

No. 19-1818

---

IN THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT

---

STATE OF RHODE ISLAND,  
*Plaintiff-Appellee,*

v.

SHELL OIL PRODUCTS COMPANY, LLC; CHEVRON CORP.; CHEVRON  
USA, INC.; EXXONMOBIL CORP.; BP, PLC; BP AMERICA, INC.; BP  
PRODUCTS NORTH AMERICA, INC.; ROYAL DUTCH SHELL PLC;  
MOTIVA ENTERPRISES, LLC; CITGO PETROLEUM CORP.;  
CONOCOPHILLIPS; CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY; PHILLIPS 66;  
MARATHON OIL COMPANY; MARATHON OIL CORPORATION;  
MARATHON PETROLEUM CORP.; MARATHON PETROLEUM COMPANY,  
LP; SPEEDWAY, LLC; HESS CORP.; LUKOIL PAN AMERICAS LLC; DOES  
1-100,  
*Defendants-Appellants,*

GETTY PETROLEUM MARKETING, INC.,  
*Defendant.*

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Rhode Island, No. 18-cv-395-WES,  
(Hon. William E. Smith)

---

**SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE THE CHAMBER OF  
COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANTS AND REVERSAL**

---

Andrew R. Varcoe  
Stephanie A. Maloney  
U.S. CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER  
1615 H Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20062  
(202) 463-5337

William M. Jay  
Andrew Kim  
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP  
1900 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 346-4000  
*wjay@goodwinlaw.com*

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae  
the Chamber of Commerce of the  
United States of America*

July 28, 2021

## **CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

In accordance with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 26.1, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America states that it is a non-profit, tax-exempt organization incorporated in the District of Columbia. The Chamber has no parent corporation, and no publicly held company has 10% or greater ownership in the Chamber.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTEREST OF THE AMICUS CURIAE .....	1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
I. Federal courts have original jurisdiction over a claim that can be based only on federal common law. ....	2
A. The well-pleaded complaint rule does not allow courts to ignore the inherently federal basis of a claim. ....	2
B. Removal of federal common law claims, however they are labeled, is wholly consistent with the policies underlying the well-pleaded complaint rule.....	5
II. The artful pleading doctrine applies here to make Rhode Island’s claims removable. ....	9
CONCLUSION .....	11

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>PAGE(S)</b>
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Am. Elec. Power Co. v. Connecticut</i> , 564 U.S. 410 (2011).....	8, 9
<i>BIW Deceived v. Local S6, Indus. Union of Marine &amp; Shipbuilding Workers of Am.</i> , 132 F.3d 824 (1st Cir. 1997).....	4
<i>Boyle v. United Techs. Corp.</i> , 487 U.S. 500 (1988).....	6
<i>Caterpillar Inc. v. Williams</i> , 482 U.S. 386 (1987).....	2
<i>City of Milwaukee v. Illinois</i> , 451 U.S. 304 (1981).....	6, 10
<i>City of New York v. Chevron Corp.</i> , 993 F.3d 81 (2d Cir. 2021) .....	7, 8, 10
<i>Franchise Tax Bd. of the State of Cal. v. Constr. Laborers Vacation Tr. for S. Cal.</i> , 463 U.S. 1 (1983).....	3
<i>Fry v. Napoleon Cmty. Schs.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 743 (2017).....	3, 4
<i>Grynberg Prod. Corp. v. British Gas, p.l.c.</i> , 817 F. Supp. 1338 (E.D. Tex. 1993).....	7
<i>Hinderlider v. La Plata River &amp; Cherry Creek Ditch Co.</i> , 304 U.S. 92 (1938).....	5
<i>Holmes Grp., Inc. v. Vornado Air Circulation Sys., Inc.</i> , 535 U.S. 826 (2002).....	6, 7, 8
<i>Illinois v. City of Milwaukee</i> , 406 U.S. 91 (1972).....	5

*Int’l Paper Co. v. Ouellette*,  
479 U.S. 481 (1987).....6

*Lopez-Munoz v. Triple-S Salud, Inc.*,  
754 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2014).....3

*New SD, Inc. v. Rockwell Int’l Corp.*,  
79 F.3d 953 (9th Cir. 1996) .....4

*North Carolina ex rel. Cooper v. Tenn. Valley Auth.*,  
615 F.3d 291 (4th Cir. 2010) .....11

*OBB Personenverkehr AG v. Sachs*,  
577 U.S. 27 (2015).....3

*In re Otter Tail Power Co.*,  
116 F.3d 1207 (8th Cir. 1997) .....4

*R.I. Fishermen’s Alliance, Inc. v. R.I. Dep’t of Env’tl Mgmt.*,  
585 F.3d 42 (1st Cir. 2009).....7

*Rodriguez v. FDIC*,  
140 S. Ct. 713 (2020).....7

*Sam L. Majors Jewelers v. ABX, Inc.*,  
117 F.3d 922 (5th Cir. 1997) .....4

*Tex. Indus., Inc. v. Radcliff Materials, Inc.*,  
451 U.S. 630 (1981).....5, 7, 9

*Wheeldin v. Wheeler*,  
373 U.S. 647 (1963).....7

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

14C Wright & Miller, Fed. Prac. & Proc. Juris. § 3722.1 (4th ed.) .....3

# 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.