

## STERN KILCULLEN & RUFOLO, LLC

### COUNSELORS AT LAW

HERBERT J. STERN\*  
KEVIN M. KILCULLEN+  
PASQUALE J. RUFOLO  
JOEL M. SILVERSTEIN\*  
MARK W. RUFOLO\*  
MICHAEL DINGER\*  
JOHN E. TRAVERS^  
KENNETH DEL VECCHIO\*\*  
ROBERT W. FERGUSON~  
EDWARD B. BECKER\*  
CORINNE M. MAROTTA  
  
ALEXANDER P. FERSA+

325 COLUMBIA TURNPIKE  
SUITE 110, P.O. BOX 992  
FLORHAM PARK, NEW JERSEY 07932-0992  
TEL: 973-535-1900 \* FAX: 973-535-9664

214 BRAZILIAN AVENUE  
SUITE 270  
PALM BEACH, FLORIDA 33480  
561-721-6525

+Admitted in NJ and FL  
\*Admitted in NJ and NY  
^Admitted In NJ, NY, PA and FL  
~Admitted in NJ, NY and FL  
\*\*Admitted In NJ and PA

September 8, 2021

### VIA ECF

Hon. John M. Vazquez, U.S.D.J.  
United States District Court  
for the District of New Jersey  
Martin Luther King Building & U.S. Courthouse  
50 Walnut Street  
Newark, NJ 07101

**Re: Case No. 20-cv-14243, City of Hoboken v. Exxon Mobil, et al.**

Dear Judge Vazquez:

Defendants write to respectfully request that the Court temporarily stay the execution of its order granting Plaintiff's motion to remand (the "Order"), Dkt. 122, to allow Defendants time to file a formal motion to stay remand pending appeal, which Defendants will file within ten days or as soon as the Court requests.<sup>1</sup> Defendants further request that the Court instruct the Court Clerk not to send a certified copy of the Order to the New Jersey Superior Court, in order to preserve the status quo until such time as Defendants' request for a stay pending appeal has been fully resolved. Defendants attempted to confer with Plaintiff, but did not receive a response prior to filing this emergency request.

Approximately one hour ago, the Court granted Plaintiff's motion to remand, holding that the Court does not have jurisdiction over Plaintiff's claims. Dkt. 122. Defendants will be appealing this decision to the Third Circuit, and also intend to file a motion to stay remand pending the appeal. Defendants have a right to appeal the Order because they removed this case under the federal officer removal statute, 28 USC § 1442. While generally "[a]n order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed is not reviewable on appeal," an "order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed pursuant to section 1442 or 1443 of this title

---

<sup>1</sup> This letter is submitted subject to, and without waiver of, any defense, affirmative defense, or objection, including personal jurisdiction, insufficient process, or insufficient service of process.

Hon. John M. Vazquez, U.S.D.J.

September 8, 2021

Page 2

shall be reviewable by appeal or otherwise.” 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d). Defendants also removed this case under the Class Action Fairness Act (“CAFA”), which codifies a statutory right to seek an appeal of the remand order. See 28 U.S.C. § 1453(c). The Supreme Court recently made clear that on appeal a court may review “any issue fairly encompassed within” a remand order of a case removed pursuant to the federal officer removal statute. *BP P.L.C. v. Mayor & City Council of Baltimore*, 141 S. Ct. 1532, 1540, 1542 (2021).

A temporary stay is warranted here to preserve Defendants’ appellate rights and spare the parties and the New Jersey Superior Court from what could be a substantial amount of unnecessary and ultimately futile litigation. If the Clerk were to transmit the remand order to the New Jersey Superior Court, “[t]he State court may thereupon proceed with such case.” 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c). As will be explained further in Defendants’ forthcoming motion to stay remand pending appeal, Defendants’ appeal will present serious legal issues, including questions of first impression in the Third Circuit. Indeed, the Third Circuit has not yet considered the propriety of any of the grounds for removal asserted by Defendants in a climate change-related action and will be able to consider all of Defendants’ grounds for removal on appeal. See *Baltimore*, 141 S. Ct. at 1540, 1542.<sup>2</sup> Absent a stay, Defendants face irreparable harm, whereas a stay would cause Plaintiff no prejudice and, in fact, would serve the public interest and the interests of judicial economy.

