

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

IN RE PORK ANTITRUST
LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:

COMMERCIAL AND
INSTITUTIONAL INDIRECT
PURCHASER PLAINTIFF ACTION

Case No. 18-cv-1776 (JRT/HB)

**Memorandum in Support of Motion
for Preliminary Approval of Class
Action Settlement Between the
Commercial and Institutional
Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs and
Defendant JBS**

Table of Contents

	Page
I. Introduction.....	1
II. Background and Basic Settlement Terms.....	1
III. Preliminary Approval of the Settlement Should be Granted.....	5
A. The Proposed Settlement Is the Result of Arm’s-Length Negotiations.....	6
B. The Settlement Provides Significant Relief to the Settlement Class and Should be Preliminarily Approved by the Court.....	7
IV. The Court Should Certify the Proposed Settlement Class.....	8
A. The Proposed Settlement Class Satisfies the Requirements of Rule 23(a)	9
1. Numerosity	9
2. Commonality	9
3. Typicality	10
4. Adequacy of Representation	10
B. The Proposed Settlement Class Satisfies the Requirements of Rule 23(b)(3).....	11
V. The Court Should Allow CIPPs to Provide a Proposed Notice Plan Later	13
VI. Conclusion	14

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Alpern v. UtiliCorp United, Inc.</i> , 84 F.3d 1525 (8th Cir. 1996)	10
<i>Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997)	8, 11, 13
<i>Ark. Educ. Ass’n v. Bd. of Educ. of Portland, Ark. Sch. Dist.</i> , 446 F.2d 763 (8th Cir. 1971)	9
<i>Blades v. Monsanto Co.</i> , 430 F.3d 562 (8th Cir. 2005)	9
<i>Bryant v. Bonded Account Serv./Checking Recovery</i> , 208 F.R.D. 251 (Minn. 2000)	11
<i>Califano v. Yamasaki</i> , 442 U.S. 682 (1979)	13
<i>Custom Hair Design by Sandy v. Cent. Payment Co., LLC</i> , 984 F.3d 595 (8th Cir. 2020)	12
<i>DeBoer v. Mellon Mortg. Co.</i> , 64 F.3d 1171 (8th Cir. 1995)	9, 10
<i>Grunin v. Int’l House of Pancakes</i> , 513 F.2d 114 (8th Cir. 1975)	7
<i>In re Hartford Sales Practices Litig.</i> , 192 F.R.D. 592 (D. Minn. 1999)	9
<i>In re Potash Antitrust Litig.</i> , 159 F.R.D. 682 (D. Minn. 1995)	11
<i>In re Wireless Tel. Fed. Cost Recovery Fees Litig.</i> , 396 F.3d 922 (8th Cir. 2005)	6
<i>In re Zurn Pex Plumbing Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 2012 WL 5055810 (D. Minn. Oct. 18, 2012)	14
<i>In re Zurn Pex Plumbing Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , 2013 WL 716088 (D. Minn. Feb. 27, 2013)	7, 13
<i>Jones v. Flowers</i> , 547 U.S. 220 (2006)	14
<i>Lockwood Motors, Inc. v. Gen. Motors Corp.</i> , 162 F.R.D. 569 (D. Minn. 1995)	9
<i>Martin v. Cargill, Inc.</i> , 295 F.R.D. 380 (D. Minn. 2013)	5, 6, 7
<i>Mullane v. Cent. Hanover Bank & Trust Co.</i> , 339 U.S. 306 (1950)	13
<i>Paxton v. Union Nat’l Bank</i> , 688 F.2d 552 (8th Cir. 1982)	10
<i>Petrovic v. Amoco Oil Co.</i> , 200 F.3d 1140 (8th Cir. 1999)	13

<i>Sandusky Wellness Ctr., LLC v. Medtox Sci, inc.</i> , 821 F.3d 992 (8th Cir. 2016)	12
<i>Smith v. ConocoPhillips Pipe Line Co.</i> , 801 F.3d 921 (8th Cir. 2015)	8
<i>Van Horn v. Trickey</i> , 840 F.2d 604 (8th Cir. 1988)	5
<i>White v. Nat’l Football League</i> , 822 F. Supp. 1389 (D. Minn. 1993)	6

Statutes & Rules

28 U.S.C. § 1715	5
Fed. R. Civ. P. 23	<i>passim</i>

Other Authorities

Class Actions Fairness Act of 2005, 28 U.S.C. § 1715	5
Manual for Complex Litigation (Third) (1995)	6
4 Newberg on Class Actions (4th ed. 2002)	6, 7, 12

I. Introduction

The Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs (“CIIPPs”)¹ seek the Court’s preliminary approval of the settlement of their claims against the JBS defendants (JBS USA Food Company; JBS USA Food Company Holdings; and Swift Pork Company). The proposed settlement arose from arm’s length negotiations and provides the CIIPPs an “ice-breaker” settlement in this litigation. JBS will pay \$12,750,000.00 (\$12.75 million) and will provide non-monetary relief through material cooperation to CIIPPs. Such cooperation is valuable and will assist the CIIPPs’ claims against non-settling defendants.

The Court should grant preliminary approval of the proposed settlement because it falls well within the range of possible approval. The Court should certify the proposed Settlement Class for settlement purposes. In a separate motion, CIIPPs will ask the Court to approve a proposed plan for disseminating notice to the Settlement Class and to schedule a Final Fairness Hearing for the proposed settlement.

II. Background and Settlement Terms.

This case represents the consolidation of separately filed putative class actions alleging that Defendants² engaged in a price-fixing conspiracy to artificially constrict the supply of pork

¹ The CIIPP representative plaintiffs are: Sandee’s Bakery; Confetti’s; Francis T. Enterprises d/b/a Erbert & Gerbert’s; Joe Lopez, d/b/a Joe’s Steak and Leaf; Longhorn’s Steakhouse; Betty’s Eat Shop; Ziggy’s BBQ Smokehouse & Ice Cream Parlor, LLC; The Grady Corporation; and Mcmjoynt LLC d/b/a The Breakfast Joynt.

² Defendants in this action include Agri Stats, Inc.; Clemens Food Group, LLC and The Clemens Family Corporation; Hormel Foods Corporation and Hormel Foods, LLC; Indiana Packers Corporation; JBS USA Food Company; Seaboard Foods LLC and Seaboard Corporation; Smithfield Foods, Inc.; Triumph Foods, LLC; and Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson

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.