06/22 43

NOTIFY

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUFFOLK, ss.

SUPERIOR COURT
CIVIL ACTION
NO. 1984CV03333-BLS1

Notice Sent
06.23.21
TCF
CC+Opc
DJT
TVWJ
TA
BOC
SAlc
CGC
MQB
TCR
GSC
MAH
AAG
RT
JAS
AAG
SS
LAG
MD

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

vs.

EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION AND ORDER ON DEFENDANT'S SPECIAL MOTION TO DISMISS THE AMENDED COMPLAINT

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by its Attorney General ("Commonwealth"), sued Exxon Mobil Corporation ("Exxon") for alleged violations of G.L. c. 93A. The Commonwealth claims that Exxon has violated c. 93A by: (1) misrepresenting and failing to disclose material facts regarding systemic climate change risks to Massachusetts investors (Count I); (2) misrepresenting the purported environmental benefit of using its Synergy™ and Mobil 1™ products and failing to disclose the risks of climate change caused by its fossil fuel products to Massachusetts consumers (Count II); and (3) promoting false and misleading "greenwashing" campaigns to Massachusetts consumers (Count III).

The matter is now before me on Exxon's Special Motion to Dismiss pursuant to the anti-SLAPP ("Strategic Litigation against Public Participation") statute, G.L. c. 231, § 59H. After a hearing and for the reasons that follow, Exxon's motion is **DENIED**.

DISCUSSION

The Massachusetts Legislature enacted the anti-SLAPP statute to counteract "SLAPP" suits, defined broadly as "lawsuits brought primarily to chill the valid exercise of the constitutional rights of freedom of speech and petition for the redress of grievances." *Duracraft Corp.* v. *Holmes Prods. Corp.*, 427 Mass. 156, 161 (1998) (objective of SLAPP suit is not to

win, but to use litigation to intimidate opponents' exercise of rights of petitioning and speech). Generally, a SLAPP suit has no merit. See *Cadle Co.* v. *Schlichtmann*, 448 Mass. 242, 248 (2007).

The anti-SLAPP statute protects "a party's exercise of its right of petition." G.L. c. 231, § 59H. In relevant part, it provides:

> In any case in which a party asserts that the civil claims, counterclaims, or cross claims against said party are based on said party's exercise of its right of petition under the constitution of the United States or of the commonwealth, said party may bring a special motion to dismiss.

That definition makes clear that "'the statute is designed to protect overtures to the government by parties petitioning in their status as citizens .... The right of petition contemplated by the Legislature is thus one in which a party seeks some redress from the government.'" *Fustolo* v. *Hollander*, 455 Mass. 861, 866 (2010), quoting *Kobrin* v. *Gastfriend*, 443 Mass. 327, 332-333 (2005). The anti-SLAPP statute defines "a party's exercise of its right to petition" as:

> [1] any written or oral statement made before or submitted to a legislative, executive, or judicial body, or any other governmental proceeding; [2] any written or oral statement made in connection with an issue under consideration or review by a legislative, executive, or judicial body, or any other governmental proceeding; [3] any statement reasonably likely to encourage consideration or review of an issue by a legislative executive, or judicial body or any other governmental proceeding; [4] any statement reasonably likely to enlist public participation in an effort to effect such consideration; or [5] any other statement falling within constitutional protection of the right to petition government.

G.L. c. 231, § 59H. For the purposes of § 59H, "[p]etitioning includes all 'statements made to influence, inform, or at the very least, reach governmental bodies—either directly or indirectly.'" *North American Expositions Co. Ltd. Partnership* v. *Corcoran*, 452 Mass. 852, 862 (2009), quoting *Global NAPS, Inc.* v. *Verizon New England, Inc.*, 63 Mass. App. Ct. 600, 605 (2005).

As the moving party, Exxon, which alleges it has been the target of a SLAPP suit, first must show, by a preponderance of the evidence, that each claim it challenges is "solely based on

[Exxon's] own petitioning activities." *Blanchard* v. *Steward Carney Hosp., Inc.*, 483 Mass. 200, 203 (2019); *Duracraft Corp.*, 427 Mass. at 167-168 (moving party must show that claims against it are based on its petitioning activities alone and have no substantial basis other than or in addition to petitioning activities); *Blanchard* v. *Steward Carney Hosp., Inc.*, 477 Mass. 141, 148 (2017) (as part of threshold burden, moving party must show that conduct complained of constitutes exercise of its right to petition). If Exxon fails to show that the only conduct about which the Commonwealth complains is petitioning activity, the court must deny the special motion to dismiss. See *Benoit* v. *Frederickson*, 454 Mass. 148, 152 (2009).[1]

If Exxon satisfies its threshold burden, then the burden shifts to the Commonwealth to demonstrate that G.L. c. 231, § 59H does not require dismissal of its claims. See *477 Harrison Ave., LLC* v. *JACE Boston, LLC*, 483 Mass. 514, 516 (2019). The Commonwealth can do so in one of two ways. First, it can establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that "[Exxon's] exercise of its right to petition was devoid of any reasonable factual support or any arguable basis in law and ... [its] acts caused actual injury to the [Commonwealth]." G.L. c. 231, § 59H. Alternatively, it can establish, "such that the motion judge can conclude with fair assurance," that each of the Commonwealth's claims is not a "'meritless'" SLAPP suit, *i.e.*, that it is both colorable and non-retaliatory. *477 Harrison Ave., LLC*, 483 Mass. at 516, 518-519, citing *Blanchard*, 477 Mass. at 159-160. If the Commonwealth does not meet its burden, the court must grant the special motion to dismiss. G.L. c. 231, § 59H.

