

TSCA Litigation Update

August 14, 2024

Herb Estreicher Eric P. Gotting

Partner Partner

Washington, DC Washington, DC

+1 202.434.4334 +1 202.434.4269

<u>estreicher@khlaw.com</u> <u>gotting@khlaw.com</u>

Legal Disclaimer



This presentation provides information about the law. Legal information is not the same as legal advice, which involves the application of law to an individual's specific circumstances. The interpretation and application of the law to an individual's specific circumstance depends on many factors. This presentation is not intended to provide legal advice.

The information provided in this presentation is drawn entirely from public information. The views expressed in this presentation are the authors' alone and not those of the authors' clients.

Herb Estreicher, Ph.D.

- Herb Estreicher is a prominent environmental lawyer who holds a Ph.D. in Chemistry from Harvard University in addition to his U.S. law degree. Herb is an expert on the TSCA and is frequently quoted in Inside EPA, Chemical Watch, and BNA Environmental Law Reporter. He has successfully argued many cases before the European Chemicals Agency Board of Appeal and has briefed cases before the EU General Court and the European Court of Justice.
- Herb represents leading manufacturers of chemicals, pesticides, and consumer products. His broad practice in international environmental regulatory law allows him to take an interdisciplinary approach with his clients and their needs. His extensive background in organic chemistry, risk assessment, and bioengineering is valued highly by his clients in the chemical, nanotechnology, and biotechnology industries.
- Herb provides advice on product liability risk control and assists his clients with crisis management for embattled products, including wood preservatives and persistent, bioaccumulative, and toxic (PBT) chemicals. He helps clients secure and maintain chemical approvals and pesticide registrations in Canada and Europe and advises clients on matters involving the Canadian Environmental Protection Act and on European chemical directive.





Eric P. Gotting

- Eric Gotting represents Keller and Heckman's clients in litigation and related issues, specializing in complex civil and appellate matters, internal investigations, and regulatory compliance. With an extensive background in environmental law, he has expanded his practice over the years to cover many of Keller and Heckman's industry sectors and regulatory areas. Eric is a former Am Law 50 litigation partner and U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division, Trial Attorney.
- Eric's practice spans a broad range of legal issues, including administrative and constitutional law, agency enforcement actions, toxic torts, product liability, general business litigation, and regulatory advice. He works with a diverse set of industries, involving chemicals, plastics, pesticides, fuels and pipelines, food and packaging, consumer goods, telecommunications, and e-cigarettes.
- As a litigator, Eric has tried cases to verdict and argued appeals before federal and state courts across the country. His experience includes class actions, mass tort litigation, AAA arbitrations, and agency proceedings. Eric has also litigated challenges to federal and state statutes, regulations, and orders. He has particular knowledge involving the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), the First Amendment, the Due Process Clause, and federal preemption. He has also filed amicus briefs in litigation involving regulatory issues facing a variety of industry sectors.





Cases (1)



Alaska Community Action on Toxics (ACAT) v. EPA	9 th Circuit	20-73099		10/16/20 – <u>Petition</u> for Review
, ,	D.C. Circuit	21-70009	HBCD Evaluation	12/3/20 Petition for Review
v. EPA	→ Moved to 9 th Circuit	21 70007		
California Professional Firefighters v. EPA	9 th Circuit	20-73578		12/9/20 – Petition for Review
Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, et. al, v.	9 th Circuit	21-70160	Asbestos Evaluation	1/26/21 Petition for Review
EPA	- Circuit	21-70100	Asbestos Evaluation	1/20/21 <u>Fetition</u> for Review
EDF et. al, v. EPA				
<u>joined with</u>	9 th Circuit	21-70162	1,4-Dioxane Evaluation	1/25/21 Petition for Review (EDF)
State of New York v. Regan				
Center for Environmental Health (CEH) et. al, v. EPA	9 th Circuit	21-	I I 4-DIOYANA EVAIDATION	2/1/21 Petition; Related to EDF
				Petition for Review (21-70162)
UAW v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	21-1057	1,4-Dioxane Evaluation	2/10/21 Petition for Review
	→ 9 th Circuit	→ 21-70930		

Cases (2)



