

Recent and Pending Cases in Food and Agriculture Antitrust and Competition Law

This information is provided by the [Food & Agriculture Impact Project](#) at the University of Arkansas School of Law.

This information is not meant to be comprehensive. It is to be used for informational purposes only and is not legal advice. This material was last updated April 1, 2025.

In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation,
No. 1:16-cv-08637 (N.D. Ill.).

Case Summary:

- The original complaint in this case was filed in 2016. In 2017, the court denied Defendants' motion to dismiss. It became known that the U.S. Department of Justice was conducting a criminal investigation, which resulted in criminal indictments of some of the defendants in 2020-2021. After the indictments, plaintiffs asked to amend their complaints to include the bid-rigging claims, but this would have delayed the case, so the court divided the case into two tracks and stayed Track 2 until Track 1 was complete.¹
- Track 1: Plaintiffs not pursuing bid-rigging claims (only supply reduction and price manipulation).
- Track 2: Plaintiffs pursuing bid-rigging claims (along with supply reduction and price manipulation claims).²

Track 1:

- Federal Antitrust Law Claims³:

¹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.7501.0.pdf>

² <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.7501.0.pdf>

³ Numerous cases also include state antitrust laws, consumer protection laws, and other state law claims. We have only included the relevant federal laws.

- Conspiracy to "fix, raise, stabilize, and maintain prices for Broilers," unreasonable restraint of trade in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §1.⁴
- Plaintiffs
 - Direct Purchasers
 - Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchasers
 - Consumer End User Indirect Purchasers
 - More than 100 direct purchasers (DAPs) who opted out of the class
- Court Granted Summary Judgement to seven defendants
 - Case, Fieldale, Foster, Fries-Claxton, Perdue, Wayne, Agri-Stats
- Court Denied Summary Judgment to eleven defendants
 - Harrison, Keystone, Koch, Mountaire, OK Foods, Peco, Pilgrim's, Raeford, Sanderson, Simmons, and Tyson.
 - All defendants except Sanderson settled before trial.
 - Sanderson prevailed at trial but settled after to halt an appeal.

Key Decisions:

- 12/16/2024 - Memorandum Opinion and Order Granting Pilgrim's Motion for Summary Judgment Against Sysco⁵
- 11/02/2024 - Amended Memorandum Opinion and Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment⁶
- 06/14/2024 - Memorandum Opinion and Order Granting Pilgrim's Pride's Motion to Enforce Settlement with Carina/Sysco.⁷
 - Appeal Filed by Sysco Corporation, 7th Circuit Court of Appeals (July 12, 2024).
- 6/30/2023 - Memorandum Opinion and Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants' motions for Summary Judgment.⁸
- 9/5/2023 - Memorandum Opinion and Order on Defendants' motion for summary judgment on certain state law issues.⁹
- 11/2/2023 - Amended Memorandum Opinion and Order on Defendants' motions for summary judgment¹⁰

⁴ https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.1.0_1.pdf

⁵ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.7451.0.pdf>

⁶ <https://casetext.com/case/in-re-broiler-chicken-antitrust-litig-24>

⁷ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.7272.0.pdf>

⁸ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.6641.0.pdf>

⁹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.6782.0.pdf>

¹⁰ https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.7028.0_1.pdf

Other Documents:

- 9/02/2016 - Original Complaint filed by Maplevale Farms¹¹
 - 12/16/2016 - Complaint filed by End User Consumer Plaintiffs¹²
 - 11/23/2016 - Complaint filed by Direct Purchaser Plaintiff Class¹³
 - 12/16/2016 - Complaint filed by Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiff Class (CIIPP)¹⁴

Current Status:

- Settlements:
 - Peco Foods (DPP) \$5.15 million¹⁵
 - Tyson (DPP, CIIPP, and End User Plaintiffs) 221.5 million¹⁶
 - Pilgrim's Pride (DPP) \$75 million¹⁷
 - George's (DPP) \$4.25 million¹⁸
 - Amick Farms, LLC (DPP) \$3.95 million¹⁹
 - Defendants Fieldale Farms, George's, Mar-Jac, Peco, Pilgrim's Pride, and Tyson (End User Plaintiffs) \$181 million.²⁰
 - Simmons Foods (DPP) \$8 million²¹
 - Mountaire (DPP) \$15.899 million
 - O.K. Foods (DPP) \$4.964 million²²
 - Fieldale Farms \$4.1 million²³
 - Defendants House of Raeford and Koch (DPP) \$75 million²⁴
 - Agri Stats, Inc. (DPP)²⁵
 - Defendants Foster Farms, Perdue, Case, Claxton, Wayne Farms, and Sanderson Farms (DPP)²⁶

¹¹ https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.1.0_1.pdf

¹² <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4508538/255/in-re-broiler-chicken-antitrust-litigation/>

¹³ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4508538/213/in-re-broiler-chicken-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4508538/253/in-re-broiler-chicken-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁵ <https://aglaw.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/In-re-chicken-Approval-Peco-George-10.26.20.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.sec.gov/ix?doc=/Archives/edgar/data/100493/000010049321000002/tsn-20210119.htm>

¹⁷ <https://aglaw.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/In-re-chicken-shareholder-announcement-1.11.21.pdf>

¹⁸ <https://aglaw.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/In-re-chicken-Approval-Peco-George-10.26.20.pdf>

¹⁹ <https://aglaw.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/In-re-chicken-Approval-Amick-Farms-10.26.20.pdf>

²⁰ <https://aglaw.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/In-re-chicken-Order-12.20.21.pdf>

²¹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.6615.0.pdf>

²² <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.6830.0.pdf>

²³ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.6833.0.pdf>

²⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4508538/7356/in-re-broiler-chicken-antitrust-litigation/>

²⁵ <https://www.broilerchickenantitrustlitigation.com/docs/Multiple/Order Granting DPP MFPA of settlement w.Agri.pdf>

²⁶ <https://www.broilerchickenantitrustlitigation.com/docs/Multiple/Order%20Granting%20Final%20Approval%20of%20Settlement%20w.FF,%20Perdue,%20Case,%20Clax,%20Wayne%20and%20Sanderson.pdf>

- Defendants House of Raeford, Koch Foods, Mountaire, O.K. Foods, Sanderson Farms, Simmons Foods, Agri Stats, Case Farms, Claxton, Foster Farms, Perdue, Wayne Farms, and Harrison Poultry (CIIPP).²⁷

Track 2:

- Direct Purchasers (DAPs) ordered to file a consolidated complaint.
- Federal Antitrust Law Claims:
 - Federal claims conspiracy to reduce supply, manipulate price, and rig bids; state antitrust claims, racketeering claims.

Key Decisions:

- 02/11/2025 - Memorandum Opinion and Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants' Motions to Dismiss²⁸

Other Documents:

- 10/23/2020 - Consolidated Complaint²⁹
- 01/29/2021 - Amended Consolidated Complaint³⁰
- 02/28/2022 - Second Amended Consolidated Complaint - document 5455 & 5456
- Motions to Dismiss - 5/06/2022
 - Defendants filed separate motions to dismiss
 - Motion by Defendant Pilgrim's Pride to dismiss track 2 complaint³¹
 - Motion by Defendants Keystone Foods, LLC, Equity Group Kentucky Division LLC, Equity Group Eufaula Division LLC, Equity Group-Georgia Division LLC to dismiss Count 1.³²
 - Motion by Defendants Tyson Breeders, Inc., Tyson Foods, Inc, Tyson Chicken, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc. to dismiss Counts 1 and 6.
 - Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim by Defendant Fieldale Farms³³
 - Motion by Defendants Sanderson Farms, Inc. to dismiss Overarching and Bid Rigging Claims
 - Motion by Defendants Sandersons Farms, Inc. to dismiss track 2 complaint
 - Document 5605 - Motion to Dismiss by Defendant Harrison Poultry to dismiss track 2 complaint.

²⁷ Order Granting Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlements Granted, In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation, No. 1:16-cv-08637, (N.D. Ill. March 10, 2025).

²⁸ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.7501.0.pdf>

²⁹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.3924.0.pdf>

³⁰ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.4244.0.pdf>

³¹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.5587.0.pdf>

³² Memorandum in Support of Motion:

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.5590.0.pdf>

³³ Memorandum in Support of Motion to Dismiss:

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954/gov.uscourts.ilnd.330954.5596.0.pdf>

- Motion by Defendant Wayne Farms, LLC to dismiss Track 2 Complaint.
- Motion by Defendant Pilgrim's Pride for Failure to State a Claim.
- 03/05/2025
 - Joint Status Report - relating to Track 2 Direct Action Plaintiff Actions³⁴
- 03/07/2025
 - Stipulated Order of Dismissal with Prejudice by Certain Direct Action Plaintiffs and Harrison Poultry³⁵

Status: Ongoing

In re Broiler Chicken Grower Antitrust Litigation II,
6:20-md-02977-RJS-CMR (E.D. Oklahoma).

Claims:

- Restraint of Trade/ Horizontal conspiracy to suppress grower pay in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §1.
- Violation of Packers and Stockyards Act section 202(a), 7 U.S.C. §192(a) (unfair, deceptive practices), 7 U.S.C. §192(f)(3)(prohibit manipulating or controlling prices) and 7 U.S.C §192(g) (conspiracy).

Key Decisions:

- 08/20/2024 - Order by District Judge Robert J. Shelby granting Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement with Pilgrim's and for Certification of the Settlement Class and Appointing Settlement Class Counsel³⁶
- 06/10/2022 – Order Approving Notice Plan and Authorizing Issuance of Notice to the Koch Settlement Class³⁷

³⁴ Joint Status Report, In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation, No. 1:16-cv-08637, (N.D. Ill.) March 7, 2025. https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/67c98a8962b13b41e88d7a80?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.iud.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F067132077729&label=Case+Filing

³⁵ Stipulated Order of Dismissal, In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation, No. 1:16-cv-08637, (N.D. Ill.) March 7, 2025. https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/67cb372d02777453b41a9bf4?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.iud.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F067132087087&label=Case+Filing

³⁶ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/22581016/617/broiler-chicken-grower-antitrust-litigation-no-ii/>

³⁷ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/22581016/366/broiler-chicken-grower-antitrust-litigation-no-ii/>

- 06/10/2022 – Order Preliminarily Approving Settlement with Koch, Certifying the Settlement Class for Purposes of Settlement, and Appointing Settlement Class Counsel³⁸
- 10/28/2022 - Order by District Judge Robert J. Shelby granting Motion for Final Approval of Settlement with Koch and Entering Final Judgment under Rule 54(B) as to Koch³⁹

Other Documents:

- 2016 – First lawsuits filed alleging that Sanderson Farms LLC, Tyson Foods Inc., Perdue Foods, and Koch Foods participated in a conspiracy to artificially suppress the growers' pay.⁴⁰
- 2016 – First lawsuits filed alleging that Sanderson Farms LLC, Tyson Foods Inc., Perdue Foods, and Koch Foods participated in a conspiracy to artificially suppress the growers' pay.⁴¹
- 12/17/2020 – Transfer Order from the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.
 - The following were transferred: District of Colorado - McEntire, et al. v. Tyson Foods, Inc., et al., 1:20-cv-2764; District of Kansas - Colvin v. Tyson Foods, Inc., et al., 2:20-cv-2464; Eastern District of North Carolina - In Re: Sanderson and Koch Broiler Chicken Grower Litigation, 7:18-cv-31; Eastern District of Oklahoma - Haff Poultry, Inc., et al. v. Tyson Foods, Inc., et al., 6:17-cv-33.⁴²
- 02/19/2021 – Amended Complaint with Jury Demand against Koch Foods, Inc., Koch Meat Co., Inc., Perdue Foods, LLC, Pilgrim's Pride Corporation, Sanderson Farms, Inc., Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Food Division), Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Processing Division), Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Production Division), Tyson Breeders, Inc., Tyson Chicken, Inc., Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc.⁴³
- 12/16/2021 - Motion for Final Approval of Settlements with Perdue and Tyson⁴⁴
- 01/05/2023 - Notice of Settlement with Defendants Sanderson Farms, Inc., Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Foods Division), Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Processing Division), and Sanderson Farms, Inc. (Production Division)⁴⁵

³⁸ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/22581016/broiler-chicken-grower-antitrust-litigation-no-ii/?page=2>

³⁹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/22581016/420/broiler-chicken-grower-antitrust-litigation-no-ii/>

⁴⁰ <https://www.law360.com/articles/1871177/pilgrim-s-pride-agrees-to-pay-100m-in-chicken-farmers-suit>

⁴¹ <https://www.law360.com/articles/1871177/pilgrim-s-pride-agrees-to-pay-100m-in-chicken-farmers-suit>

⁴² <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/22581016/broiler-chicken-grower-antitrust-litigation-no-ii/?page=1>

⁴³ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/22581016/59/broiler-chicken-grower-antitrust-litigation-no-ii/>

⁴⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/22581016/232/broiler-chicken-grower-antitrust-litigation-no-ii/>

⁴⁵ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/22581016/426/broiler-chicken-grower-antitrust-litigation-no-ii/>

Current status:

- Settlements:
 - Sanderson Farms \$17.75 million
 - Tyson Foods \$21 million
 - Perdue Foods \$14.75 million
 - Koch Foods \$15.5 million
 - Pilgrim's Pride \$100 million
 - Not required to pursue arbitration in any claims against Pilgrim's Pride for the next five years

In re Pork Antitrust Litigation,
No. CV 18-1776, (JRT/JFD) (D. Minn.).

