

**Mandate Issued on June 3, 2020**

No. 19-70115

Before: Hawkins, McKeown, and W. Fletcher, Circuit Judges

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

---

NATIONAL FAMILY FARM COALITION, *et al.*,

*Petitioners,*

v.

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY, *et al.*,

*Respondents,*

and

MONSANTO COMPANY, BASF CORPORATION, and E.I. DU PONT  
DE NEMOURS AND COMPANY

*Intervenor-Respondents.*

---

ON PETITION FOR REVIEW FROM THE UNITED STATES  
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

---

**PETITIONERS' RESPONSE TO INTERVENOR BASF'S  
MOTION TO RECALL AND STAY MANDATE**

---

CENTER FOR FOOD SAFETY

George A. Kimbrell

Sylvia Shih-Yau Wu

Amy van Saun

2009 NE Alberta St., Suite 207

Portland, OR 97211

T: (971) 271-7372

gkimbrell@centerforfoodsafety.org

swu@centerforfoodsafety.org

avansaun@centerforfoodsafety.org

CENTER FOR BIOLOGICAL  
DIVERSITY

Stephanie M. Parent

PO Box 11374

Portland, OR 97211

T: (971) 717-6404

sparent@biologicaldiversity.org

*Counsel for Petitioners*

After granting BASF Corporation (BASF) and E.I. du Pont de Nemours and Company (Corteva) intervention, the Court requested Petitioners' response to BASF's cross motion to recall the mandate so it could petition for rehearing under FRAP 41, specifically concerning whether BASF's Engenia product was properly at issue in the 2018 Registration decision and, similarly, whether the Court has exclusive jurisdiction over Engenia, based on BASF's assertion that there was no public hearing to trigger FIFRA Section 16(b), 7 U.S.C. § 136n(b). ECF 145 at 3. In light of these circumstances and the recent orders of the Court granting intervention and denying Petitioners' emergency motion, Petitioners offer the following response.

1. Intervenor BASF claims it will lose sales from immediate vacatur, but its claim rings hollow given the timing here. BASF alleges it still has \$44 million of Engenia product on hand, but does not demonstrate that the product would actually be *sold* for use this season, given that BASF declared product decisions and orders began last December and that the majority of applications will be made within 30 days of June 16, 2020. Kay Decl., ECF 130-2 ¶¶ 12, 14. As BASF notes, it has already sold four times that amount of Engenia. *Id.* ¶ 15 ("BASF

estimates that there is enough Engenia currently located throughout the customer channel to treat 26.7 million acres of soybeans and cotton.”); ¶ 16 (unsold Engenia is enough to cover 6.6 million acres).

2. BASF also cannot rely on harms to growers because it does not represent them. BASF and amici representing growers’ groups were heard on Petitioners’ emergency motion; therefore, BASF’s reliance on impacts to users does not sustain its request to recall the mandate. *See* ECF 145 at 18-19 (alleging harm to growers, which BASF does not represent).

3. Should the Court grant Intervenors’ motion and recall the mandate for the reasons presented, the interests of justice and judicial economy counsel that this Court limit Intervenors’ petitions for rehearing, and/or otherwise instruct all parties to consolidate the issues on petitions for rehearing to avoid duplicity and repetition. If the Court recalls the mandate, it should be for the limited and express purpose sought, allowing BASF and Corteva to file a joint petition for rehearing on the issue of whether the panel erred in including their dicamba products in the scope of the decision. Both BASF and Corteva sought intervention belatedly, after this Court had issued its mandate, alleging

lack of notice that their dicamba registrations were at issue in the petition for review, and claiming that their interests in showing why their products should not have been covered by the Court's decision were inadequately represented by Respondent EPA and Intervenor Monsanto. *See* ECF 130-1 at 18-19 ("There is no party that has the same incentive as BASF to explain why the panel decision should not have reached the Engenia registration"); ECF 129-1 at 21 ("Monsanto does not have same incentive to explain the Panel should not have addressed [Corteva]'s registration."). Corteva filed a notice of joinder in BASF's opposition to Petitioners' emergency motion without raising any arguments on its own. ECF 148.

Since BASF and Corteva's identical interest is in challenging the Court's determination that their products were covered by the present petition for review, the Court should limit the recall of mandate to allow them to file a single consolidated petition for review on that question. That is what the Ninth Circuit did in *Day v. Apoliona*, the only case BASF cites to support granting its intervention for the limited purpose of pursuing rehearing. *See* ECF 130-1 at 13. There, the Ninth Circuit granted the State of Hawaii's post-decision intervention request, despite

its tardiness, and simultaneously accepted its proposed petition for rehearing on a single, dispositive issue which formed the basis of the panel's decision to overturn the lower court's ruling, where the State was the only one that had raise that argument as an amicus, and where no existing party was going to seek rehearing. *Apoliona*, 505 F.3d 963, 966 (9th Cir. 2007); see *Anderson v. Knox*, 300 F.2d 296, 297 (9th Cir.1962) ("A properly drawn petition for rehearing serves a very limited purpose."). The Court need not entertain any other arguments, nor admit evidence outside of the current administrative record. See *Amster v. U.S. District Court for Cent. Dist. of Cal.*, 806 F.2d 1347, 1356 (9th Cir. 1986) ("Consideration of subsequent factual occurrences is, thus, beyond the scope of a petition for rehearing."); *id.* (an abuse of privilege of petition for rehearing "when [a party] seeks review of a scope greater than the limited confines of Fed. R. App. P. 40") (citing *Anderson*, 300 F.2d at 297).

4. To the extent that the Court decides not to limit its recall to allow petition for rehearing on this limited issue and only to Intervenor BASF and Corteva, the Court can and should still require that Respondent EPA and all Respondent-Intervenors consolidate the

# 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.