



FEBRUARY 2019

VOL. 19-2

PRATT'S

ENERGY LAW

REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: FUSION

Victoria Prussen Spears

CAPITAL AND R&D SUPPORT EMERGING FOR PRIVATE FUSION ENERGY DEVELOPMENT, BUT QUESTIONS REMAIN AS FUSION SECTOR EVOLVES

Barton J. Gordon, Tim L. Peckinpaugh, R. Paul Stimers, Michael L. O'Neill, and Kristen A. Berry

FERC ADDRESSES ADIT IN LIGHT OF DECREASE TO FEDERAL CORPORATE INCOME TAX RATE

Kenneth G. Jaffe, Sean A. Atkins, Michael N. Kunselman, Andrea Wolfman, and Michael Kellermann

FEDERAL CIRCUIT SAYS PORTION OF PURCHASE PRICE FOR WIND FARMS MAY BE ALLOCABLE TO INTANGIBLES, REVERSING COURT OF CLAIMS

Scott W. Cockerham, Christopher Saki, Brandon Short, and Angela R. Russo

TEXAS FEDERAL JUDGE TURNS UP THE HEAT ON OIL COMPANIES FACING CLIMATE CHANGE-RELATED SECURITIES CLASS ACTIONS

Paul R. Bessette, Michael J. Biles, and Jessica England

WILL INCREASING FUEL ECONOMY STANDARDS REALLY MAKE CARS LESS SAFE? NHTSA AND THE EPA'S PROPOSAL TO FREEZE FUEL ECONOMY STANDARDS AT 2020 LEVELS

Richard A. Wilhelm

Pratt's Energy Law Report

VOLUME 19

NUMBER 2

FEBRUARY 2019

Editor's Note: Fusion

Victoria Prussen Spears 35

Capital and R&D Support Emerging for Private Fusion Energy Development, But Questions Remain as Fusion Sector Evolves

Barton J. Gordon, Tim L. Peckinpugh, R. Paul Stimers,
Michael L. O'Neill, and Kristen A. Berry 37

FERC Addresses ADIT in Light of Decrease to Federal Corporate Income Tax Rate

Kenneth G. Jaffe, Sean A. Atkins, Michael N. Kunselman, Andrea Wolfman,
and Michael Kellermann 47

Federal Circuit Says Portion of Purchase Price for Wind Farms May Be Allocable to Intangibles, Reversing Court of Claims

Scott W. Cockerham, Christopher Saki, Brandon Short, and Angela R. Russo 51

Texas Federal Judge Turns Up the Heat on Oil Companies Facing Climate Change-Related Securities Class Actions

Paul R. Bessette, Michael J. Biles, and Jessica England 56

Will Increasing Fuel Economy Standards Really Make Cars Less Safe? NHTSA and the EPA's Proposal to Freeze Fuel Economy Standards at 2020 Levels

Richard A. Wilhelm 60

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please email:

Jacqueline M. Morris at (908) 673-1528
Email: jacqueline.m.morris@lexisnexis.com
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385
Fax Number (800) 828-8341
Customer Service Website <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call
Your account manager or (800) 223-1940
Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print)
ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook)
ISSN: 2374-3395 (print)
ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT’S ENERGY LAW REPORT [page number]
(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);
Ian Coles, *Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea*, 14 PRATT’S ENERGY
LAW REPORT 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc. Copyright © 2019 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SAMUEL B. BOXERMAN

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

ANDREW CALDER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

M. SETH GINTHER

Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.

STEPHEN J. HUMES

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

R. TODD JOHNSON

Partner, Jones Day

BARCLAY NICHOLSON

Partner, Norton Rose Fulbright

BRADLEY A. WALKER

Counsel, Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC

ELAINE M. WALSH

Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

SEAN T. WHEELER

Partner, Latham & Watkins LLP

Hydraulic Fracturing Developments

ERIC ROTHENBERG

Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2019 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 646.539.8300. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house energy counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in energy-related environmental preservation, the laws governing cutting-edge alternative energy technologies, and legal developments affecting traditional and new energy providers. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Pratt's Energy Law Report, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 121 Chanlon Road, North Building, New Providence, NJ 07974.