Federal Antitrust Law Claims:

- Price fixing and restraint of trade by exchanging competitively sensitive information through Agri Stats in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §1.
- DPPs brought a claim under § 4 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15(a); IPPs and CIPs brought a claim for injunctive relief under § 16 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 26.
- Action Meat DAPs, Kroger DAPs, and Publix DAPs also allege that all Defendants-except Agri Stats-violated the Packers and Stockyard Act 7 U.S.C. § 192(f).

Key Decisions:

- 09/26/2023 - Court denied Defendants' Motion to Dismiss, concluding that the plaintiffs' allegations of fraudulent concealment, price fixing, and injury due to Defendants' violation of the Packers and Stockyards Act were adequate.⁴⁶
- 10/20/2020 – Court granted in part and denied in part Defendants' Motion to Dismiss⁴⁷

Other Documents:

- 06/28/2018 - Original Complaint (end user consumers)⁴⁸

⁴⁶ <https://casetext.com/case/in-re-pork-antitrust-litig-13>

⁴⁷ *In re Pork Antitrust Litig.*, 495 F. Supp. 3d 753, 764; <https://aglaw.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/05/In-re-Pork-Order-10.20.20.pdf>.

⁴⁸ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.1.0.pdf>

- 11/6/2019 - Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs (CIIPPs) filed a class action complaint⁴⁹
- 01/15/20 - Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs filed a class action complaint⁵⁰

Current Status:

- Settlements
 - JBS \$20 million⁵¹
 - Smithfield \$42 million⁵²
 - Smithfield Foods, Inc. \$75 million⁵³
 - Seaboard Foods LLC \$9.75 million⁵⁴
 - Hormel Foods⁵⁵ \$2.249 million⁵⁶
 - Hormel Foods Corporation \$4.865 million⁵⁷
- 03/26/2025 – Order Granting Defendants’ Motion to Enforce Settlement with Sysco Corporation and Dismissing Sysco’s claims against JBS with prejudice⁵⁸

In re Turkey Antitrust Litigation,
1:19-cv-08318, (N.D. Ill.).

Federal Antitrust Law Claims:

⁴⁹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.390.0.pdf>

Amended Complaint 1/15/2020:

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.432.0.pdf>

⁵⁰ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.431.0.pdf>

⁵¹

https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.1491.0_1.pdf

⁵² <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.1548.0.pdf>

⁵³ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.1903.0.pdf>

⁵⁴ Amount from the Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion for Final Approval of the Class Action Settlement Between Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs and Seaboard Foods, LLC

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.2111.0.pdf>

⁵⁵ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.2217.0.pdf>

⁵⁶ Amount from Memorandum in Support of Motion for Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlement Between CIIPP and Defendant Hormel Foods

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320/gov.uscourts.mnd.174320.2183.0.pdf>

⁵⁷ Order Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs Motion for Final Approval, In re Turkey Antitrust Litigation, No. 1:19-cv-08318 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 10 2024).

https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/66feb9d80e30780a1c6945eb?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.mnd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F101110606347&label=Case+Filing

⁵⁸ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247.1223.0.pdf>

- Conspiracy to exchange competitively sensitive information and fix prices by limiting the turkey supply in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §1.

Key Decisions:

- 08/16/2024 - Memorandum Opinion and Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss.⁵⁹
- 03/28/2024 - Memorandum Opinion and Order Denying Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment.⁶⁰
- 11/21/2022 - Memorandum Opinion and Order Denying Defendants' Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim.⁶¹
- 10/19/2020 - Memorandum Opinion and Order Denying in Part and Granting in Part Plaintiffs Motion to Dismiss.⁶²

Other Documents:

- 12/19/2019 - Original Complaint⁶³
- 01/28/2022 - Second Amended Complaint - Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs⁶⁴
- 02/7/2022 - Third Amended Complaint - Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs⁶⁵
- 02/17/2023 – Fourth Amended Class Action Complaint⁶⁶

Current Status:

- Settlements
 - 02/3/2022 - Amended Order and Final Judgment Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Settlement Defendants Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc., Tyson Prepared Foods, Inc., and the Hillshire Brands Company.⁶⁷

⁵⁹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822.1029.0.pdf>

⁶⁰ <https://casetext.com/case/in-re-turk-antitrust-litig-1>

⁶¹ 642 F.Supp.3d 711; <https://casetext.com/case/in-re-turk-antitrust-litig>.

⁶² <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822.173.0.pdf>

The court stated:

"Plaintiffs have only adequately alleged a Sherman Act violation under a rule of reason analysis."

⁶³ https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822.1.0_1.pdf

⁶⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16610105/387/in-re-turkey-antitrust-litigation/>

⁶⁵ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16610105/417/in-re-turkey-antitrust-litigation/>

⁶⁶ [In re TURKEY ANTITRUST Litigation. This Document Relates To: Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiff Action \(1:20-cv-02295\).](#), 2023 WL 4559649

⁶⁷ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822.406.0.pdf>

- \$4.65 million⁶⁸
- 02/10/2022 - Order and Final Judgment Granting Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiff (CIIPP) Settlement with Defendants Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc., Tyson Prepared Foods, Inc., and the Hillshire Brands Company.⁶⁹
- 07/6/2021 - Tyson (Commercial and Institutional Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs) \$1.75 million⁷⁰
- 01/30/2025 - Order Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement with Defendant Cargill.⁷¹
 - \$32.5 million
- 03/25/2025 – Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement for Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs with Defendants:
 - Cooper Farms, Inc. - \$1.6875 million
 - Farbest Foods, Inc. - \$1.6875 million

In re Cattle and Beef Antitrust Litigation,
 0:22-md-03031, Consolidated Cases, No. 19-cv-1222, No. 19-cv-1129, No. 20-cv-1319, No. 20-cv-1414 (D. Minn.).

Federal Claims:

- Conspiracy to unreasonably restrain trade, and to fix, raise, and stabilize the price of wholesale beef in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §1.
- Violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act 7 U.S.C. §192 and §209 ("unfair, unjustly discriminatory, or deceptive trade practice," price fixing, restraint of trade, or creating a monopoly).

Recent Key Decisions:

- 09/14/2021- The court denied the Defendant's Motion to Dismiss except for some state law claims. The court allowed Sherman Act and Packers and Stockyards Act

⁶⁸ Amount from the Order Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiff's Motion for an Award for Costs and Ongoing Litigation Expenses From the Tyson Settlement Fund,

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822.367.0.pdf>

⁶⁹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822/gov.uscourts.ilnd.371822.433.0.pdf>

⁷⁰ <https://turkeycommercialcase.com/Content/Documents/Settlement%20Agreement.pdf>

⁷¹ Order Granting Preliminary Approval of Settlement with Defendant Cargill, In re: Turkey Antitrust Litigation, No. 19-cv-08318 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 30, 2025).

claims to proceed because there was enough “evidence at this stage to plausibly allege” a Sherman Act Section 1 violation.⁷²

- 08/17/2023 - The court granted Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss, holding that, as to the Specht Class, the cow-calf rancher plaintiffs failed to establish antitrust standing under the Sherman Act and that antitrust standing was necessary to maintain a claim under the Packers and Stockyards Act. The court held that antitrust standing was necessary for state consumer protection claims and that the cow-calf rancher plaintiffs failed to state a claim under state law.⁷³
- 05/28/2024 - The court dismissed Indirect Seller Plaintiff *Specht* Class Sherman Act, PSA, and state antitrust and consumer protection claims for lack of antitrust standing. Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss the Amended *Specht* Complaint is Granted. The Court will also dismiss the remaining state law claims arising under Minnesota, Colorado, and Florida laws.⁷⁴

Other Documents:

- 06/6/2020 - Original Complaint⁷⁵
- 06/3/2022 - Transfer Order⁷⁶
- 10/4/2022 - Order for Consolidation⁷⁷
- 01/30/2023 - Amended Complaint - Direct Action Plaintiffs⁷⁸
- 10/1/2024 - Amended Complaint - Indirect Seller Plaintiffs⁷⁹
- 03/19/2025 – Memorandum in Opposition to Cattle Plaintiffs’ and Exchange Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification⁸⁰

Current Status:

- 02/1/2022 – Direct Purchaser Class Final Settlement Agreement.⁸¹
 - \$52.5 million Settlement Fund

⁷² In re Cattle Antitrust Litig., No. CV 19-1129 (JRT/HB), 2021 WL 7757881, at *1 (D. Minn. Sept. 14, 2021); <https://aglaw.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/In-re-DPP-Beef-Memo-Opinion-9.14.21.pdf>

⁷³ No. 22-cv-3031 and 22-cv-2903, 2023 WL 5310905 (JRT/JFD) (D. Minn. August 17, 2023).

<https://casetext.com/case/in-re-cattle-beef-antitrust-litig-1>

⁷⁴ In re Cattle & Beef Antitrust Litig., No. CV 22-2903, 2024 WL 2728280 (D. Minn. May 28, 2024).

⁷⁵ https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.188051/gov.uscourts.mnd.188051.1.0_1.pdf

⁷⁶ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247.1.0.pdf>

⁷⁷ https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247.21.0_1.pdf

⁷⁸ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247.132.0.pdf>

⁷⁹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247.917.0.pdf>

⁸⁰ Filed under seal.

⁸¹ <https://beefdirectpurchasersettlement.com/docs/Court%20Docs/Settlement%20Agreement.pdf>

- 08/31/2022 - The court issued an Order Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement with JBS Defendants, No. 20-cv-1319 (D. Minn. August 31, 2022).⁸²
- 11/21/2023 - The court granted commercial and institutional indirect purchaser plaintiffs' motion for final approval of the class action settlement with defendants JBS USA Food Company, Swift Beef Company, JBS Packerland, Inc., and JBS S.A.⁸³
- 09/30/2024- Memorandum Opinion and Order Granting Plaintiffs Leave to Amend First Amended Complaint to include a new class: Backgrounder/ Stockers class (Indirect sellers just one step removed; not cow-calf producers).⁸⁴
- 10/04/2024 - McDonald's Corporation v. Cargill, Inc., 1:24-cv-07017, (E.D.N.Y) complaint against Cargill Meat Solutions Corporation, Cargill, Inc., JBS Packerland, Inc., JBS S.A., JBS USA Food Company, National Beef Packing Company, Swift Beef Company, Tyson Foods, Inc., Tyson Fresh Meats, Inc.⁸⁵
 - 10/16/2024 - Case transferred out to the U.S. District Court of Minnesota as case 0:24-cv-03937⁸⁶
 - 10/16/2024 - Consolidated with *In re: Cattle and Beef Antitrust Litigation*⁸⁷
- 11/19/2024 - Hearing on Motion to Enforce Settlement and Summary Dismissal of Sysco Corporation's Claims filed by JBS S.A., JBS Packerland, Inc., Swift Beef Company, JBS USA Food Company.⁸⁸
- 02/20/2025 - Order Granting Motion for Preliminary Approval of Settlement - JBS⁸⁹
 - \$83.5 million
- 03/26/2025 – Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Enforce Settlement with Sysco Corporation and Dismissing Sysco's claims against JBS with prejudice⁹⁰

⁸² <https://aglaw.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/In-re-DPP-Beef-Antitrust-Litigation-Order-8.31.22.pdf>

⁸³ No. 22-cv-3031, 2023 WL 8098642 (JRT/JFD) (D. Minn. Nov. 21, 2023). <https://casetext.com/case/in-re-cattle-beef-antitrust-litig-2>

⁸⁴ *In re Cattle & Beef Antitrust Litig.*, No. CV 22-2903, 2024 WL 4355119 (D. Minn. Sept. 30, 2024); <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63363039/914/in-re-cattle-and-beef-antitrust-litigation/>

⁸⁵ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/69227716/1/mcdonalds-corporation-v-cargill-inc/>

⁸⁶ https://www.pacermonitor.com/public/case/55340226/McDonalds_Corporation_v_Cargill,_Inc_et_al

⁸⁷ <https://www.law360.com/cases/670fe8644a934601de8280f1/dockets>

⁸⁸ <https://www.law360.com/cases/629e2b11216b7601866ef0fe/dockets?page=1>

⁸⁹ Order Granting Cattle Plaintiffs' Unopposed Motion for Preliminary Approval of Cattle-JBS Settlement, No. 0:22-md-03031 (D. Minn 2025).

