

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

CEDAR POINT NURSERY
and FOWLER PACKING COMPANY, INC.,
Petitioners,

v.

VICTORIA HASSID, in her official capacity as Chair
of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board; et al.,
Respondents.

**On Writ of Certiorari
to the United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit**

REPLY BRIEF FOR PETITIONERS

HOWARD A. SAGASER
IAN B. WIELAND
Sagaser, Watkins &
& Wieland PC
5260 North Palm Avenue,
Suite 400
Fresno, California 93704
Telephone: (559) 421-7000
has@sw2law.com
ian@sw2law.com

JOSHUA P. THOMPSON*
**Counsel of Record*
DAMIEN M. SCHIFF
WENCONG FA
CHRISTOPHER M. KIESER
Pacific Legal Foundation
930 G Street
Sacramento, California 95814
Telephone: (916) 419-7111
JThompson@pacificlegal.org
DSchiff@pacificlegal.org
Wfa@pacificlegal.org
CKieser@pacificlegal.org

Counsel for Petitioners

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

INTRODUCTION 1

ARGUMENT 3

 I. The Taking of a Discrete Property
 Interest Triggers Per Se Treatment 3

 A. Continuous Access Is Not Required
 for Per Se Treatment 4

 B. The Access Regulation Takes an Access
 Easement Across Petitioners’ Property 7

 C. The Board Misunderstands the “Narrow”
 Nature of the Per Se Rule 9

 II. Petitioners’ Rule Protects the
 Right to Exclude 12

 III. Petitioners’ Rule Would Not Imperil
 the NLRA or Government Inspections 15

CONCLUSION..... 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Ark. Game & Fish Comm'n v. United States</i> , 736 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	6
<i>Arkansas Game & Fish Commission v. United States</i> , 568 U.S. 23 (2012)	6
<i>Benson v. South Dakota</i> , 710 N.W.2d 131 (S.D. 2006).....	13, 20
<i>Boise Cascade Corp. v. United States</i> , 296 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	1
<i>Bridge Aina Le'a, LLC v. Hawaii Land Use Comm'n</i> , No. 20-54, 2021 WL 666361 (U.S. Feb. 22, 2021)	2
<i>Camara v. Municipal Court</i> , 387 U.S. 523 (1967)	19
<i>CCA Assocs. v. United States</i> , 667 F.3d 1239 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	12
<i>Cent. Hardware Co. v. NLRB</i> , 407 U.S. 539 (1972)	17
<i>Chase Manhattan Bank (Nat'l Ass'n) v. Broadway, Whitney Co.</i> , 294 N.Y.S.2d 416 (Sup. Ct. 1968), <i>aff'd</i> , 249 N.E.2d 767 (N.Y. 1969).....	20
<i>City of Mission Hills v. Sexton</i> , 160 P.3d 812 (Kan. 2007)	21
<i>Colony Cove Properties, LLC v. City of Carson</i> , 888 F.3d 445 (9th Cir. 2018)	12

<i>Dolan v. City of Tigard</i> , 512 U.S. 374 (1994)	15
<i>Hendler v. United States</i> , 952 F.2d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	1, 7–8
<i>Horne v. Dep’t of Agric.</i> , 576 U.S. 350 (2015)	10–11
<i>Hurtado v. United States</i> , 410 U.S. 578 (1973)	18
<i>Int’l Indus. Park, Inc. v. United States</i> , 80 Fed. Cl. 522 (2008).....	20
<i>Jerome v. Ross</i> , 7 Johns. Ch. 315 (1823)	14
<i>Kaiser Aetna v. United States</i> , 444 U.S. 164 (1979)	2, 5, 8, 10, 12
<i>Klemic v. Dominion Transmission, Inc.</i> , 138 F. Supp. 3d 673 (W.D. Va. 2015).....	20
<i>Lech v. Jackson</i> , 791 F. App’x 711 (10th Cir. 2019), <i>cert. denied</i> , 141 S. Ct. 160 (2020)	18
<i>Lechmere, Inc. v. NLRB</i> , 502 U.S. 527 (1992)	16–17
<i>Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.</i> , 446 N.E.2d 428 (N.Y. 1983).....	4
<i>Loretto v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.</i> , 458 U.S. 419 (1982)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Lucas v. S.C. Coastal Council</i> , 505 U.S. 1003 (1992)	7–8, 13, 15, 18
<i>Marshall v. Barlow’s, Inc.</i> , 436 U.S. 307 (1978)	17, 19

<i>McKay v. United States</i> , 199 F.3d 1376 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	1
<i>New York v. Burger</i> , 482 U.S. 691 (1987)	17–19
<i>NLRB v. Babcock & Wilcox Co.</i> , 222 F.2d 316 (5th Cir. 1955), <i>aff'd</i> , 351 U.S. 105 (1956)	16
<i>NLRB v. Babcock & Wilcox Co.</i> , 351 U.S. 105 (1956)	16–17
<i>Nollan v. Cal. Coastal Comm'n</i> , 483 U.S. 825 (1987)	3, 10–11
<i>Payton v. New York</i> , 445 U.S. 573 (1980)	19
<i>Penn Central Transportation Co. v.</i> <i>City of New York</i> , 438 U.S. 104 (1978)	2, 12
<i>Portsmouth Harbor Land & Hotel Co. v.</i> <i>United States</i> , 260 U.S. 327 (1922)	5, 8, 15, 21
<i>PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins</i> , 447 U.S. 74 (1980)	10
<i>Rubottom v. McClure</i> , 4 Blackf. 505 (Ind. 1838)	14
<i>Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto</i> , 467 U.S. 986 (1984)	15
<i>Sears, Roebuck & Co. v. San Diego Cty.</i> <i>Dist. Council of Carpenters</i> , 436 U.S. 180 (1978)	17

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.