UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND (Northern Division)

MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE,

Plaintiff,

v.

BP P.L.C. et al.,

Case No. 1:18-cv-02357-ELH

Defendants.

CONDITIONAL MOTION TO STAY EXECUTION OF REMAND ORDER SHOULD THE COURT GRANT THE PENDING MOTION TO REMAND¹

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 7 and 62(a), Defendants respectfully request that, should the Court grant Plaintiff's pending Motion to Remand (ECF No. 111), the Court issue an Order staying execution of the remand order for thirty days. In support thereof, Defendants state:²

- 1. On July 20, 2018, Plaintiff the Mayor & City Council of Baltimore ("Plaintiff") filed a complaint in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City.
- 2. On July 31, 2018, Defendants timely and properly removed the case pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441, 1442, 1446, 1452 and 1367(a) and 43 U.S.C. § 1349. (ECF No. 1). 28 U.S.C. § 1442 permits removal based on actions of federal officers.

¹ This Motion is submitted subject to and without waiver of any defense, affirmative defense, or objection, including personal jurisdiction, insufficient process, or insufficient service of process.

² Defendants requested a temporary stay of any remand order in their Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion to Remand, *see* ECF No. 124 at 70 n. 37, and reiterate that request here out of an abundance of caution.

- 3. On September 11, 2018, Plaintiff moved to remand the case ("Remand Motion"). (ECF No. 111). Defendants opposed Plaintiff's Remand Motion (ECF No. 124), and Plaintiff filed a Reply. (ECF No. 133). Thus, Plaintiff's Remand Motion is fully briefed.
- 4. Defendants file this Conditional Motion to Stay now, before a ruling on Plaintiff's Remand Motion, so that, if the Court were to grant the Remand Motion, it could concurrently rule on this stay motion and grant a 30-day stay within which Defendants may exercise their appeal rights and seek a further stay pending appeal in an orderly manner.
- 5. Plaintiff initially requested a hearing on its Remand Motion. *See* ECF No. 111 at p. 1. On February 20, 2019, Defendants also requested a hearing on the Remand Motion. (ECF No. 154). Plaintiff then opposed Defendants' request and withdrew its own request for a hearing. (ECF No. 155). Defendants' Request for a Hearing is pending.
- 6. The pending Remand Motion should be denied for the reasons stated in Defendants' Opposition (ECF No. 124). Should the Court grant Plaintiff's Remand Motion, Defendants plan to appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, as expressly permitted by 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d).³
- 7. Defendants' right to appeal could be compromised if a remand order were executed too soon by the Clerk of Court mailing the remand order to the Clerk of the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 62(a), Defendants thus request that, in the event the Court grants the Remand Motion, the Court stay its Order for 30 days and direct the Clerk of Court not to mail the certified remand order to the Clerk of the Circuit Court for

_

³ Remand orders in cases removed under 28 U.S.C. § 1442 are immediately appealable. 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d) (remand orders in cases removed pursuant to § 1442 "shall be reviewable by appeal"); *see also Northrop Grumman Tech. Servs., Inc. v. DynCorp Int'l, LLC*, 865 F. 3d 181, 189 n.4 (4th Cir. 2017) ("although orders remanding cases to state court generally are not reviewable on appeal, we may review such an order when, as here, the removal was made pursuant to the federal officer removal statute 28 U.S.C. § 1442") (citation omitted); *Wood v. Crane Co.*, 764. F.3d 316, 320 (4th Cir. 2014) ("This case was originally removed pursuant to §1442(a)(1) and is thus reviewable").

Baltimore City during that period.⁴ The 30-day stay will provide Defendants sufficient time to file a substantive motion to stay pending appeal that addresses the reasoning of any remand order the Court may enter. Imposition of a stay would avoid needless conflicts that might arise from the creation of concurrent jurisdiction with the Circuit Court for Baltimore City while Defendants exercise their statutory right to appeal.