⁹⁰ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247/gov.uscourts.mnd.201247.1223.0.pdf>

U.S. v. Agri Stats, Inc.,
0:23-cv-03009 (D.Minn.).

Claims:

- Facilitating the sharing of "competitively sensitive information" between meat processors, unreasonably restraining trade, suppressing competition, increasing prices and reducing output" in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §1.

Key Decisions:

- 05/28/2024 - Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Transfer and Denying Defendant's Motion to Dismiss⁹¹
- 05/17/2024 – Order Denying Motion to Stay Discovery⁹²

Other Documents:

- 09/28/2023 – Complaint filed by the U.S. Department of Justice against Agri Stats, Inc. in the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota.⁹³
- 11/06/2023 – Amended Complaint
 - Filed by the United States of America, the State of Minnesota, the State of California, the State of North Carolina, and the State of Tennessee.⁹⁴
- 11/15/2023 – Second Amended Complaint⁹⁵
 - Adds the State of Texas and the State of Utah as plaintiffs.
- 02/19/2025 - Order Denying Defendant's Motion to Compel⁹⁶

Current Status

- 06/26/2024 – Order for Settlement Conference⁹⁷
 - Settlement Conference scheduled for 2/11/25 and 2/12/25

⁹¹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/67840811/118/united-states-v-agri-stats-inc/>

⁹² <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/67840811/117/united-states-v-agri-stats-inc/>

⁹³ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-10/416782.pdf>

⁹⁴ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-11/417694.pdf>

⁹⁵ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-11/418025.pdf>

⁹⁶ Order on Motion to Compel, No. 23-cv-3009 (D. Minn. 2005).

⁹⁷ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/67840811/125/united-states-v-agri-stats-inc/>

Potato Cartel Cases,
N.D. Ill. (Nov. 2024).

Claims:

- Violation of Sections 1 and 3 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 3 by agreeing to "fix, raise, stabilize, or maintain" prices and restraining competition in the frozen potato products market.

Key Decisions:

- None yet.

Other Documents:

- Post Road Market, Inc., et al v. Lamb Weston Holdings, et al
 - 12/11/2024 - Class Action Complaint filed by Post Road Market, Inc.; Gigi's Pizza, Inc., Tourists Welcome, LLC; Chestnut Lane, LLC D/B/A Chestnut Fine Foods; Corbo's Deli Southside, LLC; Corbo's Corner Deli West, LLC; and Ark Restaurant Corp.⁹⁸
- Redner's Markets, Inc. v. Lamb Weston Holdings, Inc. et al
 - 11/15/2024 – Class Action Complaint filed by Redner's Markets, Inc.; Jury Demand⁹⁹
- Govea v. National Potato Promotion Board d/b/a Potatoes USA et al
 - 11/17/2024 – Class Action complaint filed by Alexander Govea; Jury Demand.¹⁰⁰
- Pollack v. Cavendish Farms, Ltd. et al
 - 11/18/2024 – Complaint filed by Karen Pollack; Jury Demand.¹⁰¹

⁹⁸ Complaint, Post Road Market, Inc. et al v. Lamb Weston Holdings, Inc. et al, No. 1:24-cv-12749 (N.D. Ill. 2025).

<https://www.law360.com/articles/2273016/attachments/0>

⁹⁹ Class Action Complaint, Redner's Market, Inc. v. Lamb Weston Holdings, Inc. et al, No. 1:24-cv-11801 (N.D. Ill. 2025).

<https://www.law360.com/cases/6737caf5d34bc27c67a5e391/dockets?page=2>

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.468365/gov.uscourts.ilnd.468365.1.0.pdf>

¹⁰⁰ Govea v. National Potato Promotion Board et al, No. 1:24-cv-11816 (N.D. Ill. 2025).

<https://www.law360.com/cases/673a7a89b2997613df626539/dockets>

¹⁰¹ Pollack v. Canvendish Farms, Ltd. et al, No. 1:24-cv-11864 (N.D. Ill. 2025).

<https://www.law360.com/cases/673bcda0b60ac003b6514c38/dockets?page=2>

- 11/22/2024 - Summons Issued as to Defendants Cavendish Farms, Inc., Cavendish Farms, Ltd., J.R. Simplot Company, Lamb Weston BSW, LLC, Lamb Weston Holdings, Inc., Lamb Weston Sales, Inc., Lamb Weston, Inc., McCain Foods USA, Inc., McCain Foods, Ltd.¹⁰²

Current Status:

- Plaintiff Pollack has petitioned the court to designate the Pollack and Redner cases as related and reassigned to the same judge.¹⁰³

In re Crop Inputs Antitrust Litig., 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo.).

Claims:

- Sherman Act §1, RICO Sections § 1962(c) and (d)
- The class is made up of purchasers of Crop Inputs, “seeds and crop protection chemicals such as fungicides, herbicides, and insecticides.”¹⁰⁴ The class alleges that “Defendants, manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers of Crop Inputs,” unlawfully agreed “to artificially increase and fix the prices” of Crop Inputs used by U.S. farmers.

Key Decisions:

- 9/13/2024 – Memorandum and Order of Dismissal. This action is dismissed, and this multidistrict litigation case is closed. Counts One and Five of the Consolidated Amended Complaint are dismissed with prejudice. The Court declines to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state law claims in Counts Two, Three, and Four of the Consolidated Amended Complaint and those Counts are Dismissed without prejudice.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Summons, Pollack v. Canvendish Farms, Ltd. et al, No. 1:24-cv-11864 (N.D. Ill. 2025).

<https://www.law360.com/cases/673bcda0b60ac003b6514c38/dockets?page=1>

¹⁰³ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ilnd.468365/gov.uscourts.ilnd.468365.9.0.pdf>

¹⁰⁴ Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint, In re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/61450a39fa244d03bedc0cdb?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107110013891&label=Case+Filing

¹⁰⁵ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/66e4acb80a716a06d2fa8cbd?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.f.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107111698366&label=Case+Filing

Order of Dismissal, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021);

https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/66e4a941bacd2d052d89ad1a?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107111698303&label=Case+Filing

- 12/19/2022 - Motion to Lift Stay – Plaintiffs Renewed Motion for Partial Lift of Stay of Discovery and Memorandum of Law in Support.¹⁰⁶
- 12/12/2022 – Order Granting Stipulation Regarding Process for Responding to Krieger Complaint¹⁰⁷
- 11/28/2022 – Conditional Transfer Order Finalized regarding multidistrict litigation¹⁰⁸
 - Adding KRIEGER et al v. BAYER CROPSCIENCE LP
- 07/12/2021 - Conditional Transfer Order Finalized regarding multidistrict litigation¹⁰⁹
- 06/08/2021 – Initial MDL Transfer Order - received from the MDL Panel establishing a multidistrict litigation in the Eastern District of Missouri: IN RE: CROP INPUTS ANTITRUST LITIGATION¹¹⁰

Other Documents:

- 11/10/2021 - Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction Pursuant to Rule 12(b)(2) the Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint by Defendant Federated Co-Operatives Ltd.¹¹¹
- 11/10/2021 - Motion to Dismiss Case - Motion of Defendant Syngenta Corporation to Dismiss the Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint by Defendant Syngenta Corporation.¹¹²
- 11/10/2021 - Motion to Dismiss Case by Defendant Cargill Incorporated.¹¹³
- 11/10/2021 - Joint Motion to Dismiss Case by Defendants BASF Corporation, Bayer CropScience Inc., Bayer CropScience L.P., CHS Inc., Cargill Incorporated, Corteva Inc., Federated Co-Operatives Ltd., Growmark FS, LLC, Growmark Inc., Nutrien AG Solutions, Inc., Pioneer Hi-Bred International, Inc., Simplot AB Retail Sub, Inc.,

¹⁰⁶https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/63a0f5ba81b4c00114c76244?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107110706782&label=Case+Filing

Plaintiffs' Renewed Motion For Partial Lift Of Stay Of Discovery And Memorandum Of Law In Support, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹⁰⁷https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/639782dbf1e06900a4073f17?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107110694503&label=Case+Filing

Stipulation Regarding Process For Responding To Krieger Complaint And Proposed Order, Krieger et al. v. Bayer Cropscience, LP) et al., Case No. 4:22-cv-1261(E.D. Mo. 2022).

¹⁰⁸https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/6384d57f74331c005bb7c068?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107110670361&label=Case+Filing

Conditional Transfer Order, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹⁰⁹<https://www.law360.com/cases/60bfc808bd36c5c3333f0d1e/dockets?page=28>

Conditional Transfer Order, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹¹⁰<https://www.law360.com/cases/60bfc808bd36c5c3333f0d1e/dockets?page=30>

Transfer Orders, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹¹¹<https://www.law360.com/cases/60bfc808bd36c5c3333f0d1e/dockets?page=15>

Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹¹²<https://www.law360.com/cases/60bfc808bd36c5c3333f0d1e/dockets?page=15>

Motion to Dismiss, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹¹³https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/618c3b5f62aecf00a3a63bd4?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107110095557&label=Case+Filing

Motion to Dismiss the Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

Syngenta Corporation, Tenkoz Inc., Univar Solutions, Inc., Winfield Solutions, LLC.¹¹⁴

- 9/17/2021 – Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint against defendant All Defendants Jury demand, Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint, filed by Beeman Berry Farm, LLC, George Potzner, Jones Planting Co. III, Dan Flaten, Ryan Bros., Inc., Justin Pic, Tyler Schultz, Wunsch Farms, John C. Swanson, Leon Pfaff, Amy Hapka, Charles Lex, Brad DeKrey, Duane Peiffer, Michael J. Ryan, Eagle Lake Farms Partnership, John Vehrenkamp, Randi Handwerk, JSB Farms, LLC, TOM BURKE FARMS, Kenneth Beck, Vienna Eqho Farms, Jason J. Canjar, Hapka Farms, Inc., Melinda Budde, Darren Duncan.¹¹⁵

Current Status:

- 10/11/2024 – Notice of Appeal from the Memorandum and Order granting Defendants’ Joint Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Amended Complaint entered on September 13, 2024¹¹⁶

In Re: Crop Protection Products Loyalty Program Antitrust Litigation,
Case No. 1:23-md-03062 (M.D.N.C.).

Claims:

- Pesticide manufacturers used exclusive “loyalty agreements” to block competition and force Plaintiff farmers to pay supracompetitive prices for crop protection products.¹¹⁷
- Sherman Act Sections 1 and 2, Section 3 of the Clayton Act
 - Consolidated Cases
 - Mercury Properties, LLC et al v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, No.: 1:23-cv-267 (M.D. NC) (complaint filed 3/29/2023).
 - River Island, Inc. v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, No.: 1:23-cv-242 (M.D. NC) (complaint filed 3/17/2023).

