

No. 20-1149

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY, et al.,
Petitioners,

v.

CLARE E. CONNORS, in her official capacity
as the Attorney General of Hawaii,
Respondent.

**On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Ninth Circuit**

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION

CLARE E. CONNORS*
Attorney General
KIMBERLY T. GUIDRY
Solicitor General

NICHOLAS M. MCLEAN
Deputy Solicitor General
BRYAN C. YEE
T.F. MANA MORIARTY
Deputy Attorneys General

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF THE
ATTORNEY GENERAL
425 Queen Street
Honolulu, HI 96813
Phone: (808) 586-1360
Email: hawaiiag@hawaii.gov
**Counsel of Record*

Counsel for Respondent

MAY 13, 2021

COCKLE LEGAL BRIEFS (800) 225-6964
WWW.COCKLELEGALBRIEFS.COM

QUESTION PRESENTED

Whether the court of appeals correctly determined that the state consumer-protection enforcement action at issue here—an enforcement action brought in state court by the State of Hawaii, through its Attorney General, to sanction petitioners for serious violations of state law by the imposition of civil monetary penalties and punitive damages—falls within the category of civil actions “akin to a criminal prosecution in important respects,” *Sprint Commc’ns, Inc. v. Jacobs*, 571 U.S. 69, 79 (2013) (quotation omitted), thus warranting federal court abstention under *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971), and progeny.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT.....	6
A. The State’s Civil Enforcement Action	6
B. The District Court Abstains	9
C. The Ninth Circuit Affirms	11
D. The State Court Enters Judgment Against Petitioners In The Enforcement Action.....	14
REASONS FOR DENYING THE PETITION.....	15
A. The Decision Below Correctly Applied <i>Sprint</i>	16
B. There Is No Circuit Split.....	28
C. There Is No Reason To Revisit <i>Sprint</i>	31
1. First Amendment Concerns Do Not Preclude <i>Younger</i> Abstention	32
2. The State’s Retention of Private Coun- sel Does Not Alter the <i>Younger</i> Ab- stention Analysis	34
CONCLUSION.....	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Arizona v. Rumsey</i> , 467 U.S. 203 (1984)	16
<i>Austin v. United States</i> , 509 U.S. 602 (1993)	16
<i>Cooper Indus., Inc. v. Leatherman Tool Grp., Inc.</i> , 532 U.S. 424 (2001)	23
<i>Davis v. Wholesale Motors, Inc.</i> , 86 Hawaii 405, 949 P.2d 1026 (App. 1997).....	25
<i>Doe v. Univ. of Kentucky</i> , 860 F.3d 365 (6th Cir. 2017)	29
<i>Gamble v. United States</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1960 (2019)	16
<i>Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Prods. Co.</i> , 336 U.S. 271 (1949)	19
<i>Hawaii ex rel. Louie v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.</i> , Civ. No. 14-00180(HG)(RLP), 2014 WL 3427387 (D. Haw. July 15, 2014)	8
<i>Helms Realty Corp. v. City of New York</i> , 820 F. App'x 79 (2d Cir. 2020).....	30
<i>Hertz Corp. v. Friend</i> , 559 U.S. 77 (2010)	5, 13, 20
<i>Huffman v. Pursue, Ltd.</i> , 420 U.S. 592 (1975).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Hunter v. Hirsig</i> , 660 F. App'x 711 (10th Cir. 2016)	30
<i>In re Plavix Mrktg., Sales Practices & Prods. Liability Litig.</i> , 123 F. Supp. 3d 584 (D.N.J. 2015).....	8
<i>Kisor v. Wilkie</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2400 (2019)	32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

	Page
<i>Kyles v. Whitley</i> , 514 U.S. 419 (1995).....	19
<i>Middlesex Cnty. Ethics Comm. v. Garden State Bar Ass’n</i> , 457 U.S. 423 (1982).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Minnesota Living Assistance, Inc. v. Peterson</i> , 899 F.3d 548 (8th Cir. 2018).....	31
<i>Moore v. Sims</i> , 442 U.S. 415 (1979)	32
<i>New Orleans Pub. Serv., Inc. v. Council of New Orleans</i> , 491 U.S. 350 (1989).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Ohio Civ. Rights Comm’n v. Dayton Christian Sch., Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 619 (1986).....	2, 21, 33
<i>Sirva Relocation, LLC v. Richie</i> , 794 F.3d 185 (1st Cir. 2015).....	27, 31, 34
<i>Sprint Communications, Inc. v. Jacobs</i> , 571 U.S. 69 (2013).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>State v. Shasteen</i> , 9 Haw. App. 106, 826 P.2d 879 (1992).....	24
<i>The Monrosa v. Carbon Black Exp., Inc.</i> , 359 U.S. 180 (1959).....	35
<i>Trainor v. Hernandez</i> , 431 U.S. 434 (1977)	3
<i>Trump v. Vance</i> , 941 F.3d 631 (2d Cir. 2019), <i>aff’d</i> , 140 S. Ct. 2412 (2020)	34, 35
<i>U.S. ex rel. Atkins v. McInteer</i> , 470 F.3d 1350 (11th Cir. 2006).....	35
<i>United States v. Johnston</i> , 268 U.S. 220 (1925)	19
<i>Vermont Agency of Nat. Res. v. U.S. ex rel. Stevens</i> , 529 U.S. 765 (2000)	35

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.