

No. 20-55631

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

NATIONAL PORK PRODUCERS COUNCIL, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

KAREN ROSS, *et al.*,

Defendants-Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES IN SUPPORT OF APPELLANTS

Of Counsel:

STEPHEN A. VADEN
General Counsel

CARRIE F. RICCI
Associate General Counsel

Department of Agriculture

JEFFREY BOSSERT CLARK
Acting Assistant Attorney General

ROBERT S. BREWER, JR.
United States Attorney

MICHAEL S. RAAB
THOMAS PULHAM
Attorneys, Appellate Staff
Civil Division, Room 7323
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20530
(202) 514-4332

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION AND INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES	1
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	5
A. Statutory Background	5
B. Prior Proceedings	9
1. <i>NAMI</i>	9
2. This Litigation	10
ARGUMENT	14
PROPOSITION 12 VIOLATES THE COMMERCE CLAUSE.	14
A. A State Law Improperly Regulates Extraterritorial Conduct When Its Practical Effect Is To Control Conduct Outside State Borders.	14
B. The Purpose And Practical Effects Of Proposition 12 Are To Control Methods Of Pork Production Outside California.	16
CONCLUSION	29
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:	<u>Page(s)</u>
<i>Association des Eleveurs de Canards et d'Oies du Quebec v. Harris</i> , 729 F.3d 937 (9th Cir. 2013)	24, 25
<i>Baldwin v. G.A.F. Seelig</i> , 294 U.S. 511 (1935)	16, 17, 20, 23, 27, 28
<i>BMW of N. Am., Inc. v. Gore</i> , 517 U.S. 559 (1996)	1, 15
<i>Bonaparte v. Tax Court</i> , 104 U.S. 592 (1881)	1, 15
<i>Brown-Forman Distillers Corp. v. New York State Liquor Auth.</i> , 476 U.S. 573 (1986)	14, 15, 26
<i>C & A Carbone v. Town of Clarkston</i> , 511 U.S. 383 (1994)	17, 18, 23, 25
<i>Chinatown Neighborhood Ass'n v. Harris</i> , 794 F.3d 1136 (9th Cir. 2015)	13, 26, 27
<i>Cort v. St. Paul Fire & Marine Ins. Cos.</i> , 311 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2002)	8
<i>Daniels Sharpsmart, Inc. v. Smith</i> , 889 F.3d 608 (9th Cir. 2018)	24, 25, 26
<i>Healy v. Beer Inst.</i> , 491 U.S. 324 (1989)	1, 3, 15, 24, 26
<i>Legato Vapors v. Cook</i> , 847 F.3d 825 (7th Cir. 2017)	21, 22
<i>Medtronic v. Lohr</i> , 518 U.S. 470 (1996)	18

National Foreign Trade Council v. Natsios
 181 F.3d 38 (1st Cir. 1999),
aff'd sub nom. Crosby v. National Foreign Trade Council, 530 U.S. 363 (2000)..... 22

North Am. Meat Inst. v. Becerra,
 420 F. Supp. 3d 1014 (C.D. Cal. 2019)6, 8, 9, 10

North Am. Meat Inst. v. Becerra:
 No. 19-8569, 2020 WL 919153 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2020) 10

Pharm. Research & Mfrs. of Am. v. Walsh,
 538 U.S. 644 (2003) 25, 26

Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.,
 397 U.S. 137 (1970) 14

Rocky Mountain Farmers Union v. Corey,
 730 F.3d 1070 (9th Cir. 2013) 25

Rocky Mountain Farmers Union v. Corey,
 740 F.3d 507 (9th Cir. 2014) 28

Rocky Mountain Farmers Union v. Corey,
 913 F.3d 940 (9th Cir. 2019)13, 27, 28

Sam Francis Found. v. Christies, Inc.,
 784 F.3d 1320 (9th Cir. 2015)23, 24, 25

South Dakota v. Wayfair, Inc.,
 138 S. Ct. 2080 (2018) 14

World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson,
 444 U.S. 286 (1980) 15

Statutes:

7 U.S.C. § 1635 *et seq* 2

7 U.S.C. § 1635..... 2

7 U.S.C. § 2036(a)	3
7 U.S.C. § 7501(4).....	3
7 U.S.C. § 7502(a)	3
7 U.S.C. § 7502(g).....	3
28 U.S.C. § 517.....	5
Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25990(a)	7, 18
Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25990(b)(2)	8
Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25991(e)(1).....	7
Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25991(e)(3).....	7
Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25991(u)	8
Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25993(a)	8
Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25993(b).....	8
Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25995(e)	6
Proposition 2, https://go.usa.gov/xGp9V	5-6, 6
Proposition 12, https://go.usa.gov/xGpXH	7, 18, 19

Rule:

Fed. R. App. P. 29(a).....	5
----------------------------	---

Legislative Materials:

Cal. Assembly Comm. on Agric., Bill Analysis of AB 1437, (Apr. 29, 2009)	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.