

# CADWALADER

Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP  
700 Sixth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20001  
Tel +1 202 882 2200 Fax +1 202 882 2400  
www.cadwalader.com

New York London Charlotte Washington  
Houston Beijing Hong Kong Brussels

## MEMO ENDORSED

USDC SDNY  
DOCUMENT  
ELECTRONICALLY FILED  
DOC #  
DATE FILED: 6/20/13

RECEIVED  
JUN 19 2013  
CHAMBERS OF  
WILLIAM H. PAULEY  
U.S.D.J.

June 19, 2013

VIA FACSIMILE (212- 805-6390)

Hon. William H. Pauley III  
United States District Judge  
Daniel Patrick Moynihan  
United States Courthouse  
500 Pearl Street  
New York, NY 10007-1312

Re: In re Crude Oil Commodity Futures Litigation, Master File No. 11 Civ. 3600 (WHP)

Dear Judge Pauley:

We write regarding the Court's order dated June 11, 2013 ("Order") which requires any third party who objects to the putative Class Plaintiffs' First Request for the Production of Documents ("Document Request"), made pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order entered on June 25, 2012 in United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Parson Energy et al., 11 Civ. 3543 (Doc. No. 59) to file such objections by June 21, 2013. This firm represents third party, Shell Oil Company and certain affiliated entities (collectively "Shell").

We understand that certain documents produced by Shell to the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC"), pursuant to a request for confidentiality under the Freedom of Information Act, were produced by the CFTC to Parson Energy, and that such documents are potentially responsive to Class Plaintiffs' Document Request.

Shell intends to file objections. Given that Shell received notice of the Order on June 14, 2013 (see Exhibit A attached to this letter) we respectfully request an extension until June 27, 2013 to file such objections.

Regards,

*Application denied.*

*Anthony Mansfield/cmc*  
Anthony M. Mansfield

SO ORDERED:

cc: Ann Stephens, Esq.

*William H. Pauley III*  
WILLIAM H. PAULEY III U.S.D.J.  
6/20/13

Anthony M. Mansfield Tel +1 202 882 2321 Fax +1 202 882 2400 anthony.mansfield@cwt.com

USActive 28020367.1

**SUSMAN GODFREY L.L.P.**

A REGISTERED LIMITED LIABILITY PARTNERSHIP  
SUITE 5100  
1000 LOUISIANA STREET  
HOUSTON, TEXAS 77002-8088  
(713) 661-9368  
FAX (713) 664-8888  
WWW.SUSMANGODFREY.COM

SUITE 8100  
901 MAIN STREET  
DALLAS, TEXAS 75202-3775  
(214) 754-1900

SUITE 980  
1001 AVENUE OF THE STARS  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90067-6029  
(310) 758-3100

SUITE 3800  
1201 THIRD AVENUE  
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-3000  
(206) 818-3880

18TH FLOOR  
880 LEUNGTON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-6826  
(212) 336-8330

ANDREW PISTILLI  
DIRECT DIAL (212) 726-2012

E-MAIL [APISTILLI@SUSMANGODFREY.COM](mailto:APISTILLI@SUSMANGODFREY.COM)

June 14, 2013

VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL AND EMAIL

Anthony Mansfield  
Cadwalader Wickersham & Taft LLP  
700 Sixth Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20001

Re: In re: Crude Oil Commodity Futures Litigation, 11 Civ. 3600

Dear Counsel:

I represent the plaintiffs in *In re: Crude Oil Commodity Futures Litigation*, 11 Civ. 3600, pending before Judge William Pauley in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. I understand that you previously produced documents to the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission under subpoena, which the CFTC subsequently produced to the Defendants in *CFTC v. Parnon Energy, Inc., et al.*, 11 Civ. 3543, pending before the same court. The documents you produced are the subject of certain document requests propounded by the plaintiffs in *In re: Crude Oil Commodity Futures Litigation*.

Judge Pauley has issued an order (attached) requiring any objection to the production of the documents you previously produced to be filed on the dockets of 11 Civ. 3600 and 11 Civ. 3543 by June 21, 2003. Objections will be heard at 2:00 pm on July 1, 2013, in Courtroom 20B of the Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse.

Under the Stipulated Protective Order (attached) in *In re: Crude Oil Commodity Futures Litigation*, the documents you previously produced will be treated according to their original designation.

