

No. 21-\_\_\_\_\_

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

JOHNSON & JOHNSON AND JOHNSON & JOHNSON  
CONSUMER COMPANIES, INC.,

*Petitioners,*

*v.*

LYNN FITCH, Attorney General of the State of  
Mississippi, ex rel. THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI,

*Respondent.*

---

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO  
THE MISSISSIPPI SUPREME COURT

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

|                      |                                |
|----------------------|--------------------------------|
| Robert M. Loeb       | E. Joshua Rosenkranz           |
| Elizabeth R. Moulton | <i>Counsel of Record</i>       |
| Sheila Baynes        | ORRICK, HERRINGTON &           |
| Zachary Hennessee    | SUTCLIFFE LLP                  |
| ORRICK, HERRINGTON & | 51 West 52nd Street            |
| SUTCLIFFE LLP        | New York, NY 10019             |
| 1152 15th Street, NW | (212) 506-5000                 |
| Washington, DC 20005 | jrosenkranz@orrick.com         |
|                      | <i>Counsel for Petitioners</i> |

---

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. In *Puerto Rico v. Franklin California Tax-Free Trust*, this Court held that courts should “not invoke any presumption against pre-emption” when a “statute ‘contains an express pre-emption clause.’” 136 S. Ct. 1938, 1946 (2016). Obeying that command, four circuits and a state supreme court no longer apply any such presumption to express pre-emption clauses. Four state supreme courts (now including the Mississippi Supreme Court) and two circuits, however, continue to apply the presumption to pre-emption provisions that they find ambiguous, or that touch on a state’s historic police powers, or both.

Did the Mississippi Supreme Court err in narrowly construing an express preemption clause on the ground that a presumption against pre-emption applies here because it considered the pre-emption provision ambiguous and because the provision touches on historic state police powers?

2. The lower courts are divided over what types of agency actions can pre-empt state law. One circuit and the Mississippi Supreme Court hold that only notice-and-comment rulemaking qualifies as pre-emptive. In contrast, seven circuits and a state supreme court reject that line, giving pre-emptive force to final administrative actions that warrant *Chevron* deference or to any final agency action with the force of law.

Did the Mississippi Supreme Court err in holding that only notice-and-comment rulemaking can pre-empt state law?

**PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS**

Petitioners Johnson & Johnson and Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc. (now known as Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc.) were defendants-appellants below.

Respondent Lynn Fitch, Attorney General of the State of Mississippi, ex rel. the State of Mississippi, was plaintiff-appellee below.

## CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

1. Johnson & Johnson is a publicly held company. It has no parent corporation, and no publicly held company owns 10% or more of Johnson & Johnson's stock.

2. Johnson & Johnson Consumer Companies, Inc. (now known as Johnson & Johnson Consumer Inc.) is wholly owned by Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. is wholly owned by DePuy Synthes, Inc. DePuy Synthes, Inc. is wholly owned by Johnson & Johnson International. Johnson & Johnson International is wholly owned by Johnson & Johnson.

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

Supreme Court of Mississippi:

*Johnson & Johnson et al. v. Fitch ex rel. Mississippi*, No. 2019-IA-00033-SCT (Miss. April 1, 2021)

Chancery Court of Hinds County:

*State of Mississippi, ex rel. Jim Hood v. Johnson & Johnson et al.*, No. G-2014-1207 (Miss. Ch. Ct., Hinds Cty. Dec. 18, 2018)

# 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.