New York et. al, v. EPA	9 th Circuit	21-70684	1,4-Dioxane Evaluation	3/22/21 Petition for Review
ACAT v. EPA	9 th Circuit	21-70168	DecaBDE Rule	1/27/21 <u>Petition</u> for Review
Yurok Tribe, et. al v. EPA	9 th Circuit	21-70670		3/19/21 <u>Petition</u> for Review
Center for Environmental Health, et. al, v. Regan	U.S. District Court N. District of CA → Transfer to U.S. District Court in NC → 4 th Circuit Appeal	4:21-cv-01535 → 22-00073 → 23-1467	PFAS TSCA Testing	3/3/21 <u>Complaint</u> for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief 2/1/22 Amended <u>Complaint</u>
Asbestos Disease Awareness Organization, et. al, v. EPA	U.S. District Court For The Northern District of California At San Francisco	21-cv-03716	Asbestos Evaluation	5/18/21 <u>Complaint</u>
Breast Cancer Prevention Partners et. al, v. EPA	U.S. District Court For The Northern District of California	21-cv-7360	Delayed Proposal to List Diisononyl Phthalate (DINP) on Toxics Release Inventory (TRI)	9/22/21 <u>Complaint</u>
Air-Conditioning, Heating, and Refrigeration Institute et al., v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	21-1196	PIP Rule Delay	10/1/21 Petition for Review
National PFAS Contamination Coalition et al., v. EPA	D.C. District Court	22-cv-00132	Reporting Loopholes in PFAS TRI Listing	1/20/22 <u>Complaint</u> for Injunctive Relief
Vinyl Institute, Inc., v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	22-1089	Test Order	5/23/22 Petition for Review
National Foam, Inc., v EPA	D.C. Circuit	22-1208	PFAS Test Order	8/15/22 <u>Petition</u> for Review

Cases (3)



TDCE Consortium v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	<u>22-1216</u>	TDCE Test Order	8/22/22 Petition for Review
Lanxess Corp, et al., v. EPA		22-2036	Test Order for <i>o</i> -dichlorobenzene	5/31/22 - Petition for Review
Denka Performance Elastomer LLC v. EPA	U.S. Dist. Ct. Eastern District of Louisiana	23-cv-00147	EPA Chloroprene Assessment	1/11/23 - <u>Complaint</u>
U.S. v. Inhance Technologies → Inhance Technologies v. U.S.	Dist. Ct. Eastern District of Pennsylvania → 5 th Circuit	22-cv-05055-JFM → 23-60620	SNUR Enforcement	12/19/22 <u>Complaint</u> 12/8/23 <u>Petition</u> in 5 th Cir.
DuPont de Nemours, Inc., v. EPA	3 rd Circuit	23-1444	PFAS Test Order	3/9/23 Petition for Review
Cherokee Concerned Citizens v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	23-1096	EPA Approval of Pyrolysis Chemicals	4/7/23 Petition for Review
Environmental Defense Fund v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	23-1166	TSCA Confidential Data Rule	6/29/23 <u>Petition</u> for Review 7/31/23 American Chemistry Council Motion to <u>Intervene</u> in Support of Respondents (EPA)

Cases (4)



U.S. District Court for D.C.	23-cv-2113	Peer Review of Formaldehyde IRIS Assessment	7/20/23 <u>Complaint</u> 9/15/23 – <u>Amended</u> Complaint
9 th Circuit	23-70158	TSCA Lead Wheel Weight Rule	8/22/23 – <u>Petition</u> for Writ of Mandamus
Dist. Ct. D.C.	23-2715	Past-Due TSCA Chemical	9/18/23 <u>Complaint</u> for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief
Dist. Ct. D.C.	23-3726	Evaluations	12/13/23 <u>Complaint</u> for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief
D.C. Circuit	23-1300	PCB Cleanup Rule	10/30/23 Petition for Review
11 th Circuit → 5 th Circuit	24-11206 → 24-60193	Ashastas Dula	4/18/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
D.C. Circuit → 5 th Circuit	24-1090 → 24-60193		4/19/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review of the Asbestos Rule
[[9 th Circuit Dist. Ct. D.C. Dist. Ct. D.C. D.C. Circuit 11 th Circuit → 5 th Circuit D.C. Circuit	9th Circuit 23-70158 Dist. Ct. D.C. 23-2715 Dist. Ct. D.C. 23-3726 D.C. Circuit 23-1300 11th Circuit 24-11206 \rightarrow 5th Circuit \rightarrow 24-60193 D.C. Circuit 24-1090	23-cv-2113 IRIS Assessment

Cases (5)



United Steel, Paper, and Forestry, Rubber, Manufacturing, Energy, Allied Industrial and Service Workers Int'l Union (USW) v. EPA	D.C. Circuit → 5 th Circuit	24-1089 → 24-60193		4/19/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
Texas Chemistry Council v. EPA	5 th Circuit	24-60193	1	4/19/24 Petition for Review
National Association of Chemical Distributors, et al., v EPA	D.C. Circuit	24-1127	Risk Management Program (RMP) Rule Update	5/10/24 Petition for Review
Worksafe, Inc. v. EPA	9 th Circuit → D.C. Circuit	24-3234 → 24-1202	TSCA Risk Evaluation Rule	5/21/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
USW v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	24-1151		5/21/24 Petition for Review
International Assoc. of Machinists and Aerospace Workers v. EPA	4 th Circuit → D.C. Circuit	24-1462 → 24-1182		5/21/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
Texas Chemistry Council and ACC v. EPA	5 th Circuit → D.C. Circuit	24-60257 → 24-1185		5/23/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers and American Petroleum Institute v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	24-1237		7/10/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
East Fork Enterprises, Inc. v. EPA	5 th Circuit	24-60256	2024 Methylene Chloride Rule	5/10/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
Sierra Club v. EPA	9 th Circuit → 5 th Circuit	24-3350 → 24-60256		5/28/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
ACC v. EPA	D.C. Circuit	24-1256	2024 Methylene Chloride Rule	7/19/24 <u>Petition</u> for Review
CEH and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) v. EPA	D.D.C.	24-2194	PFAS TSCA Rulemaking	7/25/24 <u>Complaint</u>

Where do I file my lawsuit?