¹¹⁴https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/618c3b5d62aecf00a3a63bc2?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107110095308&label=Case+Filing

Joint Motion to Dismiss, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹¹⁵https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/61450a39fa244d03bedc0cdb?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107110013891&label=Case+Filing

Consolidated Amended Class Action Complaint, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹¹⁶https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/670949a50250250197d65f9e?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.moed.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F107111742222&label=Case+Filing

Notice of Appeal, In Re: Crop Inputs Antitrust Litigation, Case No. 4:21-md-02993 (E.D. Mo. 2021).

¹¹⁷ <https://www.cohenmilstein.com/case-study/in-re-crop-protection-products-loyalty-program-antitrust-litigation/>

- *Jessen v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al*, No. 1:23-cv-243 (M.D.N.C.) (Complaint filed 3/17/2023).
- *Vann v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al*, No. 1:23-cv-244 (M.D.N.C.) (Complaint filed 3/17/2023).
- *Teske v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al*, No. 1:23-cv-090 (M.D.N.C.) (Complaint filed 2/01/2023).
- *King v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al*, No. 1:23-cv-1117 (M.D.N.C.) (Complaint filed 12/21/2022).
- *Slovak v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al*, No. 1:23-cv-1059 (M.D.N.C.) (Complaint filed 12/08/2022).
- *Slayer Farms, LLC v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al*, No. 1:23-cv-1055 (M.D.N.C.) (Complaint filed 12/07/2022).

Key Decisions:

- 02/06/2023 - MDL Initial Transfer Order transferring actions listed on Schedule A to the Middle District of North Carolina, and with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable Thomas D. Schroeder.¹¹⁸
- 02/22/2023 - MDL Transfer In on 2/16/23 from Illinois Southern Case No. 3:23cv00328 and MDL Transfer In on 2/17/2023 from Mississippi Southern Case No. 3:22cv00735.¹¹⁹
- 02/28/2023 - MDL Transfer In of cases transferred 2/22/2023 from Indiana Southern MDL No. 3062: INS Case No. 1:22cv02411/Assigned NCMD Case No. 1:23CV163; INS Case No. 1:22cv02420/Assigned NCMD Case No. 1:22cv164; INS Case No. 1:22cv02423/Assigned NCMD Case No. 1:23cv165; INS Case no. 1:22cv02447¹²⁰
- 02/28/2023 - MDL Transfer In Case Receipt on 2/27/2023 from Pennsylvania Western Case No. 2:23cv00069.¹²¹
- 10/31/2024 - Stipulated Protective Order¹²²

Other Documents:

- 03/11/2024 - Motion To Dismiss For Failure To State A Claim by Syngenta Corporation, Syngenta Crop Protection AG, Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.¹²³

¹¹⁸ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/66800762/in-re-crop-protection-products-loyalty-program-antitrust-litigation/>

¹¹⁹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/66800762/in-re-crop-protection-products-loyalty-program-antitrust-litigation/>

¹²⁰ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/66800762/in-re-crop-protection-products-loyalty-program-antitrust-litigation/>

¹²¹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/66800762/in-re-crop-protection-products-loyalty-program-antitrust-litigation/>

¹²² <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/66800762/165/in-re-crop-protection-products-loyalty-program-antitrust-litigation/>

¹²³ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/66800762/94/in-re-crop-protection-products-loyalty-program-antitrust-litigation/>

- 09/05/2023 – Amended Complaint Consolidated Complaint against defendant Corteva, Inc., Syngenta Corporation, Syngenta Crop Protection AG, Syngenta Crop Protection, LLC.¹²⁴

Current Status:

- Ongoing

Griffin v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al,

No. 4:22-cv-01287 (E.D. Ark.).

Claims:

- Sherman Act §§ 1, 2; Clayton Act 15 U.S.C. §14; Arkansas Unfair Practices Act; Arkansas Deceptive Trade Practices Act
- Loyalty programs offered to distributors and retailers by Syngenta and Corteva allegedly “block cheaper generic crop-protection products from the market” and force Arkansas farms to pay supracompetitive prices for these products.¹²⁵

Key Decisions:

- 01/17/2024 – Order denying “Defendants’ joint motion to transfer to the Middle District of North Carolina”¹²⁶
- 2/19/2025 – Order Denying Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss¹²⁷

Other Documents:

- 12/30/2022 – Complaint filed¹²⁸
- 03/01/2024 – Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction against All Defendants by Corteva Inc¹²⁹

¹²⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/66800762/78/in-re-crop-protection-products-loyalty-program-antitrust-litigation/>

¹²⁵ <https://www.rgrdlaw.com/news-item-Arkansas-Attorney-General-and-Robbins-Geller-Obtain-Landmark-Ruling-in-Crop-Protection-Products-Antitrust-Case.html>

¹²⁶ <https://casetext.com/case/state-v-syngenta-crop-prot-ag/>

¹²⁷ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/67b620ef90bd2a00731fad3a?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.f.ared.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02716218873&label=Case+Filing

Order Denying Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, Griffin v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, Case No. 4:22-cv-01287 (E.D. Ark. 2022).

¹²⁸ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/63af2d5b4c89d8005d4a0cd9?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.f.ared.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02715656135&label=Case+Filing

Complaint, Griffin v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, Case No. 4:22-cv-01287 (E.D. Ark. 2022).

¹²⁹ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/65e5dc343f7745027242ee16?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.f.ared.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02715977010&label=Case+Filing

Motion to Dismiss, Griffin v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, Case No. 4:22-cv-01287 (E.D. Ark. 2022).

- 03/22/2024 - First Amended Complaint with Jury Demand filed by Tim Griffin¹³⁰
- Docket - <https://www.law360.com/cases/63af2d976dde840100f447e4/dockets>
- 04/27/2024 – Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Amended Complaint by All Defendants¹³¹
- 03/25/2025 - Corteva’s Answer to First Amended Complaint¹³²

Current Status:

- 03/21/2025 – Scheduling Order – Jury trial removed from calendar¹³³

Othart Dairy Farms, LLC et al v. Dairy Farmers Of America, Inc. et al,
2:22-cv-00251 (D. N.M.).

Claims:

- Section 1 of the Sherman Act
- “Plaintiffs alleged that Defendants violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act by conspiring to fix prices of raw Grade A milk in the Southwest U.S. by sharing pricing information, selectively “de-pooling” milk, and coordinating price decisions.”¹³⁴
- Docket - <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63212648/othart-dairy-farms-llc-v-dairy-farmers-of-america-inc/>

Key Decisions:

- 07/27/2022 - Memorandum Opinion and Order GRANTING Defendants' Motion to Stay Discovery, DENYING Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Surreply, and DENYING without prejudice Plaintiffs' Motion to Appoint Interim Co-Lead Counsel¹³⁵

¹³⁰ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/65fdc1ad6edcca03e1aabc3a?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.ared.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02715992374&label=Case+Filing

Amended Complaint, Griffin v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, Case No. 4:22-cv-01287 (E.D. Ark. 2022).

¹³¹ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/662f9b22a4515a04c8912b1b?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.ared.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02716018640&label=Case+Filing

Motion to Dismiss, Griffin v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, Case No. 4:22-cv-01287 (E.D. Ark. 2022).

¹³² Defendant Corteva’s Answer to First Amended Complaint, Griffin v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, Case No. 4:22-cv-01287 (E.D. Ark. 2022).

¹³³ Order Canceling Deadline, Griffin v. Syngenta Crop Protection AG et al, Case No. 4:22-cv-01287 (E.D. Ark. 2022).

¹³⁴ <https://en.edairynews.com/antitrust-d-n-m-court-rescinds-discovery-deadlines-in-new-mexico-dairy-farmers-suit-against-dairy-cooperatives/>

¹³⁵ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63212648/50/othart-dairy-farms-llc-v-dairy-farmers-of-america-inc/>

- 03/11/2024 - Order DENYING Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Complaint and LIFTING STAY¹³⁶
- 01/08/2025 - Order granting in part and denying in part Motion for Reconsideration of the Discovery Bifurcation Order and to Compel Defendants to Properly Respond to Plaintiffs Requests for Production; granting Motion to Amend/Correct;. . . and setting a scheduling conference on 2/13/2025¹³⁷

Other Documents:

- 05/31/2022 – Motion To Dismiss For Failure To State A Claim by Dairy Farmers Of America, Inc., Greater Southwest Agency, Select Milk Producers, Inc.¹³⁸
- 04/04/2022 – Complaint filed by Bright Star Dairy, LLC, Pareo Farm II, Inc., Sunset Dairy, LLC, Pareo Farm, Inc., Desertland Dairy, LLC, Othart Dairy Farms, LLC, Del Oro Dairy, LLC.¹³⁹

Current Status:

- Ongoing

Barr et al. v. Wadiak et al. Case 3:24-cv-03041-TLB (W.D. Ark.).

Claims:

- Packers and Stockyards Act Claims: §202(a) (7 U.S.C. § 192(a)), § 202(g) (7 U.S.C. § 192(g)), 7 U.S.C. § 228b-1, 7 U.S.C. § 197(b), 202(a) (9 C.F.R. § 201.100(d)), 202(a) (9 C.F.R. § 201.82(b)).
- Poultry Growers allege that Cooks Venture and its principal executive officers used deceptive practices including misrepresentation and failure to disclose material information to induce growers to enter poultry growing arrangements, deceptively hid material contract breaches from the Growers, and deceptively concealed its poor financial condition. They also allege violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act designed to reduce payments to growers by intentionally using practices that

¹³⁶<https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63212648/71/othart-dairy-farms-llc-v-dairy-farmers-of-america-inc/>

¹³⁷ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63212648/175/othart-dairy-farms-llc-v-dairy-farmers-of-america-inc/>

¹³⁸ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63212648/38/othart-dairy-farms-llc-v-dairy-farmers-of-america-inc/>

¹³⁹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63212648/1/othart-dairy-farms-llc-v-dairy-farmers-of-america-inc/>

routinely delayed the weighing of birds for hours after being transported from the contract-growers' farms to processing plants and holding yards.¹⁴⁰

Documents:

- 12/18/2024 – Amended Complaint with Jury Demand¹⁴¹
- 11/29/2024 – Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction
- 09/25/2024 – Complaint and Jury Trial Demand against All Defendants¹⁴²
- 1/17/2025 - Defendant Matthew Wadiak's Answer to First Amended Complaint¹⁴³
- 12/31/2024 - Defendant Blake Evans and Tim Singleton's Answer to First Amended Complaint¹⁴⁴
- 12/30/2024 - Separate Defendant John Niemann's Answer to First Amended Complaint¹⁴⁵
- Docket -
<https://www.law360.com/cases/66f41dcbb4422901a0e49203/dockets?page=1>

Current Status:

- Ongoing
- Related bankruptcy case: In Re: Cooks Venture Poultry Jay Inc., 1:24-BK-10830, 10829, 10828 (U.S. Bankruptcy Court, District of Delaware).¹⁴⁶
 - 4/19/2024 - Petition Filed
 - 9/30/2024 - Report of Sale to Bel's Poultry, LLC
 - Current Status: Awaiting Discharge

¹⁴⁰https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/676358c020719b22163d0c77?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.arwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02912818153&label=Case+Filing

First Amended Complaint, Barr et al. v. Wadiak et al. Case 3:24-cv-03041-TLB (W.D. Ark. 2024).

¹⁴¹https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/676358c020719b22163d0c77?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.arwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02912818153&label=Case+Filing

Amended Complaint, Barr et al. v. Wadiak et al. Case 3:24-cv-03041-TLB (W.D. Ark. 2024).

¹⁴² https://farmstand.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/Doc-02_24.09.25_Verified-Complaint.pdf

¹⁴³https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/678ae5c9fcc037b4fc1ca576?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.arwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02912828369&label=Case+Filing

Answer and Affirmative Defenses, Barr et al. v. Wadiak et al. Case 3:24-cv-03041-TLB (W.D. Ark. 2024).

¹⁴⁴https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/677439761a20eea23e68662f?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.f.arwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02912821134&label=Case+Filing

Answer Defenses and Jury Demand to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Barr et al. v. Wadiak et al. Case 3:24-cv-03041-TLB (W.D. Ark. 2024).

