Case 18-1170, Document 215, 01/24/2019, 2482009, Page1 of 2

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP

2001 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1047

TELEPHONE (202) 223-7300

LLOYD K. GARRISON (1946-1991) RANDOLPH E. PAUL (1946-1956) SIMON H. RIFKIND (1950-1995) (1927-1950)

LOUIS S. WEISS JOHN F. WHARTON (1927-1977)

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(202) 223-7321

WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

(202) 204-7393

WRITER'S DIRECT E-MAIL ADDRESS janderson@paulweiss.com 1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10019-6064 TELEPHONE (212) 373-3000

UNIT 5201, FORTUNE FINANCIAL CENTER 5 DONGSANHUAN ZHONGLU CHAOYANG DISTRICT, BEIJING 100020, CHINA TELEPHONE (86-10) 5828-6300

HONG KONG CLUB BUILDING, 12TH FLOOR 3A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL TELEPHONE (852) 2846-0300

> ALDER CASTLE 10 NOBLE STREET LONDON EC2V 7JU, UNITED KINGDOM TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1600

> FUKOKU SEIMEL BUILDING 2-2 UCHISAIWAICHO 2-CHOME CHIYODA-KU, TOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE 77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100 P.O. BOX 226 TORONTO, ONTARIO M5K 1J3 TELEPHONE (416) 504-0520

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, SUITE 200 POST OFFICE BOX 32 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032 TELEPHONE (302) 655-4410

January 24, 2019

BY ECF

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe Clerk of Court U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse 40 Foley Square New York, NY 10007

Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Healey, No. 18-1170 — Response to FRAP 28(j) Letter Re:

Dear Ms. Wolfe:

We write on behalf of Exxon Mobil Corporation ("ExxonMobil") in response to the letter submitted by the Massachusetts Attorney General on January 17, 2019. In that letter, the Attorney General notified this Court that the United States Supreme Court denied ExxonMobil's petition in a related case. Before the Supreme Court, ExxonMobil sought review of the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts's ruling that it could exercise personal jurisdiction over the company notwithstanding its limited contacts with Massachusetts.

The Supreme Court's decision not to hear ExxonMobil's challenge is irrelevant to the issues before this Court. Whether ExxonMobil is subject to personal

PARTNERS RESIDENT IN WASHINGTON

DAVID J. BALL J. STEVEN BAUGHMAN CRAIG A. BENSON JOSEPH J. BIAL PATRICK S. CAMPBELL ANDREW J. FORMAN KENNETH A. GALLO

ROBERTO J. GONZALEZ JONATHAN S. KANTER MARK F. MENDELSOHN JANE B. O'BRIEN ALEX YOUNG K. OH CHARLES F. "RICK" RULE

PARTNERS NOT RESIDENT IN WASHINGTON

PARTNERS NOT RESIDENT IN W
MATTHEW W. ABBOTT*
EDWARD T. ACKERMAN*
JACOB A. ADLERSTEIN*
ALLAN J. ARFFA
ROBERT A. ATKINS*
SCOTT A. BARSHAY*
P. AND ALLERSTEIN*
ALLAN J. ARFFA
ROBERT A. ATKINS*
SCOTT A. BARSHAY*
P. AND ALLERSTEIN*
ALLAN J. BARSHAY*
P. AND ALLERSTEIN*
AND ALLERSTEIN*
JOHN F. BALSAMAN*
LYNN B. BAYARD*
MITCHELL L. BERG*
MARK S. BERGMAN
DAVID M. BERNICK*
BRUCE BIRENBOIM*
H. CHRISTOPHER BOEHNING*
ANGEL W. BRITCHER
BUSANNA M. BUERGEL*
JESSICA S. CAREY*
JESSICA S. CAREY*
JEANETTE K. CHAN*
GEOFFREY R. CHEPIGA*
ELLEN N. CHING*
WILLIAM A. CLAREMAN*
LEWIS R. C. LAYTON
JAY COHEN
KELLEY A. CORNISH*
CHRISTOPHER J. CUMMINGS*
THOMAS V. DE LA BASTIDE III*
ARIEL J. DECKELBAUM*
ALICE BELISLE EATON*
ANDREW J. FIRLICH*
CESLIE GORDON FAGEN
ROBERT C. FISCH*
BRIAN P. FINNEGAN*
ROBERT C. FISCH*
MANUEL S. FREY*
ANDREW U. GAINES*
MICHAEL S. GREYZMAN*
ANDREW U. GAINES*
MICHAEL S. FREY*
ANDREW U. GOODALL*
ERIC GOODISON*
CATHERINE L. GOODALL*
ERIC GOODISON*
BRIAN S. GRIEVE*
ANDREW G. GORDON*
BRIAN S. GRIEVE* NEIL GOLDMAN*
CATHERINE L. GOODALL*
ERIC GOODISON*
CHARLES H. GOOGE, JR.*
ANDREW G. GORDON*
BRIAN S. GRIEVE*
UDI GROFMAN*
GANOMBRIDGE*
BRUCE. AGTENPLAN*
GAINES GWATHMEY, III*
ALAN S. HALPERIN*
JUSTIN G. HAMILL*
CLAUDIA HAMMERMAN*
BRIAN S. HERMANN*
MICHELE HIRSHMAN*
DAVID S. HUNTINGTON*
ALORETTA A. IPPOLITO*
JAREN JANGGNESANI*
BRIAN M. JANSON*
JEH C. JOHNSON
MEREDITH J. KANE*
BRAAD S. KARP*

