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

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 P.O. 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

August 31, 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 regarding City of Hoboken v. Chevron Corp., 2022 WL 3440653 (3d Cir. Aug. 17, 2022).

Contrary to appellee's suggestion, the Third Circuit did not address whether defendants' claims actually arose under federal common law. See Op. 24-25. Rather, it treated defendants' invocation of federal common law as an ordinary preemption defense that could not support removal under the well-pleaded complaint rule. See id. But appellants do not invoke federal common law as a defense; they contend that federal common law necessarily and exclusively supplies the substantive law for claims seeking redress for climate-related injuries. See Reply Br. 8. Decisions from both this Court and the Supreme Court establish that a plaintiff may not defeat removal by artfully pleading state-law claims to omit necessary federal questions. See Br. of Appellants 32.

The Third Circuit also held (Op. 23, 25) that statutory complete preemption provides the only doctrinal basis to remove federal claims labeled as arising under state law. But the Supreme Court has never so held, see Reply Br. 11-12, and this Court's precedent holds that the artful-pleading doctrine covers claims necessarily

Appellate Case: 21-1752 Page: 1 Date Filed: 08/31/2022 Entry ID: 5193664 arising under federal common law. See Br. of Appellants 28-30, 32-33 (discussing In re Otter Tail Power Co., 116 F.3d 1207 (8th Cir. 1997)). This Court's rule sensibly ensures that plaintiffs cannot use artful pleading and venue selection to prevent the federal judiciary from developing federal common law in areas implicating uniquely federal interests.

With respect to *Grable* jurisdiction: the Third Circuit's analysis is flawed because it rests on the same fiction that federal common law supplies only an ordinary preemption defense. *See* Op. 26. Because federal common law in fact provides the substantive rules governing the elements of appellee's claims, resolving those claims necessarily requires the resolution of substantial federal questions. *See* Br. of Appellants 35.

The Third Circuit's holdings on jurisdiction under OCSLA and the federal-officer removal statute are erroneous for the reasons explained in appellants' briefing. *See* Br. of Appellants 40-50.

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: 08/31/2022 Entry ID: 5193664

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 August 31, 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: 08/31/2022 Entry ID: 5193664