Should you have any additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

/s/ Warren T. Burns

Enclosures: June 11, 2013 Order (Dkt #96)  
Stipulated Protective Order

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

U.S. COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

-against-

PARNON ENERGY INC., ARCADIA PETROLEUM LTD,  
ARCADIA ENERGY (SUISSE) SA, NICHOLAS J.  
WILDGOOSE AND JAMES T. DYER,

Defendant.

11 Civ. 3543 (WHP)

Master File No. 11 Civ. 3600  
(WHP)

-----  
IN RE: CRUDE OIL COMMODITY FUTURES  
LITIGATION  
-----

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:  
ALL MATTERS

**NOTICE OF APPEARANCE**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that JOSHUA L. SHAPIRO, an attorney with the firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft LLP, duly admitted to practice law in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, hereby appears as counsel for Third Parties Gavilon, LLC, Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc., and Shell Oil Company in the above-referenced actions and hereby requests that all papers in these actions be served upon, and all communications directed to, the undersigned at the address provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 21, 2013

s/ Joshua L. Shapiro

Joshua L. Shapiro  
CADWALADER, WICKERSHAM & TAFT LLP  
One World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281  
Telephone: (212) 504-5575  
Facsimile: (212) 504-6666  
joshua.shapiro@cwt.com

*Attorney for Third Parties Gavilon, LLC,  
Morgan Stanley Capital Group, Inc., and  
Shell Oil Company*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

U.S. COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

-against-

PARNON ENERGY INC., ARCADIA PETROLEUM LTD,  
ARCADIA ENERGY (SUISSE) SA, NICHOLAS J.  
WILDGOOSE AND JAMES T. DYER,

Defendant.

11 Civ. 3543 (WHP)

Master File No. 11 Civ. 3600  
(WHP)

-----  
IN RE: CRUDE OIL COMMODITY FUTURES  
LITIGATION  
-----

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:  
ALL MATTERS

**OBJECTIONS OF THIRD PARTY, SHELL OIL COMPANY, TO  
CLASS PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS**

**I. Introduction**

Pursuant to this Court's order dated June 11, 2013 (Docket No. 96), third party, Shell Oil Company, on behalf of itself and certain affiliated entities (collectively "Shell"), respectfully submits its objections to the Putative Class Plaintiffs' First Request for the Production of Documents, made pursuant to the Stipulated Protective Order entered on June 25, 2012 in *United States Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Parnon Energy et al.*, 11 Civ. 3543 (Docket No. 59) ("Document Request").

The Document Request, and in particular Request Nos. 126 and 135 to which Shell's confidential information would ostensibly be responsive, go beyond what is permitted under the

discovery rules. Despite the fact that Class Plaintiffs' action, as pled (i) is directed to the conduct of Parnon Energy, Inc., Arcadia Petroleum Ltd., Arcadia Energy (Suisse) SA and certain employees of the same ("Defendants"), (ii) is focused on trading in a specific grade of physical crude oil – West Texas Intermediate ("WTI"), and (iii) is bounded in time (January through May 2008) ("Relevant Period"), the requests would reach documents or communications that are (i) unrelated to the Defendants, (ii) concern **any aspect** of the crude oil markets, including **any grade** of crude oil, (iii) without limitation in time. Indeed, the information Class Plaintiffs seek relates to **forty-six third parties**, none of whom to Shell's understanding are alleged to have any involvement in Class Plaintiffs' action. For these reasons and the reasons set forth below, Shell objects specifically to Request Nos. 126 and 135 of the Document Request, and the Document Request generally to the extent that any other specific requests would call for the production of Shell's documents.

## II. Background<sup>1</sup>

On information and belief, sometime in the second half of 2008, the U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission ("CFTC") initiated a non-public review of the crude oil markets in the United States. As part of its review, Shell understands that the CFTC sought documents and information from a wide range of market participants covering an approximately two-year period (2007 and 2008). The CFTC inquiry was not limited to West Texas Intermediate crude oil, but rather covered all grades of domestic oil. As part of this review, Shell produced a variety of documents and information to the CFTC, including to the best of Shell's recollection records pertaining to Shell's refining operations, pipeline capacity, storage capacity and trading of crude

---

<sup>1</sup> As it has been as much as 5 years since Shell produced documents to the CFTC, and given the short window of time allowed by the Court for Shell to file its objections, Shell's factual recitation in this Objection is based on its best recollection of events.

oil. In connection with its document productions, Shell requested confidential treatment under the Freedom of Information Act pursuant to CFTC Rule 145.9, 17 C.F.R. §145.9.

