

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN**

JEFFREY PARKER, DONALD B. LOSEY,)
and SHELLEY WEATHERFORD,)
individually and on behalf of themselves, the)
GKN Group Retirement Savings Plan, and all)
others similarly situated,)

Plaintiffs,)

vs.)

GKN NORTH AMERICA SERVICES, INC.,)
BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF GKN NORTH)
AMERICA SERVICES, INC., and the)
BENEFIT COMMITTEE,)

Defendants.)

Case No. 2:21-cv-12468-SFC-JJCG

Hon. Sean F. Cox

Mag. Jonathan J.C. Grey

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION FOR LEAVE
TO PARTICIPATE AS *AMICUS CURIAE***

The Chamber’s proposed amicus brief will make a “clear and distinct” contribution to the issues before this Court. *Prairie Rivers Network v. Dynegy Midwest Generation, LLC*, 976 F.3d 761, 763 (7th Cir. 2020) (Scudder, J., in chambers). As the Chamber’s motion explained, the Chamber’s distinct vantage point, informed by its role representing thousands of members that maintain or provide services to ERISA-governed retirement plans, allows it to offer valuable context to the Court—context about ERISA’s text, history, and structure and context about the realities of plan management. Critically, “context” is precisely what the

Supreme Court has instructed lower courts to carefully consider when ruling on motions to dismiss in ERISA cases. *Hughes v. Northwestern Univ.*, 142 S. Ct. 737, 742 (2022). Plaintiffs' laundry list of reasons for why the Court should refuse to even consider this context is not persuasive.

Plaintiffs first attempt to position *all* district-court amicus briefs as improper. That is a nonstarter: It is well established that district courts "have broad discretion" to accept amicus briefs. *Auto. Club of N.Y., Inc. v. Port Auth. of N.Y. and N.J.*, 2011 WL 5865296, at *1 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 22, 2011); *see also United States ex rel. Fry v. Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati*, 2009 WL 485501, at *6 (S.D. Ohio Feb. 26, 2009) (recognizing that amicus participation is within "the sound discretion of the courts"). Countless district courts, including this one, have welcomed amicus participation. *E.g., Eshaki v. Whitmer*, 2021 WL 1192913, at *1 (E.D. Mich. Mar. 30, 2021); *Int'l Union, United Auto., Aerospace & Agric. Implement Workers of Am. v. McClelland*, 2020 WL 5834750, at *2 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 1, 2020).

Plaintiffs' efforts to portray the posture of this case as inappropriate for amicus participation fare no better. Amicus briefs are routinely accepted at the motion-to-dismiss stage, *see, e.g., United States v. U.S. Steel Corp.*, 2021 WL 860941, at *6 (N.D. Ind. Mar. 8, 2021); *Fed. Energy Regulatory Comm'n v. Vitol, Inc.*, 2020 WL 4586363, at *2 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2020), including from the Chamber itself, *see, e.g., United States v. DaVita Inc.*, No. 21-229 (D. Colo. Oct. 20, 2021), ECF No. 68;

United States v. Walgreen Co., No. 21-32 (W.D. Va. Sept. 9, 2021), ECF No. 22; *New York v. U.S. Dep’t of Labor*, No. 18-1747 (D.D.C. Nov. 9, 2018) (minute order); *Facebook, Inc. v. IRS*, No. 17-6490 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2018), ECF No. 25. Moreover, amicus briefs are routinely accepted over a party’s objection. *See, e.g.*, *Health Alliance of Greater Cincinnati*, 2009 WL 485501, at *6; *Pavek v. Simon*, 2020 WL 1467008, at *1 (D. Minn. Mar. 26, 2020); *Safari Club Int’l v. Harris*, 2015 WL 1255491, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2015); *Oberer Land Developers, Ltd. v. Beavercreek Township, Ohio*, 2006 WL 8442896, at *1 (W.D. Ohio Apr. 19, 2006); *Caremark, Inc. v. Goetz*, 395 F. Supp. 2d 683, 684 (M.D. Tenn. 2005).¹

Plaintiffs’ hyperbolic objections to the Chamber as supposedly engaging in “patently partisan” advocacy, advancing an “extreme pro-corporate agenda,” and turning the motion into a “political battleground,” Opp. 7, 10 (ECF No. 35), boil down to a complaint that the Chamber supports Defendants. But as Plaintiffs’ cited cases recognize, amici are frequently “interested in a particular outcome.” *Prairie Rivers Network*, 976 F.3d at 763 (granting the Chamber’s motion for leave to file). The relevant question is not whether the amicus supports a particular outcome, but rather whether the brief will “contribute in clear and distinct ways” to the Court’s

¹ Plaintiffs object (Opp. at 3 n.2) that the Chamber cites cases where the court granted leave with “paperless docket entries or one-page orders that lack reasoning or analysis for granting leave.” But the fact that courts grant leave in summary orders merely shows the routine nature of these motions.