Over the past four years, approximately 23 other state and municipal entities have filed similar climate change actions in courts across the country, all of which involve significant national interests. In light of these significant national interests, this Court should allow Defendants time to seek a stay of remand pending appeal to the Third Circuit. See, e.g., *Northrup Grumman Tech. v. DynCorp Int’l, LLC*, No. 1:16-cv-00534-JCC-IDD, 2016 WL 3180775, at \*2 (E.D. Va. June 7, 2016) (directing clerk to “refrain from executing the Court’s Order . . . remanding the case back to the Circuit Court” so the parties could brief a stay of the remand order pending appeal), *aff’d*, 865 F.3d 181 (4th Cir. 2017).

Indeed, in prior climate change-related cases, federal courts in California, Hawaii, Rhode Island, Minnesota, Connecticut and Maryland allowed defendants time to brief a motion to stay pending appeal after a grant of remand. See, e.g., Order Granting Motions to Remand, *County of San Mateo v. Chevron Corp. et al.*, No. 17-4929 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2018), ECF No. 223 at 5–6; Order, *City & County of Honolulu v. Sunoco LP*, No. 20-163 (D. Haw. Feb. 16, 2021), ECF No. 130; Order, *County of Maui v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*, No. 20-470 (D. Haw. Feb. 16, 2021), ECF No. 101; Opinion and Order, *State of Rhode Island v. Chevron Corp. et al.*, No. 18-395 (D.R.I. July 22, 2019), ECF No. 122 at 16–17; Order, *Minnesota v. Am. Petroleum Inst.*, No. 20-1636 (D. Minn. Apr. 7, 2021), ECF No. 86; Order, *Connecticut v. Exxon Mobil Corp.*, No. 20-1555 (D. Conn. June 11, 2021), ECF No. 56 Memorandum Opinion, *Mayor and City Council of Baltimore v. BP P.L.C. et al.*, No. 18-2357 (D. Md. June 20, 2019), ECF No. 182 at 3.

---

<sup>2</sup> Following *Baltimore*, many other appellate courts will also soon address, for the first time, the propriety of several removal grounds asserted in climate change-related actions. See, e.g., *Shell Oil Prods. Co. v. Rhode Island*, No. 20-900, 2021 WL 2044535 (U.S. May 24, 2021); *Chevron Corp. v. County of San Mateo*, No. 20-884, 2021 WL 2044534 (U.S. May 24, 2021); *Suncor Energy, Inc. v. Board of County Commissioners of Boulder County*, No. 20-783, 2021 WL 2044533, at \*1 (U.S. May 24, 2021).

Hon. John M. Vazquez, U.S.D.J.

September 8, 2021

Page 3

Judge Chhabria of the Northern District of California, for example, stayed execution of his remand order to allow defendants an opportunity to file a motion to stay pending appeal and then, in granting defendants' motion, explained: "[t]he Court finds that the[r]e are controlling questions of law as to which there is substantial ground for difference of opinion and that their resolution by the court of appeals will materially advance the litigation." Order Granting Motions to Stay, *County of San Mateo v. Chevron Corp. et al.*, No. 17-4929 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 9, 2018), ECF No. 240. Most recently, Chief Judge Tunheim of the District of Minnesota stayed execution of his remand order pending appeal, concluding that "this action raises weighty and significant questions that intersect with rapidly evolving areas of legal thought." *Minnesota v. American Petroleum Institute*, 2021 WL 3711072, at \*2 (D. Minn. Aug. 20, 2021) (emphasis added). More specifically, the court found that "the Second Circuit's decision in *City of New York* provides a legal justification for addressing climate injuries through the framework of federal common law," *id.*, and "the *Baltimore* decision increases the likelihood that an appellate court will determine that certain climate change claims arise exclusively under federal law," *id.* at \*3. The Court also noted that this "is not a case of applying thoroughly developed law to well-tread factual patterns; when it comes to questions of the proper forum for adjudicating harms related to climate change, 'the legal landscape is shifting beneath [our] feet.'" *Id.* at \*4. For these and other reasons, the court concluded: "Considerations of judicial economy and conservation of resources also weigh in favor of staying execution of the remand order as the Eighth Circuit determines whether the state or federal court has jurisdiction over this matter." *Id.* The same is true here—given the shifting "legal landscape," it makes eminent sense to stay the remand Order until the Third Circuit has the opportunity to weigh in on these important issues. *Id.*