Texas Federal Judge Turns Up the Heat on Oil Companies Facing Climate Change-Related Securities Class Actions

*By Paul R. Bessette, Michael J. Biles, and Jessica England**

In the first climate-change related securities class action against a major oil and gas company, the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas issued a surprisingly shareholder-friendly opinion denying a motion to dismiss filed by Exxon Mobil Corporation. The authors of this article discuss the decision and offer lessons for oil and gas companies that can be used to avoid future challenges by shareholders to oil and gas reserve estimates.

The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas issued a surprisingly shareholder-friendly opinion denying a motion to dismiss filed by Exxon Mobil Corporation.¹ The shareholders alleged that Exxon and its management team (including Rex Tillerson) made material false statements concerning Exxon's oil and gas reserves to maintain its stellar credit rating and secure a \$12 billion debt offering on favorable terms. Specifically, the shareholder plaintiffs alleged that Exxon applied a proxy carbon cost when evaluating investment and business decisions that underestimated the actual costs of government policy changes on climate-related control.

Plaintiffs also alleged that as the price of oil and gas declined in 2014, Exxon did not follow other oil and gas companies and reduce (or "de-book") its oil and gas reserves. Rather, Exxon falsely assured investors that it had superior investment processes and project management that allowed it to profitably extract its oil and gas assets. According to plaintiffs, the market learned the truth about these misstatements through a series of partial disclosures that concerned potential and actual reductions to Exxon's proved oil and gas reserves.

WHY IS THE DECISION IMPORTANT?

The opinion is important because it is the first climate-change related securities class action against a major oil and gas company. It is also significant

* Paul R. Bessette (pbessette@kslaw.com) is a partner at King & Spalding LLP defending companies and individuals in securities and shareholder litigation, as well as in SEC investigations and enforcement actions. Michael J. Biles (mbiles@kslaw.com) is a partner at the firm focusing on securities litigation in federal and state courts. Jessica England (jengland@kslaw.com) is an associate at the firm focusing on complex commercial disputes.

¹ See *Ramirez v. Exxon Mobil Corp., et al.*, Civ. No. 3:16-CV-3111-K.

because it departs from opinions of numerous federal courts that have refused to uphold securities claims based on the allegation that an oil company should have de-booked reserves sooner than it did—most courts recognize that estimating oil and gas reserves is inherently subjective and requires a substantial amount of technical judgment.² The Northern District of Texas allowed these claims to proceed because plaintiffs sufficiently alleged at the pleading stage that the proxy carbon cost that Exxon used in its public statements and disclosures was different and higher than the one the company was using internally.

THE DECISION

The district court disagreed with Exxon that its statements concerning its oil and gas reserves were statements of opinion, which under the U.S. Supreme Court’s ruling in *Omnicare, Inc. v. Laborers Dist. Council Constr. Indus. Pension Fund*,³ would require the plaintiff to allege facts demonstrating that the defendants subjectively did not believe their opinions about reserves. Citing *Barre v. Intervoice-Brite, Inc.*,⁴ a case that predates *Omnicare* by 10 years, the district court held that *Omnicare* does not apply to alleged violations of generally accepted accounting principles (“GAAP”). On this point, the Northern District of Texas is more shareholder friendly than the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, which held that estimates of goodwill reserves were opinions and must satisfy *Omnicare*’s heightened “subjective knowledge” standard.⁵

The district court’s opinion in *Ramirez v. Exxon Mobil Corp.* is also strikingly pro-shareholder in its conclusion that Exxon’s forward-looking statements made in 2016 that extended low oil prices might result in a de-booking of proved oil reserves were not protected by the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (“PSLRA”) safe harbor or the bespeaks caution doctrine. The court agreed with plaintiffs that Exxon’s cautionary language was inadequate and that plaintiffs sufficiently alleged facts showing that Exxon knew that a de-booking of its reserves was “all but certain.” This holding is surprising because Exxon’s SEC

² See e.g., *Truk Int’l Fund LP v. Wehlmann*, 737 F. Supp. 2d 611, 624–25 (N.D. Tex. 2009) (dismissing the claim because “a reasonable investor would have recognized the speculative and uncertain nature of the formulation of estimates of proved reserves”); *In re China N. E. Petroleum Holdings Ltd. Sec. Litig.*, No. 10 CIV. 4577 MGC, (S.D.N.Y. Dec. 10, 2014) (dismissing the claim because of a lack of scienter and recognizing the “numerous uncertainties inherent in estimating quantities of proved reserves”).

