No. 16-283

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

SCOTT GILCHRIST,

Petitioner,

v.

NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE, *et al.*,

Respondents.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

BRIEF OF MILLER RESPONDENTS IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER

JOHN J. PENTZ
Counsel of Record
19 Widow Rites Lane
Sudbury, MA 01776
(978) 261-5725
jjpentz3@gmail.com

Attorney for Miller Respondents

268211

COUNSEL PRESS
(800) 274-3321 • (800) 359-6859

QUESTION PRESENTED

1. May a court approve a class action settlement of unripe and immature claims based upon undeveloped science?

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CITED AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

This appeal arises from the settlement of a class action lawsuit against the NFL by a class of retired NFL players for injuries caused by traumatic brain injury sustained while playing in the NFL. The centerpiece of this litigation when it was filed was the condition known as Chronic Traumatic Encephalopathy, or CTE, which was first discovered in the brain of former Pittsburgh Steeler Mike Webster, and is commonly referred to as the "industrial disease" of the NFL. Of the 93 former NFL players who have had their brains autopsied following their deaths, most were found to have evidence of CTE. App. 222.

Over the course of the litigation, Class Counsel, despite having alleged claims for personal injury related to CTE in the complaints, lost confidence in the viability of the CTE diagnosis, conceding that the science on CTE was too immature to support recovery for class members suffering from that condition. Rather than amending the class definition or deleting the CTE claims from the complaint, however, Class Counsel proceeded to settle those claims for no compensation, while obtaining recovery for other, rarer, conditions that are not exclusively associated with head trauma. Class Counsel explicitly conceded that this tradeoff had taken place, and that releasing all future CTE claims for no compensation had been traded for enhanced compensation for Alzheimer's, Parkinson's Disease and ALS. 3rd Circuit Appendix at p. 3860 ("Expanding the settlement to include CTE would have meant making cuts elsewhere, such as abandoning coverage for ALS, Alzheimer's Disease, or Parkinson's Disease.").

Respondents, along with many other class members, objected to the settlement on the grounds that it improperly releases the unripe CTE claims for no consideration, uses the unripeness of the CTE claims as the justification for their uncompensated release, and treats similarly situated class members differently based upon an arbitrary deadline for Death with CTE claims. The district court approved the settlement over these objections on April 22, 2015. App. 94. A panel of the Third Circuit affirmed the district court's decision on April 18, 2016. On June 1, 2016, the full Third Circuit denied rehearing *en banc*.

Compensated conditions ALS, Parkinsons and Alzheimers are, in the words of the District Court, "all well-defined and robustly studied conditions." App. 243. CTE, in contrast, is "nascent" and "in its infancy." App. 219-220. "The Court first determined that '[t]he study of CTE is nascent, and the symptoms of the disease, if any, are unknown.'" App. 75. Despite the fact that no living class member can state a claim for CTE, let alone a viable one, the District Court approved the settlement because it provides compensation for the other four conditions, and because some of the players whose brains showed signs of CTE *post-mortem* also reportedly suffered from one of the covered conditions. App. 76.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

I. Unripe Claims Based Upon Immature Science Are Not Appropriate For Class Settlement.

As the Fifth Circuit held in *Castano v. The American Tobacco Co.*, 84 F.3d 784 (5th Cir. 1996), a tort must be "mature" before it is appropriate for class resolution. "The

plaintiffs' claims are based on a new theory of liability and the existence of new evidence." *Id.* at 748.

> "Fairness may demand that mass torts with few prior verdicts or judgments be litigated first in smaller units even single-plaintiff, single-defendant trials until general causation, typical injuries, and levels of damages become established. Thus, "mature" mass torts like asbestos or Dalkon Shield may call for procedures that are not appropriate for incipient mass tort cases, such as those involving injuries arising from new products, chemical substances, or pharmaceuticals."

Id. at 748-749 (quoting MANUAL FOR COMPLEX LITIGATION §33.26).

Similarly, the Third Circuit held in 1998 that a factor to be considered in the approval of a class action settlement is "the maturity of the underlying substantive issue, as measured by experience in adjudicating individual actions, the development of scientific knowledge, the extent of discovery on the merits, and other factors that bear on the ability to assess the probable outcome of a trial on the merits..." *In re Prudential Ins. Co. Am. Sales Practices Litig.*, 148 F.3d 283, 323 (3rd Cir. 1998). The NFL Concussion Settlement violates every one of these prongs. There have been no individual CTE trials to create data points that can be used to assess the Settlement's denial of compensation for CTE. There has been no merits discovery. The science is, by everyone's admission and boasting, immature, "nascent," and in its "infancy." Indeed, "'the longitudinal epidemiological

studies necessary to build a robust clinical profile will still take a considerable amount of time.'" App. 78.

