PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

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

WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047

February 11, 2022

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

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:

Under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j), appellants write in response to appellee's letter regarding *West Virginia State University Board of Governors* v. *Dow Chemical Co.*, 23 F.4th 288 (4th Cir. 2022) and *Delaware* v. *BP America Inc.*, 2022 WL 58484 (D. Del. Jan. 5, 2022).

Dow Chemical illustrates why federal-officer jurisdiction lies here. The "archetyp[al] case" for federal-officer jurisdiction is when a private-contractor defendant "complete[d] tasks to further government projects or goals, like building military equipment." 23 F.4th 288, at 304; *id.* at 300 n.8. Here, appellants supplied the government with fossil-fuel products under exacting specifications to support the national defense. Br. 43. By contrast, the defendants' conduct in *Dow Chemical* was "limited to strict compliance with the RCRA regulations." 23 F.4th at 303.

Dow Chemical has no bearing on appellants' federal common-law and Grable grounds for removal. The Dow Chemical defendants argued that the putative state-law claims at issue challenged, in substance, remedial measures under RCRA, bringing those claims within RCRA's citizen-suit provision and establishing federal jurisdiction. Id. at 308. The court disagreed, based on its analysis of the particular claims at issue and relevant RCRA provisions, while acknowledging that artfully pleaded

Appellate Case: 21-1752 Page: 1 Date Filed: 02/11/2022 Entry ID: 5126548

state-law claims can create federal jurisdiction. *See id.* at 308, 311. This case is different: appellee's artfully pleaded claims, which seek redress for injuries allegedly caused by global climate change, are removable because they are necessarily governed by federal common law and necessarily raise substantial federal issues, both of which grounds supply federal jurisdiction.

With respect to *Delaware*, the district court there erred by conflating defendants' federal common-law ground for removal with federal preemption, *contra* Br. 32; Reply 8; by ignoring the interaction between the federal common-law and *Grable* analyses, *contra* Br. 35; by concluding, erroneously, that defendants had not acted under federal officers and crediting plaintiff's jurisdictional disclaimer, *contra* Reply 21; and by overlooking OCLSA's broad grant of jurisdiction to all actions "arising out of, or in connection with" operations on the shelf, Reply 24-25.

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: 02/11/2022 Entry ID: 5126548

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 February 11, 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: 02/11/2022 Entry ID: 5126548