- 8. In consolidated cases involving virtually identical removal issues and alleged global warming claims brought against many of the defendants named herein (and in which plaintiffs are represented by the same San Francisco law firm that represents Plaintiff here), Judge Chhabria of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California similarly stayed his remand order before the Clerk of the Court mailed it to the originating California state courts.⁵ Judge Chhabria noted that such a stay was "appropriate" to "sort out whether a longer stay pending appeal [was] warranted." *See* Case Nos. 17-cv-04929-VC, ECF No. 223 (N.D. Cal.); 17-cv-04934-VC, ECF No. 207 (N.D. Cal.); 17-cv-04935-VC, ECF No. 208 (N.D. Cal.). Those California cases remain in federal court and stayed while the Ninth Circuit's review is pending.
- 9. This approach has been adopted within, and endorsed by, the Fourth Circuit as well. *See Northrup Grumman Tech. v. DynCorp Int'l, LLC*, 2016 WL 3180775 (E.D. Va. June 7, 2016) (directing Clerk of Court to "refrain from executing the Court's Order remanding the case back to the Circuit Court."), *aff'd* 865 F.3d 181 (4th Cir. 2017). The stay in *Northrup Grumman*

⁴ See Fed R. Civ. P. 62(a) ("execution on a judgment, and proceedings to enforce it are stayed for 30 days after its entry, unless the Court orders otherwise"); see also Fed R. Civ. P. 54(a) (defining "judgment" as "any order from which an appeal lies").

⁵ District Judge Alsup denied a motion to remand in a similar climate change case against many of the defendants in this action and dismissed the case on the merits. *See* Case Nos. 17-cv-06011-WHA, ECF No. 287; 17-cv-06012-WHA, ECF No. 239 (N.D. Cal.) The appeal of that decision is also pending in the Ninth Circuit. *See* Case No. 18-16663 (9th Cir.).

caused the district court to retain jurisdiction and allowed the parties to brief a stay of the remand order pending appeal to the Fourth Circuit.

For all the foregoing reasons, Defendants respectfully request that this Honorable Court stay the execution of any remand order that the Court may enter in this case, by either entering the conditional stay in the text of the remand order itself, or by concurrently entering the proposed Order to that effect, which is attached.⁶

Respectfully submitted,

CHEVRON CORP. AND CHEVRON U.S.A., INC. By Counsel

Dated: April 3, 2019

By: /s/ Ty Kelly_

Ty Kelly (Bar No. 27166)

Jonathan Biran (Bar No. 28098)

BAKER DONELSON

100 Light Street, 19th Floor

Baltimore, MD 21202

Telephone: (410) 685-1120

E-mail: tykelly@bakerdonelson.com E-mail: jbiran@bakerdonelson.com

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

Joshua S. Lipshutz (pro hac vice)

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

333 South Grand Avenue

Los Angeles, CA 90071

Telephone: (213) 229-7000

Facsimile: (213) 229-7520

E-mail: tboutrous@gibsondunn.com

E-mail: jlipshutz@gibsondunn.com

Anne Champion (pro hac vice)

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

200 Park Avenue

New York, NY 10166-0193

Telephone: (212) 351-4000

⁶ Prior to filing this Conditional Motion, Defendants sought Plaintiff's position on the relief requested herein but Plaintiff indicated it did not consent.

Facsimile: (212) 351-5281

E-mail: achampion@gibsondunn.com

Neal S. Manne (*pro hac vice*) SUSMAN GODFREY LLP 1000 Louisiana, Suite 5100

Houston, TX 77002

Telephone: (713) 651-9366 Facsimile: (713) 654-6666

E-mail: nmanne@susmangodfrey.com

Attorneys for Defendants CHEVRON CORPORATION and CHEVRON U.S.A., INC.

