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

June 17, 2022

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:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j), appellants write in response to appellee's letter discussing *Rhode Island* v. *Shell Oil Products Co.*, 35 F.4th 44 (1st Cir. 2022). Appellants submit that the First Circuit erred by rejecting removal based on federal common law, deepening existing circuit conflicts.

In particular, the First Circuit failed to grapple with the Second Circuit's holding in *City of New York* v. *Chevron Corp.*, 993 F.3d 81 (2021), that claims seeking redress for climate-change injuries arise under federal common law. *See* 35 F.4th at 55. The Second Circuit properly reasoned that such "sprawling" claims are incompatible with our Constitution's federalist structure and the need for uniformity on matters of national energy and environmental policy. 993 F.3d at 91-92. That reasoning applies squarely here. *See* Br. of Appellants 19-21.

The First Circuit also acknowledged, without deciding the issue, that it had previously expressed skepticism about whether the artful-pleading doctrine operates independently of the complete-preemption doctrine. 35 F.4th at 52. But as this Court has explained in the context of removal based on federal common law, "[a] plaintiff's characterization of a claim as based solely on state law is not dispositive of

Appellate Case: 21-1752 Page: 1 Date Filed: 06/17/2022 Entry ID: 5168836

whether federal question jurisdiction exists." In re Otter Tail Power Co., 116 F.3d 1207, 1213 (1997) (citation omitted).

Finally, the First Circuit incorrectly concluded that jurisdiction is absent because the Clean Air Act displaced the applicable federal common law. 35 F.4th at 55-56. That reasoning conflates the merits of the claims with the Court's jurisdiction. Reply Br. 2-3. Although the Act may displace any remedy under federal common law, it does not displace the entire source of law altogether. See also City of New York, 993 F.3d at 95 & n.7. The Tenth Circuit similarly erred. See Board of County Commissioners v. Suncor Energy (U.S.A.) Inc., 25 F.4th 1238 (10th Cir. 2022).

The First Circuit's holdings on *Grable*, federal-officer, and OCSLA jurisdiction are erroneous for the reasons explained in appellants' briefing. *See* Br. of Appellants 34-50.

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: 06/17/2022 Entry ID: 5168836

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 June 17, 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: 06/17/2022 Entry ID: 5168836