PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

2001 K STREET, NW TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10019-6064 TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

UNIT 5201, FORTUNE FINANCIAL CENTER 5 DONGSANHUAN ZHONGLU CHAOYANG DISTRICT, BEIJING 100020, CHINA TELEPHONE (86-10) 5828-6300

SUITES 3601 – 3606 & 3610 36/F, GLOUCESTER TOWER THE LANDMARK 15 QUEEN'S ROAD, CENTRAL HONG KONG TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

ALDER CASTLE
10 NOBLE STREET
LONDON EC2V 7JU, UNITED KINGDOM
TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

535 MISSION STREET, 24TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105 TELEPHONE (628) 432-5100

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING 2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE
77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100
PO. BOX 226
TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3
TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200 POST OFFICE BOX 32 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032 TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410

KANNON K. SHANMUGAM

TELEPHONE (202) 223-7325 FACSIMILE (202) 204-7397 E-MAIL: kshanmugam@paulweiss.com

January 18, 2022

BY ELECTRONIC FILING

Michael E. Gans Clerk of Court United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit Thomas F. Eagleton Courthouse 111 South 10th Street, Room 24.329 St. Louis, MO 63102

> Re: State of Minnesota v. American Petroleum Institute, et al., No. 21-1752; American Petroleum Institute, et al. v. State of Minnesota, No. 21-8005

Dear Mr. Gans:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j), appellants file this letter in response to appellee's letter regarding *Buljic* v. *Tyson Foods, Inc.*, Civ. No. 21-1010, 2021 WL 6143549 (8th Cir. Dec. 30, 2021).

The record here establishes that appellants, through numerous actions over the past eight decades, have "acted under" federal officers for purposes of federal-officer jurisdiction. See Br. 41-44; Watson v. Phillip Morris Cos., 551 U.S. 142, 151-152 (2007). Even the district court agreed that appellants have identified several "plausible ways in which [they] may have acted under the direction of federal officers." Add. 23a.

No analogous record existed in *Buljic*. See 2021 WL 6143549, at *7. There, defendant Tyson Foods argued that several federal policies and statements amounted to directives that Tyson continue operating its meat-processing plants during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Id.* at *5-*6. By following those alleged directives, Tyson contended that it had "acted under" the direction of a federal officer. *Id.* The court rejected that argument for two reasons. *First*, because meat processing is not typically a federal duty, Tyson was not helping federal officers to fulfill a "basic governmental task." *Id.* at *5. *Second*, the government merely encouraged—but did

Appellate Case: 21-1752 Page: 1 Date Filed: 01/18/2022 Entry ID: 5117989

Michael E. Gans

not direct—Tyson to take certain actions, including keeping its plants open. *Id.* at *6.

This case is distinct in both respects. First, appellants have undertaken tasks that *would* normally fall to the federal government, including providing specialized military supplies vital to the national defense and, through their work as operators and lessees of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, reducing reliance on imported oil. Second, the government has directed appellants in connection with those tasks, including by controlling the precise specifications of aviation fuel, mandating production in World War II, requiring payment of in-kind royalties to augment the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, and strictly overseeing fossil-fuel exploration on federal lands. *See* Reply Br. 21-23. Because the government has done far more than merely designate the fossil-fuel industry as important, federal-officer jurisdiction is appropriate.

We would appreciate it if you would circulate this letter to the panel at your earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Kannon K. Shanmugam Kannon K. Shanmugam

cc: All counsel of record (via electronic filing)

Appellate Case: 21-1752 Page: 2 Date Filed: 01/18/2022 Entry ID: 5117989

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kannon K. Shanmugam, counsel for defendants-appellants Exxon Mobil Corporation and ExxonMobil Oil Corporation, and a member of the bar of this Court, certify that, on January 18, 2022, the foregoing document was filed through the Court's electronic filing system. I further certify that all parties required to be served have been served.

/s/ Kannon K. Shanmugam
Kannon K. Shanmugam

Appellate Case: 21-1752 Page: 3 Date Filed: 01/18/2022 Entry ID: 5117989