

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

<p>IN RE CATTLE ANTITRUST LITIGATION</p> <p>This document relates to:</p> <p>ALL CASES</p>	<p>Case No. 0:19-cv-1222-JRT-HB</p>
<p>PETERSON, et al., v. JBS S.A., et al.,</p> <p>Plaintiffs, Defendants.</p>	<p>Case No. 0:19-cv-1129-JRT-HB</p>
<p>IN RE DPP BEEF LITIGATION</p> <p>This document relates to:</p> <p>ALL CASES</p>	<p>Case No. 0:20-cv-1319-JRT-HB</p>
<p>ERBERT & GERBERT'S, INC., Plaintiff, v. CARGILL, INC., et al., Defendants.</p>	<p>Case No. 0:20-cv-1414-JRT-HB</p>

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'
JOINT MOTION TO DISMISS THE FEDERAL CLAIMS**

(REDACTED)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

LEGAL STANDARD 4

ARGUMENT..... 5

I. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO PLEAD A VIOLATION OF THE SHERMAN ACT 5

 A. Plaintiffs’ Witness Allegations Do Not Provide Direct Evidence Of A
 Conspiracy 6

 1. Witness 1’s allegations do not support a conspiracy..... 6

 a. Neither Witness 1 nor his source was in a position to know
 about the alleged agreement..... 7

 b. Even if credited, Witness 1’s allegations do not substantiate
 the claim of a conspiracy 11

 2. Witness 2 offers no direct evidence of a conspiracy 14

 B. Plaintiffs Fail To Plead Parallel Conduct Supporting The Inference Of A
 Conspiracy 15

 1. Plaintiffs fail to plead that Defendants engaged in parallel
 slaughter reductions..... 17

 a. Plaintiffs’ estimates of Defendants’ quarterly slaughter
 volumes do not support their alleged conspiracy..... 17

 b. Plaintiffs’ other Defendant-specific slaughter volume
 allegations do not support the alleged conspiracy 22

 c. Reducing slaughter volumes when prices are high is rational
 economic behavior 25

 2. Plaintiffs fail to plead that Defendants agreed to curtail cash cattle
 purchases 26

 3. Plaintiffs fail to plead that Defendants coordinated how they
 bought cash cattle 29

 4. Plaintiffs fail to plead that Defendants manipulated cattle imports 33

 5. Plaintiffs fail to plead that Defendants closed plants as part of the
 conspiracy..... 35

 C. Plaintiffs Fail To Plead Other Facts Supporting The Inference Of A
 Conspiracy 37

 1. Plaintiffs have not alleged sufficient plus factors..... 37

 2. Plaintiffs’ regression model does not show a conspiracy..... 44

 3. The complaints explain why fed cattle prices lawfully fell..... 46

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

D. Purchaser Plaintiffs Fail To Allege An Injury In Fact That Confers Standing To Sue 48

E. R-CALF And NFU Lack Standing To Seek Money Damages..... 49

II. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO PLEAD A VIOLATION OF THE PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ACT 50

III. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO PLEAD A VIOLATION OF THE COMMODITY EXCHANGE ACT..... 52

A. Plaintiffs’ CEA Claims Are Derivative Of Their Sherman Act Claims 52

B. Plaintiffs Fail To Plead The Elements Of A CEA Claim 53

C. Plaintiffs’ Secondary Liability Claims Fail Because They Fail To Allege A Primary Liability Claim 55

IV. PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS ARE TIME-BARRED..... 55

A. Plaintiffs Do Not Plead Fraudulent Concealment..... 56

1. Plaintiffs do not allege that Defendants concealed the supposed conspiracy..... 57

2. Plaintiffs do not allege that they failed to discover the alleged conspiracy..... 58

3. Plaintiffs do not plead diligence..... 59

B. The Continuing-Violation Doctrine Does Not Permit Plaintiffs To Recover Damages For Acts Outside The Limitations Period..... 61

CONCLUSION 62

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	4, 5, 37
<i>Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters</i> , 459 U.S. 519 (1983)	50
<i>Bell Atl. Corp v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Blomkest Fertilizer, Inc. v. Potash Corp. of Sask.</i> , 203 F.3d 1028 (8th Cir. 2000)	30, 35, 42
<i>Brown v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 628 F.3d 451 (8th Cir. 2010)	5
<i>In re Canadian Imp. Antitrust Litig.</i> , 470 F.3d 785 (8th Cir. 2006)	48, 49
<i>In re Cattle Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 19-cv-1222, 2020 WL 5884676 (D. Minn. Sept. 29, 2020).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>CFTC v. M25 Invs., Inc.</i> , No. 09-cv-1831, 2010 WL 769367 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 6, 2010).....	54
<i>In re Chi. Bd. Options Exch. Volatility Index Manipulation Antitrust Litig.</i> , 390 F. Supp. 3d 916 (N.D. Ill. 2019)	55
<i>In re Chocolate Confectionary Antitrust Litig.</i> , 801 F.3d 383 (3d Cir. 2015).....	8, 43
<i>In re Citric Acid Litig.</i> , 191 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 1999)	40
<i>In re Dairy Farmers of Am., Inc. Cheese Antitrust Litig.</i> , 801 F.3d 758 (7th Cir. 2015)	53
<i>E.L. by White v. Voluntary Interdistrict Choice Corp.</i> , 864 F.3d 932 (8th Cir. 2017)	48
<i>In re Elevator Antitrust Litig.</i> , 502 F.3d 47 (2d Cir. 2007).....	43

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

Cases (continued)	Page(s)
<i>In re EpiPen Direct Purchaser Litig.</i> , No. 20-cv-0827, 2021 WL 147166 (D. Minn. Jan. 15, 2021)	61
<i>Erie Cty. v. Morton Salt, Inc.</i> , 702 F.3d 860 (6th Cir. 2012)	39, 40
<i>Five Smiths, Inc. v. Nat’l Football League Players Ass’n</i> , 788 F. Supp. 1042 (D. Minn. 1992)	41
<i>In re Flat Glass Antitrust Litig.</i> , 191 F.R.D. 472 (W.D. Pa. 1999)	60
<i>In re Graphics Processing Units Antitrust Litig.</i> , 527 F. Supp. 2d 1011 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	42
<i>Griffin v. Smithfield Foods, Inc.</i> , 183 F. Supp. 2d 824 (E.D. Va. 2002)	51
<i>In re GSE Bonds Antitrust Litigation</i> , 396 F. Supp. 3d 354 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Harry v. Total Gas & Power N. Am., Inc.</i> , 889 F.3d 104 (2d Cir. 2018).....	53
<i>Hinds Cty., Miss. v. Wachovia Bank N.A.</i> , 620 F. Supp. 2d 499 (S.D.N.Y. 2009).....	42
<i>Hinds Cty., Miss. v. Wachovia Bank N.A.</i> , 700 F. Supp. 2d 378 (S.D.N.Y. 2010).....	7, 8, 10
<i>Holiday Wholesale Grocery Co. v. Philip Morris, Inc.</i> , 231 F. Supp. 2d 1253 (N.D. Ga. 2002)	44
<i>IBP, Inc. v. Glickman</i> , 187 F.3d 974 (8th Cir. 1999)	30, 51
<i>In re Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.</i> , 618 F.3d 300 (3rd Cir. 2010)	11, 38, 39
<i>Insulate SB, Inc. v. Advanced Finishing Sys., Inc.</i> , 797 F.3d 538 (8th Cir. 2015)	5

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.