¹⁴⁵https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/6772fd064bc2358a1a1b6732?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.f.arwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F02912820908&label=Case+Filing

Answer to Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, Barr et al. v. Wadiak et al. Case 3:24-cv-03041-TLB (W.D. Ark. 2024).

¹⁴⁶[https://www.westlaw.com/Document/I0796E134FE6311EEA8B88B7FE8922EE3/View/FullText.html?transitionType=Default&contextData=\(sc.Default\)&VR=3.0&RS=cb1t1.0](https://www.westlaw.com/Document/I0796E134FE6311EEA8B88B7FE8922EE3/View/FullText.html?transitionType=Default&contextData=(sc.Default)&VR=3.0&RS=cb1t1.0)

Black v. Case Farms Case No. 5:24-cv-35 (W.D. N.C.).

Claims:

- Packers and Stockyards Act Claims: 7 U.S.C. §§ 192(a),(b),(c).

Documents:

- 01/31/2024 – Complaint against Randy Black with Jury Demand¹⁴⁷
- 09/20/2024 – Amended Complaint with Jury Demand¹⁴⁸
- 01/31/2025 – Second Amended Complaint with Jury Demand¹⁴⁹
- 02/13/2025 – Defendant’s Answer to Amended Complaint¹⁵⁰

Current Status:

- Ongoing

In re: Deere & Company Repair Services Antitrust Litigation, No. 3:22-cv-50188 MDL No. 3030 (N.D. Ill.).

Claims:

- Sherman Antitrust Act §§1 and 2
- “Plaintiffs allege that Deere & Company’s anticompetitive conduct has prevented farmers and independent repair shops from performing certain repairs on Deere-

¹⁴⁷https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/65baceb2fb0cf4029bedbd9d?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.ncwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F13515209285&label=Case+Filing

Class Action Complaint, Black v. Case Farms Case No. 5:24-cv-35 (W.D. N.C. 2024).

¹⁴⁸https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/66edc0a8abd3f10aee4cebb0?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.ncwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F13515385016&label=Case+Filing

Amended Class Action Complaint, Black v. Case Farms Case No. 5:24-cv-35 (W.D. N.C. 2024).

¹⁴⁹https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/679d2296bac689123efbfc97?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.ncwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F13515474778&label=Case+Filing

Second Amended Complaint, Black v. Case Farms Case No. 5:24-cv-35 (W.D. N.C. 2024).

¹⁵⁰

https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/67ae65d67ce8df53b66b2d01?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.ncwd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F13515485285&label=Case+Filing

Answer to Second Amended Complaint, Black v. Case Farms Case No. 5:24-cv-35 (W.D. N.C. 2024).

branded agricultural equipment.”¹⁵¹ These restrictions can harm consumers by forcing “independent repair shops out of business,” by delaying repairs, and by “rais[ing] prices and reduc[ing] quality.” Plaintiffs allege that the repair restrictions implemented by Deere violate Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and “ha[ve] restrained trade in, and monopolized, an aftermarket for “Deere Repair Services.”

Key Decisions:

- 06/01/2022 – MDL Transfer Order¹⁵²
- ¹⁵³
- 03/08/2023 - Stipulation and Notice of Voluntary Dismissal without Prejudice of Plaintiff Robbins Family Grain, LLC¹⁵⁴
- 11/27/2023 - Memorandum Opinion and Order denying Defendant's motion for judgment on the pleadings¹⁵⁵
- 09/25/2024 – Case Management Order¹⁵⁶
- 3/3/2025 - Order Regarding Common Interest Applicability.¹⁵⁷

Other Documents:

- 10/24/2022 - Consolidated Class Action Complaint¹⁵⁸
 - filed by Trinity Dale Wells, Colvin Farms, Plum Ridge Farms, Ltd., Blake Johnson, Robbins Family Grain, LLC, Hapka Farms, Inc., Eagle Lake Farms Partnership, England Farms & Harvesting, LLC, Wilson Farms Land & Cattle Co. LLC
- 12/08/2022 - Motion by Defendant Deere & Company for judgment on the pleadings¹⁵⁹
- 01/27/2023 - Memorandum by All Plaintiffs in Opposition to motion for judgment on the pleadings
- 02/14/2023 – Statement of Interest of the United States of America¹⁶⁰

¹⁵¹ In re: Deere & Company Repair Services Antitrust Litigation, No. 3:22-cv-50188 MDL No. 3030 (N.D. Ill.)

¹⁵² <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/1/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁵³ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/113/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁵⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/125/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁵⁵ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/159/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁵⁶ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/188/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁵⁷ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/217/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁵⁸ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/85/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁵⁹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/104/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

¹⁶⁰ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/63557210/120/deere-company-repair-services-antitrust-litigation/>

Current Status:

- Ongoing

Federal Trade Commission et al v. Deere & Company, No. 3:25-cv-50017 (N.D. Ill.).

Federal Antitrust law Claims:

- FTC alleges Deere is in violation of Section 5(a) of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C. § 45(a), and Section 2 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 2.¹⁶¹

Documents:

- 01/15/2025 – Compliant filed by the Federal Trade Commission, State of Illinois, and State of Minnesota.¹⁶²
- 02/07/2025 – Statement filed by CNH, AGCO, and Kubota concerning confidential and competitively sensitive information.¹⁶³

Current Status:

- 01/15/2025 – Compliant Filed.¹⁶⁴
- 02/07/2025 – Amended Complaint Filed.¹⁶⁵
- 02/07/2025- Statement Filed.¹⁶⁶
- 03/17/2025 – Defendant’s Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings and Brief in Support¹⁶⁷

¹⁶¹ https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/DeereCoREDACTEDComplaintCaseNo325-cv-50017.pdf

¹⁶² https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/DeereCoREDACTEDComplaintCaseNo325-cv-50017.pdf

¹⁶³ <https://www.law360.com/articles/2295197/attachments/0>

Statement of Non-parties, Federal Trade Commission et al. v. Deere and Co., No. 3:25-cv-50017, MDL No. 3030 (N.D. Il. 2025).

¹⁶⁴ https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/DeereCoREDACTEDComplaintCaseNo325-cv-50017.pdf

¹⁶⁵ https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/dkt_44_-_redacted_public_amended_complaint.pdf

¹⁶⁶ <https://www.law360.com/articles/2295197/attachments/0>

Statement, Federal Trade Commission et al. v. Deere and Co., No. 3:25-cv-50017, MDL No. 3030 (N.D. Il. 2025).

¹⁶⁷ <https://www.law360.com/articles/2312214/attachments/0>

Defendant’s Memorandum in Support of Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings, Federal Trade Commission et al. v. Deere and Co., No. 3:25-cv-50017, MDL No. 3030 (N.D. Il. 2025).

Jien, et al. v. Perdue Farms, Inc. et al., No. 1:19-cv-00252, MDL No. 3030 (N.D. Ill.).

Federal Antitrust Law Claims:

- Conspiracy to “to fix and depress the compensation paid to non-supervisory production and maintenance employees at chicken processing plants in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.”¹⁶⁸

Key Decisions:

- 10/08/2019 – Motion for consolidation of related actions granted.¹⁶⁹
- 03/10/2021 – Defendant’s motion to dismiss granted and denied in part.¹⁷⁰

Other Documents:

- 08/30/2019 – Compliant filed by Judy Jien, Kieo Jibidi, and Elaisa Clement.¹⁷¹
- 10/04/2019 – Motion for Consolidation of Related Actions filed.¹⁷²
- 11/02/2020 – Amended Complaint Filed.¹⁷³
- 12/18/2020 – Motion to Dismiss Filed.¹⁷⁴
- 03/10/2021 – Memorandum Opinion Entered.¹⁷⁵
- 04/07/2021 – Answer to Amended Complaint Filed.¹⁷⁶

Current Status:

- Settlements
 - Allen Harim Foods: \$5 million
 - Amick Farms: \$6.25 million
 - Butterball: \$8.5 million
 - Cargill Meat Solutions: \$15 million

¹⁶⁸ <https://www.cohenmilstein.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Complaint-Jien-v-Perdue-08302019.pdf>

¹⁶⁹ <https://www.law360.com/articles/1207992/attachments/0>

Motion for Consolidation of Related Actions, Jien, et al. v. Perdue Farms, Inc. et al., No. 1:19-cv-002521 (D. Md. 2019).

¹⁷⁰ <https://casetext.com/case/jien-v-perdue-farms-inc-1>

¹⁷¹ <https://www.cohenmilstein.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/07/Complaint-Jien-v-Perdue-08302019.pdf>

¹⁷² <https://www.law360.com/articles/1207992/attachments/0>

¹⁷³ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/5fa07bc43b5ca30476beb5d9?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.mdd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F093111360261&label=Case+Filing

Second Amended Consolidated Complaint, Jien, et al. v. Perdue Farms, Inc. et al., No. 1:19-cv-002521 (D. Md. Nov. 2, 2020).

¹⁷⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16146316/400/jien-v-perdue-farms-inc/>

¹⁷⁵ <https://casetext.com/case/jien-v-perdue-farms-inc-1>

¹⁷⁶ Pls.’ Am. Compl., Jien, et al. v. Perdue Farms, Inc. et al., No. 1:19-cv-002521 (D. Md. April 7, 2021).

- Case Farms and Case Foods: \$8.5 million
- Fieldale Farms: \$5.5 million
- Foster Poultry Farms: \$13.3 million
- George's: \$5.8 million
- Jennie-O Turkey Store: \$3.5 million
- Koch Foods: \$18.5 million
- Mountaire Farms: \$13.5 million
- O.K. Foods: \$4.75 million
- Peco Foods: \$3 million
- Perdue Farms and Perdue Foods: \$60.65 million
- Pilgrim's Pride: \$29 million
- Sanderson Farms: \$38.3 million
- Simmons Foods: \$12 million
- Tyson and Keystone Foods: \$115.5 million
- Wayne Farms: \$31.5 million¹⁷⁷

American Proteins, Inc. et al v. River Valley Ingredients, LLC et al, 2:22-cv-00091, (N.D. Ga.) .

Claims:

- Sherman Act 15 U.S.C. §§ 1, 2; Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 15
- “Antitrust suit accusing Tyson Foods of driving a company out of the poultry rendering market in the Southeast through a group boycott and intimidation tactics that forced the owners to sell the business well below its value.”¹⁷⁸

Key Decisions:

- 11/08/2022 – Order Denying Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss¹⁷⁹
 - 06/19/2023 - Order denying Motion to Transfer Case¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷ <https://www.classaction.org/news/poultry-producer-settlements-totaling-nearly-400m-resolve-lawsuit-over-alleged-wage-suppression-conspiracy>

¹⁷⁸ <https://www.law360.com/articles/1547978>

¹⁷⁹ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/636a93b8b8757700a46b0c1f?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.gand.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F055114970504&label=Case+Filing

Order Denying Motion to Dismiss, American Proteins, Inc. et al v. River Valley Ingredients, LLC et al, Case No. 2:22-cv-00091, (N.D. Ga. 2022).

¹⁸⁰ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/6491d584eae63b03337a6c53?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.gand.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F055115491597&label=Case+Filing

Order, American Proteins, Inc. et al v. River Valley Ingredients, LLC et al, Case No. 2:22-cv-00091, (N.D. Ga. 2022).

Other Documents:

- 05/11/2022 – Complaint with Jury Trial Demand¹⁸¹
- 07/01/2022 – Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim with Brief In Support by River Valley Ingredients, LLC, Tyson Farms, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc.¹⁸²
- 12/20/2022 - Motion to Transfer Case to United States District Court for the District of Delaware with Brief In Support by River Valley Ingredients, LLC, Tyson Farms, Inc., Tyson Poultry, Inc.¹⁸³
- 3/14/2025 – Joint Motion to Amend¹⁸⁴

Current Status:

- Ongoing

Brown v. JBS USA Food Company, et al., No.1:22-cv-02946-STV (D. Co).

