

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION

R.J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO COMPANY;
SANTA FE NATURAL TOBACCO
COMPANY, INC.; ITG BRANDS, LLC;
LIGGETT GROUP LLC; NEOCOM, INC.;
RANGILA ENTERPRISES INC.; RANGILA
LLC; SAHIL ISMAIL, INC.; and IS LIKE
YOU INC.;

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES FOOD AND DRUG
ADMINISTRATION;

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES;

STEPHEN M. HAHN,
in his official capacity as Commissioner of the
United States Food and Drug Administration;
and

ALEX M. AZAR II,
in his official capacity as Secretary of the United
States Department of Health and Human
Services;

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:20-cv-00176

PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND.....	2
A. The Challenged Rule and Statutory Provisions.....	2
B. Plaintiffs Challenge the Graphic-Warnings Requirements and Detail How Those Requirements Harm Them.....	3
C. The Court’s Scheduling Order.....	6
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	7
ARGUMENT.....	8
I. THE MOTION TO DISMISS SHOULD BE DENIED AS PROCEDURALLY IMPROPER BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THE COURT’S SCHEDULING ORDER.....	8
II. THE MOTION TO DISMISS SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE VENUE IS PROPER IN THIS DISTRICT REGARDLESS OF NEOCOM’S STANDING.....	9
A. Venue Is Proper Because Neocom Had a Good-Faith, Colorable Basis For Bringing Its Claims.....	10
B. Venue Is Proper Because the Rule Regulates the Manufacturers’ Speech In This District.....	12
III. THE MOTION TO DISMISS SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE NEOCOM HAS STANDING.....	13
A. Neocom Has Standing Based on First Amendment Harms.....	15
B. Neocom Has Standing Based on Aesthetic Harms.....	19
C. Neocom Has Standing Because It Will Suffer an Increased Regulatory Burden.....	21
D. Neocom Has Standing Because It Will Suffer Monetary Harm.....	22
IV. AT MINIMUM, THE COURT SHOULD GRANT LEAVE TO AMEND, OR TRANSFER, RATHER THAN DISMISS.....	29
CONCLUSION.....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island</i> , 517 U.S. 484 (1996).....	18
<i>Albany Ins. Co. v. Almacenadora Somex, S.A.</i> , 5 F.3d 907 (5th Cir. 1993).....	8
<i>Allandale Neighborhood Ass’n v. Austin Transp. Study Policy Advisory Comm.</i> , 840 F.2d 258 (5th Cir. 1988).....	24
<i>Am. Beverage Ass’n v. City & Cty. of San Francisco</i> , 916 F.3d 749 (9th Cir. 2019).....	18, 19
<i>Aralez Pharm. Inc. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.</i> , No. 217CV00071JRGRSP, 2017 WL 3437894 (E.D. Tex. Aug. 10, 2017).....	7
<i>B, Inc. v. Miller Brewing Co.</i> , 663 F.2d 545 (5th Cir. 1981).....	10, 11
<i>Bel-Ray Co., Inc. v. Chemrite (Pty) Ltd.</i> , 181 F.3d 435 (3d Cir. 1999).....	9
<i>Bishop v. Oklahoma ex rel. Edmondson</i> , 447 F. Supp. 2d 1239 (N.D. Okla. 2006).....	13
<i>Burns v. Events & Transp. Assocs., Inc.</i> , No. CV 08-713 LH/RHS, 2008 WL 11322233 (D.N.M. Dec. 15, 2008).....	11
<i>Carpenters Indus. Council v. Zinke</i> , 854 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2017)	24
<i>Cellco P’ship v. FCC</i> , 357 F.3d 88 (D.C. Cir. 2004)	21
<i>Clear Channel Commc’ns, Inc. v. Citigroup Global Mkts., Inc.</i> , 541 F. Supp. 2d 874 (N.D. Tex. 2008).....	12
<i>Columbia Broad. Sys. v. United States</i> , 316 U.S. 407 (1942).....	18

