

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

CHEVRON CORPORATION, *et al.*,
Petitioners,

v.

CITY OF OAKLAND, *et al.*,
Respondents.

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

**BRIEF OF RESPONDENTS IN OPPOSITION TO
PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

BARBARA J. PARKER
MARIA BEE
ZOE M. SAVITSKY
MALIA MCPHERSON
CITY OF OAKLAND
One Frank Ogawa Plaza, 6th Fl.
Oakland, CA 94612

*Counsel for the People of the
State of California and
City of Oakland*

DENNIS J. HERRERA,
RONALD P. FLYNN
YVONNE R. MERÉ
MATTHEW D. GOLDBERG
ROBB W. KAPLA
CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO
City Hall, Room 234
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

*Counsel for the People of the
State of California and
City & County of San Francisco*

VICTOR M. SHER
Counsel of Record
MATTHEW K. EDLING
MICHAEL BURGER
MARTIN D. QUIÑONES
KATIE H. JONES
QUENTIN C. KARPILOW
SHER EDLING, LLP
100 Montgomery St., Ste. 1410
San Francisco, CA 94104
(628) 231-2500
vic@sheredling.com

MICHAEL RUBIN
CORINNE JOHNSON
BARBARA J. CHISHOLM
ALTSHULER BERZON LLP
177 Post Street, Suite 300
San Francisco, CA 94108

*Counsel for the People of the
State of California, City of Oakland,
and City & County of San Francisco*

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- I. Whether a California state law public nuisance claim alleging wrongful and deceptive promotion of hazardous consumer goods “arises under” a congressionally displaced body of federal common law regarding interstate air pollution for purposes of removal jurisdiction.
- II. Whether respondents waived their right to appeal an erroneously denied remand motion by filing an amended complaint to conform to that erroneous ruling while expressly preserving their appellate rights, and then opposing petitioners’ motion to dismiss that amended complaint.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	4
A. Background	4
B. Proceedings Below	5
REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION.....	7
I. No federal common law “governs” the People’s claims.....	7
II. Petitioners’ federal-common-law theory of removal does not warrant review.	12
1. The Ninth Circuit’s application of the well-pleaded complaint rule does not implicate any circuit split.	13
2. The Ninth Circuit correctly applied this Court’s precedent.	18
III. The Ninth Circuit’s application of <i>Caterpillar</i> does not warrant review.	26
IV. The Questions Presented have minimal practical importance, and this petition is a poor vehicle to review them.....	33
CONCLUSION	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Albert v. Smith's Food & Drug Centers, Inc.</i> , 356 F.3d 1242 (10th Cir. 2004)	28
<i>Altria Grp., Inc. v. Good</i> , 555 U.S. 70 (2008)	9
<i>Am. Elec. Power Co. v. Connecticut</i> , 564 U.S. 410 (2011)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Armstrong v. Exceptional Child Ctr., Inc.</i> , 575 U.S. 320 (2015)	22
<i>Atherton v. F.D.I.C.</i> , 519 U.S. 213 (1997)	25
<i>Banco Nacional de Cuba v. Sabbatino</i> , 376 U.S. 398 (1964)	21
<i>Barbara v. N.Y. Stock Exch., Inc.</i> , 99 F.3d 49 (2d Cir. 1996)	29
<i>Battle v. Seibels Bruce Ins. Co.</i> , 288 F.3d 596 (4th Cir. 2002)	16
<i>Bd. of Cty. Comm'rs of Boulder Cty. v. Suncor Energy (U.S.A.) Inc.</i> , 405 F. Supp. 3d 947 (D. Colo. 2019)	18
<i>Beneficial Nat'l Bank v. Anderson</i> , 539 U.S. 1 (2003)	13, 20
<i>Bernstein v. Lind-Waldock & Co.</i> , 738 F.2d 179 (7th Cir. 1984)	29
<i>Bond v. United States</i> , 572 U.S. 844 (2014)	33
<i>Brough v. United Steelworkers of Am., AFL-CIO</i> , 437 F.2d 748 (1st Cir. 1971)	28
<i>California v. ARC Am. Corp.</i> , 490 U.S. 93 (1989)	9, 11
<i>Caterpillar Inc. v. Lewis</i> , 519 U.S. 61 (1996)	<i>passim</i>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—continued

	Page
<i>Caterpillar Inc. v. Williams</i> , 482 U.S. 386 (1987)	12, 13, 14
<i>Caudill v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of N.C.</i> , 999 F.2d 74 (4th Cir. 1993)	17
<i>Chamber of Com. of U.S. v. Whiting</i> , 563 U.S. 582 (2011)	11
<i>Cipollone v. Liggett Grp., Inc.</i> , 505 U.S. 504 (1992)	22
<i>Citizens for Odor Nuisance Abatement v.</i> <i>City of San Diego</i> , 8 Cal.App.5th 350 (2017).....	9
<i>City of Milwaukee v. Illinois & Michigan</i> , 451 U.S. 304 (1981)	21, 25, 26
<i>City of Modesto Redev. Agency v. Superior Ct.</i> , 119 Cal.App.4th 28 (2004).....	8
<i>City of New York v. Chevron Corp.</i> , 993 F.3d 81 (2d Cir. 2021).....	14, 15, 16
<i>Cty. of San Mateo v. Chevron Corp.</i> , 294 F. Supp. 3d 934 (N.D. Cal. 2018)	18, 20
<i>Cty. of Santa Clara v. Atl. Richfield Co.</i> , 137 Cal.App.4th 292 (2006).....	5, 8
<i>Earth Island Institute v. Crystal Geyser Water Co.</i> , ___ F. Supp. 3d ___, 2021 WL 684961 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 23, 2021).....	18
<i>Ellingsworth v. Vermeer Mfg. Co.</i> , 949 F.3d 1097 (8th Cir. 2020)	30
<i>Empire Healthchoice Assurance, Inc. v. McVeigh</i> , 547 U.S. 677 (2006)	17
<i>Fla. Lime & Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul</i> , 373 U.S. 132 (1963)	9
<i>Franchise Tax Bd. of State of Cal. v. Constr.</i> <i>Laborers Vacation Tr. for S. Cal.</i> , 463 U.S. 1 (1983)	12, 23

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.