Case: 19-56408, 10/15/2020, ID: 11859575, DktEntry: 49-1, Page 1 of 3

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

NORTH AMERICAN MEAT INSTITUTE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

XAVIER BECERRA, in his official capacity as Attorney General of California; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees,

THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES; et al.,

Intervenor-Defendants-Appellees. No. 19-56408

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-08569-CAS-FFM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Central District of California Christina A. Snyder, District Judge, Presiding

> Argued and Submitted June 5, 2020 Pasadena, California

FILED

OCT 15 2020

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

Before: CALLAHAN and IKUTA, Circuit Judges, and BENCIVENGO,** District Judge.

North American Meat Institute (NAMI) appeals the district court's denial of its motion for a preliminary injunction. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), and we affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in holding that NAMI was unlikely to succeed on the merits of its dormant Commerce Clause claim. NAMI acknowledges that Proposition 12 is not facially discriminatory. The district court did not abuse its discretion in concluding that Proposition 12 does not have a discriminatory purpose given the lack of evidence that the state had a protectionist intent. Given the inconsistencies in dormant Commerce Clause jurisprudence, the district court did not abuse its discretion in relying on *Association des Eleveurs de Canards et d'Oies du Quebec v. Harris*, 729 F.3d 937 (9th Cir. 2013), to hold that Proposition 12 does not have a discriminatory effect because it treats in-state meat producers the same as out-of-state meat producers. *See* Cal. Health & Safety Code § 25990(b); *Wayfair v. South Dakota*, 138 S. Ct. 2080, 2100–01 (2018) (Gorsuch, J., concurring).

^{**} The Honorable Cathy Ann Bencivengo, United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, sitting by designation.

Case: 19-56408, 10/15/2020, ID: 11859575, DktEntry: 49-1, Page 3 of 3

The district court did not abuse its discretion in concluding that Proposition 12 does not directly regulate extraterritorial conduct because it is not a price control or price affirmation statute. *See Healy v. Beer Inst.*, 491 U.S. 324, 336 (1989); *Pharm. Rsch. & Mfrs. of Am. v. Walsh*, 538 U.S. 644, 669–70 (2003).

The district court also did not abuse its discretion in holding that Proposition 12 does not substantially burden interstate commerce. Proposition 12 does not impact an industry that is inherently national or requires a uniform system of regulation. *See Pac. Nw. Venison Producers v. Smitch*, 20 F.3d 1008, 1014–15 (9th Cir. 1994). It was not an abuse of discretion to conclude that Proposition 12 does not create a substantial burden because the law precludes sales of meat products produced by a specified method, rather than imposing a burden on producers based on their geographical origin. *See Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.*, 397 U.S. 137, 145 (1970).

Finally, because the district court did not abuse its discretion when it held that NAMI was unlikely to succeed on the merits, the district court did not err when it refused to consider the other preliminary injunction factors. *See Glob. Horizons, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Labor*, 510 F.3d 1054, 1058 (9th Cir. 2007). **AFFIRMED.**

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Office of the Clerk

95 Seventh Street San Francisco, CA 94103

Information Regarding Judgment and Post-Judgment Proceedings

Judgment

• This Court has filed and entered the attached judgment in your case. Fed. R. App. P. 36. Please note the filed date on the attached decision because all of the dates described below run from that date, not from the date you receive this notice.

Mandate (Fed. R. App. P. 41; 9th Cir. R. 41-1 & -2)

• The mandate will issue 7 days after the expiration of the time for filing a petition for rehearing or 7 days from the denial of a petition for rehearing, unless the Court directs otherwise. To file a motion to stay the mandate, file it electronically via the appellate ECF system or, if you are a pro se litigant or an attorney with an exemption from using appellate ECF, file one original motion on paper.

Petition for Panel Rehearing (Fed. R. App. P. 40; 9th Cir. R. 40-1) Petition for Rehearing En Banc (Fed. R. App. P. 35; 9th Cir. R. 35-1 to -3)

(1) A. Purpose (Panel Rehearing):

- A party should seek panel rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:
 - A material point of fact or law was overlooked in the decision;
 - ► A change in the law occurred after the case was submitted which appears to have been overlooked by the panel; or
 - An apparent conflict with another decision of the Court was not addressed in the opinion.
- Do not file a petition for panel rehearing merely to reargue the case.

