

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
AMARILLO DIVISION

JAMIE WAZELLE; TAY AUNG; §
ELIZABETH CASEL; MANIVANH §
CHANTHANAKHONE; MANUEL §
CONTRERAS; REBECA CORRAL; §
PATRICIA COSSEY; JOZETTE ES- §
COTO; CRUZ GARCIA, SR.; §
SHERYL GARDNER; DENETRIA §
GONZALEZ; RENE GUTIERREZ; §
BRIAN HALL; BRANDON IVORY; §
NINI AYE KAYAPHU; KO LATT; §
ARMANDO LIRA; DERESTIA LIRA; §
MYA LIRA; VALARIE LIRA; AUNG §
MOE; BIAK MORRIS; MALEAK §
RECTOR; MARICELA RIOS; NATA- §
SHA RIOS; GUADALUPE RONDAN; §
MIGUEL RONDAN; JAVIER RUBIO; §
IGNACIO RUIZ; SYLVIA RUIZ; §
MITCHELL SANCHEZ; BILLY §
SHAW; KYAW SOE; NYEIN SOE; §
THIDA SOE; BREANA SOLIS; LA- §
DONNA TRULL; AND TIN SOE, IN- §
DIVIDUALLY AND AS PERSONAL §
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ES- §
TATE OF MAUNG MAUNG TAR, §

Plaintiffs, §

vs. §

TYSON FOODS, INC.; ERNESTO §
SANCHEZ; KEVIN KINIKIN; and §
FARREN FERNANDEZ, §

Defendants. §

NO. 2:20-cv-00203-Z

DEFENDANT TYSON FOODS, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF ISSUES.....	1
BACKGROUND.....	4
A. The Complaint.....	4
B. Federal regulation of meat and poultry facilities	5
C. Designation of critical infrastructure.....	6
ARGUMENT.....	10
I. The complaint’s allegations of causation are far too conclusory and speculative under <i>Iqbal</i> and <i>Twombly</i>	10
II. The complaint takes no account of the broad, express preemp- tion of the Federal Meat Inspection Act.....	17
A. The FMIA expressly preempts state-law requirements that differ from or add to the FMIA regulations.	17
B. The FMIA regulates the control of “infectious disease” at meat-processing facilities.	18
C. Plaintiffs cannot impose state-law “requirements” that differ from or add to the FMIA’s regulations.	19
III. The complaint takes no account of the federal designation of Ty- son facilities as critical infrastructure.	21
CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
<i>Amalgamated Ass’n of St., Elec. Ry. & Motor Coach Emps. v. Lockridge</i> , 403 U.S. 274 (1971)	17, 23
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	passim
<i>Bass v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 669 F.3d 501 (5th Cir. 2012)	3
<i>Bates v. Dow Agrosciences LLC</i> , 544 U.S. 431 (2005)	20
<i>Cary v. Hickenlooper</i> , 673 F. App’x 870 (10th Cir. 2016)	15
<i>Crosby v. Nat’l Foreign Trade Council</i> , 530 U.S. 363 (2000)	22, 23
<i>Dakota Cent. Tel. Co. v. State of S. Dakota ex rel. Payne</i> , 250 U.S. 163 (1919)	23
<i>Dames & Moore v. Regan</i> , 453 U.S. 654 (1981)	23
<i>Delaney v. Stryker Orthopaedics</i> , Civ. A. No. 08-03210 (DMC), 2009 WL 564243 (D.N.J. Mar. 5, 2009)	21
<i>Doe v. Boys Clubs of Greater Dallas, Inc.</i> , 907 S.W.2d 472 (Tex. 1995)	12
<i>E. Air Lines, Inc. v. McDonnell Douglas Corp.</i> , 532 F.2d 957 (5th Cir. 1976)	22
<i>Eclectic Props. E., LLC v. Marcus & Millichap Co.</i> , 751 F.3d 990 (9th Cir. 2014)	11
<i>Geier v. Am. Honda Motor Co.</i> , 529 U.S. 861 (2000)	21, 24
<i>Guidry v. Bank of LaPlace</i> , 954 F.2d 278 (5th Cir. 1992)	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>Hernandez v. Casey</i> , Civ. A. No. 3:16-CV-452-M-BH, 2017 WL 685679 (N.D. Tex. Jan. 12, 2017), report and recommendation adopted by Civ. A. No. 3:16-CV-452-M, 2017 WL 680309 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 21, 2017)	12
<i>Hillman v. Maretta</i> , 569 U.S. 483 (2013)	22
<i>Hines v. Davidowitz</i> , 312 U.S. 52 (1941)	24
<i>Horowitz v. Stryker Corp.</i> , 613 F. Supp. 2d 271 (E.D.N.Y. 2009)	3, 21
<i>In re Abbott</i> , 954 F.3d 772 (5th Cir. 2020)	14
<i>In re Great Lakes Dredge & Dock Co.</i> , 624 F.3d 201 (5th Cir. 2010)	10
<i>N. Pac. Ry. Co. v. State of N. Dakota ex rel. Langer</i> , 250 U.S. 135 (1919)	23
<i>Nat’l Meat Ass’n v. Harris</i> , 565 U.S. 452 (2012)	18, 21
<i>Osburn v. Anchor Labs., Inc.</i> , 825 F.2d 908 (5th Cir. 1987)	21
<i>Peterson v. Silverado Senior Living, Inc.</i> , 790 F. App’x 614 (5th Cir. 2019)	15
<i>Rancho Viejo, LLC v. Norton</i> , 323 F.3d 1062 (D.C. Cir. 2003)	23
<i>Riegel v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> , 552 U.S. 312 (2008)	20
<i>Rincon v. Covidien</i> , No. 16-CV-10033 (JMF), 2017 WL 2242969 (S.D.N.Y. May 22, 2017)	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>Rubins v. Tisdale</i> , Civ. A. No. 2:12-CV-118-J, 2012 WL 4932159 (N.D. Tex. Oct. 17, 2012).....	10
<i>San Diego Bldg. Trades Council, Millmen’s Union, Local 2020 v.</i> <i>Garmon</i> , 359 U.S. 236 (1959)	24
<i>Swindol v. Aurora Flight Scis. Corp.</i> , 805 F.3d 516 (5th Cir. 2015)	5
<i>Terrebonne v. Blackburn</i> , 646 F.2d 997 (5th Cir. 1981)	14
<i>Trout Point Lodge, Ltd. v. Handshoe</i> , 729 F.3d 481 (5th Cir. 2013)	5
<i>United States v. Garcia</i> , 855 F.3d 615 (4th Cir. 2017)	5
<i>Valentine v. Collier</i> , 960 F.3d 707 (5th Cir. 2020)	14
<i>Waller v. Hanlon</i> , 922 F.3d 590 (5th Cir. 2019)	10, 11
<i>Winn v. Medtronic, Inc.</i> Civ. A. No. 3:16-CV-452-M, 2017 WL 680309 (N.D. Tex. Feb. 21, 2017).....	19, 20, 21

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.