By: /s/ John B. Isbister

John B. Isbister (Bar No. 00639) Jaime W. Luse (Bar No. 27394) TYDINGS & ROSENBERG LLP One East Pratt Street, Suite 901

Baltimore, MD 21202 Telephone: 410-752-9700 Facsimile: 410-727-5460

Email: jisbister@tydingslaw.com Email: jluse@tydingslaw.com

Philip H. Curtis (pro hac vice) Nancy G. Milburn (pro hac vice)

ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER

250 West 55th Street

New York, NY 10019-9710 Telephone: (212) 836-8383 Facsimile: (212) 715-1399

E-mail: philip.curtis@arnoldporter.com E-mail: nancy.milburn@arnoldporter.com

Matthew T. Heartney (admitted *pro hac vice*) ARNOLD & PORTER KAYE SCHOLER 777 South Figueroa Street, 44th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90017-5844

Telephone: (213) 243-4000 Facsimile: (213) 243-4199

E-mail: matthew.heartney@arnoldporter.com

Attorneys for Defendants BP PRODUCTS NORTH AMERICA INC., BP P.L.C. and BP AMERICA INC. By: /s/ Craig A. Thompson

Craig A. Thompson, (Bar No. 26201)

VENABLE LLP

750 East Pratt Street, Suite 900

Baltimore, MD 21202

Telephone: (410) 244-7605 Facsimile: (410) 244-7742

Email: cathompson@venable.com

Theodore V. Wells, Jr. (pro hac vice)

Daniel J. Toal (pro hac vice) Jaren Janghorbani (pro hac vice)

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON &

GARRISON LLP

1285 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10019-6064 Telephone: (212) 373-3089

Fax: (212) 492-0089

E-mail: twells@paulweiss.com E-mail: dtoal@paulweiss.com

E-mail: jjanghorbani@paulweiss.com

Attorneys for Defendants EXXONMOBIL CORPORATION and EXXONMOBIL OIL CORPORATION

By: /s/ James M Webster, III

David C. Frederick (*pro hac vice*) James M. Webster, III (Bar No. 23376) Brendan J. Crimmins (*pro hac vice*) David K. Suska (*pro hac vice*) KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C. 1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 400 Washington, D.C. 20036

Washington, D.C. 20036 Telephone: (202) 326-7900 Facsimile: (202) 326-7999

E-mail: dfrederick@kellogghansen.com E-mail: jwebster@kellogghansen.com E-mail: bcrimmins@kellogghansen.com E-mail: dsuska@kellogghansen.com

Jerome C. Roth (*pro hac vice*) Elizabeth A. Kim (*pro hac vice*) MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP 560 Mission Street Twenty-Seventh Floor San Francisco, California 94105-2907

Telephone: (415) 512-4000 Facsimile: (415) 512-4077 E-mail: jerome.roth@mto.com E-mail: elizabeth.kim@mto.com

Attorneys for Defendants SHELL OIL COMPANY and ROYAL DUTCH SHELL, plc

By: /s/ Warren N. Weaver

Warren N Weaver (Bar No. 3600) Peter Sheehan (Bar No. 29310) WHITEFORD TAYLOR AND PRESTON LLP Seven Saint Paul St Ste 1400 Baltimore, MD 21202 Telephone: (410) 347-8757 Facsimile: (410) 223-4177 Email: wweaver@wtplaw.com

Nathan P. Eimer, Esq. (pro hac vice) Pamela R. Hanebutt, Esq. (pro hac vice) Lisa S. Meyer, Esq. (pro hac vice) Raphael Janove, Esq. (pro hac vice) EIMER STAHL LLP 224 South Michigan Ave., Ste. 1100

Chicago, IL 60604 Telephone: (312) 660-7600 Facsimile: (312) 692-1718

E-mail: neimer@EimerStahl.com E-mail: phanebutt@EimerStahl.com E-mail: lmeyer@EimerStahl.com E-mail: rjanove@Eimerstahl.com

Attorneys for Defendant CITGO PETROLEUM CORPORATION

By: /s/ Michael Alan Brown

Michael A. Brown, Esq. (Bar No. 07483) Leianne S. McEvoy, Esq. (Bar No. 28280) NELSON MULLINS RILEY &

SCARBOROUGH LLP

100 S. Charles Street, Suite 1200 Baltimore, Maryland 21202 Telephone: 443-392-9400

Telephone: 443-392-9400 Facsimile: 443-392-9499

Mike.brown@nelsonmullins.com Leianne.mcevoy@nelsonmullins.com

John F. Savarese, Esq. (pro hac vice) Ben M. Germana, Esq. (pro hac vice) WACHTELL, LIPTON, ROSEN & KATZ 51 West 52nd Street

