

No. 09-1403

In The
Supreme Court of the United States

—◆—
ERICA P. JOHN FUND, INC.
F/K/A ARCHDIOCESE OF MILWAUKEE
SUPPORTING FUND, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

HALLIBURTON CO. AND DAVID J. LESAR,

Respondents.

—◆—
On Writ Of Certiorari To The
United States Court Of Appeals
For The Fifth Circuit

—◆—
BRIEF OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
SHAREHOLDER AND CONSUMER ATTORNEYS
AS *AMICUS CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER

—◆—
MICHAEL J. MIARM
Counsel of Record
DANIEL P. CHIPLOCK
LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN
& BERNSTEIN, LLP
250 Hudson Street
8th Floor
New York, NY 10013
(212) 355-9500
mmiarmi@lchb.com

Counsel for
Amicus Curiae NASCAT

COCKLE LAW BRIEF PRINTING CO. (800) 225-6964
OR CALL COLLECT (402) 342-2831

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTEREST OF <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i>	1
II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
III. ARGUMENT.....	5
A. This Court Has Endorsed A Rebuttable Presumption Of Reliance Premised On The Fraud-On-The-Market Doctrine, Which Allows Securities Class Plaintiffs To Meet The Predominance Requirement Of Rule 23	5
B. Availability Of The <i>Basic</i> Presumption Turns On Whether The Security At Issue Traded In An “Efficient” Market	9
C. Courts Assessing Market Efficiency At The Class Certification Stage Engage In A Fact-Intensive Analysis.....	16
D. Market Efficiency And Loss Causation Are Distinct Concepts, And The Latter Should Not Be Conscripted As A Prerequisite To Triggering The Fraud-On-The-Market Presumption....	32
IV. CONCLUSION	38

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

CASES

<i>Basic Inc. v. Levinson</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cammer v. Bloom</i> , 711 F. Supp. 1264 (D.N.J. 1989)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Caremark, Inc. v. Coram Healthcare Corp.</i> , 113 F.3d 645 (7th Cir. 1997).....	33
<i>Castillo v. Envoy Corp.</i> , 206 F.R.D. 464 (M.D. Tenn. 2002)	36
<i>Cheney v. CyberGuard Corp.</i> , 213 F.R.D. 484 (S.D. Fla. 2003)	10
<i>Dura Pharms., Inc. v. Broudo</i> , 544 U.S. 336 (2005)	32, 33, 34, 35, 37
<i>Eckstein v. Balcors Film Investors</i> , 8 F.3d 1121 (7th Cir. 1993).....	13, 15
<i>Freeman v. Laventhol & Horwath</i> , 915 F.2d 193 (6th Cir. 1990)	10, 11, 13, 14
<i>Gariety v. Grant Thornton, LLP</i> , 368 F.3d 356 (4th Cir. 2004)	10, 13, 19
<i>Hayes v. Gross</i> , 982 F.2d 104 (3d Cir. 1992).....	10, 19
<i>In re Accredo Health, Inc., Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 03-2216 DP, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97621 (W.D. Tenn. Mar. 7, 2006)	15
<i>In re Alstom SA Sec. Litig.</i> , 253 F.R.D. 266 (S.D.N.Y. 2008).....	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>In re Boston Scientific Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 604 F. Supp. 2d 275 (D. Mass. 2009)	37
<i>In re Countrywide Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , Lead Case No. CV-07-05295-MRP (MAN _x), 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 129807 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 9, 2009).....	17, 31
<i>In re Dura Pharms., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 99cv0151-L(NLS), 2001 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 25907 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2001), <i>rev'd</i> , <i>Broudo v. Dura Pharms., Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 933 (9th Cir. 2003), <i>rev'd</i> , 544 U.S. 336 (2005)	34
<i>In re DVI Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 249 F.R.D. 196 (E.D. Pa. 2008)	14
<i>In re HealthSouth Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 257 F.R.D. 260 (N.D. Ala. 2009).....	18
<i>In re Mills Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 257 F.R.D. 101 (E.D. Va. 2009)	10
<i>In re Nature's Sunshine Prods. Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 251 F.R.D. 656 (D. Utah 2008)	14
<i>In re NetBank, Inc., Sec. Litig.</i> , 259 F.R.D. 656 (N.D. Ga. 2009)	27, 30
<i>In re New Motor Vehicles Canadian Exp. Antitrust Litig.</i> , 522 F.3d 6 (1st Cir. 2008).....	16
<i>In re PolyMedica Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 432 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2005)	<i>passim</i>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES – Continued

	Page
<i>In re Res. Am. Sec. Litig.</i> , 202 F.R.D. 177 (E.D. Pa. 2001).....	15
<i>In re VeriFone Sec. Litig.</i> , 784 F. Supp. 1471 (N.D. Cal. 1992), <i>aff'd</i> , 11 F.3d 865 (9th Cir. 1993).....	16
<i>In re Xcelera.com Sec. Litig.</i> , 430 F.3d 503 (1st Cir. 2005).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Krogman v. Sterritt</i> , 202 F.R.D. 467 (N.D. Tex. 2001)	23, 24
<i>Lehocky v. Tidel Techs., Inc.</i> , 220 F.R.D. 491 (S.D. Tex. 2004).....	17, 22, 29, 31
<i>Lentell v. Merrill Lynch & Co.</i> , 396 F.3d 161 (2d Cir. 2005).....	33
<i>Levinson v. Basic Inc.</i> , 786 F.2d 741 (6th Cir. 1986) <i>vacated on other grounds</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988).....	6
<i>Menkes v. Stolt-Nielsen S.A.</i> , 270 F.R.D. 80 (D. Conn. 2010)	24
<i>Miller v. Thane Int'l, Inc.</i> , 615 F.3d 1095 (9th Cir. 2010)	18, 35, 36
<i>O'Neil v. Appel</i> , 165 F.R.D. 479 (W.D. Mich. 1995).....	22
<i>Peil v. Speiser</i> , 806 F.2d 1154 (3d Cir. 1986)	7, 15

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.