analysis. *Id.*; see also *Neonatology Assocs., P.A. v. Comm’r of Internal Revenue*, 293 F.3d 128, 132 (3d Cir. 2002) (Alito, J.) (an amicus brief may assist the court by “explain[ing] the impact a potential holding might have on an industry or other group”) (internal quotation marks omitted). As a court in the Northern District of Illinois recently explained in permitting the Chamber to file an amicus brief and denying the plaintiffs’ motion for reconsideration of that decision in an excessive-fee case similar to this one, “the proposed amicus brief could provide the Court wi[th] a broader view of the impact of the issues raised in the case”—“an appropriate basis to allow amicus participation.” *Baumeister v. Exelon Corp.*, No. 21-6505 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 11, 2022), ECF No. 44; see also *Singh v. Deloitte*, No. 21-8458 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 14, 2022), ECF No. 41 (granting the Chamber’s motion for leave to file over the plaintiffs’ opposition); *Barcnas v. Rush Univ. Med. Ctr.*, No. 22-366 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 4, 2022), ECF No. 38 (same).²

On that core question, Plaintiffs offer no response. Indeed, it is not until the

² Plaintiffs point (at 3) to a recent decision in which the court denied the Chamber’s motion for leave, but Plaintiffs do not explain how one court’s exercise of its discretion to deny a motion for leave in any way should cabin *this Court’s* discretion to permit the filing of the Chamber’s brief, as five other courts have done. Moreover, currently pending before the Sixth Circuit are two separate cases involving the issue at the core of the Chamber’s brief—the standard for evaluating allegations of imprudence in an ERISA class action—and in both cases, the court has the benefit of the Chamber’s experience and views on the issue. See *Smith v. CommonSpirit Health*, No. 21-5964 (amicus brief filed Feb. 18, 2022), ECF No. 35; *Forman v. TriHealth, Inc.*, No. 21-3977 (amicus brief filed Apr. 14, 2022), ECF No. 34. There is no reason why this Court should decline to consider the same information here.

eighth item on Plaintiffs’ list that Plaintiffs suggest the Chamber’s proposed brief would not assist the Court in resolving the pending motion to dismiss, and even then Plaintiffs fail to engage with the content of the brief. *See* Opp. 9-10. As the Chamber explained, its proposed brief serves several functions courts have identified as useful: It “explain[s] the broader regulatory or commercial context” in which this case arises; “suppl[ies] empirical data informing” the issue on appeal; and “provid[es] practical perspectives on the consequences of particular outcomes.” *Prairie Rivers Network*, 976 F.3d at 763.³ The brief does all of this in service of contextualizing Plaintiffs’ allegations—as the Supreme Court has instructed courts to do under the pleading standard articulated in *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007), and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662 (2009). And while Defendants have their own representation, “[e]ven when a party is very well represented, an amicus may provide important assistance to the court.” *Neonatology Assocs.*, 293 F.3d at 132.

Plaintiffs’ sole response is that the brief “argues facts.” Opp. 8-9. Not so. Plaintiffs confuse providing factual *context* with litigating the veracity of the facts *of this particular case* as pleaded. A primary function of an amicus is to provide the

³ Moreover, while Plaintiffs argue (at 2, 7 & n.3) that amicus participation should be reserved for appellate cases, the brief does not explain why “practical perspective[.]” and a discussion of the “broader regulatory or commercial context” is somehow less helpful to district courts.

Court with additional industry context or other empirical or factual information that the parties could not themselves provide. *See Prairie Rivers*, 976 F.3d at 763. Here, the Chamber’s brief provides contextual information bearing on whether the assertions in Plaintiffs’ complaint are plausible and non-conclusory. That is why Plaintiffs’ cited decisions are inapplicable.

The only time Plaintiffs’ brief engages with the content of the Chamber’s argument, Plaintiffs mischaracterize the Chamber’s position. Plaintiffs suggest that the Supreme Court rejected the Chamber’s argument regarding the burdens of inappropriate ERISA litigation when it chose not to endorse a presumption of prudence in cases involving employee stock ownership plans. Opp. 11-12. Nowhere does the Chamber’s proposed brief suggest applying a presumption of this kind. Rather, it follows the precise test the Supreme Court announced—namely, that courts should undertake a “careful, context-sensitive scrutiny of a complaint’s allegations.” *Fifth Third Bancorp v. Dudenhoeffer*, 573 U.S. 409, 425 (2014); *see also Hughes*, 142 S. Ct. at 742; Proposed Amicus Br. (ECF No. 33-1) at 4-5, 7, 11. And given the Chamber’s extensive and varied experience with both retirement-plan management and ERISA litigation, the Chamber can offer a unique perspective on the shape that scrutiny should take here.

For these reasons and those stated in the motion for leave to file, the Chamber respectfully requests that the Court grant it leave to file the proposed amicus brief.

Dated: May 23, 2022

Jaime A. Santos
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP
1900 N Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 346-4000

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Eric Pelton

Eric J. Pelton (P40635)
David Porter (P76785)
KIENBAUM HARDY
VIVIANO PELTON & FORREST, P.L.C.
280 N. Old Woodward, Ste. 400
Birmingham, MI 48009
(248) 645-0000
epelton@khvpf.com
dporter@khvpf.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae the
Chamber of Commerce of the United
States of America*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan by using the court's CM/ECF system on May 23, 2022.

I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the court's CM/ECF system.

Dated: May 23, 2022

/s/ Eric J. Pelton

Eric J. Pelton (P40635)

David Porter (P76785)

KIENBAUM HARDY

VIVIANO PELTON & FORREST, P.L.C.

280 N. Old Woodward, Ste. 400

Birmingham, MI 48009

(248) 645-0000

epelton@khvpf.com

dporter@khvpf.com

*Counsel for Amicus Curiae the Chamber
of Commerce of the United States of
America*