Claims:

- Conspiracy “to fix and depress the compensation paid to employees at red meat processing plants in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1.”¹⁸⁵

Key Decisions:

- 09/27/2023 – Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Denied.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸¹ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/627d1b64a9a0f100a26ab430?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.gand.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F055114560060&label=Case+Filing

Complaint, American Proteins, Inc. et al v. River Valley Ingredients, LLC et al, Case No. 2:22-cv-00091, (N.D. Ga. 2022).

¹⁸² <https://www.law360.com/cases/627d1a38d30b91cd2d37522f/dockets?page=25>

Motion to Dismiss, American Proteins, Inc. et al v. River Valley Ingredients, LLC et al, Case No. 2:22-cv-00091, (N.D. Ga. 2022).

¹⁸³ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/63a247083521a500a2754754?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.gand.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F055115067997&label=Brief+Brief+in+Support+of+Motion+to+Transfer

Brief in Support of Tyson’s Motion to Transfer Venue, American Proteins, Inc. et al v. River Valley Ingredients, LLC et al, Case No. 2:22-cv-00091, (N.D. Ga. 2022).

¹⁸⁴ <https://www.law360.com/cases/627d1a38d30b91cd2d37522f/dockets>

Joint Motion to Amend, American Proteins, Inc. et al v. River Valley Ingredients, LLC et al, Case No. 2:22-cv-00091, (N.D. Ga. 2022).

¹⁸⁵ <https://www.cohenmilstein.com/case-study/brown-v-jbs-usa-food-company-et-al/>

¹⁸⁶ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.219.0.pdf>
<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.220.0.pdf>

- 02/07/2024 – Order Granted Defendant Nebraska Beef, Ltd.’s Motion for Joinder.¹⁸⁷
- 01/15/2025 – Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim Denied.¹⁸⁸
- 03/26/2025 – Order Denying in Part and Granting in Part Defendants’ Joint Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim.¹⁸⁹
- 03/26/2025 – Order Denying in Part and Granting in Part Defendant Greater Omaha Packing Co., Inc.’s Motion to Dismiss.¹⁹⁰

Other Documents:

- 11/04/2022 - Complaint Filed.¹⁹¹
- 01/12/2024 – Amended Complaint Filed.¹⁹²
- 02/17/2024 – Defendants’ Motions to Dismiss¹⁹³
- 04/05/2024 – Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss for Failure to State a Claim.¹⁹⁴

Settlements:

- Cargill - \$29, 750,000 million.¹⁹⁵
- National Beef Packing - \$14.2 million.¹⁹⁶
- Hormel Foods - \$13.5 million.¹⁹⁷
- Tyson Foods - \$72 million.¹⁹⁸
- JBS USA Foods - \$55 million.¹⁹⁹
- Seaboard Foods - \$10 million²⁰⁰
- Perdue Foods - \$1.25 million.²⁰¹

¹⁸⁷ Order Granting Defendant Nebraska Beef, Ltd.’s Motion for Joinder, Brown v. JBS USA Food Company et al, No. 1:22-cv-02946 (D. Co.).

¹⁸⁸ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.382.0.pdf>

¹⁸⁹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.400.0.pdf>

¹⁹⁰ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.401.0.pdf>

¹⁹¹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.1.0.pdf>

¹⁹² <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.260.0.pdf>

¹⁹³ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.159.0.pdf>

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.164.0.pdf>

¹⁹⁴ Joint Motions to Dismiss, Brown v. JBS USA Food Company et al, No. 1:22-cv-02946 (D. Co.).

¹⁹⁵ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.382.0.pdf>

¹⁹⁶ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.306.0.pdf>

¹⁹⁷ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.306.0.pdf>

¹⁹⁸ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.322.4.pdf>

¹⁹⁹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.322.3.pdf>

²⁰⁰ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.306.0.pdf>

²⁰¹ <https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cod.219735/gov.uscourts.cod.219735.65.0.pdf>

Alqosh Enterprises, Inc. and NMRM, Inc. v. PepsiCo, Inc. and Frito-Lay North America, Inc., No. 2:25-cv-1327, (C.D. Cal.).

Claims:

- Anti-Trust, Robinson-Patman Act
- Class action filed by two convenience stores alleging that PepsiCo and Frito-Lay “are violating the Robinson-Patman Act's prohibition against charging higher prices to "disfavored" retail customers while charging lower prices to "favored" retailers” by charging chain grocery stores such as Walmart and Target much lower prices than independent convenience stores.²⁰²

Documents:

- 02/17/2025 - Complaint²⁰³

Current Status:

- Ongoing

U.S. v. Cargill Meat Solutions,
No. 22-cv-1821 (D. Md.).

Claims:

- Violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §1 by engaging in an anticompetitive agreement and unlawful restraint of trade regarding compensation for workers.²⁰⁴
- Plaintiff alleges Defendants violated Section 202(a) of the Packers and Stockyards Act, 7 U.S.C. 192(a) by using "deceptive practices" regarding grower contracts.²⁰⁵

Key Decisions:

- 04/09/2024 - Modified Final Judgement²⁰⁶

²⁰² <https://www.law360.com/articles/2299505/pepsi-frito-lay-accused-of-favoring-chains-with-chip-prices>

²⁰³ <https://www.law360.com/articles/2299505/attachments/0>

Complaint, Alqosh Enterprises, Inc. et al. v. PepsiCo, Inc. et al., No. 2:25-cv-1327 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 17, 2025).

²⁰⁴ <https://www.justice.gov/media/1238931/dl?inline>

²⁰⁵ <https://www.justice.gov/media/1238931/dl?inline>

²⁰⁶ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2024-08/424533.pdf>

- Restitution \$15 million for Cargill Meat Solutions, \$38.3 million for Sanderson, and \$31.5 million for Wayne.
- 04/09/2024 - Modified Final Judgement - Georges²⁰⁷
 - \$5.8 million
- 06/05/2023 - Final Judgment - Webber, Meng, Sahl & Company and G. Jonathan Meng²⁰⁸

Other Documents:

- 07/25/2022 - Complaint²⁰⁹
- 1/18/2025 - Memorandum in Support of U.S. Motion to Enforce Final Judgment Against Wayne-Sanderson²¹⁰
- 2/17/2025 - Agri Stats Motion to Intervene²¹¹
- 2/19/2025 - George's Opposition to U.S. Motion to Enforce Final Judgment²¹²
- 3/3/2025 - U.S. Response in Opposition to Agri Stats' Motion to Intervene²¹³
- 3/10/2025 - U.S. Reply in Support of Motion to Enforce Judgment Against Wayne-Sanderson²¹⁴
- 3/17/2025 – Agri Stats Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Intervene²¹⁵

Current Status:

- The Cargill, Sanderson, Wayne and Georges settlements prohibit direct or indirect communications with poultry processors about worker compensation and expire 7 years from date of entry or after 3 years, it “may be terminated upon notice” by the court, if “no longer necessary or in the public interest.”²¹⁶
- Sanderson and Wayne cannot “reduce the Base Payment made to any Grower supplying broiler chicken to the Settling Defendants as a result of that Grower’s performance or as a result of the Grower’s performance in comparison with the performance of other Growers supplying the Settling Defendants.” They can still offer up to a certain amount of incentive pay to growers within the stipulations of

²⁰⁷ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2024-08/424531.pdf>

²⁰⁸ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-11/418171.pdf>

²⁰⁹ <https://www.justice.gov/media/1238931/dl?inline>

²¹⁰ <https://www.justice.gov/atr/media/1386181/dl?inline>

²¹¹ Agri Stats Inc. Motion to Intervene, 1:22-cv-1821 (D. Md. 2025).

²¹² George's Opposition to U.S. Motion to Enforce Final Judgment, 1:22-cv-1821 (D. Md. 2025).

²¹³ U.S. Response in Opposition to Agri Stats Motion to Intervene, 1:22-cv-1821 (D. Md. 2025).

²¹⁴ U.S. Reply in Support of Motion to Enforce Judgment Against Wayne-Sanderson, 1:22-cv-1821 (D. Md. 2025).

²¹⁵ Agri Stats Inc. Reply Memorandum in Support of Motion to Intervene, 1:22-cv-1821 (D. Md. 2025).

²¹⁶ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2024-08/424533.pdf>
<https://www.justice.gov/d9/2024-08/424531.pdf>

the final judgement. They also cannot retaliate against any grower who reports concerns to the government appointed compliance monitor or other government agency. The companies are also required to follow the grower disclosure contract requirements in the transparency rules finalized by USDA.²¹⁷

- The Webber, Meng, Sahl & Company settlement prohibits providing services “directly or indirectly” for the purpose of exchanging “Confidentially Competitively Sensitive Information.” It prohibits joining any meeting “of members of the same trade, industry, or profession” that is not open to the public” if the meeting relates to poultry processing or exchange of "Confidentially Competitively Sensitive Information." It also prohibits accepting "Confidentially Competitively Sensitive Information" from any poultry processor or its representative and participating in any non-public discussion of compensation in the poultry processing industry.²¹⁸

In Re: Packaged Seafood Products Antitrust Litigation, 3:15-md-02670 (S.D. Cal.).

Federal Antitrust Law Claims:

- Conspiracy to restrain trade and fix prices of packaged seafood products in violation of Sections 1 and 3 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§1, 3.

Key Decisions:

- 11/16/2021 - Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Direct Action Plaintiffs and End Purchaser Plaintiffs Motions for Partial Summary Judgment Against Starkist Company Based on Guilty Pleas and Admissions in Parallel Criminal Proceedings²¹⁹
- 03/21/2022 - Order (1) Granting Plaintiffs Motion for Reconsideration; (2) Vacating Order Granting Defendants Motion to Dismiss; (3) Denying Defendants Motion to Dismiss; and (4) Denying as Moot Plaintiffs Motion for Certification of Rule 54(B) Judgment and The Parties Joint Motion To Seal.²²⁰

²¹⁷ <https://www.justice.gov/atr/media/1365521/dl?inline>

²¹⁸ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-11/418171.pdf>

²¹⁹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/2654/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²²⁰ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/2781/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

- 04/18/2022 - Order denying Defendants' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Plaintiffs' gear-type claims²²¹
- 07/19/2022 - Order denying Defendants' motion for partial summary judgment against Plaintiffs' private label claims.²²²
- 10/19/2022 - Order granting in part and denying in part Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment on certain State Law Claims²²³
- 04/21/2023 - Order granting 2023 Starkist Co., Del Monte Corporation, and Dongwon Industries Co., Ltd's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment dismissing all claims for purchases made prior to May 30, 2011²²⁴
- 08/18/2023 - Order granting in part and denying in part The Lion Companies' Motion For Summary Judgment²²⁵

Other Documents:

- 10/05/2018 – Amended Complaint with Jury Demand Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint against Big Catch Cayman LP, Bumble Bee Foods LLC, Chicken of the Sea International, Inc., Dongwon Industries Co., Ltd., Lion Capital (Americas), Inc., Lion Capital LLP, Starkist Company, Thai Union Group Public Company, Ltd., Tri-Union Seafoods LLC(doing business as Chicken of the Sea International, Inc.), filed by Piggly Wiggly Alabama Distributing Co., Inc., Olean Wholesale Grocery Cooperative, Inc., Central Grocers, Inc., Benjamin Foods LLC, Trepcos Imports and Distribution LTD, Pacific Groservice Inc.²²⁶
- 10/05/2018 – Amended Complaint with Jury Demand Sixth Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint of the Indirect Purchaser End Payer Plaintiffs against All Defendants²²⁷
- 10/05/2018 – Amended Complaint with Jury Demand Commercial Food Preparer Plaintiffs' Fourth Amended Complaint against Big Catch Cayman LP, Bumble Bee

²²¹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/2809/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²²² <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/2873/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²²³ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/2925/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²²⁴ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/3051/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²²⁵ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/3103/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²²⁶ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/1460/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²²⁷ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/1461/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

Foods LLC, Del Monte Corporation, Dongwon Industries Co., Ltd., Lion Capital (Americas), Inc., Lion Capital LLP, Starkist Company, Thai Union Group Public Company, Ltd., Tri-Union Seafoods LLC, filed by Harvesters Enterprises, LLC, Rushin Gold, LLC, Painted Plate Catering, Sandee's Catering, Francis T Enterprises, Lesgo Personal Chef LLC, Maquoketa Care Center, GlowFisch Hospitality, Groucho's Deli of Five Points, LLC, Groucho's Deli of Raleigh, A-1 Diner, Thyme Cafe & Market, Inc., Capitol Hill Supermarket, Confetti's Ice Cream Shoppe, Janet Machen, Erbert & Gerbert's, Inc., Dutch Village Restaurant, SIMON-HINDI, LLC.²²⁸

Current Status:

- 08/23/2024 - Order Granting End Payer Plaintiffs Motion For Preliminary Approval of Class Action Settlements²²⁹
 - StarKist settlement amount is \$130,000,000
 - Lion Companies Settlement Agreement amount is \$6,000,000
- 08/23/2024 - Order Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs Motion For Preliminary Approval of Settlements²³⁰
 - “total value of the settlement agreements with COSI and TUG, StarKist and DWI, and the Lion Companies is \$83,701,961.86 (including a partial reimbursement of fees and advanced costs from the COSI settlement)”²³¹
- 11/15/2024 – Order Granting Commercial Food Preparer Plaintiffs’ Motion for Final Approval of Starkist and Lion Settlements²³²
- 11/22/2024 - Order Granting End Payer Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlements and Judgment.²³³
- 11/22/2024 - Order Granting Direct Purchaser Plaintiffs' Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement²³⁴

²²⁸ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/1470/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²²⁹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/3302/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²³⁰ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/3303/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²³¹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/3303/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>. Pg. 13.

