

Oral Argument Held April 21, 2020

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-70115

NATIONAL FAMILY FARM COALITION, *ET AL.*
Petitioners,

v.

U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, *ET AL.*
Respondents,

and

MONSANTO COMPANY,
Intervenor-Respondent.

On Petition For Review of Agency Action
of the United States Environmental Protection Agency

EPA'S RESPONSE TO PETITIONERS' EMERGENCY MOTION TO
ENFORCE THIS COURT'S VACATUR AND TO HOLD EPA IN CONTEMPT

Jonathan D. Brightbill
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General
Environment and Natural Resources Division

Sarah A. Buckley
Trial Attorney
J. Brett Grosko
Senior Trial Attorney
Environment and Natural Resources Division
U.S. Department of Justice
P.O. Box 7611
Washington, D.C. 20044
(202) 616-7554 (Buckley)
(202) 305-0342 (Grosko)
sarah.buckley@usdoj.gov
brett.grosko@usdoj.gov

Of Counsel:
Scott Garrison
Michele Knorr
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Office of General Counsel
Pesticides & Toxics Substances Law
Office
1200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20460

June 16, 2020

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	3
A. EPA’s Registration Decision and the Court’s Order.....	3
B. EPA’s Cancellation Order and Existing Stocks Provision.....	5
ARGUMENT.....	7
I. Petitioners demonstrate no “exceptional circumstances” supporting recall of the mandate.....	8
A. The Court’s vacatur order was clear and definitive and should not be expanded or revised.	9
B. Petitioners’ desired “clarification” goes beyond the relief authorized by FIFRA and is contrary to basic principles of administrative law.....	10
C. The Court need not and should not recall the mandate to rule on the unaddressed ESA issues.	13
II. EPA acted consistent with and did not violate the Court’s Order.	14
A. The Cancellation Order did not violate “a specific and definite court order” and thus cannot give rise to contempt sanctions.....	14
B. The Cancellation Order was consistent with the vacatur order.	18
III. Petitioners’ motion is not the proper vehicle—and this court is not the proper tribunal—to review the Cancellation Order.....	21
CONCLUSION.....	21

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Aerojet-Gen. Corp. v. Am. Arbitration Ass’n</i> , 478 F.2d 248 (9th Cir. 1973)	9
<i>Abearn v. Int’l Longshore & Warehouse Union</i> , 721 F.3d 1122 (9th Cir. 2013)	15
<i>Cal. Wilderness Coal. v. Dep’t of Energy</i> , 631 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2011)	10
<i>Calderon v. Thompson</i> , 523 U.S. 538 (1998)	8, 10
<i>Chambers v. NASCO, Inc.</i> , 501 U.S. 32 (1991)	14
<i>FCC v. Pottsville Broad. Co.</i> , 309 U.S. 134 (1940)	11
<i>Fed. Power Comm’n v. Idaho Power Co.</i> , 344 U.S. 17 (1952)	10, 11
<i>Gates v. Shinn</i> , 98 F.3d 463 (9th Cir. 1996).....	15
<i>Greater Bos. Television Corp. v. FCC</i> , 463 F.2d 268 (D.C. Cir. 1971).....	13, 21
<i>Int’l Longshoremen’s Ass’n v. Phila. Marine Trade Ass’n</i> , 389 U.S. 64.....	17
<i>Int’l Union, United Mine Workers of Am. v. Bagwell</i> , 512 U.S. 821 (1994)	14
<i>M2 Software Inc. v. Madacy Entm’t</i> , 463 F.3d 870 (9th Cir. 2006)	8

Monsanto Co. v. Geertson Seed Farms,
130 S. Ct. 2743 (2010) 11, 21

Nat’l Family Farm Coal. v. EPA,
Case No. 17-70196 4

Nat. Res. Def. Council v. EPA,
676 F. Supp. 2d 307 (S.D.N.Y. 2009)..... 6

Pollinator Stewardship Council v. EPA,
806 F.3d 520 (9th Cir. 2015) 1, 6, 12

Reno Air Racing Ass’n, Inc. v. McCord,
452 F.3d 1126 (9th Cir. 2006) 15

Taggart v. Lorenzen,
139 S. Ct. 1795 (2019) 15

United States Code

7 U.S.C. § 136a..... 5, 12

7 U.S.C. § 136a(a) 2, 11, 12, 19

7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(7)(B) 4

7 U.S.C. § 136d(a)(1) 6

7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(1) 5

7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(1)(A)..... 5, 11

7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(F) 20

7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G) 5, 12

7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(H) 12

7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(I) 12

7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(K).....	6, 12
7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(S).....	12
7 U.S.C. § 136l.....	5
7 U.S.C. § 136n(a).....	21
7 U.S.C. § 136n(b).....	8, 10, 13

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d).....	16
----------------------------	----

Federal Register

56 Fed. Reg. 29,362 (June 26, 1991).....	6, 19
72 Fed. Reg. 68,580 (Dec. 5, 2007).....	6
85 Fed. Reg. 34,622 (June 5, 2020).....	6

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.