³ — U.S. —, 135 S. Ct. 1318, 1327 (2015).

⁴ 397 F. 3d 249, 257 (5th Cir. 2005).

⁵ See *City of Dearborn Heights Act 345 Police & Fire Retirement Sys. v. Align Tech., Inc.*, 856 F.3d 605, 618 (9th Cir. 2017).

filings contained fairly detailed cautionary language of the events that could cause a reduction in reserves and expressly warned that a de-booking was possible.

The district court also rejected Exxon's argument that it was not required to update its proved oil reserves during interim periods—U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission ("SEC") regulations⁶ only requires annual updates of oil and gas reserves. The district court held that "other provisions" under GAAP⁷ require companies to update proved reserves in interim financial reports when "adverse events significantly affect proved reserves." Interestingly, the district court did not identify the "adverse events" that should have caused Exxon to revise reserves during interim financial periods.

On the element of scienter, the district court concluded that plaintiffs adequately alleged a "strong inference" of fraudulent intent based on internal documents reviewed by Exxon's management committee that showed that the internal "proxy cost" for carbon regulations was much lower than what the company stated publicly. The district court, however, significantly departed from most federal courts in its analysis of plaintiffs' motive allegations.

Specifically, the court concluded that Exxon's motive to maintain its high credit rating and to conduct a large debt offering was sufficient to support "a strong inference of scienter as to all defendants." This conclusion stands in sharp contrast with numerous federal courts that have concluded that such generalized motives are insufficient to plead scienter under the PSLRA.⁸

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Unfortunately for Exxon, and other oil and gas companies that will have to deal with this opinion as authority in other cases, a denial of a motion to dismiss is an interlocutory order and likely will not be reviewed by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. But there are some lessons that oil and gas companies can learn from this opinion to avoid future challenges by shareholders to oil and gas reserve estimates.

- Oil and gas companies should explain in plain English how they

⁶ 17 C.F.R. § 229.1202(a)(2).

⁷ ASC 275 and 932.

⁸ See e.g., *Indiana Elec. Workers' Pension Tr. Fund IBEW v. Shaw Grp., Inc.*, 537 F.3d 527, 544 (5th Cir. 2008) ("The desire to maintain a high credit rating is universally held among corporations and their executives and consequently does not contribute significantly to an inference of scienter.") (quoting *Fla. State Bd. of Admin. v. Green Tree Fin. Corp.*, 270 F.3d 645, 664 (8th Cir. 2001)); *San Leandro Emergency Med. Grp. Profit Sharing Plan v. Philip Morris Companies, Inc.*, 75 F.3d 801, 814 (2d Cir. 1996) ("We do not agree that a company's desire to maintain a high bond or credit rating qualifies as a sufficient motive for fraud[.]").

calculate and use proxy costs of carbon when calculating financial projections. Exxon argued that plaintiffs confused two separate proxy costs—one for carbon and another for greenhouse gases. But the court held that Exxon's disclosure created the impression that it used just one proxy cost value across all business units. The takeaway here is that companies should not provide partial or incomplete disclosures of key metrics or assumptions—if there are multiple assumptions used, they should be disclosed clearly and in plain English.

- Companies should constantly update and refresh their cautionary language about factors that can adversely impact oil and gas reserves. Each quarter, companies should consider whether there have been any adverse events that significantly impact the company's oil and gas reserves. Analyzing your public competitors' risk factors is a good start. But a quarterly deep dive into company-specific factors, including a consultation with internal and independent petroleum engineers, is necessary.
- Although insider sales were not at issue in *Ramirez v. Exxon Mobil Corp.* (in fact, Exxon conducted a stock buy-back during the class period), insider selling can provide plaintiffs a powerful motive to pursue securities fraud claims. The best strategy to minimize risks associated with insider sales is for all company officers and directors to create insider trading plans that comply with the requirements of Rule 10b5-1. Sales made in compliance with 10b5-1 plans generally cannot be used as evidence of scienter.