²³² <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/4193574/3323/in-re-packaged-seafood-products-antitrust-litigation/>

²³³ <https://casetext.com/case/in-re-packaged-seafood-prods-antitrust-litig-61>

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.casd.490709/gov.uscourts.casd.490709.3327.0.pdf>

²³⁴

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.casd.490709/gov.uscourts.casd.490709.3326.0.pdf>

- 11/25/2024 – Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Suggestion of Remand re 3314²³⁵
 - Associated Wholesale Grocers, Inc. v. Bumble Bee Foods LLC et al., Case No. 18cv1014-JLS-MDD remanded to the United States District Court for the District of Kansas

U.S. v. Koch Foods, Inc., No. 1:23-cv-15813 (N.D. Ill.).

Claims:

- “On November 9, 2023, the United States filed a civil Complaint against Koch, seeking an adjudication that the provision of a contract termination penalty (the “exit penalty”) Koch has imposed on certain farmers producing chickens (“growers”) violates Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, and other federal laws. The Complaint alleged that, since 2014, Koch contracts have required many growers to pay Koch an exit penalty if they terminate their contracts with Koch and switch to another processor. The Complaint further alleged that, since at least 2018, Koch sought to enforce this exit penalty provision through threatened or actual litigation against growers who tried to switch, and Koch collected exit penalties from several growers. Koch's conduct has deterred growers from leaving Koch and switching to its competitors.”²³⁶

Key Decisions:

- 02/09/2024 - Unopposed Motion by Plaintiff United States of America for Final Judgment and Related Relief²³⁷
- 02/12/2024 – Final Judgement Order²³⁸
- 11/09/2023 – Proposed Final Judgement²³⁹

Other Documents:

- 11/09/2023 - Complaint²⁴⁰

²³⁵https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/674502d556434c05cda118d3?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.casd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F037120719556&label=Case+Filing

Order Granting Plaintiff's Motion for Suggestion of Remand, U.S. v. Koch Foods, Inc., No. 1:23-cv-15813 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 9, 2023).

²³⁶ *United States v. Koch Foods Inc.*, 1:23-cv-15813, 2 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 9, 2024).

²³⁷<https://casetext.com/case/united-states-v-koch-foods-inc-2>

²³⁸https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/65ca5c88e2339297616164a6?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.ilnd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F067129947733&label=Case+Filing

²³⁹ <https://www.justice.gov/d9/2023-11/418161.pdf>

²⁴⁰https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/654d0889ce7d7d018d8eacff?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.ilnd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F067129519036&label=Case+Filing

Current Status:

- Settled

Breaking Free, LLC v. JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC, No. 4:18-CV-01659-ACA, 2021 WL 2139052 (N.D. Ala.).

Claims:

- Plaintiffs alleged violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act, the Agricultural Fair Practices Act, and other state law claims.²⁴¹

Key Decisions:

- 04/08/2019 – Order Grants in Part and Denies in Part Defendants motions to dismiss.²⁴²
- 05/26/2021 - Order Granting Summary Judgment in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiffs on these two federal claims. Because there is no independent basis for jurisdiction over Plaintiffs' state law claims for fraud and breach of contract, declining to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the claims dismissing those claims without prejudice.²⁴³
- 05/26/2020 - Order Granting Summary Judgment in favor of Defendants and against Plaintiffs on Plaintiffs' Packers and Stockyards Act claim and Agricultural Fair Practices Act claim; dismissing without prejudice, Plaintiffs' state law fraud and breach of contract claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C.²⁴⁴
- 06/24/2021 – Notice of Appeal²⁴⁵
- 06/25/2021 – Transmitted to 11th Circuit Court of Appeals

²⁴¹ <https://casetext.com/case/breaking-free-llc-v-jcg-foods-of-ala-llc>

²⁴² https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/5cab6e1fb8689576f1906518?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.alnd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F01915051932&label=Case+Filing

Memorandum Opinion and Order, Breaking Free, LLC v. JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC, Case No. 4:18-CV-01659-ACA, (N.D. Ala. 2021).

²⁴³ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/60aed1aa742a360231a89f0d?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.alnd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F01915707804&label=Case+Filing

Memorandum Opinion, Breaking Free, LLC v. JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC, Case No. 4:18-CV-01659-ACA, (N.D. Ala. 2021).

²⁴⁴ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5cab6e473b73963d3503728b/dockets?page=1>

Order for Summary Judgement, Breaking Free, LLC v. JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC, Case No. 4:18-CV-01659-ACA, (N.D. Ala. 2021).

²⁴⁵ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5cab6e473b73963d3503728b/dockets?page=1>

Notice of Appeal, Breaking Free, LLC v. JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC, USCA Case Number 21-12169, (N.D. Ala. 2021).

- 01/24/2022 - ORDER of USCA - ORDER: Pursuant to Appellants Breaking Free, LLC, Connie Buttram and Appellees JCG Foods of Alabama LLC, Koch Foods, Inc. and Koch Meat Co Inc's motion for voluntary dismissal, FRAP Rule 42 and 11th Cir. R. 42-1(a), the above referenced appeal was duly entered dismissed on this date.²⁴⁶

Other Documents:

- 05/28/2019 - Answer to Amended Complaint by JCG Foods of Alabama LLC, Koch Foods Inc, Koch Meat Co Inc²⁴⁷
- 11/16/2020 - Motion for Summary Judgment by JCG Foods of Alabama LLC, Koch Foods Inc, Koch Meat Co Inc.²⁴⁸

Current Status:

- Dismissed on appeal

Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky.).

Claims:

- A group of chicken growers in Kentucky alleged that Tyson's tournament payment system violated the Packers and Stockyards Act.²⁴⁹

Key Decisions:

- 08/18/2015 – Order Denying Motion to Dismiss²⁵⁰
- 11/13/2015 – Memorandum Order and Opinion granting in part and denying in part Motion to Dismiss²⁵¹

²⁴⁶ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5cab6e473b73963d3503728b/dockets?page=1>

Order of USCA, Breaking Free, LLC v. JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC, USCA Case Number 21-12169, (N.D. Ala. 2021).

²⁴⁷ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5cab6e473b73963d3503728b/dockets?page=5>

Answer to Amended Complaint, Breaking Free, LLC v. JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC, Case No. 4:18-CV-01659-ACA, (N.D. Ala. 2021).

²⁴⁸ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5cab6e473b73963d3503728b/dockets?page=3>

Motion for Summary Judgement, Breaking Free, LLC v. JCG Foods of Alabama, LLC, Case No. 4:18-CV-01659-ACA, (N.D. Ala. 2021).

²⁴⁹ <https://www.law360.com/articles/662905>

²⁵⁰ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/55dc99b5ad561a1e20000005?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.kywd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F08313051080&label=Case+Filing

Order Denying Motion to Dismiss, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky. 2020).

²⁵¹ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/564623171c699d3517000006?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.kywd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F08313113825&label=Case+Filing

Memorandum Opinion and Order, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky. 2020).

- 09/04/2018 - Order Granting The Motion to Voluntarily Dismiss filed by Plaintiff, Poultry Specialty Service, LLC²⁵²
- 09/12/2018 - Agreed Order Voluntarily Dismissing Wishbone Poultry²⁵³
- 10/27/2020 - Memorandum Opinion And Order granting in part and denying in part Motion for Summary Judgment.²⁵⁴
 - “The judge denied summary judgment to Tyson on claims related to breach of contract and violations of the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, but did grant summary judgment in favor of Tyson on a claim of breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.”²⁵⁵
- 01/06/2022 - Order on Motion for Miscellaneous Relief²⁵⁶
- 08/18/2022 – Text Order: The Court grants the Plaintiffs' Motion for a Trial, sets a jury trial to begin on 2/21/23, and adopts the parties' proposed schedule as laid out in their Joint Response²⁵⁷
- 06/14/2023 - Notice of Settlement (Joint) by Tyson Chicken, Inc.²⁵⁸
- 09/01/2023 - TEXT ORDER: All parties have signed a filing indicating, in accordance with their signed notice of settlement (DN 335), that this case should be dismissed with prejudice (DN 338). Accordingly, this action stands dismissed with prejudice under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(ii) and the Court strikes it from the active docket²⁵⁹

Other Documents:

- 06/01/2015 – State Court Complaint and Notice of Removal²⁶⁰
- 07/30/2015 – Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint and Jury Demand²⁶¹

²⁵² https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/5b8ec27b01283b3a3e509166?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.kywd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F08313837825&label=Case+Filing

Order Voluntarily Dismissing Poultry Specialty Service, LLC, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky. 2020).

²⁵³ <https://www.law360.com/cases/556dbc330994ef4d2d000001/dockets?page=23>

Order Voluntarily Dismissing Wishbone Poultry, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky. 2020).

²⁵⁴ https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/9715646/morris-v-tyson-chicken-inc/?q=4%3A15-cv-00077&type=o&order_by=score+desc&stat_Published=on&stat_Unknown=on

²⁵⁵ <https://www.law360.com/articles/1323437>

²⁵⁶ https://www.courtlistener.com/opinion/9716468/morris-v-tyson-chicken-inc/?q=4%3A15-cv-00077&type=o&order_by=score+desc&stat_Published=on&stat_Unknown=on

²⁵⁷ <https://www.law360.com/cases/556dbc330994ef4d2d000001/dockets?page=7>

²⁵⁸ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/648a24af785adf027c0f0be5?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.kywd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F08315176736&label=Case+Filing

Joint Motion for Settlement, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky. 2020).

²⁵⁹ <https://www.law360.com/cases/556dbc330994ef4d2d000001/dockets?page=1>

²⁶⁰ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/556db97dcd136f0e25000005?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.kywd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F08312993549&label=+State+Court+Complaint

Complaint, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc, Case No. 4:15-cv-00077-JHM-HBB (Hopkins County Circuit Court, 2015).

²⁶¹ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/55baa7d60994ef4874000002?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.kywd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F08313038801&label=Case+Filing

Amended Complaint, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky. 2020).

- Adds Packers and Stockyards Act Claim
- 05/22/2020 – Motion for Summary Judgement²⁶²
- 08/02/2022 – Motion for Trial by Plaintiffs²⁶³

Current Status:

- Settled

Sanders v. Koch Foods, Inc., No. 3:19-CV-721-DPJ-FKB, 2020 WL 3621322 (S.D. Miss.).

Federal Claims:

- “This lawsuit asserts that a poultry company discriminated against and mistreated a black poultry grower.”²⁶⁴
- Civil Rights - 42 U.S.C. § 1981 and 7 U.S.C. 213 and 192 (a)-(b).

