ALSTON&BIRD LLP

WWW.ALSTON.COM



Class Action Litigation/Antitrust ADVISORY •

AUGUST 19, 2013

Applying Comcast Corp. v. Behrend, D.C. Circuit Derails Freight Surcharge Class

Last term, in *Comcast Corp. v. Behrend*, 133 S. Ct. 1426 (2013), the Supreme Court made clear that class certification is inappropriate if the plaintiffs' injury model does not fit their liability theory.

Two weeks ago, in *In re Rail Freight Fuel Surcharge Antitrust Litigation*, No. 12-7085 (D.C. Cir. Aug. 9, 2013), the D.C. Circuit applied *Behrend* to vacate class certification because the plaintiffs' injury model was not tailored to their alleged harm. The ruling could be a sign of things to come.

In Fuel Surcharge, the district court certified the class despite a potentially fatal flaw in the plaintiffs' statistical models.

In *Fuel Surcharge*, shippers who use railroads to ship items allege that a number of railroads conspired to fix fuel surcharge rates. The shippers moved for class certification based on expert regression models that purportedly measured antitrust impact across the putative class, but as the railroads' expert pointed out, the plaintiffs' models produced a number of "false positives" because it "detect[ed] injury where none could exist." The plaintiffs' expert conceded the flaw, but the district court nevertheless certified the class because, in its view, the plaintiffs' regression models were "plausible." The court didn't address the flaw in the plaintiffs' statistical models.

Applying *Behrend*, the D.C. Circuit vacated class certification because the district court ignored the flaw in the plaintiffs' statistical models, and that flaw went to whether there was common proof of classwide injury.

The D.C. Circuit vacated the district court's class-certification order, emphasizing that, after *Behrend*, "[i]t is now clear... that Rule 23 not only authorizes a hard look at the soundness of statistical models that

This advisory is published by Alston & Bird LLP to provide a summary of significant developments to our clients and friends. It is intended to be informational and does not constitute legal advice regarding any specific situation. This material may also be considered attorney advertising under court rules of certain jurisdictions.

¹ In re Rail Freight Fuel Surcharge Antitrust Litig. at slip op. 13.

² *Id.* at slip op. 7–8.

WWW.ALSTON.COM 2

purport to show predominance—the rule *commands* it."³ Because the district court ignored the admitted flaw in the plaintiffs' regression models, the appellate court reasoned, class certification could not stand:

As we see it, *Behrend* sharpens the defendants' critique of the damages model as prone to false positives. It is now indisputably the role of the district court to scrutinize the evidence before granting certification, even when doing so "requires inquiry into the merits of the claim." If the damages model cannot withstand this scrutiny then, that is not just a merits issue. [The regression] models are essential to the plaintiffs' claim they can offer common evidence of classwide injury. *No damages model, no predominance, no class certification.*⁴

Fuel Surcharge proves that Behrend has bite—some takeaways.

Fuel Surcharge is significant because it is the first circuit decision strongly applying *Behrend*. Here are some takeaways from the decision:

- After Behrend, we predicted that many speculative or unreasonable damages models that would have
 passed muster before Behrend will fall by the wayside after the decision. Fuel Surcharge evidences
 that trend.
- *Fuel Surcharge* will further encourage defendants to make *Behrend*-type arguments in *Daubert* motions. In some respects, *Behrend* is *Daubert* by another name, so it's only natural that class defendants will start to use *Behrend* alongside *Daubert* in Rule 702 attacks on admissibility.
- *Fuel Surcharge*, like *Behrend*, is an antitrust case, but neither case's reasoning is confined to the antitrust context. On the contrary, both *Behrend* and *Fuel Surcharge* speak generally of the need for rigorous analysis of statistical models at the class-certification stage. Every class plaintiff must demonstrate that common evidence is available to prove that each putative class member suffered injury.
- In rejecting the district court's analysis, the D.C. Circuit noted that "the district court looked to cases from other circuits suggesting that false positives do not indict the viability of a class, since '[c]lass certification is not precluded simply because a class may include persons who have not been injured by the defendant's conduct." (Citing cases from the Fifth and Seventh Circuits.) *Fuel Surcharge* makes it hard for class plaintiffs in the D.C. Circuit to argue for certification of classes full of uninjured people.

³ *Id.* at slip op. 18 (emphasis added).

⁴ *Id.* at slip op. 15 (emphasis added).

To receive similar advisories in the future, please go to **Class Action Litigation Advisories** or **Antitrust Advisories**. Be sure to put "subscribe" in the subject line.