PATRICK N. KARSNITZ*
JOHN C. KENNEDY*
BRIAN KIIPLER
KILEJ WIKLEIN*
ALAN W. KILEIN*
ALAN W. KILEIN*
ALAN W. KORNBERG
DANIEL J. KRAMER*
DAVID K. LAKHOHIR
STEPHEN P. LAMB*
JOHN E. LANGE*
GREGORY F. LAUFER*
MARCO V. ANDOTTI*
EDWIN S. MAYNARD*
JEFFREY D. MARELL*
MARCO V. MASOTTI*
EDWIN S. MAYNARD*
JEFFREY D. MARELL*
MARCO V. MASOTTI*
EDWIN S. MAYNARD*
LIZABETH R. MCCOLM*
ALVARO MEMBRILLERA*
CLAUDINE MEREDIH-SOUJON*
WILLEABETH R. MCCOLM*
ALVARO MEMBRILLERA*
CLAUDINE MEREDIH-SOUJON*
WILLEABETH R. MCCOLM*
ALVARO MEMBRILLERA*
CLAUDINE MEREDIH-SOUJON*
WALTER G. SHORTELL*
CATHERINE NYARADY*
BRAD R. OKUN*
KELLEY D. PARKER*
LINDSAY B. PARKER*
LINDSAY B. PARKER*
VALERIE E. RADWANER*
CARL L. RE BNER*
WALTER G. RICCIARDI*
WALTER

*NOT AN ACTIVE MEMBER OF THE DC BAR

Catherine O'Hagan Wolfe, Clerk

2

jurisdiction in Massachusetts was neither raised in this appeal nor in the District Court. Nevertheless, the Attorney General claims the denial of certiorari should be deemed relevant because it confirms that the state court ruling precludes the claims raised in this appeal. That is incorrect. ExxonMobil has never asserted that Supreme Court review might deprive the state court's ruling of preclusive force.

To the contrary, as argued at pages 53–61 of ExxonMobil's opening brief and pages 30–37 of its reply, ExxonMobil contends that res judicata does not bar its claims against the Attorney General because the limited-purpose state court proceedings did not reach and were incapable of entertaining any of the constitutional claims asserted in this earlier-filed action. It is undisputed that the state court never adjudicated ExxonMobil's constitutional claims, expressly stating it would "not address Exxon's arguments regarding free speech." (JA-1017 n.2.) Nor was ExxonMobil afforded a full and fair opportunity to litigate its constitutional claims in the summary state court proceedings, which merely allowed ExxonMobil to test the validity of the civil investigative demand under state law. Hence, in the absence of a "final judgment on the merits," the Attorney General cannot establish the elements for claim preclusion. *See Kobrin* v. *Bd. of Registration in Med.*, 444 Mass. 837, 843 (2005).

Because the Supreme Court, like the Massachusetts state courts, did not consider the constitutional claims presented in this case, the Supreme Court's denial of certiorari does not bolster the Attorney General's position.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Justin Anderson Justin Anderson

cc: All counsel of record (by ECF)