

No. 20-55930

In the
United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

R.J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO COMPANY, ET AL.
Plaintiffs-Appellants,
v.

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ET AL.,
Defendants-Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California, No. 2:20-cv-4880 (Hon. Dale S. Fischer)

**BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE PUBLIC HEALTH LAW CENTER, ACTION ON
SMOKING AND HEALTH, CALIFORNIA STATE ASSOCIATION OF
COUNTIES, CHANGELAB SOLUTIONS, INTERNATIONAL
CITY/COUNTY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, INTERNATIONAL
MUNICIPAL LAWYERS ASSOCIATION, LEGAL RESOURCE CENTER
FOR PUBLIC HEALTH POLICY, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
COUNTIES, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES, PUBLIC HEALTH
ADVOCACY INSTITUTE, AND U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS IN
SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES AND AFFIRMANCE**

Rachel Bloomekatz
1148 Neil Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43201
(614) 259-7611
rachel@bloomekatzlaw.com
Counsel for Amici Curiae

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No publicly held corporation owns 10% or more of the stock in any amicus curiae. Nor is any amicus curiae a subsidiary of any parent company.

/s/ Rachel Bloomekatz
Rachel Bloomekatz
Counsel for Amici Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Corporate Disclosure Statement	i
Table of Contents	ii
Table of Authorities.....	iv
Introduction	1
Interest of Amici Curiae	4
Argument.....	6
I. The TCA preserved long-established state and local government authority over tobacco product sales within their borders.....	6
A. The TCA expressly preserves local government authority over tobacco retail sales.....	7
B. The TCA only preempted local regulations that would force manufacturers to change their processes for each local jurisdiction.	10
II. Los Angeles County’s restriction on the sale of flavored tobacco products is not a “product standard” preempted by the TCA.	13
A. The Ordinance is not a “product standard” because it does not require manufacturers to create tobacco products in any particular way.	13
B. The industry’s contrary arguments are wrong.....	15
C. No circuit court has ever concluded that a ban on the sale of flavored tobacco products is a “product standard.”.....	20
III. Los Angeles County’s Ordinance is not impliedly preempted because local sales bans on flavored tobacco products do not pose an obstacle to the FDA’s regulatory authority.	21
A. There is a “high threshold” for obstacle preemption especially where Congress has explicitly preserved state authority.....	22

B. The Ordinance is not impliedly preempted by the FDA’s inaction on menthol.	23
C. The industry’s implied preemption argument would have grave consequences for local public health laws that often serve as policy laboratories.	25
Conclusion	27
Form 8: Certificate of Compliance	28
Certificate of Service	29
Addendum: Identity of Amici Curiae	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

<i>AATCLC v. FDA</i> , No. 4:20-cv-04012-KAW (N.D. Cal. Nov. 12, 2020)	23
<i>Altria Grp., Inc. v. Good</i> , 555 U.S. 70 (2008).....	7
<i>Austin v. Tennessee</i> , 179 U.S. 343 (1900).....	2, 3, 6
<i>Bates v. Dow Agrosciences LLC</i> , 544 U.S. 431 (2005).....	7
<i>Berger v. Philip Morris USA, Inc.</i> , 185 F. Supp. 3d 1324 (M.D. Fla. 2016)	9, 25
<i>Chamber of Comm. v. Whiting</i> , 563 U.S. 582 (2011).....	22, 23
<i>Cote v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 909 F.3d 1094 (11th Cir. 2018)	9
<i>Graham v. R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.</i> , 857 F.3d 1169 (11th Cir. 2017)	6, 12, 24
<i>Indep. Gas & Serv. Stations Ass'n v. Chicago</i> , 112 F. Supp. 3d 749 (N.D. Ill., 2015)	17, 20, 21
<i>Nat'l Ass'n of Tobacco Outlets, Inc. v. City of Providence</i> , 731 F.3d 71 (1st Cir. 2013).....	10, 12, 17, 20
<i>Nat'l Meat Ass'n v. Harris</i> , 565 U.S. 452 (2012).....	17, 18
<i>P.R. Dep't of Consumer Affairs v. Isla Petroleum Corp.</i> , 485 U.S. 495 (1998).....	24
<i>R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. City of Edina</i> , 482 F. Supp. 3d 875 (D. Minn. 2020).....	20

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.