Case: 11-2665 Document: 76-1 Page: 1 12/23/2011 482182 UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT 10

Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse 40 Foley Square, New York, NY 10007 Telephone: 212-857-8500

MOTION INFORMATION STATEMENT

Docket Number(s): <u>11-2665</u>	Caption [use short title]
Motion for: Leave to File Brief of Amicus Curiae	In re Barclays Bank PLC Securities Litigation
Set forth below precise, complete statement of relief sought:	
Leave to file an amicus curiae brief in support of	
the Defendants-Appellees seeking affirmance	
MOVING PARTY: Chamber of Commerce of the U.S. Plaintiff Appellant/Petitioner Appellee/Respondent	OPPOSING PARTY: Marshall Freidus, et al.
MOVING ATTORNEY: Richard D. Bernstein	OPPOSING ATTORNEY: Mark Solomon
Willkie Farr & Gallagher LLP [name of attorney, with firm] 1875 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006	, address, phone number and e-mail] <u>Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP</u> <u>655 West Broadway, Suite 1900</u> <u>San Diego, CA</u> 92101
(202) 303-1000; rbernstein@willkie.com	(619) 231-7423; marks@rgrdlaw.com
Court-Judge/Agency appealed from: U.S. District Court, Southerr Please check appropriate boxes: Has movant notified opposing counsel (required by Local Rule 27.1): Yes No (explain): Opposing counsel's position on motion: Unopposed Opposed Don't Know Does opposing counsel intend to file a response:	FOR EMERGENCY MOTIONS, MOTIONS FOR STAYS AND INJUNCTIONS PENDING APPEAL: Has request for relief been made below? Yes Has this relief been previously sought in this Court? Yes No Requested return date and explanation of emergency:
Yes No Don't Know	
Is oral argument on motion requested? □ Yes □ No (requested) Has argument date of appeal been set? □ Yes ☑ No If yes, etc.	ts for oral argument will not necessarily be granted)
Signature of Moving Attorney:	Has service been effected? Yes No [Attach proof of service]
	DRDER
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT the motion is GRANTED DENIED.	
	FOR THE COURT: CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE, Clerk of Court
Date:	_ By:

Form T-1080



(Docket Number in District Court: 1:09-cv-01989-PAC)

IN THE United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit

MARSHALL FREIDUS, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, STEWART THOMPSON and SHARON THOMPSON, Trustees for the S.O. Thompson Rev. Trust and the S.G. Thompson Rev. Trust, DORA L. MAHBOUBI,

Lead Plaintiffs-Appellants,

(caption continued on inside cover)

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MOTION OF THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF THE DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES SEEKING AFFIRMANCE

Robin S. Conrad Rachel L. Brand NATIONAL CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER, INC. 1615 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20062 (202) 463-5337 Richard D. Bernstein *Counsel of Record* WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP 1875 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 303-1000

Mei Lin Kwan-Gett Zheyao Li WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP 787 Seventh Avenue New York, NY 10019 (212) 728-8000

Counsel for Amicus Curiae The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America LARRY MORRISON, Individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, JEFFREY LEFCOURT, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, BEVERLY PELLEGRINI, on behalf of herself and all others similarly situated, ALFRED FAIT, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated,

---V.---

Consolidated Plaintiffs,

BARCLAYS BANK PLC, BARCLAYS PLC, MATTHEW WILLIAM BARRETT, JOHN SILVERSTER VARLEY, NAGUIB KHERAJ, ROBERT EDWARD DIAMOND, JR., SIR RICHARD BROADBENT, RICHARD LEIGH CLIFFORD, DAME SANDRA J.N DAWSON, SIR ANDREW LIKIERMAN, SIR NIGEL RUDD, STEPHEN GEORGE RUSSELL, JOHN MICHAEL SUNDERLAND, BARCLAYS CAPITAL SECURITIES LIMITED, CITIGROUP GLOBAL MARKETS INC., MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH, INCORPORATED, WACHOVIA CAPITAL MARKETS, LLC, MORGAN STANLEY & CO. INCORPORATED, UBS SECURITIES LLC, A.G. EDWARDS & SONS, INC., BNP PARIBAS SECURITIES CORP., GOLDMAN, SACHS & CO., KEYBANC CAPITAL MARKETS INC, RBC DAIN RAUSCHER INC., SUNTRUST CAPITAL MARKETS, INC., WELLS FARGO SECURITIES, LLC, MARCUS AGIUS, DR. CHRISTOPHER LUCAS, GARY A. HOFFMAN, FREDERIK SEEGERS, DAVID G. BOOTH, FULVIO CONTI, DANIEL CRONJE, BANC OF AMERICA SECURITIES LLC,

Defendants-Appellees.

RULE 26.1 CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America is not a publicly traded corporation. It has no parent corporation and no publicly traded corporation owns more than 10% of its stock.

Pursuant to Rule 29(b) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America ("Chamber") respectfully seeks leave to file a brief as *amicus curiae* in support of the Defendants-Appellees, seeking this Court's affirmance of the decision below.¹ The Chamber's proposed brief accompanies this motion.

The Chamber seeks leave to file a brief to address one particular issue that has potential implications far beyond this case. Plaintiffs-Appellants ("Plaintiffs") argue that statements made by Barclays Bank PLC ("Barclays") that are immaterial or at most statements of opinion gave rise to a duty to disclose all underlying facts that might lead someone to a different opinion or view. This unprecedented argument would routinely impact numerous businesses of many kinds that participate in the United States securities markets.