If you have any questions or would like additional information, please contact your Alston & Bird attorney or any of the following:

Randall L. Allen randall.allen@alston.com 404.881.7196

Joshua L. Becker joshua.becker@alston.com 404.881.4732

Debra D. Bernstein debra.bernstein@alston.com 404.881.4476

Adam J. Biegel adam.biegel@alston.com 404.881.4692

Teresa T. Bonder teresa.bonder@alston.com 404.881.7369

Brian D. Boone 704.444.1106 brian.boone@alston.com

Kristine McAlister Brown kristy.brown@alston.com 404.881.7584

Lisa R. Bugni lisa.bugni@alston.com 404.881.4959

Gidon M. Caine gidon.caine@alston.com 650.838.2060 Stephanie D. Clouston stephanie.clouston@alston.com 214.922.3403

Charles W. Cox 213.576.1048 charles.cox@alston.com

John R. Crews john.crews@alston.com 214.922.3408

Cari K. Dawson cari.dawson@alston.com 404.881.7766

Derin B. Dickerson derin.dickerson@alston.com 404.881.7454

Daniel F. Diffley dan.diffley@alston.com 404.881.4703

Michael J. Hartley michael.hartley@alston.com 213.576.1004

Frank A. Hirsch, Jr. frank.hirsch@alston.com 919.862.2278

Susan E. Hurd susan.hurd@alston.com 404.881.7572 John A. Jordak, Jr. john.jordak@alston.com 404.881.7868

William H. Jordan bill.jordan@alston.com 404.881.7850

Michael P. Kenny mike.kenny@alston.com 404.881.7179

J. Thomas Kilpatrick tom.kilpatrick@alston.com 404.881.7819

Peter Kontio peter.kontio@alston.com 404.881.7172

Peter E. Masaitis peter.masaitis@alston.com 213.576.1094

Matthew P. McGuire matt.mcguire@alston.com 919.862.2279

Andrew E. Paris drew.paris@alston.com 213.576.1119

Michele A. Powers michele.powers@alston.com 213.576.1030 Tiffany L. Powers tiffany.powers@alston.com 404.881.4249

Matthew D. Richardson matt.richardson@alston.com 404.881.4478

Jon G. Shepherd jon.shepherd@alston.com 214.922.3418

Brian Stimson brian.stimson@alston.com 404.881.4972

Kyle G.A. Wallace kyle.wallace@alston.com 404.881.7808

Jonathan E. Wells jonathan.wells@alston.com 404.881.7472

Amber C. Wessels amber.wessels@alston.com 212.210.9594

ALSTON&BIRD LLP _

WWW.ALSTON.COM

© ALSTON & BIRD LLP 2013

ATLANTA: One Atlantic Center ■ 1201 West Peachtree Street ■ Atlanta, Georgia, USA, 30309-3424 ■ 404.881.7000 ■ Fax: 404.881.7777

BRUSSELS: Level 20 Bastion Tower ■ Place du Champ de Mars ■ B-1050 Brussels, BE ■ +32 2 550 3700 ■ Fax: +32 2 550 3719

CHARLOTTE: Bank of America Plaza ■ 101 South Tryon Street ■ Suite 4000 ■ Charlotte, North Carolina, USA, 28280-4000 ■ 704.444.1000 ■ Fax: 704.444.1111

DALLAS: 2828 North Harwood Street ■ 18th Floor ■ Dallas, Texas, USA, 75201 ■ 214.922.3400 ■ Fax: 214.922.3899

LOS ANGELES: 333 South Hope Street ■ 16th Floor ■ Los Angeles, California, USA, 90071-3004 ■ 213.576.1000 ■ Fax: 213-576-1100

NEW YORK: 90 Park Avenue ■ 12th Floor ■ New York, New York, USA, 10016-1387 ■ 212.210.9400 ■ Fax: 212.210.9444

RESEARCH TRIANGLE: 4721 Emperor Blvd. ■ Suite 400 ■ Durham, North Carolina, USA, 27703-85802 ■ 919.862.2200 ■ Fax: 919.862.2260

SILICON VALLEY: 275 Middlefield Road ■ Suite 150 ■ Menlo Park, California, USA, 94025-4004 ■ 650-838-2000 ■ Fax: 650.838.2001

WASHINGTON, DC: The Atlantic Building ■ 950 F Street, NW ■ Washington, DC, USA, 20004-1404 ■ 202.756.3300 ■ Fax: 202.756.3333

VENTURA COUNTY: 2801 Townsgate Road ■ Suite 215 ■ Westlake Village, California, USA, 91361 ■ 805.497.9474 ■ Fax: 805.497.8804