For these reasons, Defendants respectfully ask the Court to temporarily stay execution of the Order and instruct the Court Clerk not to send a certified copy of the Order to the New Jersey Superior Court, pending briefing on Defendants' forthcoming motion to stay, which Defendants will file within ten days or as soon as the Court requests. Attached is a proposed order granting the requested relief.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Herbert J. Stern  
Herbert J. Stern

STERN, KILCULLEN & RUFOLLO, LLC

Herbert J. Stern

hstern@sgklaw.com

Joel M. Silverstein

jsilverstein@sgklaw.com

325 Columbia Turnpike, Suite 110

Florham Park, New Jersey 07932-0992

Telephone: 973.535.1900

Facsimile: 973.535.9664

*Hon. John M. Vazquez, U.S.D.J.*

*September 8, 2021*

*Page 4*

By: /s/ Paul J. Fishman

Paul J. Fishman

ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE  
SCHOLER LLP

Paul J. Fishman

[paul.fishman@arnoldporter.com](mailto:paul.fishman@arnoldporter.com)

One Gateway Center

Newark, NJ 07102-5310

Telephone: (973) 776-1901

Facsimile: (973) 776-1919

Nancy Milburn, *pro hac vice*

[nancy.milburn@arnoldporter.com](mailto:nancy.milburn@arnoldporter.com)

Diana Reiter, *pro hac vice*

[diana.reiter@arnoldporter.com](mailto:diana.reiter@arnoldporter.com)

250 West 55th Street

New York, NY 10019-9710

Telephone: (212) 836-8000

Facsimile: (212) 836-8689

Matthew T. Heartney, *pro hac vice*

[matthew.heartney@arnoldporter.com](mailto:matthew.heartney@arnoldporter.com)

John D. Lombardo, *pro hac vice*

[john.lombardo@arnoldporter.com](mailto:john.lombardo@arnoldporter.com)

777 South Figueroa Street, 44th Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90017-5844

Telephone: (213) 243-4000

Facsimile: (213) 243-4199

Jonathan W. Hughes, *pro hac vice*

[jonathan.hughes@arnoldporter.com](mailto:jonathan.hughes@arnoldporter.com)

Three Embarcadero Center, 10th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111-4024

Telephone: (415) 471-3156

Facsimile: (415) 471-3400

*Attorneys for Defendants*

*BP plc and BP America Inc.*

By: /s/ Kevin H. Marino

Kevin H. Marino

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

Theodore J. Boutrous Jr. (*pro hac vice*)

[tboutrous@gibsondunn.com](mailto:tboutrous@gibsondunn.com)

333 South Grand Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Telephone: 213.229.7000

Facsimile: 213.229.7520

William E. Thomson, *pro hac vice*

[wthomson@gibsondunn.com](mailto:wthomson@gibsondunn.com)

333 South Grand Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Telephone: 213.229.7000

Facsimile: 213.229.7520

Andrea E. Neuman, *pro hac vice*

[aneuman@gibsondunn.com](mailto:aneuman@gibsondunn.com)

