U.S. Supreme Court Docket, October 2015 Term — Antitrust & Trade Regulation Cases

Granted Opinions	Docket No.	Subject	Status, Deadlines	Holding
Herson v. City of Richmond Granted 10/5/15	14-1322 (4/30/15)	Advertising	Petition granted; Ninth Circuit judgment vacated; and case remanded for further consideration in light of *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*. Attorneys: Joshua Reuben Furman for Petitioners. Matthew D. Zinn (Shute Mihaly & Weinberger LLP) for Respondent. Respondent Brief (6/5/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (6/19/15) Supreme Court Docket	Whether Richmond's mere assertion of a content-neutral justification renders its facially content-based sign code content-neutral and justifies Richmond's ban on noncommercial signs—including political signs—where commercial signs are allowed. Ninth Circuit decision (10/21/14)
RJR Nabisco, Inc. v. The European Community Granted 10/1/15	15-138 (7/27/15)	RICO	Respondent Brief (8/21/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (9/9/15) Attorneys: Gregory G. Katsas (Jones Day) for Petitioners. John J. Halloran Jr. (John H. Halloran, Jr., P.C.) for Respondents. Supreme Court Docket	Whether, or to what extent, the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act applies extraterritorially. Second Circuit decision (4/23/14)
Campbell-Ewald Co. v. Gomez Granted 5/18/15	14-857 (1/16/15)	Privacy	10/14/15—Oral Argument Transcript Respondent Brief (3/23/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (4/7/15)	Whether a case becomes moot, and thus beyond judicial power of Article III, when the plaintiff receives an offer of complete relief on his claims. Whether the answer to the first

Last updated: 10/14/2015

©2015 CCH Incorporated. All rights reserved.

			Respondent Supp. Brief (4/16/15) Petitioner Supp. Reply Brief (4/14/15) Petitioner Brief (7/16/15) Respondent Brief (8/24/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (9/22/15) Select Amicus Briefs: United States; U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Consumer Data Industry Association; Lawyers for Civil Justice; Trans Union LLC; Washington Legal Foundation Attorneys: Gregory G. Garre (Latham & Watkins, LLP) for Campbell-Ewald Co. Michael J. McMorrow (McMorrow Law PC) and Jonathan F. Mitchell for Respondent. Supreme Court Docket	question is any different when the plaintiff has asserted a class claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23, but receives an offer of complete relief before any class is certified. Whether the doctrine of derivative sovereign immunity recognized in *Yearsley v. W.A. Ross Construction Co.*, 309 U.S. 18 (1940), for government contractors is restricted to claims arising out of property damage caused by public works projects. Ninth Circuit decision (9/19/14)
DIRECTV, Inc. v. Imburgia Granted 3/23/15	14-462 (10/21/14)	Advertising	10/6/15—Oral Argument Transcript; Oral Argument Audio Merit Briefs: Respondent Brief (1/28/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (2/10/15) Select Amicus Briefs: U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Atlantic Legal Foundation; Washington Legal Foundation; Arbitration and Contracts Scholars; Law Professors Attorneys: Christopher Landau (Kirkland & Ellis LLP) for DIRECTV, Inc. Thomas G. Goldstein (Goldstein & Russell, P.C.) for Respondents. Supreme Court Docket	Whether the California Court of Appeal erred by holding, in direct conflict with the Ninth Circuit, that a reference to state law in an arbitration agreement governed by the Federal Arbitration Act requires the application of state law preempted by the Federal Arbitration Act. California Court of Appeal decision (4/7/14)

©2015 CCH Incorporated. All rights reserved.

