

**Case No. 19-70115**

---

**IN THE 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

---

**BRIEF OF *AMICUS CURIAE* CROPLIFE AMERICA  
IN SUPPORT OF INTERVENOR-RESPONDENTS'  
PETITIONS FOR REHEARING *EN BANC***

---

*Of Counsel:*

Rachel Lattimore

*Executive Vice President &  
General Counsel*

Caleb Pearson

*Assistant General Counsel*

Ashley Boles

*Counsel*

CropLife America

1156 15th Street NW, Ste. 400

Washington, DC 20005

Karen Ellis Carr

Stanley H. Abramson

Donald C. McLean

Kathleen R. Heilman

ARENT FOX LLP

1717 K Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006

karen.carr@arentfox.com

Tel: (202) 715-8531

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae CropLife America*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT .....	v
INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF INTEREST .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	3
I.    EPA Has Long Regulated Pesticides Pursuant to a Rigorous, Science-Based Framework Under FIFRA. ....	3
II.   The Panel’s June 3 Order Usurped the Agency’s Role and Failed to Accord Appropriate Deference to EPA’s Decision- making. ....	8
A.   The Dicamba Registrations Are the Product of EPA’s Rigorous Review and the Registrants’ Substantial Investment. ....	8
B.   By Substituting its Policy Preferences for EPA’s Scientific Review, the Panel Exceeded the Boundaries of Review under the “Substantial Evidence” Standard. ....	10
CONCLUSION.....	13
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>Andrews v. Shalala</i> , 53 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 1995) .....	10
<i>Baltimore Gas &amp; Elec. Co. v. NRDC</i> , 462 U.S. 87 (1983).....	10
<i>Biestek v. Berryhill</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1148 (2019).....	10
<i>Ctr. for Biological Diversity v. EPA</i> , No. 11-cv-00293, 2013 WL 1729573 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2013) .....	7
<i>Davis v. EPA</i> , 348 F.3d 772 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	11
<i>Indus. Safety Equip. Ass'n v. EPA</i> , 656 F. Supp. 852 (D.D.C. 1987), <i>aff'd</i> , 837 F.2d 1115 (D.C. Cir. 1988) .....	13
<i>League of Wilderness Defs. Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project v. Allen</i> , 615 F.3d 1122 (9th Cir. 2010) .....	11
<i>Nat'l Ass'n of Home Builders v. Defs. of Wildlife</i> , 551 U.S. 644 (2007).....	12
<i>Nat'l Oilseed Processors Ass'n v. Browner</i> , 924 F. Supp. 1193 (D.D.C. 1996), <i>aff'd in part sub nom. Troy Corp. v. Browner</i> , 120 F.3d 277 (D.C. Cir. 1997).....	9
<i>Nat'l Wildlife Fed'n v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs</i> , 384 F.3d 1163 (9th Cir. 2004) .....	12
<i>New York v. EPA</i> , 852 F.2d 574 (D.C. Cir. 1988).....	11

*Reckitt Benckiser, Inc. v. Jackson*,  
762 F. Supp. 2d 34 (D.D.C. 2011)..... 7

*Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.*,  
467 U.S. 986 (1984)..... 3, 4

**Statutes and Regulations**

Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act

7 U.S.C. §§ 136–136y..... 3

7 U.S.C. § 136(bb)..... 5

7 U.S.C. § 136(q)(1)(F), (G)..... 5

7 U.S.C. § 136a(a)..... 3

7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(2)(B) ..... 5

7 U.S.C. § 136a(c)(7)(C) ..... 5, 6

7 U.S.C. § 136a(g)(1)(A)(iii)–(iv) ..... 6

7 U.S.C. § 136j(a)(2)(G)..... 5

7 U.S.C. § 136n(b)..... 10

Federal Environmental Pesticide Control Act of 1972, Pub. L. No. 92-  
516, 86 Stat. 973 (1972) ..... 3

40 C.F.R. § 152.50..... 4, 5

40 C.F.R. pt. 158..... 5

40 C.F.R. § 158.30..... 5

H.R. Rep. No. 92-511 (1971)..... 3, 4, 7, 12

S. Rep. No. 92-838 (1972), *reprinted in* 1972 U.S.C.C.A.N. 3393 ..... 4

**Miscellaneous**

EPA, *Registration Decision for the Continuation of Uses of Dicamba on Dicamba Tolerant Cotton and Soybean*, <https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=EPA-HQ-OPP-2016-0187-0968> (Oct. 31, 2018)..... 8-9

Phillips McDougall, *Evolution of the Crop Protection Industry since 1960*, <https://croplife.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/Phillips-McDougall-Evolution-of-the-Crop-Protection-Industry-since-1960-FINAL.pdf> (Nov. 2018) ..... 11

# 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.