

No. 21-241

In the Supreme Court of the United States

MONSANTO COMPANY, PETITIONER

v.

EDWIN HARDEMAN

*ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT*

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE

ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR
*Solicitor General
Counsel of Record*

TODD KIM
Assistant Attorney General

MALCOLM L. STEWART
Deputy Solicitor General

YAIRA DUBIN
*Assistant to the Solicitor
General*

MATTHEW R. OAKES
Attorney

*Department of Justice
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001
SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov
(202) 514-2217*

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, 7 U.S.C. 136 *et seq.*, preempts respondent's state-law claims alleging that petitioner tortiously failed to warn of the carcinogenic risks associated with its pesticide product.

2. Whether the district court abused its discretion in admitting expert medical testimony that relied in part on clinical experience.

(1)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Statement	1
Discussion.....	6
I. The preemption question does not warrant review	6
A. The court of appeals correctly held that FIFRA does not preempt respondent’s state-law failure-to-warn claims	6
1. FIFRA does not expressly preempt respondent’s state-law failure-to-warn claims	7
2. FIFRA does not impliedly preempt respondent’s state-law claims.....	14
B. Further review is not warranted.....	17
II. The court of appeals’ evidentiary ruling does not warrant review	20
Conclusion	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:

<i>Bates v. Dow Agrosciences LLC</i> , 544 U.S. 431 (2005).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Bland v. Verizon Wireless, (VAW) L.L.C.</i> , 538 F.3d 893 (8th Cir. 2008).....	22
<i>Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council</i> , 530 U.S. 363 (2000).....	14
<i>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm., Inc.</i> , 509 U.S. 579 (1993).....	5, 20
<i>Hall v. Conoco, Inc.</i> , 886 F.3d 1308 (10th Cir. 2018).....	22
<i>PLIVA, Inc. v. Mensing</i> , 564 U.S. 604 (2011)	15, 16
<i>Riegel v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 552 U.S. 312 (2008)	18, 19

(III)

IV

Cases—Continued:	Page
<i>Tamraz v. Lincoln Elec. Co.</i> , 620 F.3d 665 (6th Cir. 2010), cert. denied, 563 U.S. 988 (2011).....	20, 21
<i>Wyeth v. Levine</i> , 555 U.S. 555 (2009)	15
Statutes, regulations, and rules:	
Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act,	
7 U.S.C. 136 <i>et seq.</i>	1
7 U.S.C. 136(q)(1)(A).....	2
7 U.S.C. 136(q)(1)(G).....	2, 8, 11
7 U.S.C. 136(bb).....	2, 12
7 U.S.C. 136a(a)	1
7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(1)(C)	1
7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(1)(D)	1
7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(1)(F)	1
7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(5)(B)	2
7 U.S.C. 136a(c)(5)(D)	2
7 U.S.C. 136a(f)(2).....	2, 8, 17
7 U.S.C. 136a(g)(1)(A).....	2
7 U.S.C. 136j(a)(1)(E).....	2
7 U.S.C. 136j(a)(2)(G).....	10
7 U.S.C. 136v(a)	3
7 U.S.C. 136v(b).....	<i>passim</i>
7 U.S.C. 136v(c)(1).....	3
Medical Device Amendments of 1976,	
21 U.S.C. 360k(a)	18
Safe Drinking Water and Toxic Enforcement Act of 1986, Cal. Health & Safety Code (West 2006):	
§ 25249.5	3
§ 25249.6	3
§ 25249.7 (West Supp. 2022).....	3

Statutes, regulations, and rules—Continued:	Page
§§ 25249.8-25249.13	3
§ 25249.8(b)	4
§ 25249.11	20
§ 25249.14 (West Supp. 2022).....	3
40 C.F.R.:	
Section 156.10(i)(2)(ii)	10
Section 156.62 (2004).....	18
Section 156.64 (2004).....	18
Section 156.70(b).....	11
Section 158.130(d)(1)	11
Fed. R. Evid.:	
Rule 702.....	20, 22, 23
Rule 702(a)	23
Rule 702(d)	23
Miscellaneous:	
Comm. on Rules of Practice & Procedure, Judicial Conf. of the U.S., <i>Preliminary Draft: Proposed Amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate, Bankruptcy, Civil, and Criminal Procedure, and the Federal Rules of Evidence</i> (Aug. 6, 2021), <a href="https://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/
pending-rules-and-forms-amendments">https://www.uscourts.gov/rules-policies/ pending-rules-and-forms-amendments	23
EPA:	
<i>Glyphosate: Interim Registration Review Decision, Case Number 0178</i> (Jan. 22, 2020), <a href="https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/
2020-01/documents/glyphosate-interim-
reg-review-decision-case-num-0178.pdf">https://www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/ 2020-01/documents/glyphosate-interim- reg-review-decision-case-num-0178.pdf	13
<i>Label Review Manual</i> (rev. Mar. 2018), <a href="https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/
label-review-manual">https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/ label-review-manual	11

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.