## UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL on MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

## IN RE: LOUISIANA COASTAL ZONE LAND LOSS LITIGATION

MDL No. 2856

#### **ORDER DENYING TRANSFER**

**Before the Panel:**<sup>\*</sup> Certain energy company defendants<sup>1</sup> move under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to centralize pretrial proceedings in this litigation in the Eastern District of Louisiana. The litigation consists of 41 actions, 29 in the Eastern District of Louisiana and 12 in the Western District of Louisiana, as listed on Schedule A. The Panel has been notified of one additional action involving related issues, which is pending in the Eastern District of Louisiana.

Responding plaintiffs the Parishes of Plaquemines, Jefferson, Cameron, and St. Bernard, and District Attorneys Keith Stutes and Bridget Dinvaut oppose centralization, as do plaintiff-intervenors the State of Louisiana, through the Department of Natural Resources, Office of Coastal Management, and its Secretary, Thomas F. Harris, and the State of Louisiana *ex rel*. Jeff Landry, Attorney General. Defendant Cox Operating, L.L.C., supports centralization in the Eastern District of Louisiana.

On the basis of the papers filed and the hearing session held, we conclude that centralization is not necessary for the convenience of the parties and witnesses or to further the just and efficient conduct of this litigation. The 41 actions broadly implicate certain common factual questions concerning the reasons why five Louisiana parishes (Plaquemines, Cameron, Jefferson, St. Bernard, and Vermilion) have been experiencing coastal land loss and other damage, and more specifically, the extent, if any, to which defendants' oil and gas exploration, production, and transportation

<sup>\*</sup> Judges Sarah S. Vance and Lewis A. Kaplan took no part in the decision of this matter. Certain other Panel members have interests that normally would disqualify them under 28 U.S.C. § 455 from participating in the decision of this matter. Accordingly, the Panel invoked the Rule of Necessity, and those members participated in the decision of this matter in order to provide the forum created by the governing statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1407. *See In re Adelphia Commc 'ns Corp. Sec. & Derivative Litig. (No. II)*, 273 F. Supp. 2d 1353 (J.P.M.L. 2003); *In re Wireless Tel. Radio Frequency Emissions Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 170 F. Supp. 2d 1356, 1357-58 (J.P.M.L. 2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Moving defendants are Chevron U.S.A., Inc., Chevron U.S.A. Holdings Inc., The Texas Company, The Union Oil Company of California, Chevron Pipe Line Company, ConocoPhillips Company, Burlington Resources Oil & Gas Company LP, The Louisiana Land and Exploration Company LLC, Exxon Mobil Corporation, Mobil Oil Exploration & Producing Southeast, Inc., Atlantic Richfield Company, BP America Production Company, and BP Products North America Inc.

### -2-

activities in those parishes have contributed to that loss. But each action involves oil and gas operations conducted in a different "Operational Area," and is brought against a different cast of defendants. Moving defendants do not contend that the various oil and gas fields in these Operational Areas were developed at the same time or operated in the same manner. Similarly, defendants do not assert that other possible causes of land loss and damage are the same from Operational Area to Operational Area. Although issues concerning federal and state regulation of the oil and gas industry and certain industry practices may be common across the actions, the nature of these cases suggests that most pretrial proceedings, particularly discovery, will be largely individualized.

Aside from the preponderance of individualized issues, centralization under Section 1407 does not appear necessary. Plaintiffs and plaintiff-intervenors represent that they are amenable to Section 1404 transfer of the Western District of Louisiana cases to the Eastern District of Louisiana for possible consolidation. Even if such transfer is not administratively practicable, as defendants contend, the 41 cases are pending in two adjacent districts. Informal coordination by the involved courts and cooperative efforts by counsel thus should be feasible to avoid or minimize duplicative pretrial proceedings.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the motion for centralization of these actions is denied.

PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

arjorie O. Rendell Acting Chair

Charles R. Breyer R. David Proctor Ellen Segal Huvelle Catherine D. Perry

# IN RE: LOUISIANA COASTAL ZONE LAND LOSS LITIGATION

MDL No. 2856

## **SCHEDULE A**

Eastern District of Louisiana

PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. ROZEL OPERATING COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05189
JEFFERSON PARISH, ET AL. v. DESTIN OPERATING COMPANY, INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05206
PARISH OF PLAQUEMINES, ET AL. v. HILCORP ENERGY COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05210
JEFFERSON PARISH, ET AL. v. ANADARKO E&P ONSHORE, LLC, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05213
PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. EXCHANGE OIL & GAS CORPORATION,
ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05215
PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. RIVERWOOD PRODUCTION COMPANY, INC.,
ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05217
PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. JUNE ENERGY, INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05218
PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. CHEVRON U.S.A., INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05220
ST. BERNARD PARISH, ET AL. v. ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05222
JEFFERSON PARISH, ET AL. v. CHEVRON U.S.A. HOLDINGS, INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05224
PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. GREAT SOUTHERN OIL & GAS CO., INC., ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05227
PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. NORTHCOAST OIL COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05228
PLAQUEMINES, ET AL. v. CONOCOPHILLIPS COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05230
PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. LINDER OIL COMPANY, ET AL.,
C.A. No. 2:18-05231
PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. DEVON ENERGY PRODUCTION COMPANY,
L.P., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05234 PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. GOODRICH PETROLEUM COMPANY, LLC,
ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05238
PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. APACHE OIL CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05240
JEFFERSON PARISH, ET AL. v. EQUITABLE PETROLEUM CORPORATION,
ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05242

- A2 -

### MDL No. 2856 Schedule A (Continued)

JEFFERSON PARISH v. ATLANTIC RICHFIELD COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05246 JEFFERSON PARISH v. CANLAN OIL COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05252 PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. TOTAL PETROCHEMICALS & REFINING USA, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05256 JEFFERSON PARISH v. EXXON MOBIL CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05257 PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. BEPCO, L.P., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05258 PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. PALM ENERGY OFFSHORE, L.L.C., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05259 PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. HELIS OIL & GAS COMPANY, LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05260 PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. CASKIDS OPERATING COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05262 PLAQUEMINES PARISH v. HHE ENERGY COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05263 PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. CAMPBELL ENERGY CORPORATION, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05264 PLAQUEMINES PARISH, ET AL. v. LLOG EXPLORATION & PRODUCTION COMPANY, LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-05265 Western District of Louisiana CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. AUSTER OIL & GAS, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00677

- CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. BALLARD EXPLORATION CO., INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00678
- CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. BRAMMER ENGINEERING, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00679
- CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. BURLINGTON RESOURCES OIL & GAS CO. LP, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00682
- CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. ALPINE EXPLORATION COMPANIES, INC., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00684
- CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. BAY COQUILLE, INC., ET AL.,
  - C.A. No. 2:18-00685
- CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00686
- CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. BP AMERICA PRODUCTION COMPANY, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00687
- CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. APACHE CORP. OF DELAWARE, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00688

- A3 -

## MDL No. 2856 Schedule A (Continued)

CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. ANADARKO E & P ONSHORE LLC, ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00689
CAMERON PARISH, ET AL. v. BEPCO, L.P., ET AL., C.A. No. 2:18-00690
STUTES, ET AL. v. GULFPORT ENERGY CORP., ET AL., C.A. No. 6:18-00691