UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

JUDY JIEN, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

PERDUE FARMS, INC. *et al.*,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 1:19-cv-02521-SAG

OMNIBUS OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS TO DISMISS

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. STATEMENT OF FACTS 2

III. LEGAL STANDARD 8

IV. ARGUMENT 9

A. NAMED PLAINTIFFS HAVE STANDING TO ASSERT CLAIMS ON BEHALF OF ALL CLASS MEMBERS. 10

1. Defendants' Arguments Concerning the Typicality of Class Representatives Are Premature. 10

2. Defendants' Arguments Are Inconsistent with This Court's Prior Opinion and Other Compensation-Fixing Cases. 14

B. THE SAC DOES NOT RELY ON GROUP PLEADING. 16

C. THE SAC PLAUSIBLY ALLEGES A *PER SE* CLAIM AGAINST JENNIE-O, SANDERSON FARMS, AND MOUNTAIRE FARMS. 20

1. The SAC Links the Direct Evidence of the *Per Se* Claim to Jennie-O, Sanderson Farms, and Mountaire Farms. 20

2. Individual Defendants' Arguments to the Contrary Are Without Merit. 22

a. Jennie-O's arguments to dismiss the *per se* claim are unavailing. 22

b. Sanderson Farms' arguments to dismiss the *per se* claim are unavailing. 24

c. Mountaire Farms' arguments to dismiss the *per se* claim are unavailing. 27

D. THE SAC PLAUSIBLY ALLEGES A RULE OF REASON CLAIM AGAINST JENNIE-O, MOUNTAIRE FARMS, AND SANDERSON FARMS. 29

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

1. Plaintiffs Adequately Alleged That Jennie-O, Mountaire Farms, and Sanderson Farms Participated in the Agreement to Exchange Information. 30

2. Plaintiffs' Allegations of Anticompetitive Effects Remain Sufficient. 31

3. Individual Defendants' Arguments to the Contrary Are Unavailing. 32

a. Jennie-O's arguments to dismiss the rule of reason claim are unavailing. 32

b. Mountaire Farms' arguments to dismiss the rule of reason claim are unavailing. 35

c. Sanderson Farms' arguments to dismiss the rule of reason claim are unavailing. 36

E. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS AGAINST JENNIE-O ARE NOT TIME BARRED. 38

1. Plaintiffs May Seek Damages against Jennie-O under Count I for the Entire Class Period. 39

a. Jennie-O is jointly and severally liable for prior acts of co-conspirators under Count I. 39

b. The SAC alleges facts indicating Jennie-O knew "what had gone on before" joining the WMS meetings and WMS surveys in 2015. 42

2. Plaintiffs May Seek Damages against Jennie-O under Count II for the Entire Class Period. 43

a. Plaintiffs have adequately pled fraudulent concealment of Count II. 43

b. Plaintiffs allege that Jennie-O engaged in conspiratorial misconduct prior to 2015. 49

V. CONCLUSION. 49

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

FEDERAL CASES

3 Lab, Inc. v. Kim,
2007 WL 2177513 (D.N.J. July 26, 2007).....27

Amchem Prods. v. Windsor,
521 U.S. 591 (1997).....11

Baehr v. Creig Northrop Team, P.C.,
2018 WL 643502 (D. Md. Dec. 7, 2018).....46

Baker v. United States,
21 F.2d 903 (4th Cir. 1927) 38, 40

Bautista v. CytoSport, Inc.,
223 F. Supp. 3d 182 (S.D.N.Y. 2016).....15

Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007).....8, 22, 24, 25

Bender v. Elmore & Throop, P.C.,
963 F.3d 403 (4th Cir. 2020) 33

Blum v. Yaretsky,
457 U.S. 991 (1982).....13

In re Broiler Antitrust Litig.,
290 F. Supp. 3d 722 (N.D. Ill. 2017) 10

Burgess v. Baltimore Police Dep't,
2016 WL 795975 (D. Md. Mar. 1, 2016).....17

Burtch v. Milberg Factors, Inc.,
662 F.3d 212 (3d Cir. 2011).....26

Burton v. Chrysler Grp. LLC,
2012 WL 831843 (D.S.C. Mar. 12, 2012) 12

Carrier Corp. v. Outokumpu Oyj,
673 F.3d 430 (6th Cir. 2012) 46

Colson v. Avnet, Inc.,
687 F. Supp. 2d 914 (D. Ariz. 2010) 27

...

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Cont'l Ore Co. v. Union Carbide & Carbon Corp.,
370 U.S. 690 (1962).....19

Dickson v. Microsoft Corp.,
309 F.3d 193 (4th Cir. 2002).....29, 31

Edmonson v. Eagle Nat'l Bank,
922 F.3d 535 (4th Cir. 2019).....46, 47

Geske v. PNY Techs., Inc.,
2020 WL 7042887 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 30, 2020).....13

Giuliano v. SanDisk Corp.,
2014 WL 4685012 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 19, 2014).....12

GO Comput., Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.,
508 F.3d 170 (4th Cir. 2007).....47

In re GSE Bonds Antitrust Litig.,
396 F. Supp. 3d 354 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).....26

Harrison v. E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.,
2016 WL 3231535 (N.D. Cal. June 13, 2016).....12

Hester v. Martindale-Hubbell, Inc.,
659 F.2d 433 (4th Cir. 1981).....39

Hinds Cnty. v. Wachovia Bank N.A.,
700 F. Supp. 2d 378 (S.D.N.Y. 2010).....25, 27, 28

Houck v. Substitute Tr. Servs., Inc.,
791 F.3d 473 (4th Cir. 2015).....8

Huey v. Honeywell, Inc.,
82 F.3d 327 (9th Cir. 1996).....34

In re Interior Molded Doors Antitrust Litig.,
2019 WL 4478734 (E.D. Va. Sept. 18, 2019).....13

In re K-Dur Antitrust Litig.,
338 F. Supp. 2d 517 (D.N.J. 2004).....41

Kjessler v. Zaappaaz, Inc.,
2019 WL 3017132 (S.D. Tex. Apr. 24, 2019).....15

In re Liquid Aluminum Sulfate Antitrust Litig.,
2017 WL 3131977 (D.N.J. July 20, 2017).....40, 41

DOCKET ALARM
Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.