B. Purpose (Rehearing En Banc)

• A party should seek en banc rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:

- Consideration by the full Court is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions; or
- ► The proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance; or
- ► The opinion directly conflicts with an existing opinion by another court of appeals or the Supreme Court and substantially affects a rule of national application in which there is an overriding need for national uniformity.

(2) **Deadlines for Filing:**

- A petition for rehearing may be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party in a civil case, the time for filing a petition for rehearing is 45 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the mandate has issued, the petition for rehearing should be accompanied by a motion to recall the mandate.
- See Advisory Note to 9th Cir. R. 40-1 (petitions must be received on the due date).
- An order to publish a previously unpublished memorandum disposition extends the time to file a petition for rehearing to 14 days after the date of the order of publication or, in all civil cases in which the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party, 45 days after the date of the order of publication. 9th Cir. R. 40-2.

(3) Statement of Counsel

• A petition should contain an introduction stating that, in counsel's judgment, one or more of the situations described in the "purpose" section above exist. The points to be raised must be stated clearly.

(4) Form & Number of Copies (9th Cir. R. 40-1; Fed. R. App. P. 32(c)(2))

- The petition shall not exceed 15 pages unless it complies with the alternative length limitations of 4,200 words or 390 lines of text.
- The petition must be accompanied by a copy of the panel's decision being challenged.
- An answer, when ordered by the Court, shall comply with the same length limitations as the petition.
- If a pro se litigant elects to file a form brief pursuant to Circuit Rule 28-1, a petition for panel rehearing or for rehearing en banc need not comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32.

Case: 19-56408, 10/15/2020, ID: 11859575, DktEntry: 49-2, Page 3 of 4

- The petition or answer must be accompanied by a Certificate of Compliance found at Form 11, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.
- You may file a petition electronically via the appellate ECF system. No paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise. If you are a pro se litigant or an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, file one original petition on paper. No additional paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise.

Bill of Costs (Fed. R. App. P. 39, 9th Cir. R. 39-1)

- The Bill of Costs must be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment.
- See Form 10 for additional information, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.

Attorneys Fees

•

- Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1 describes the content and due dates for attorneys fees applications.
- All relevant forms are available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms* or by telephoning (415) 355-7806.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari

Please refer to the Rules of the United States Supreme Court at www.supremecourt.gov

Counsel Listing in Published Opinions

- Please check counsel listing on the attached decision.
- If there are any errors in a published <u>opinion</u>, please send a letter **in writing within 10 days** to:
 - Thomson Reuters; 610 Opperman Drive; PO Box 64526; Eagan, MN 55123 (Attn: Jean Green, Senior Publications Coordinator);
 - and electronically file a copy of the letter via the appellate ECF system by using "File Correspondence to Court," or if you are an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, mail the Court one copy of the letter.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Form 10. Bill of Costs

Instructions for this form: <u>http://www.ca9.uscourts.gov/forms/form10instructions.pdf</u>

9th Cir. Case Number(s)				
Case Name				
The Clerk is requested to award costs to (<i>party name(s)</i>):				
I swear under penalty of perjury that the copies for which costs are requested were				
actually and necessarily produced, and that the requested costs were actually expended.				
Signature		Date		
(use "s/[typed name]" to sign electronically-filed documents)				
COST TAXABLE	(eac	REQUESTED (each column must be completed)		
DOCUMENTS / FEE PAID	No. of P Copies	ages per Copy	Cost per Page	TOTAL COST
Excerpts of Record*			\$	\$
Principal Brief(s) (Opening Brief; Answering Brief; 1st, 2nd, and/or 3rd Brief on Cross-Appeal; Intervenor Brief)			\$	\$
Reply Brief / Cross-Appeal Reply Brief			\$	\$
Supplemental Brief(s)			\$	\$
Petition for Review Docket Fee / Petition for Writ of Mandamus Docket Fee				\$
TOTAL:				\$
*Example: Calculate 4 copies of 3 volumes of excerpts of record that total 500 pages [Vol. 1 (10 pgs.) +				

Vol. 2 (250 pgs.) + *Vol.* 3 (240 pgs.)] as:

No. of Copies: 4; Pages per Copy: 500; Cost per Page: .10 (or actual cost IF less than .10); TOTAL: $4 \times 500 \times .10 = 200$.

Feedback or questions about this form? Email us at <u>forms@ca9.uscourts.gov</u>