- TSCA Judicial Review Provision Section 19 (15 USC 2618)
 - EPA rulemaking or certain TSCA orders (Section 4, 5(e), 5(f), 5(i))
 - DC Circuit Court of Appeals or
 - Federal Circuit Court where principal place of business is located
 - E.g., TSCA risk evaluation rule (4th, 5th, 9th, and DC Circuits)
 - E.g., Vinyl Inst. v. EPA (DC Cir. 22-1089) (112-TCE test order)
 - Section 6(b) low priority designation
 - DC Circuit Court of Appeals only

Where do I file my lawsuit (cont.)?



- TSCA Section 20 (15 USC 2619) citizens suit against non-EPA defendant
 - ♦ U.S. District Court where violation occurred or
 - U.S. District Court where the defendant has principal place of business
 - ♦ E.g., NGO suits alleging company failed to make required filings with EPA
- TSCA Section 20 citizens suit against EPA
 - ♦ U.S. District Court in DC <u>or</u>
 - U.S. District Court where the plaintiff is located
 - ♦ E.g., CEH et al. v. EPA (DDC 24-2194)

Where do I file my lawsuit (cont.)?



- TSCA Section 21 (15 USC 2620) citizens petition denial
 - ♦ U.S. District Court (28 USC 1391)
 - ♦ E.g., Food and Water Watch v. EPA (N.D. Cal. 17-02162)
- TSCA Section 16 (15 USC 2615) civil penalty appeal
 - DC Circuit Court of Appeals or
 - ♦ Federal Circuit Court where you are headquartered or transact business

How do I initiate my lawsuit?



- Federal circuit court of appeals
 - Petition for Review
 - Statement of Issues (DC Circuit)
 - E.g., National Foam v. EPA (DC Cir. 22-1208)
- Federal district court
 - ♦ Complaint
 - E.g., Cmty. In-Power v. EPA (DDC 23-2715)
 - E.g., ACC v. EPA (DDC 23-3726)

Injunction or Stay Order



- Four factors
 - Substantial likelihood of success on the merits
 - Irreparable harm (must be imminent)
 - E.g., Inhance Tech. v. U.S. (5th Cir. 23-60620)
 - Balance of equities
 - Prejudice to EPA
 - Potential harm to public interest
 - E.g., Inhance Tech. v. U.S. (5th Cir. 23-60620)
- Petition for EPA administrative stay first?
 - FRAP 18(a)(1) ("must ordinarily move first before the agency")

Intervention



- ◆ FRCP 24
 - Intervention as of right
 - Timely motion
 - Third party's rights will be impaired or impeded
 - Do existing parties adequately represent third party interests?
 - Permissive intervention
 - Timely motion
 - Third party shares a common question of law or fact with existing parties
 - Cannot unduly delay or prejudice existing parties
- ◆ FRAP 15
 - ♦ 30-day deadline
 - ♦ Courts generally follow FRCP 24
- E.g., East Fork Enter. v. EPA (5th Cir. 24-60256)

Merits Briefing and Amicus Briefs



- Merits briefs
 - Review typically limited to the administrative record
 - ♦ Court will not entertain post hoc agency rationale
 - No additional discovery or admission of evidence
 - No trial-like proceedings
 - Court decides on the briefs
- Amicus briefs ("friend of the court")
 - Not a party to the litigation
 - Provide additional context (e.g., point of law, impact on industry, etc.)
 - Cost-effective form of participation
 - ♦ FRAP 29 (file 7 days after merits brief)
 - E.g., Inhance Tech. v. U.S. (5th Cir. 23-60620) (KH coalition brief)

Additional Thoughts



- Build coalitions to reduce litigation costs
- Rely on amicus briefs to stake-out position
- Participate in public rulemaking comments to preserve arguments
- Consider impact of recent Supreme Court decisions
 - Loper Bright Enter. v. Raimondo (overruled Chevron doctrine)
 - Jarkesy v. SEC (Seventh Amendment right to jury)





Please join us at 1:00 PM Eastern U.S. Wednesday, Aug. 21, 2024 https://www.khlaw.com/OSHA3030



Please join us at 10:00 AM Eastern U.S. Wednesday, Aug. 28, 2024 https://www.khlaw.com/REACH-3030



Please join us at 1:00 PM Eastern U.S. Wednesday, Sept. 18, 2024 https://www.khlaw.com/TSCA-3030



Register Now!









Eric P. Gotting
Partner

Washington, DC +1 202.434.4269 gotting@khlaw.com



Herb Estreicher Partner

Washington, DC +1 202.434.4334 estreicher@khlaw.com