In Count I, the conduct complained of is Exxon's alleged misrepresentation of and failure to disclose material facts regarding systemic climate change risks to Massachusetts investors. In

[1] Contrary to the Commonwealth's suggestion, *see* Commonwealth's Opposition at page 11, I may not "pass over" this threshold inquiry. A court should apply the augmented *Duracraft* framework sequentially. *477 Harrison Ave., LLC* v. *JACE Boston, LLC*, 483 Mass. 514, 515, 519 (2019).

Count II, it is Exxon's alleged misrepresentation of the purported environmental benefit of consumer use of its Synergy™ and Mobil 1™ products and failure to disclose the risks of climate change caused by its fossil fuel products to Massachusetts consumers. Count III complains of Exxon's promotion of allegedly false and misleading "greenwashing" campaigns designed to "convey a false impression that [it] is more environmentally responsible than it really is, and so to induce consumers to purchase its products." Amended Complaint, ¶ 540.

Exxon argues that its statements to investors constitute petitioning activity because they "'were issued in a manner that was likely to influence or, at the very least, reach' regulators and 'members of the public wishing to weigh in' on climate policy." Motion, page 14, quoting *Blanchard*, 477 Mass. at 151. Exxon also contends that its public statements regarding its Synergy™ and Mobil 1™ products constitute petitioning activity because, "at a minimum, this speech was intended and reasonably likely to 'enlist the participation of the public' in the [climate] policy debate at the heart of the Attorney General's lawsuit." Motion, page 15. Finally, Exxon argues that the statements the Commonwealth labels as "greenwashing" are actually its "advocacy of climate policy choices under consideration by various government and regulating bodies." Motion, page 16.[2]

Exxon has failed to meet its threshold burden of showing that the Commonwealth's claims are based *solely* on Exxon's petitioning activities.[3] As an initial matter, Exxon has

[2] Exxon does not specify in its papers which definition of § 59H applies to qualify its statements as "exercise[s] of its right of petition." When asked to do so during the hearing, Exxon responded that it relies on all of them.

[3] The parties disagree whether the anti-SLAPP statute applies to civil enforcement actions brought by the Attorney General on the Commonwealth's behalf. Because Exxon has not met its initial burden of showing that the Commonwealth's claims against it are based solely on its petitioning activities, I need not reach this issue.

entirely failed to explain how any of the omissions alleged by the Commonwealth as violating c. 93A qualify as petitioning protected by § 59H, which applies only to "statements."[4]

With respect to statements on which the Commonwealth relies, the mere fact "[t]hat a statement concerns a topic that has attracted governmental attention, in itself, does not give that statement the [petitioning] character contemplated by the statute." *Global NAPs, Inc.*, 63 Mass. App. Ct. at 605. Further, although a commercial motive may not preclude a finding that speech constitutes protected petitioning activity, it "may provide evidence that particular statements do not constitute petitioning activity." *Fustolo*, 455 Mass. at 870 & n.11, citing *North Am. Expositions Co. Ltd. Partnership*, 452 Mass. at 863. For example, speech that is intended to achieve a purely commercial result, such as increasing demand for one's products or services, is not protected petitioning activity. See *Cadle Co.*, 448 Mass. at 250-254 (defendant lawyer's publication of statements on website, allegedly to share with public information about company's allegedly unlawful business practices, which he previously provided to regulatory officials and courts, did not constitute petitioning activity where he "created the Web site, at least in part, to generate more litigation to profit himself and his law firm"); *Ehrlich* v. *Stern*, 74 Mass. App. Ct. 531, 540-542 (2009). The court considers statements in the context in which they were made in determining whether they are protected petitioning. See *Wynne* v. *Creigle*, 63 Mass. App. Ct. 246, 253 (2005).

---

[4] In its complaint, the Commonwealth alleges not only misrepresentations by Exxon, but also failures to disclose information that the Commonwealth contends would be relevant to Massachusetts investors and consumers. For example, ¶ 18 of the Amended Complaint states: "In its communications with investors, including [Exxon's] supposed disclosures about climate change, ... ExxonMobil has failed to disclose the full extent of the risks of climate change to the world's people, the fossil fuel industry, and [Exxon]." Further, "[i]n its marketing and sales of ExxonMobil products to Massachusetts consumers, ... ExxonMobil likewise has failed ... to disclose in those advertisements and promotional materials that the development, refining, and normal consumer use of ExxonMobil fossil fuel products emit large volumes of greenhouse gases, which are causing global average temperatures to rise and destabilizing the global climate system." *Id.* at ¶ 33; see also ¶ 538.