The Chamber is the Nation's largest federation of business companies and associations. It directly represents 300,000 members and indirectly represents the interests of over 3 million business, trade, and professional organizations of every size, in every sector, and from every region of the country. Over 96% of the Chamber's members are small businesses with 100 or fewer employees. An important function of the Chamber is to represent the interests of its members in

¹ The Plaintiffs-Appellants have not consented to the Chamber's filing of an *amicus* brief supporting affirmance.

matters before Congress, the Executive Branch, and the courts. To that end, the Chamber regularly files *amicus curiae* briefs in cases that raise issues of general concern to the nation's business community, such as those involving the federal securities laws, including *Pacific Investment Management Co. LLC v. Mayer Brown LLP*, 603 F.3d 144 (2d Cir. 2010), *Gearren v. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.*, 660 F.3d 605 (2d Cir. 2011), *Erica P. John Fund, Inc. v. Halliburton Co.*, 131 S. Ct. 2179 (2011), and *Stoneridge Investment Partners, LLC v. Scientific Atlanta, Inc.*, 552 U.S. 148 (2008).

Many of the Chamber's members are companies subject to the U.S. securities laws who would be directly and adversely affected if the Court were to hold that a statement that is immaterial or at most a statement of opinion gives rise to a duty to disclose all underlying facts that might cause a different person to reach a different opinion or view. While this particular case involves mortgagerelated assets, the limitless argument advocated by Plaintiffs would have broad ramifications for every company subject to the Securities Act of 1933 or the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The Chamber's proposed brief is "desirable" and "relevant to the disposition of the case," Fed. R. App. P. 29(b)(2), because it "alerts the merits panel to possible implications of the appeal." *Neonatology Assocs. v. Comm'r of Internal Revenue*, 293 F.3d 128, 133 (3d Cir. 2002) (Alito, J.). Plaintiffs propose that

-2-

general, subjective statements characterizing an issuer's business that are immaterial or at most opinions create a duty to disclose the size and financial results of particular business lines encompassed within the statements. Such a duty would be unprecedented and, if adopted, would vastly increase the litigation risk faced by numerous issuers in the U.S. securities markets, harming our competitiveness in an already volatile economic climate.

The Chamber's proposed *amicus* brief demonstrates that there is no principled basis to limit Plaintiffs' proposed bootstrap argument to cases involving subprime and other mortgage-related assets. If Plaintiffs' position were accepted, then any company's statement of opinion about its business could be a basis for suit for failing to itemize business lines or other factual details that might lead to a different opinion or view. For example, suppose a company had stated an opinion that its European "business is stable." It could later be sued with 20-20 hindsight for failure to disclose details about the size or financial results of every business line in every country in that region. A furniture company stating its opinion that its "business is stable" would be subject to suit for failure to disclose details of its sales of tables, chairs, beds, and every other component of its business. And so on for countless other industries.

For the reasons set forth herein, the Chamber's motion for leave to file the accompanying proposed *amicus* brief should be granted.

-3-

Dated: December 23, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Robin S. Conrad Rachel L. Brand NATIONAL CHAMBER LITIGATION CENTER, INC. 1615 H Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20062 (202) 463-5337 /s/ Richard D. Bernstein Richard D. Bernstein *Counsel of Record* WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP 1875 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 (202) 303-1000

Mei Lin Kwan-Gett Zheyao Li WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP 787 Seventh Avenue New York, NY 10019 (212) 728-8000

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

7258960

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE & CM/ECF FILING

11-2665-cv Freidus v. Barclays Bank PLC

I hereby certify that I caused the foregoing Motion of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America for Leave to File a Brief as *Amicus Curiae* in Support of Defendants-Appellees Seeking Affirmance to be served on counsel for Lead Plaintiffs-Appellants and Defendants-Appellees via Electronic Mail generated by the Court's electronic filing system (CM/ECF) with a Notice of Docket Activity pursuant to Local Appellate Rule 25.1:

David H. Braff Michael T. Tomaino, Jr. Adam T. Kirgis SULLIVAN & CROMWELL LLP 125 Broad Street New York, New York 10004

Jay B. Kasner Scott Musoff SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP 4 Times Square New York, New York 10036

Attorneys for Defendants-Appellees

Mark Solomon Andrew J. Brown Joseph D. Daley ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, California 92101

Samuel H. Rudman David A. Rosenfeld Mario Alba, Jr. ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP 58 South Service Road, Suite 200 Melville, New York 11747

Ramzi Abadou Eli R. Greenstein Stacey M. Kaplan Erik D. Peterson KESSLER TOPAZ MELTZER & CHECK, LLP 580 California Street, Suite 1750 San Francisco, California 94104

Attorneys for Lead Plaintiffs-Appellants I further certify that an electronic copy was uploaded to the Court's electronic filing system.

Dated: December 23, 2011

Notary Public: Sworn to me this

Notary Public, State of New York

December 23, 2011

No. 01HA6251181

John Hagel

Zheyao Li

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

JOHN WAGNER HAGEL Notary Public, State of New York No. 01HA6251181 Qualified in New York County Commission Expires Nov. 14, 2015

Qualified in New York County Commission Expires November 14, 2015