200 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10166

Telephone: 212.351.4000

Facsimile: 212.351.4035

Thomas G. Hungar, *pro hac vice*

[thungar@gibsondunn.com](mailto:thungar@gibsondunn.com)

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.,

Washington, DC 20036

Telephone: 202.955.8500

Facsimile: 202.467.0539

Joshua D. Dick, *pro hac vice*

[jdick@gibsondunn.com](mailto:jdick@gibsondunn.com)

555 Mission Street

San Francisco, CA 94105

Telephone: 415.393.8200

Facsimile: 415.374.8451

SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P

Erica W. Harris, *pro hac vice*

[eharris@susmangodfrey.com](mailto:eharris@susmangodfrey.com)

1000 Louisiana, Suite 5100

Houston, TX 77002

Telephone: (713) 651-9366

Facsimile: (713) 654-6666

*Hon. John M. Vazquez, U.S.D.J.*

*September 8, 2021*

*Page 5*

MARINO, TORTORELLA & BOYLE,  
P.C.

Kevin H. Marino

[kmarino@khmarino.com](mailto:kmarino@khmarino.com)

John D. Tortorella

[jtortorella@khmarino.com](mailto:jtortorella@khmarino.com)

437 Southern Boulevard

Chatham, NJ 07928

Tel: (973) 824-9300

Fax: (973) 824-8425

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON  
& GARRISON LLP

Theodore V. Wells, Jr.

[twells@paulweiss.com](mailto:twells@paulweiss.com)

Daniel J. Toal, *pro hac vice*

[dtoal@paulweiss.com](mailto:dtoal@paulweiss.com)

Yahonnes Cleary, *pro hac vice*

[ycleary@paulweiss.com](mailto:ycleary@paulweiss.com)

Caitlin E. Grusauskas, *pro hac vice*

[cgrusauskas@paulweiss.com](mailto:cgrusauskas@paulweiss.com)

1285 Avenue of the Americas

New York, NY 10019

Tel: (212) 373-3000

Fax: (212) 757-3990

*Attorneys for Defendants Exxon Mobil  
Corp. and ExxonMobil Oil Corp.*

By: Anthony P. Callaghan

Anthony P. Callaghan

GIBBONS P.C.

Anthony P. Callaghan, Esq.

Thomas R. Valen, Esq.

Sylvia-Rebecca Gutiérrez, Esq.

One Gateway Center

Newark, NJ 07102

Tel: (973) 596-4500

Fax: (973) 596-0545

[acallaghan@gibbonslaw.com](mailto:acallaghan@gibbonslaw.com)

[tvalen@gibbonslaw.com](mailto:tvalen@gibbonslaw.com)

[sgutierrez@gibbonslaw.com](mailto:sgutierrez@gibbonslaw.com)

*Attorneys for Defendants*

*Chevron Corp and Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*

By: /s/ Anthony J. Zarillo, Jr.

Anthony J. Zarillo, Jr.

RIKER DANZIG SCHERER HYLAND &  
PERRETTI LLP

Anthony J. Zarillo, Jr.

[azarillo@riker.com](mailto:azarillo@riker.com)

Jeffrey M. Beyer

[jbeyer@riker.com](mailto:jbeyer@riker.com)

One Speedwell Avenue

Morristown, NJ 07962-1981

Telephone: 973.538.0800

Facsimile: 973.451.3708

MCGUIREWOODS LLP

Andrew G. McBride, *pro hac vice*

[amcbride@mcguirewoods.com](mailto:amcbride@mcguirewoods.com)

2001 K Street N.W.

Suite 400

Washington, DC 20006-1040

Telephone: 202.857.2487

Facsimile: 202.828.2987

Brian D. Schmalzbach, *pro hac vice*

[bschmalzbach@mcguirewoods.com](mailto:bschmalzbach@mcguirewoods.com)

800 East Canal Street

Richmond, VA 23219

Telephone: 804.775.4746

Facsimile: 804.698.2304

*Attorneys for Defendant American  
Petroleum Institute*

By: /s/ Loly G. Tor

Loly G. Tor

K&L GATES LLP

Loly G. Tor

[loly.tor@klgates.com](mailto:loly.tor@klgates.com)

One Newark Center, 10th Fl.

