

What's New – U.S. Constitutional Law Developments

Marc Sorini

AIDV Conference 2018

October 2, 2018

www.mwe.com

Boston Brussels Chicago Dallas Düsseldorf Frankfurt Houston London Los Angeles Miami Milan Munich New York Orange County Paris San Francisco Seoul Silicon Valley Washington, DC
Strategic alliance with MWE China Law Offices (Shanghai)

© 2018 McDermott Will & Emery. The following legal entities are collectively referred to as "McDermott Will & Emery," "McDermott" or "the Firm": McDermott Will & Emery LLP, McDermott Will & Emery AARPI, McDermott Will & Emery Belgium LLP, McDermott Will & Emery Rechtsanwälte Steuerberater LLP, McDermott Will & Emery Studio Legale Associato and McDermott Will & Emery UK LLP. These entities coordinate their activities through service agreements. This communication may be considered attorney advertising. Previous results are not a guarantee of future outcome.

Topic 1 – The Commerce Clause

- The Constitution (Article I, Section 8, Clause 3[3]) states:
 - **[The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes[.]**
- The “**dormant**” **Commerce Clause** is a judge-made doctrine that permits private litigants to challenge state laws that
 - **Discriminate** in favor of in-state interests at the expense of out-of-state interests;
 - Place an **unreasonable burden** on interstate commerce; or
 - Have the effect of **regulating conduct outside the state’s borders**
- In the case of state laws involving alcohol, the **21st Amendment** operates as a partial limitation on normal Commerce Clause principles

The Commerce Clause – *Granholm v. Heald*

- In the **2005 *Granholm v. Heald* decision**, the Supreme Court invoked the dormant Commerce Clause’s non-discrimination principle to strike down state laws that permitted in-state wineries to sell and ship directly to consumers, but denied out-of-state wineries that same privilege
 - While acknowledging the partial limitation of the 21st Amendment, the Court held that the Amendment would rarely shield a facially-discriminatory law from challenge – such laws are virtually *per se* invalid
 - Nothing in the discriminatory treatment of out-of-state wines implicated the core purposes of the 21st Amendment to justify upholding the law
- Notably, the *Granholm* opinion, quoting a concurring opinion from an earlier non-Commerce Clause case, labeled the three-tier system “**unquestionably legitimate**”

- Since the decision, **Circuit Courts** (courts of appeal below the Supreme Court) have struggled to reconcile *Granholm's* holding with the “unquestionably legitimate” reference to three-tier
- A number of decisions have concluded that in the context of state laws concerning alcohol, *Granholm's* non-discrimination principle **must be limited to discrimination by states against out-of-state producers and products**
 - See, e.g., *Southern Wine & Spirits v. Div. of Alc. Bev. Control* (8th Cir. 2013); *Arnold's Wine v. Boyle* (2nd Cir. 2009)
- To date these cases have stymied attempts to use *Granholm* to extend interstate direct-to-consumer wine shipping rights to importers, retailers, and other players besides U.S. wineries

The Commerce Clause – Coming of the “Son of *Granholm*”

- Now several recent residency cases have demonstrated that different U.S. Courts of Appeals disagree with one another – a so-called “**Circuit split**”
 - ***Cooper v. Texas Alc. Bev. Comm’n*** (“**Cooper II**”) (5th Cir. 2016) – Texas residency requirements for retail licenses remain unconstitutional, notwithstanding *Siesta Village Market v. Steen* (5th Cir. 2010)
 - ***Byrd v. Tenn. Wine & Spirits Retailers*** (6th Cir. 2018) – Tennessee residency requirements for retail licensees is unconstitutional; detailed opinion recognizes and highlights the Circuit split, eventually rejecting the limitation on *Granholm* to producers and products
- In circumstances like this (where U.S. Courts of Appeals disagree), the Supreme Court is likely to step in and decide a case in order to restore uniformity of legal interpretations
- Meanwhile, **pending litigation** seeks to take the issue of retailer interstate direct-to-consumer rights to Courts of Appeal, and eventually the Supreme Court
 - NAWR-supported lawsuit in Illinois (*Lebamoff*)
 - Other cases pending in Indiana and Michigan

Topic 2 – The First Amendment

- The First Amendment states (emphasis supplied):
 - **Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.**
- The Amendment empowers courts to invalidate laws deemed to violate its command
- Originally directed only at federal law (“Congress shall . . .”), but today applies to state laws as well

First Amendment – *Central Hudson* Test

1. Speech must concern **lawful activity** and **not be misleading**
 - Threshold for determining if First Amendment applies at all
2. Speech restriction in question must advance a **substantial governmental interest**
3. Speech restriction in question must **directly advance** the substantial governmental interest(s) asserted
4. Speech restriction in question must **not be more extensive than necessary** to serve the substantial governmental interest
 - Later cases elaborate that the state must show a “**reasonable fit**” between the interest and the means chosen to advance it



First Amendment – Laws Regulating Alcohol Not Safe

- ***Rubin v. Coors*** (1995) – Court struck down the Federal Alcohol Administration Act’s ban on alcohol content labeling for malt beverages (beer)
- ***44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island*** (1996)
 - Overturned state ban on truthful price advertising of alcohol beverages
 - Plurality squarely rejected the suggestion that earlier cases (*Posadas* and *Edge*) created a different standard for “sin” products/ “vice” activities
 - What constitutes a “sin” would require endless line drawing
 - Would create a perverse incentive for legislatures to put a “vice” or “sin” label on anything whose advertisement they wish to suppress
- **“We now hold that the Twenty-first Amendment does not qualify the constitutional prohibition against laws abridging the freedom of speech”**

- ***Retail Digital Network v. Prieto*** (9th Circuit *en banc*, 2017) – California’s tied-house prohibitions on suppliers or wholesalers providing retailers with anything of value in exchange for advertising upheld (relying on *Actmedia v. Stroh*, 1986)
- ***Missouri Broadcasters v. Lacy*** (8th Circuit, 2017) – Missouri statute and regulations prohibiting (1) advertising price discounts; (2) advertising below-cost pricing; and (3) requiring listing of multiple retailers in supplier-paid advertising (equiv. to TTB “retailer advertising services” regulation), potentially unconstitutional under the First Amendment
 - On remand, District Court (in June 2018) enjoined enforcement of the statutes and regulations at issue
- ***Texas ABC v. Mark Anthony Brewing*** (Tex. Ct. App., 2017) – Texas’ ban on private-label malt beverages does not violate First Amendment because underlying conduct – a trademark licensing agreement between a supplier and a retailer – is illegal and thus not protected under the First Amendment

Thank you for your time and attention

Marc Sorini

Doc ID # 155602573

www.mwe.com

Boston Brussels Chicago Dallas Düsseldorf Frankfurt Houston London Los Angeles Miami Milan Munich New York Orange County Paris San Francisco Seoul Silicon Valley Washington, DC
Strategic alliance with MWE China Law Offices (Shanghai)

© 2018 McDermott Will & Emery. The following legal entities are collectively referred to as "McDermott Will & Emery," "McDermott" or "the Firm": McDermott Will & Emery LLP, McDermott Will & Emery AARPI, McDermott Will & Emery Belgium LLP, McDermott Will & Emery Rechtsanwälte Steuerberater LLP, McDermott Will & Emery Studio Legale Associato and McDermott Will & Emery UK LLP. These entities coordinate their activities through service agreements. This communication may be considered attorney advertising. Previous results are not a guarantee of future outcome.