In *In re Diet Drugs Prods. Liab. Litig.*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12275 (E.D. PA 2000), on which the District Court in this case heavily relied, the court took pains to ensure that both the tort and the science underlying it were mature and sufficiently developed to guide a reasonable settlement matrix.

> In addition, the science underlying this litigation is sufficiently mature. While superiority concerns may exist where litigation involves a novel legal theory or where injuries have a considerable latency period or where there is inadequate evidence to support liability, causation and damages, none of those concerns exist here.

In re Diet Drugs Prods. Liab. Litig., 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 12275 at *172 (E.D. PA 2000).

In this case, the science could not be more immature or undeveloped, as the district court held, and the Panel recognized. "The Court first determined that 'the study of CTE is nascent, and the symptoms of the disease, if any, are unknown.'" App. 75. "At the time of the Court's decision, only about 200 brains with CTE had been examined, and the only way currently to diagnose CTE is a post-mortem examination of the subject's brain." *Id.* Again, as found by the Panel, the symptoms of CTE are "unknown," yet the claims of all class members for this yet unknown disease have been prospectively released.

More significantly, however, than Class Counsel being disarmed, the undeveloped nature of CTE science means that no living class member can state a claim for CTE. There are no ripe Article III claims for CTE among living NFL retirees.

Class members who have yet to be diagnosed with a concussion-related disease have suffered no injury caused by the NFL, and therefore cannot allege a claim for damages at this time. They lack Article III standing to sue the NFL, and therefore may not be included in a settlement class. "[T]he proceeding is a nonadversarial endeavor to impose on countless individuals without currently ripe claims an administrative compensation regime binding on those individuals if and when they manifest injuries... [E]xposure-only claimants lack standing to sue: Either they have not yet sustained any cognizable injury or, to the extent the complaint states claims and demands relief for emotional distress, enhanced risk of disease, and medical monitoring, the settlement provides no redress." *Amchem Prods. v. Windsor,* 521 U.S. 591, 612 (1997).

This Court did not reach the standing issues in *Amchem* because the Third Circuit had resolved the matter on a logically antecedent issue, but this Court did hold that "Rule 23's requirements must be interpreted in keeping with Article III constraints, and with the Rules Enabling Act." *Id.* at 613. This Court noted that if it had not reversed on certification, the jurisdictional and standing issues would "loom larger." *Id.* at n.15.

In this case, the Article III issue is even starker than it was in *Amchem*. At least in that case, the diseases of mesothelioma and asbestosis were well-defined,

diagnosable and supported by expert and scientific evidence. Here, in contrast, CTE is an entirely new and unexplored condition that is only in its infancy, as both the District Court and Panel recognized in their opinions. It is impossible for any living person to state a claim for CTE, because the condition may only be confirmed *post mortem*, and because the very symptoms of the condition are "unknown," in the words of the Panel. In this context, it was reversible error for Class Counsel to allege, and then release, thousands of claims for CTE when there is no adequate lead plaintiff suffering from the condition who can state a claim against the NFL for CTE.

Class Counsel alleged unripe claims for a disease that is only beginning to be studied, but may affect up to 75% of all former NFL players. Class Counsel then used CTE's scientific infancy *against* the class members by arguing that, because Plaintiffs could not prevail on a litigated CTE claim since the science was too new, it was fair to release the claims for no consideration (while obtaining consideration for other, more well-defined diseases). The District Court and the Court of Appeals Panel then adopted this reasoning, without considering the more fundamental implication that, if the claims for CTE would fail for lack of scientific and medical development and understanding, then they do not exist for purposes of Article III.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, this Court should GRANT Gilchrist's petition for writ of certiorari.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN J. PENTZ
Counsel of Record
19 Widow Rites Lane
Sudbury, MA 01776
(978) 261-5725
jjpentz3@gmail.com

Attorney for Miller Respondents
Cleo Miller, Judson Flint,
Elmer Underwood, Ken Jones,
Fred Smerlas, Jim Rourke,
Lou Piccone, James David Wilkins, II