*Hon. John M. Vazquez, U.S.D.J.*

*September 8, 2021*

*Page 6*

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
Steven M. Bauer, *pro hac vice*  
Steven.Bauer@lw.com  
Margaret A. Tough, *pro hac vice*  
[Margaret.Tough@lw.com](mailto:Margaret.Tough@lw.com)  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
San Francisco, CA 94111-6538  
Tel: (415) 391-0600  
Fax: (415) 395-8095

*Attorneys for Defendants Phillips 66 and  
Phillips 66 Company*

By: /s/ Jeffrey S. Chiesa

Jeffrey S. Chiesa

CHIESA SHAHINIAN & GIANTOMASI  
PC

Jeffrey S. Chiesa  
[jchiesa@csglaw.com](mailto:jchiesa@csglaw.com)

Dennis M. Toft  
[dtoft@csglaw.com](mailto:dtoft@csglaw.com)

Michael K. Plumb  
[mplumb@csglaw.com](mailto:mplumb@csglaw.com)

One Boland Drive  
West Orange, New Jersey 07052  
Telephone: (973) 325-1500  
Facsimile: (973) 325-1501

BARTLIT BECK LLP

Jameson R. Jones, *pro hac vice*  
jameson.jones@bartlitbeck.com

Daniel R. Brody, *pro hac vice*  
dan.brody@bartlitbeck.com

1801 Wewatta Street  
Suite 1200  
Denver, CO 80202  
Telephone: (303) 592-3100  
Facsimile: (303) 592-3140

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

Steven M. Bauer, *pro hac vice*  
Steven.Bauer@lw.com

Margaret A. Tough, *pro hac vice*

Newark, NJ 07102  
Phone: (973) 848-4026

KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD,  
FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.

David C. Frederick, *pro hac vice*  
dfrederick@kellogghansen.com  
Grace W. Knofczynski, *pro hac vice*  
gknofczynski@kellogghansen.com  
Daniel S. Severson, *pro hac vice*  
dseverson@kellogghansen.com  
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
Phone: (202) 326-7900

*Attorneys for Defendants Royal Dutch  
Shell plc and Shell Oil Company*

*Hon. John M. Vazquez, U.S.D.J.*

*September 8, 2021*

*Page 7*

[Margaret.Tough@lw.com](mailto:Margaret.Tough@lw.com)

505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000

San Francisco, CA 94111-6538

Tel: (415) 391-0600

Fax: (415) 395-8095

*Attorneys for Defendants*

*ConocoPhillips and ConocoPhillips*

*Company*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

CITY OF HOBOKEN

Plaintiff,

v.

EXXON MOBIL CORP., EXXONMOBIL OIL  
CORP., ROYAL DUTCH SHELL PLC,  
SHELL OIL COMPANY, BP P.L.C., BP  
AMERICA INC., CHEVRON CORP.,  
CHEVRON U.S.A. INC., CONOCOPHILLIPS,  
CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY, PHILLIPS  
66, PHILLIPS 66 COMPANY, AMERICAN  
PETROLEUM INSTITUTE,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:20-cv-14243-

JMV-MF

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' REQUEST FOR A  
TEMPORARY STAY OF EXECUTION  
OF REMAND ORDER**

The Court orders that Defendants' request for a temporary stay of execution of this Court's remand order, Dkt. 122, is hereby GRANTED, and the Court's remand order is STAYED. The stay shall remain in place until this Court rules on Defendants' forthcoming motion to stay pending appeal and, if that motion is denied, until the Third Circuit rules on the motion to stay Defendants intend to file in that forum, if necessary.

**SO ORDERED** this \_\_ day of \_\_\_\_, 2021.

\_\_\_\_\_  
The Honorable John M. Vazquez  
United States District Judge