tours, and other contacts among competitors made the Broiler industry particularly susceptible to anticompetitive manipulation. These factors, among others, enabled Defendants to effectively conspire to inflate the prices of Broilers above those that would prevail in a competitive market.

4. In 2007, the price of Broilers decreased. As a result—commencing as early as January 2008 and continuing throughout the Conspiracy Period—Defendants conspired to curtail competition in the market for Broilers by reducing the supply of Broilers, manipulating the price indices for wholesale Broilers, and fixing prices and rigging bids for Small Bird Broilers² sold to Friendly's and other restaurants.

5. Defendants used multiple means to sustain the Conspiracy. First, beginning in 2008, Defendants engaged in a series of supply reductions at the start of the distribution chain. Defendants purposefully destroyed breeder hens and eggs to achieve these artificial decreases in Broiler supply. Defendants also manipulated the price indices associated with wholesale Broiler prices at the end of the distribution chain. Defendants' conduct ensured that buyers purchased Broilers from Defendants at inflated non-competitive prices.

² Generally, Small Birds are defined as birds slaughtered between 7 and 9 weeks, weighing less than 4 and 1/4 pounds.

6. In furtherance of the Conspiracy, Defendants reached anti-competitive agreements and understandings during regularly scheduled trade association meetings, investor conferences, competitor plant tours, and other contacts with one another.

7. Defendants also coordinated their strategy for achieving their desired anti-competitive ends by exchanging confidential and commercially sensitive information regarding production, capacity, and pricing of Broilers. As part of this strategy, Defendants exchanged information regarding anticipated future production through Defendant Agri Stats, Inc. (“Agri Stats”). Defendants used this data to coordinate production outputs, monitor each other’s production figures for Broilers, and otherwise facilitate the Conspiracy.

8. Defendants also engaged in a conspiracy targeted at restaurants like Friendly’s that purchased Small Bird Broilers (“Small Bird Conspiracy”). Friendly’s, like many restaurants, contracted directly with Defendants for the purchase of their proprietary chicken products. Friendly’s submitted requests for bids to multiple Defendants to supply the Friendly’s system with Small Bird Broilers.

9. Starting as early as 2012 and continuing until as late as 2017 (“Small Bird Conspiracy Period”), Defendants conspired to fix prices and submit artificially high bids to Friendly’s and other restaurants in an effort to drive up Small Bird Broiler prices, and in turn, Defendants’ profits.

10. As a result of Defendants Small Bird price-fixing and bid-rigging Conspiracy, Defendants were able to exact significant price increases from Friendly’s and other restaurants at the same time wholesale prices of Small Bird Broilers were decreasing.

11. Defendants adhered to their collusive agreements and understandings throughout the Conspiracy Period. Defendants reaped the benefits of their illegal conduct through their production and sale—directly and through their wholly-owned or controlled subsidiaries and affiliates—of

Broilers at inflated non-competitive prices. Indeed, during key periods in the Conspiracy Period Defendants continuously urged one another to “lower supply in order to offset reduced demand and to support higher market prices.”

12. Through their collusive, anticompetitive actions, Defendants negated the economic benefits of increased competition. Defendants’ conduct resulted in their customers, including Friendly’s, paying millions of dollars in overcharges to Defendants.

13. Defendants concealed their anticompetitive and unlawful conduct from their customers, regulators, and the public. For instance, it was not publicly known until November 2016 that certain Defendants and their co-conspirators manipulated and artificially inflated the George Dock price index. And, it was not until June 2020 with the Department of Justice’s Indictment of executives of Defendants Claxton and Pilgrim’s Pride that Defendants’ conspiracy to fix prices and rig bids of Small Bird Broilers to restaurants like Friendly’s was revealed.

14. “Plus factors” are economic actions and outcomes, above and beyond parallel conduct by oligopolistic firms that are generally inconsistent with unilateral conduct but largely consistent with explicitly coordinated action. Numerous “plus factors” existed in the Broiler industry during the Conspiracy Period including, but not limited to: (i) extensive information sharing through Agri Stats and other means; (ii) numerous opportunities for Defendants to collude in a variety of forums; (iii) inter-Defendant trades and purchases that often were against independent self-interest; (iv) increased exports of Broilers to other countries that were also often against independent self-interest; (v) multiple industry characteristics that facilitated collusion, such as high vertical integration, high barriers to entry, high industry consolidation and concentration, inelastic supply and demand, a lack of significant substitutes for chicken, depressed economic conditions, and a history of government investigations and collusive conduct; and (vii) the manipulation of the Georgia Dock price index.

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.