Key Decisions:

- 07/02/2020 – Order granting Koch’s motion to dismiss in part and denying in part²⁶⁵
 - Claims under Packers and Stockyards Act dismissed; “claims for race discrimination and breach of contract” proceeding?²⁶⁶
- 03/30/2021 - Text-Only Order finding as moot Motion to Consolidate Cases and finding as moot Motion for Joinder, in light of the remand of 3:20-CV-787 to state court.²⁶⁷
- 12/08/2021 – Settlement Conference²⁶⁸
- 06/02/2022 – Order denying motion for Summary Judgement²⁶⁹

²⁶² <https://www.law360.com/cases/556dbc330994ef4d2d000001/dockets?page=14>

Motion for Summary Judgement, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky. 2020).

²⁶³ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/62e9a727b7856800f379ce79?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.kywd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F08314944264&label=Case+Filing

Motion for Trial, Morris v. Tyson Chicken, Inc., 497 F. Supp. 3d 282 (W.D. Ky. 2020).

²⁶⁴ https://scholar.google.com/scholar_case?case=5526009077234380887&q=Sanders+v.+Koch+Foods,+Inc.&hl=en&as_sdt=1006; Sanders v. Koch Foods, Inc., CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:19-CV-721-DPJ-FKB, (S.D. Miss. Jul. 2, 2020)

²⁶⁵ <https://casetext.com/case/sanders-v-koch-foods-inc>

²⁶⁶ <https://casetext.com/case/sanders-v-koch-foods-inc>

²⁶⁷ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5d9deee393d28305d6eba3ec/dockets?page=19>

²⁶⁸ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5d9deee393d28305d6eba3ec/dockets?page=13>

²⁶⁹ https://www.law360.com/dockets/download/6298cf8efe8cb0693403cb4e?doc_url=https%3A%2F%2Fecf.msusd.uscourts.gov%2Fdoc1%2F10517014477&label=Case+Filing

Order, Sanders v. Koch Foods, Inc., Case No. 3:19-cv-00721, (S.D. Miss. 2020).

- 09/20/2023 – Agreed Order of Dismissal with Prejudice²⁷⁰

Other Documents:

- 10/08/2019 - Complaint against Koch Farms of Mississippi, LLC, Koch Foods of Mississippi, LLC, Koch Foods, Incorporated filed by Carlton Sanders, Stephen H. Smith.²⁷¹
- 11/05/2019 – Amended Complaint²⁷²
- 12/06/2019 - Motion to Dismiss²⁷³
- 03/13/2020 - Notice of Potential Participation by United States²⁷⁴
- 12/15/2020 – Motion to Consolidate Cases and Motion for Joinder²⁷⁵
- 12/16/2021 – Motion for Summary Judgement by Koch Farms²⁷⁶

Current Status:

- Dismissed²⁷⁷

Lutz v. Case Farms, LLC, No. 5:20-cv-00103 (W.D.N.C.).

Claims:

- Plaintiffs allege “violation of the federal Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, and federal Declaratory Judgment Act, as well as willful breach of contract, declaratory judgment, fraud, negligent misrepresentation, temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, violation of Chapter 75 of the North Carolina General Statutes, tortious interference with Contract, and defamation.”²⁷⁸

²⁷⁰ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5d9deee393d28305d6eba3ec/dockets?page=1>

Order of Dismissal, Sanders v. Koch Foods, Inc., Case No. 3:19-cv-00721, (S.D. Miss. 2020).

²⁷¹ <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/mississippi/mssdce/3:2019cv00721/105788>

²⁷² <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/mississippi/mssdce/3:2019cv00721/105788>

²⁷³ <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/mississippi/mssdce/3:2019cv00721/105788>

²⁷⁴ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5d9deee393d28305d6eba3ec/dockets?page=27>

Notice of Potential Participation by United States, Sanders v. Koch Foods, Inc., Case No. 3:19-cv-00721, (S.D. Miss. 2020).

²⁷⁵ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5d9deee393d28305d6eba3ec/dockets?page=21>

Motion to Consolidate Cases and Motion for Joinder, Sanders v. Koch Foods, Inc., Case No. 3:19-cv-00721, (S.D. Miss. 2020).

²⁷⁶ <https://www.law360.com/cases/5d9deee393d28305d6eba3ec/dockets?page=13>

Motion for Summary Judgement, Sanders v. Koch Foods, Inc., Case No. 3:19-cv-00721, (S.D. Miss. 2020).

²⁷⁷ <https://casetext.com/case/sanders-v-koch-foods-inc>

²⁷⁸ North Carolina Western District Court. Aug 06, 2020. Lutz V. Case Farms, Llc Complaint. 5:20cv103.

- Class action complaint alleges violation of Packers and Stockyards Act for retaliating against the Plaintiff after he complained that the feed and birds supplied were poor quality and interfered with his ability to get paid fairly under the tournament system.²⁷⁹

Key Decisions:

- 08/11/2020 - Order granting Motion to Expedite Briefing on Preliminary Injunction and to Expedite Discovery²⁸⁰
- 08/31/2020 - Order granting Motion for Preliminary Injunction.²⁸¹
- 09/30/2020 - Order granting Motion for Extension of Time to Answer²⁸²
- 12/10/2020 - Notice of Voluntary Dismissal of Defendant Case Farms, LLC by David Lutz²⁸³

Other Documents:

- 08/06/2020 – Class Action Complaint²⁸⁴

Current Status:

- Terminated

Parker v. Case Farms, LLC, No. 1:20-cv-00011 (W.D.N.C.).

Claims:

- Plaintiffs alleged violation of Packers and Stockyards Act for retaliating against the Plaintiff after he complained that the feed and birds supplied were poor quality and interfered with his ability to get paid fairly under the tournament system.²⁸⁵

Key Decisions:

- 05/11/2020 - Order granting Motion for Protective Order.²⁸⁶

²⁷⁹ North Carolina Western District Court. Aug 06, 2020. Lutz V. Case Farms, Llc Complaint. 5:20cv103.

²⁸⁰ <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/north-carolina/ncwdce/5:2020cv00103/101363>

²⁸¹ <https://casetext.com/case/lutz-v-case-farms-llc>

²⁸² <https://dockets.justia.com/docket/north-carolina/ncwdce/5:2020cv00103/101363>

²⁸³ <https://www.law360.com/dockets/documents/5fd2a35139ab080741e9d63a>

Notice of Voluntary Dismissal, Lutz v. Case Farms, LLC, Case No. 5:20-cv-00103 (W.D.N.C. 2020).

²⁸⁴ Complaint, Lutz v. Case Farms, LLC, Case No. 5:20-cv-00103 (W.D.N.C. 2020).

²⁸⁵ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/1/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

²⁸⁶ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

- 09/08/2020 – Order granting Motion to Dismiss Count II of the Complaint by Case Farms, LLC, Guy Perkins; accepting Memorandum and Recommendations. Plaintiff's fraud claim is Dismissed with Prejudice.²⁸⁷
- 11/30/2020 - Order denying Defendant's Motion for Attorney Fees and Other Sanctions.²⁸⁸
- 07/20/2021 – Case Settled²⁸⁹

Other Documents:

- 1/10/2020 – Complaint with Jury Demand²⁹⁰
- 1/13/2020 – Motion for Preliminary Injunction²⁹¹
- 03/13/2020 - Motion to Dismiss Count II of the Complaint by Case Farms, LLC²⁹²

Current Status:

- Civil Case was closed as of 8/18/2021 pursuant to the filing of the Stipulation of Dismissal.²⁹³

Kroger Albertson's Merger Cases

Current Status:

- Kroger and Albertsons filed a Joint Motion to Dismiss with the Federal Trade Commission on December 12, 2024.²⁹⁴

²⁸⁷ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/39/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

²⁸⁸ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/53/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

²⁸⁹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

²⁹⁰ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/1/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

²⁹¹ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

²⁹² <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

²⁹³ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/16679411/parker-v-case-farms-llc/>

²⁹⁴

https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/612381.2024.12.16_joint_motion_to_dismiss_the_complaint_public.pdf

Federal Trade Commission et al v. Kroger Company, et al., No. 3:24-cv-00347 (D. Oregon).

Claims:

- The “proposed acquisition may be substantially [likely] to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in violation of Section 7 of the Clayton Act, 15 U.S.C. § 18, or Section 5 of the FTC Act, 15 U.S.C § 45.”²⁹⁵

Key Decisions:

- 12/10/2024 – Opinion and Order Granting Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Temporary Restraining Order.²⁹⁶

Other Documents:

- 02/26/2024 – Complaint Filed.²⁹⁷
- 02/26/2024 – Plaintiff’s Motion for Entry of Stipulated TRO.²⁹⁸
- 04/29/2024 – Answers Filed.^{299 300}

State of Washington v. Kroger Company, et al., No. 24-2-00977-9 SEA (King County Superior Court).

Claims:

- The proposed transaction will likely harm competition and will create a monopoly.³⁰¹

Key Decisions:

- 12/10/2024 – Order Granting Permanent Injunction³⁰²

²⁹⁵ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/68284514/1/federal-trade-commission-v-kroger-company/>

²⁹⁶ https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ord.178374/gov.uscourts.ord.178374.521.0_3.pdf

²⁹⁷ https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.ord.178374/gov.uscourts.ord.178374.1.0_1.pdf

²⁹⁸ <https://www.courtlistener.com/docket/68284514/4/federal-trade-commission-v-kroger-company/>

²⁹⁹ https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/609971_-_albertsons_-_answer.pdf

³⁰⁰ https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/609968_-_kroger_-_answer.pdf

³⁰¹ [https://agportal-s3bucket.s3.us-west-](https://agportal-s3bucket.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/uploadedfiles/Another/News/Press_Releases/0093_Complaint_AmendRedactions_WA_021224%20%28002%29.pdf?VersionId=m0mkgZNbOms.m8h.qwHNHJVdEmXIVFR8)

[2.amazonaws.com/uploadedfiles/Another/News/Press_Releases/0093_Complaint_AmendRedactions_WA_021224%20%28002%29.pdf?VersionId=m0mkgZNbOms.m8h.qwHNHJVdEmXIVFR8](https://agportal-s3bucket.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/uploadedfiles/Another/News/Press_Releases/0093_Complaint_AmendRedactions_WA_021224%20%28002%29.pdf?VersionId=m0mkgZNbOms.m8h.qwHNHJVdEmXIVFR8)

³⁰² Order Granting Permanent Injunction, State of Washington v. Kroger Company et al., No. 24-2-00977-9 SEA (King County Superior Court).

Other Documents:

- 02/12/2024 – Complaint Filed.³⁰³

State of Colorado v. Kroger Company, et al., No. 24CV030459 (2nd Judicial District of Colorado).

Claims:

- The proposed merger is likely to lessen competition in violation of C.R.S. § 6-4-107 and C.R.S. § 6-4-104.³⁰⁴

Key Decisions:

- 03/05/2025 - Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Count I as Moot³⁰⁵

Other Documents:

- 02/14/2024 – Complaint Filed.³⁰⁶
- 02/14/2024 – Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction.³⁰⁷

Albertsons v. Kroger Company, No. 2024-1276-LWW (Chancery Court of Delaware).

Claims:

- Breach of contract and breach of covenant of good faith and fair dealing.³⁰⁸

Documents:

- 12/11/2024 – Complaint Filed.³⁰⁹

³⁰³ *Id.*

³⁰⁴ <https://www.naag.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/CO-v.-Kroger-complaint.pdf>

³⁰⁵ Order Granting Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Count I as Moot, State of Colorado v. Kroger Co. et al., No. 24CV30459 (District Court, City and County of Denver, CO).

³⁰⁶ *Id.*

³⁰⁷ <https://www.naag.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/02/CO-v.-Kroger-Motion-for-Preliminary-Injunction.pdf>

³⁰⁸ <https://www.albertsoncompanies.com/newsroom/press-releases/news-details/2024/Albertsons-Files-Lawsuit-Against-Kroger-for-Breach-of-Merger-Agreement/default.aspx>

³⁰⁹ <https://www.albertsoncompanies.com/newsroom/press-releases/news-details/2024/Albertsons-Files-Lawsuit-Against-Kroger-for-Breach-of-Merger-Agreement/default.aspx>

This information is provided by the [Food & Agriculture Impact Project](#) at the University of Arkansas School of Law.



School of Law
LL.M. in Agricultural and Food Law