Climate change indisputably is a topic that has attracted governmental attention. And, indeed, some Exxon statements referenced in the complaint constitute protected petitioning within the scope of § 59H because they were made "in connection with an issue under consideration or review by a legislative, executive, or judicial body" and/or "to encourage consideration or review of an issue by a legislative executive, or judicial body or any other governmental proceeding." However, Exxon cannot "obtain dismissal through an anti-SLAPP motion just because *some* of the allegations in the complaint are directed at conduct by the defendants that constitutes petitioning activity." *Haverhill Stem LLC* v. *Jennings*, 99 Mass. App. Ct. 626, 634 (2021). Rather, Exxon must show "that the complaint, fairly read, is based *solely* on petitioning, and to that end the allegations need to be carefully parsed even within a single count." *Id.* (emphasis in original). It is apparent from the context in which they were made that many Exxon statements referenced in the complaint are not protected. See *Cadle Co.*, 448 Mass. at 250 (attorney published statements "not as a member of the public who had been injured by … alleged practices, but as an attorney advertising his legal services").[5]

Review of a just a few of the Commonwealth's allegations suffices to demonstrate that each of its claims is not based *solely* on Exxon's petitioning activities. First, with respect to Count I, the Commonwealth alleges that Exxon has consistently represented *to investors* that it will "face virtually no meaningful transition risks from climate change because aggressive regulatory action is unlikely, renewable energy sources are uncompetitive, and fossil fuel demand and investment will continue to grow." Amended Complaint, ¶ 497. As an example,

[5] As an example, Exxon's "lobbying efforts" are arguably protected petitioning activities. But the anti-SLAPP inquiry produces an all or nothing result as to each count of the complaint. *Ehrlich*, 74 Mass. App. Ct. at 536. "Either [a] count survives the anti-SLAPP inquiry or it does not, and the statute does not create a process for parsing counts to segregate components that can proceed from those that cannot." *Id.* (citations omitted).

the Commonwealth alleges that, in its 2019 Energy and Carbon Summary issued *to investors*, Exxon modeled a scenario where global temperatures would increase by 2 degrees Celsius. Amended Complaint, ¶ 506. Exxon stated:

> [b]ased on currently anticipated production schedules, we estimate that by 2040 a substantial majority of our year-end 2017 proved reserves will have been produced. Since the 2°C scenarios average implies significant use of oil and natural gas through the middle of the century, we believe these reserves face little risk from declining demand.

Amended Complaint, ¶ 510. In the same document, Exxon claimed that its "actions to address the risks of climate change ... position ExxonMobil to meet the demands of an evolving energy system." Amended Complaint, ¶ 606. One of those "actions" is "[p]roviding products to help [Exxon's] customers reduce their emissions," including its Synergy™ fuels, which "yield better gas mileage, reduce emissions and improve engine responsiveness." *Id.*

Second, as to Count II, the Commonwealth alleges that Exxon markets its Synergy™ brand fuels *to consumers*, on *its promotional website*, as being "engineered for [b]etter gas mileage" and "[l]ower emissions." *Id.* at ¶ 595. For example, Exxon promotes its "Synergy Diesel Efficient™" fuel *to consumers* as the "latest breakthrough technology," and the "first diesel fuel widely available in the US" that helps "increase fuel economy" and "[r]educe emissions and burn cleaner," and represents that it "was created to let you drive cleaner, smarter and longer." *Id.* at ¶ 593. Finally, in support of Count III, the Commonwealth alleges that Exxon's "Protect Tomorrow. Today," *marketing campaign* amounts to deceptive "greenwashing" because Exxon falsely states that "Protect Tomorrow. Today" "defines [its] approach to the environment." *Id.* at ¶¶ 633, 639, 643.

Exxon has not shown, by a preponderance of the evidence, that it made any of these statements solely, or even primarily, to influence, inform, or reach any governmental body,

directly or indirectly. Instead, the statements appear to be directed at influencing investors to retain or purchase Exxon's securities or inducing consumers to purchase Exxon's products and thereby increase its profits. Compare *Cadle Co.*, 448 Mass. at 252 ("palpable commercial motivation behind" defendant's creation of website "so definitively undercuts" petitioning character of statements published on website) with *Cardno ChemRisk, LLC* v. *Foytlin*, 476 Mass. 479, 485-486 (2017) (activists' blog highlighting deceptive practices of company that reported on oil spill was protected petitioning activity, "implicit[ly] call[ing] for its readers to take action" to influence government). Because neither such statements nor the omissions alleged by the Commonwealth are protected under G.L. c. 59H, Exxon's special motion to dismiss must be denied.

ORDER

For the reasons stated above, it is hereby **ORDERED** that Exxon's Special Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint pursuant to the anti-SLAPP statute, G.L. c. 231, § 59H, is **DENIED**.

/s/ Karen F. Green
Karen F. Green
Associate Justice of the Superior Court

Dated: June 22, 2021