PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

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

WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047

March 9, 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

Mr. 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 the non-final "outline of the court's analysis" in *City & County of Honolulu* v. *Sunoco*, *LP*, No. 1CCV-20-380 (Haw. Cir. Ct. Feb. 22, 2022), denying a motion to dismiss a climate-change lawsuit for failure to state a claim.

In holding that federal common law did not govern the plaintiffs' claims, the state trial court in *Sunoco* erred by failing properly to account for the sweeping harms alleged. Although the court accurately noted that the complaint sought redress for injuries allegedly caused by climate change, including "flooding" and the "costs of prevention, mitigation, repair, and abatement," slip op. 2, the court erroneously accepted the plaintiffs' characterization of the complaint as merely seeking damages for harms allegedly caused by marketing and promotion of fossil-fuel products, rather than global emissions. *See id.* at 3.

The Second Circuit rejected a similar attempt at artful pleading in *City of New York* v. *Chevron Corp.*, 993 F.3d 81 (2021). It stated, in no uncertain terms, that plaintiffs may not "disavow[] any intent to address emissions" while "identifying

Appellate Case: 21-1752 Page: 1 Date Filed: 03/09/2022 Entry ID: 5134919

such emissions as the singular source" of the alleged harm. *Id.* at 91. When greenhouse gas emissions are the source of plaintiffs' harms, the Second Circuit held, federal common law provides the rule of decision. *See id.* So too here: though the State argues that it asserts consumer-protection *claims*, both the complaint and the statements of its counsel at oral argument below confirm that the State is seeking broad *relief* for harms allegedly caused by global greenhouse-gas emissions. See App. 86; D. Ct. Dkt. 67, at 61-62.

The trial court also concluded that the Clean Air Act displaces any federal common law that might otherwise displace state law. But that is a question about the *sufficiency* of the plaintiffs' claims that properly arose on a motion to dismiss. It has no bearing on the question of *jurisdiction* at issue here. See Reply Br. 2-3.

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: 03/09/2022 Entry ID: 5134919

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Kannon K. Shanmugam, counsel for defendants-appellants Exxon Mobil Corporation and ExxonMobil Corporation, and a member of the bar of this Court, certify that, on March 9, 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: 03/09/2022 Entry ID: 5134919