

No. 19-16696

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

SANDERSON FARMS, INC., *et al.*,

Defendant-Appellee.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
Case No. 17-cv-03592-RS

PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

ELSNER LAW & POLICY, LLC
Gretchen Elsner
Gretchen@ElsnerLaw.org
314 South Guadalupe Street
Santa Fe, NM 87501
Telephone: (505) 303-0980

THE LAW OFFICE OF
PAIGE M. TOMASELLI
Paige M. Tomaselli (CSB No. 237737)
paige@tomasellilaw.com
719 Golden Gate Avenue
Richmond, CA 94801
Telephone: (619) 339-3180

Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION1

ARGUMENT2

I. APPELLANTS HAVE ARTICLE III STANDING.2

A. Appellants Diverted Scarce Resources to Counteract the Effects of Appellee’s Unfair Practices.....3

B. The Supreme Court Has Set the Injury Bar Low and Appellants Easily Meet That Bar.....8

C. This Court Must Consider All Grounds for Appellants’ Article III Standing.11

1. The UCL Has Always Been Appellants First Cause of Action.11

2. Appellants Can Fully Analyze Standing on Appeal.....16

II. THE SWORN DECLARATIONS ADDITIONALLY DEMONSTRATE ORGANIZATIONAL STANDING.22

A. Sanderson Seeks to Suppress the Declarations Because They Demonstrate Appellants’ Standing.22

B. The Declarations Are Consistent with Deposition Testimony and Sanderson Does Not Provide Any Contrary Examples.25

CONCLUSION.....30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases	Page(s)
<i>Adler v. Fed. Republic of Nigeria</i> , 107 F.3d 720 (9th Cir. 1997)	26, 27
<i>Am. Fed. of Gov't Employees Local 1 v. Stone</i> , 502 F.3d 1027 (9th Cir. 2007)	8
<i>Am. President Lines, Ltd. v. Int'l Longshore & Warehouse Union</i> , <i>Alaska Longshore Div., Unit 60</i> , 721 F.3d 1147 (9th Cir. 2013)	16
<i>Am. Diabetes Ass'n v. U.S. Dep't of the Army</i> , 938 F.3d 1147 (9th Cir. 2019)	9, 10, 14
<i>City of L.A. v. County of Kern</i> , 581 F.3d 841 (9th Cir. 2009)	16
<i>City of Littleton v. Z. J. Gifts D-4, L.L.C.</i> , 541 U.S. 774 (2004).....	21
<i>City of Oakland v. Lynch</i> , 798 F.3d 1159 (9th Cir. 2015)	16
<i>Constr. Indus. Ass'n of Sonoma Cty. v. City of Petaluma</i> , 522 F.2d 897 (9th Cir. 1975)	9
<i>Czyzewski v. Jevic Holding Corp.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 973 (2017).....	8
<i>East Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Trump</i> , 2020 U.S. App. LEXIS 6620 (9th Cir. 2020)	passim
<i>Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommate.com LLC</i> , 666 F.3d 1216 (9th Cir. 2012)	4, 5, 6
<i>FW/PBS, Inc. v. Dallas</i> , 493 U.S. 215 (1990).....	21

Federal Cases (Cont'd)	Page(s)
<i>Gerlinger v. Amazon</i> , 526 F.3d 1253 (9th Cir. 2008)	23
<i>Havens Realty Corp. v. Coleman</i> , 455 U.S. 363 (1982).....	1, 8
<i>Hemmings v. Tidyman's Inc.</i> , 285 F.3d 1174 (9th Cir. 2002)	20
<i>Hinojos v. Kohl's Corp.</i> , 718 F.3d 1098 (9th Cir. 2013)	14, 15
<i>Kimes v. Stone</i> , 84 F.3d 1121 (9th Cir. 1996)	18
<i>Lake v. Lake</i> , 817 F.2d 1416 (9th Cir. 1987)	17, 18, 25
<i>Mashiri v. Epsten Grinnell & Howell</i> , 845 F.3d 984 (9th Cir. 2017)	19
<i>National Council of La Raza v. Cegavske</i> , 800 F.3d 1032 (9th Cir. 2015)	4, 5, 6, 25
<i>Petron v. SFR Invs. Pool 1, LLC</i> , 754 Fed. App'x 590 (9th Cir. 2019)	19
<i>Pfingston v. Ronan Eng'g Co.</i> , 284 F.3d 999 (9th Cir. 2002)	18
<i>Rodriguez v. City of San Jose</i> , 930 F.3d 1123 (9th Cir. 2019)	9
<i>Sherman v. SEC (In re Sherman)</i> , 491 F.3d 948 (9th Cir. 2007)	17
<i>Singleton v. Wulff</i> , 428 U.S. 106 (1976).....	18

Federal Cases (Cont'd)	Page(s)
<i>Smith v. Arthur Andersen LLP</i> , 421 F.3d 989 (9th Cir. 2005)	17
<i>Sweet People Apparel, Inc. v. Phoenix Fibers, Inc.</i> , 748 Fed. App'x 123 (9th Cir. 2019)	19
<i>Thompson v. Cty. of Franklin</i> , 15 F.3d 245 (1994).....	21
<i>United States v. Campbell</i> , 42 F.3d 1199 (9th Cir. 1994)	21
<i>United States v. Northrop Corp.</i> , 59 F. 3d 953 (9th Cir. 1995)	18
<i>United States v. Olano</i> , 507 U.S. 725 (1993).....	20
<i>United States v. Sierra Pac. Indus. Inc.</i> , 862 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2017)	19
<i>Utah Animal Rights Coalition v. Salt Lake City Corp.</i> , 371 F.3d 1248 (10th Cir. 2004)	22
<i>Van Asdale v. Int'l Game Tech.</i> , 577 F.3d. 989 (9th Cir. 2009)	29
<i>Warth v. Seldin</i> , 422 U.S. 490 (1975).....	8
 Rules	
Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b)	14
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(h)(3).....	23, 25
Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6).....	22, 24
 Constitutional Provisions	
U.S. Const. Article III, § 2	22

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.