Pending Petitions	Docket No.	Subject	Status, Deadlines	Questions Presented
Grover v. Choice Hotels International, Inc.	15-443	Franchising & Distribution	Response due 11/9/15 Attorneys: Matthew J. Anderson (Anderson Agostino & Keller, P.C.) for Petitioners. Supreme Court Docket	Whether abandonment by an attorney may provide a basis for relief in a monetary civil action under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b)(6). Whether a client is obligated to diligently follow his own case when he is unknowingly relying on the misrepresentation of his attorney. Seventh Circuit decision (7/7/15)
Heinz v. U.S.	15-432	Antitrust	Response due 11/6/15 Attorneys: Nathaniel Z. Marmur for Petitioners. Donald B. Verrilli Jr., U.S. Department of Justice. Supreme Court Docket	Whether 18 U.S.C. §3293(2), which extends the statute of limitations for mail or wire fraud from five to ten years if the fraud "affects a financial institution," applies where the defendants is a bank employee, the bank is a culpable actor, and the alleged effect is that the bank made payments to settle, or incurred legal fees to defend, certain civil, regulatory and criminal actions. In other words, does the statute apply where the bank "affects itself"? Second Circuit decision (6/4/15)
Westgate Resorts, Ltd., L.P. v. Overton	15-327 (9/14/15)	Consumer Protection & Privacy	Response due 10/16/15 Attorneys: John H. Pelzer (Greenspoon Marder, P.A.) for Petitioner.	Whether a punitive damages award that is nearly fourteen times the compensatory damages, primarily based upon the defendant's nationwide wealth, violates the due process clause of the Constitution? Whether awarding punitive damages that are nearly fourteen times compensatory damages based on conduct meeting only one

©2015 CCH Incorporated. All rights reserved.

			Supreme Court Docket	of the *Campbell* reprehensibility factors violates the due process clause of the Constitution? Tenn. App. decision (11/20/14)
American Freedom Defense Initiative v. Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority	15-141 (7/27/15)	Advertising	Response due 10/28/15 Attorneys: Robert Joseph Muise (American Freedom Law Center) for Petitioners. Jeffrey J. Pyle (Prince Lobel Tye, LLP) for Respondents. Supreme Court Docket	Whether the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) created a public forum by accepting for display on its property a wide array of controversial political and public-issue ads, including ads that address the same controversial subject matter as Petitioners' pro-Israel ad, and thus violated the First Amendment by rejecting Petitioners' ad based on its content. Regardless of the nature of the forum, whether the MBTA's rejection of Petitioners' advertisement based on an advertising guideline that prohibits ads considered by MBTA officials to be "demeaning and disparaging" was a viewpoint-based restriction of speech in violation of the First Amendment. First Circuit decision (3/30/15)
A.V.E.L.A., Inc. v. Fifty-Six Hope Road Music, Ltd.	15-264 (6/29/15)	Advertising	Response due 10/2/15 Attorneys: Michael R. Adele (Technology Litigation Center) for Petitioners.	Does Lanham Act § 43(a) protect a deceased celebrity's persona-successor without it showing that the celebrity's persona acquired secondary meaning so that it identifies the persona-successor as the source of sponsorship or approval? Does a Plaintiff satisfy 43(a)'s "consumer confusion" requirement even without evidence that its

©2015 CCH Incorporated. All rights reserved.

			Supreme Court Docket	sponsorship or approval would have any consequence to purchasers? Ninth Circuit decision (2/20/15)
Eastman Kodak Co. v. Collins Inkjet Corp.	15-412 (6/15/15)	Antitrust	Response due 11/4/15 Attorneys: Marc G. Schildkraut (Cooley LLP) for Petitioner. Supreme Court Docket	Whether it constitutes unlawful tying, and whether the plaintiff has antitrust standing to claim unlawful tying, when the plaintiff cannot be excluded by defendant's pricing and in fact can profitably retain its full market share and enhance competition by competing on price? Whether an antitrust plaintiff can suffer irreparable injury as a result of potential loss of market share when the plaintiff could retain its entire market share by lowering its prices without going below its own cost? Sixth Circuit decision (3/16/15)
The Harvard Drug Group, LLC v. Barr	14-1194 (3/27/15)	Privacy	Respondent Brief (5/12/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (5/26/15) Attorneys: Stephen E. Glazek (Barris, Scott, Denn & Driker, PLLC) for Petitioner. Scott L. Nelson (Public Citizen Litigation Group) for Respondent. Supreme Court Docket	Whether a case becomes moot, and thus beyond the judicial power of Article III, when the plaintiff receives an offer of complete relief on his claim. Whether the answer to the first question is any different when the plaintiff has asserted a class claim under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and receives an offer of complete relief before any class is certified. Eleventh Circuit decision (1/29/15)
The Dow Chemical Co. v. Industrial	14-1091 (3/9/15)	Antitrust	Respondent Brief (5/11/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (5/22/15)	Whether, in certifying a class under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(b)(3), courts may

©2015 CCH Incorporated. All rights reserved.