New York, NY 10019 PHONE: (212) 403-1000 FAX: (212) 403-2000

E-mail: JFSavarese@wlrk.com E-mail: BMGermana@wlrk.com

Sean C. Grimsley, Esq. (pro hac vice) Jameson R. Jones, Esq. (pro hac vice)

BARTLIT BECK LLP

1801 Wewatta Street, Suite 1200 Denver, CO 80202

PHONE: (303) 592-3100 FAX: (303) 592-3140

E-mail: sean.grimsley@bartlit-beck.com E-mail: jameson.jones@bartlit-beck.com

Attorneys for Defendants
CONOCOPHILLIPS and
CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY

By: /s/ Jonathan C. Su

Jonathan Chunwei Su (Bar No. 16965) LATHAM AND WATKINS LLP 555 Eleventh St NW, Ste 1000 Washington, DC 20004-1304 Telephone: (202) 637-2200 Facsimile: (202) 637-2201 Email: jonathan.su@lw.com

Steven M. Bauer (pro hac vice) Margaret A. Tough (pro hac vice) LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111-6538 PHONE: (415) 391-0600

PHONE: (415) 391-060 FAX: (415) 395-8095

E-mail: steven.bauer@lw.com E-mail: margaret.tough@lw.com

Attorneys for Defendant PHILLIPS 66

By: /s/ Shannon S. Broome

Shannon S. Broome (*pro hac vice*) HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP

50 California Street

San Francisco, CA 94111

Tel: (415) 975-3718 Fax: (415) 975-3701

E-mail: SBroome@HuntonAK.com

Shawn Patrick Regan (*pro hac vice*) HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP 200 Park Avenue New York, NY 10166

Tel: (212) 309-1046 Fax: (212) 309-1100

E-mail: SRegan@HuntonAK.com

Ann Marie Mortimer (*pro hac vice*) HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP 550 South Hope Street, Suite 2000

Los Angeles, CA 90071 Tel: (213) 532-2103 Fax: (213) 312-4752

E-mail: AMortimer@HuntonAK.com

Perie Reiko Koyama (Bar No. 20017) HUNTON ANDREWS KURTH LLP 2200

Pennsylvania Ave. NW Washington, DC 20037 Telephone: (202) 778-2274 Email: pkoyama@huntonak.com

Attorneys for Defendants MARATHON PETROLEUM CORP. and SPEEDWAY, LLC

By: /s/ Emily Wilson
Emily Wilson (Bar No. 20780)
Megan Berge (pro hac vice)
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
1299 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: (202) 639-7700

Email: Emily.wilson@bakerbotts.com Email: megan.berge@bakerbotts.com

Scott Janoe (*pro hac vice*) BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 910 Louisiana Street Houston, Texas 77002 Telephone: (713) 229-1553 Facsimile: (713) 229 7953

Facsimile: (202) 639-1171

Email: scott.janoe@bakerbotts.com

Attorneys for Defendant HESS CORP.

By: /s/ Michelle N. Lipkowitz

Michelle N. Lipkowitz (Bar No. 27188) Thomas K. Prevas (Bar No. 29452) SAUL EWING ARNSTEIN & LEHR LLP Baltimore, Maryland 21202-3133

Telephone: (410) 332-8683 Facsimile (410) 332-8123

Email: michelle.lipkowitz@saul.com Email: Thomas.prevas@saul.com

Attorneys for Defendants CROWN CENTRAL LLC, and CROWN CENTRAL NEW HOLDINGS LLC

By: /s/ Tracy Roman

Kathleen Taylor Sooy (*pro hac vice*) Tracy A. Roman (Bar No. 11245) CROWELL & MORING LLP 1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20004 Telephone: 202-624-2500 Facsimile: 202-628-5116 Email: ksooy@crowell.com

Email: troman@ crowell.com

Attorneys for Defendants CNX RESOURCES CORPORATION, CONSOL ENERGY INC. and CONSOL MARINE TERMINALS LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on this <u>3rd</u> day of April 2019, the foregoing document was filed through the ECF system and was therefore served on all registered participants identified on the Notice of Electronic Filing.

<u>/s/ Ty Kelly</u> Ty Kelly