Contender Farms, L.L.P. v. USDA,
779 F.3d 258 (5th Cir. 2015)..... 16, 21, 22

Crane v. Napolitano,
920 F. Supp. 2d 724 (N.D. Tex. 2013)..... 11

Czyzewski v. Jevic Holding Corp.,
137 S. Ct. 973 (2017)..... 24

Danvers Motor Co., Inc. v. Ford Motor Co.,
432 F.3d 286 (3d Cir. 2005)..... 14, 24

Denver Area Educ. Telecomms. Consortium v. FCC,
518 U.S. 727 (1996) (plurality opinion)..... 17

Duarte ex rel. Duarte v. City of Lewisville,
759 F.3d 514 (5th Cir. 2014)..... 21

EMED Techs. Corp. v. Repro-Med Sys., Inc.,
No. 2:17-CV-728-WCB-RSP, 2018 WL 2544564 (E.D. Tex. June 4, 2018)..... 7

Emison v. Catalano,
951 F. Supp. 714 (E.D. Tenn. 1996)..... 13

Estate of Abtan v. Blackwater Lodge & Training Ctr.,
611 F. Supp. 2d 1 (D.D.C. 2009)..... 13

Exact Order Specialties v. Glow Indus., Inc.,
No. 03:12-CV-00631-HU, 2012 WL 3597432 (D. Or. Aug. 20, 2012)..... 11

Exxon Corp. v. FTC,
588 F.2d 895 (3d Cir. 1978)..... 10, 11

Farmland Dairies v. McGuire,
771 F. Supp. 80 (S.D.N.Y. 1991)..... 13

Flu Shots of Tex., Ltd. v. Lopez,
No. 3:13-CV-144-O, 2013 WL 2449175 (N.D. Tex. June 5, 2013)..... 30

Foremost Sales Promotions, Inc. v. Dir. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms,
860 F.2d 229 (7th Cir. 1988)..... 18

Francesca’s Collections, Inc. v. Medina,
No. CIV.A. H-11-307, 2011 WL 3925062 (S.D. Tex. Sept. 7, 2011)..... 29

...

Friends of the Earth, Inc. v. Laidlaw Emt'l Servs. (TOC), Inc.,
528 U.S. 167 (2000).....20

Galderma Labs., L.P. v. Teva Pharm. USA, Inc.,
290 F. Supp. 3d 599 (N.D. Tex. 2017).....14

Graham v. Dyncorp Int'l, Inc.,
973 F. Supp. 2d 698 (S.D. Tex. 2013)..... 29, 30

Guidance Endodontics, LLC v. Dentsply Int'l, Inc., No. CIV 08-1101 JB/RLP, 2009 WL
3672495 (D.N.M. Sept. 29, 2009).....25

Honey Holdings I, Ltd. v. Alfred L. Wolff, Inc.,
81 F. Supp. 3d 543 (S.D. Tex. 2015).....12

Horiban v. Hartford Ins. Co.,
979 F. Supp. 1073 (E.D. Tex. 1997).....11

Humane Soc. of the U.S. v. Hodel,
840 F.2d 45 (D.C. Cir. 1988).....20

Hunt v. Bankers Tr. Co.,
799 F.2d 1060 (5th Cir. 1986).....9

In re CTLI, LLC,
534 B.R. 895 (Bankr. S.D. Tex. 2015).....9

In re Horseshoe Entm't,
337 F.3d 429 (5th Cir. 2003).....30

In re Volkswagen of Am., Inc.,
545 F.3d 304 (5th Cir. 2008) (en banc).....30

In re Whitaker Constr. Co., Inc.,
178 F. App'x 412 (5th Cir. 2006) (per curiam).....24

Jacquez v. Compass Bank,
No. EP-15-CV-26-RFC, Doc. 5 (W.D. Tex. Mar. 4, 2015).....9

Japan Whaling Ass'n v. Am. Cetacean Soc.,
478 U.S. 221 (1986).....20

Jelec USA v. Safety Controls, Inc.,
No. CIV A H-06-2379, 2006 WL 3358896 (S.D. Tex. Nov. 17, 2006).....13

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.