Polymers, Inc.			Select Amicus Briefs: DRI—The Voice of the Defense Bar Attorneys: Carter G. Phillips (Sidley Austin LLP) for Petitioner. Cory L. Andrews for the Washington Legal Foundation. Paul D. Clement (Bancroft PLLC) for Industrial Polymers, Inc. Supreme Court Docket	presume class-wide injury from an alleged price-fixing agreement, even when prices are individually negotiated and individual purchasers frequently succeed in negotiating away allegedly collusive overcharges. Whether a class may be certified or a class-wide damages judgment affirmed where plaintiffs' common "proof" of damages is a model that (a) does not purport to determine the actual damages of most class members, but instead applies an "average" overcharge estimated from a sample of transactions of very different purchasers, or (b) assumes that defendants engaged in multiple antitrust violations, even though plaintiffs attempted to prove only one violation at trial. Tenth Circuit decision (9/29/14)

©2015 CCH Incorporated. All rights reserved.

Denied Petitions	Docket No.	Subject	Status, Deadlines	Questions Presented
Mercer Outdoor Advertising, LLC v. City of Hermitage, Pennsylvania	15-19 (6/30/15)	Advertising	Petition denied 10/5/15 Respondent Brief (7/29/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (8/14/15) Attorneys: E. Adam Webb (Webb, Klase & Lemon, L.L.C.) for Petitioner. Samuel Hood Foreman (Weber Gallagher) for Respondents. Supreme Court Docket	Whether the judgment below should be vacated and the case remanded for further consideration in light of *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*. Third Circuit decision (4/2/15)
LaCertosa v. Blackman Plumbing Supply Co., Inc.	14-1509 (6/21/15)	RICO	Petition denied 10/5/15 Response due 7/23/15 Respondent Waiver Attorneys: John LaCertosa, *pro se*. Joseph T. Roccanova (Yuen, Roccanova & Seltzer, P.C.) for Respondents. Supreme Court Docket	Whether the District Court for the Eastern District of New York and the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals erred in their judgment by rendering such judgment with reliance and reference to *Manson v. Stacescu*, 11 F.3d 1127, 1131 (2d Cir. 1993). Whether the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals erred in not recognizing the "special duty" exception when considering the petitioner's individual standing. Whether the District Court for the Eastern District of New York and the 2nd Circuit Court of Appeals erred in their judgment by ordering their judgment without considering the evidence the petitioner referenced in his allegations and pleadings. Second Circuit decision (11/6/14)
Fred Martin Motor	14-1455	Franchising	Petition denied 10/5/15	Whether by reopening the final order of a federal bankruptcy court and permitting a

©2015 CCH Incorporated. All rights reserved.

Co. v. Spitzer Autoworld Akron, LLC	(6/11/15)	& Distribution	Respondent Brief (7/10/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (9/4/15) Attorneys: Kannon K. Shanmugam (Williams & Connolly LLP) for Petitioner. Anthony B. Giardini (Anthony B Giardini Co. LPA) and Tiberio Trimmer (Dawda, Mann, Mulcahy & Sadler, PLC) for Spitzer Autoworld Akron, LLC. Supreme Court Docket	private arbitrator to reverse it, Section 747 of the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2010 is unconstitutional. Sixth Circuit decision (1/16/15)
Felder's Collision Parts, Inc. v. All Star Advertising Agency, Inc.	14-1299 (4/27/15)	Antitrust	Petition denied 10/5/15 Respondent Brief (6/29/15) Attorneys: Harvey S. Bartlett III. (Jones Swanson Huddell & Garrison, LLC) for Petitioner. Mark A. Cunningham (Jones Walker, L.L.P.) for Respondents. Supreme Court Docket	Whether, for purposes of a predatory pricing claim under the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1 and 2, cost should be measured at the time of the point-of-sale to the end-consumer, which is when the anticompetitive harm occurs, or whether the predatory competitor is entitled to factor in after-sale kickbacks from a conspiring supplier to show that the sale was not made below its cost. Fifth Circuit decision (1/27/15)
City of San Jose v. Office of the Commissioner of Baseball	14-1252 (4/15/15)	Antitrust	Petition denied 10/5/15 Respondent Brief (6/17/15) Petitioner Reply Brief (6/30/15) Attorneys: Joseph W. Cotchett (Cotchett, Pitre & McCarthy) for Petitioners. John W. Keker (Keker & Van Nest LLP) for Respondents. Supreme Court Docket	Whether professional baseball is exempt from antitrust law in matters relating to franchise relocation. Ninth Circuit decision (1/15/15)

©2015 CCH Incorporated. All rights reserved.