Shell understands that in May 2011, the CFTC filed an enforcement action against the Defendants in this Court (“CFTC Action”). Pursuant to the CFTC Action, Shell understands that the CFTC produced a variety of documents to the Defendants, including documents produced to the CFTC by Shell as part of the above described inquiry. Shell understands that the CFTC produced documents to the Defendants for all of 2008 (and beyond), not just the Relevant Period.

On April 16, 2013, Class Plaintiffs served a first request for production of documents on the Defendants. 134 of the 136 requests appear to be focused on the Defendants’ alleged activities involving WTI crude oil during the Relevant Period. However, Request Nos. 126 and 135 are not similarly focused. Rather, they provide, in pertinent part, as follows:

126. All documents or communication **concerning the United States domestic crude oil industry, trading of physical crude oil** and/or trading of NYMEX WTI calendar spreads with any of the following entities, their affiliates and/or agents during the Relevant Period . . .

135. All document requests, interrogatories, subpoenas and any other discovery issued by or to the Defendants in *U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Parnon Energy, Inc., Arcadia Petroleum Ltd., Arcadia Energy (Suisse) SA, Nicholas J. Wildgoose and James T. Dyer*, No. 11 Civ. 3543 (S.D.N.Y.) and all responses, objections and any documents or other information produced in response thereto. For the avoidance of doubt, this request includes, but is not limited to, all documents production (sic) by the CFTC to the Defendants in *U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission v. Parnon Energy, Inc., Arcadia Petroleum Ltd., Arcadia Energy (Suisse) SA, Nicholas J. Wildgoose and James T. Dyer*, No. 11 Civ. 3543 (S.D.N.Y.).

(emphasis supplied). For purposes of the Document Request, “Relevant Period” means “between **at least** January 1, 2008 and **at least** May 15, 2008.” (emphasis supplied).

### III. General Objections

Shell asserts these General Objections to the Document Request. These General Objections, unless otherwise stated, apply to each individual request, and these General Objections are incorporated by reference in the Specific Objections set forth below. Furthermore, these General Objections are neither waived nor limited by the Specific Objections.

1. Shell objects to each document request to the extent it seeks to impose obligations beyond those required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Local Rules for the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, and/or any other applicable rule or court order.

2. Shell objects to each document request to the extent it seeks the production of information that constitutes proprietary information, trade secrets or other confidential research, development or commercial information of Shell. Disclosure of such information would cause substantial economic harm to Shell. Further, such information is neither relevant to any issue in this lawsuit nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

3. Shell objects to each document request to the extent it seeks, or can be construed to seek, the disclosure of information protected from discovery by the attorney-client privilege, the evaluation privilege, the work-product doctrine or any other applicable privilege, exemption, or immunity recognized under federal, state, or international law.

4. Shell objects to each document request to the extent that it requires the production of documents for which Shell requested confidential treatment pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act under CFTC Rule 145.9, 17 C.F.R. § 145.9.

5. Shell objects to each document request to the extent that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome, vexatious, or harassing.

6. Shell objects to each document request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion.

7. Shell objects to each document request to the extent that it seeks documents not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party and is not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

8. Shell objects to each document request to the extent that it requires the production of documents that contain private information about individuals.

9. Shell reserves all objections that may be available to it at any hearing or trial or on any motion to the use or admissibility of any information provided or documents produced, as well as the right to object to further discovery relating to the subject matter of any information or document provided.

#### IV. Specific Objections

Rule 26(b) allows for discovery regarding “any non-privileged matter that is relevant to any party’s claim or defense.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b). “Relevant information need not be admissible at the trial if the discovery appears reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.” *Id.* Evidence is irrelevant and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence where the evidence does not relate to the claims or defenses in the lawsuit. *See Micro Motion, Inc. v. Kane Steel Co.*, 894 F.2d 1318, 1322-23 (Fed. Cir. 1990). “Even the broad scope of civil discovery contemplated by the Federal Rules has its limits, however. ‘[R]ule 26, the general discovery rule, [does not] permit[] blanket discovery upon bare skeletal request when confronted with an objection . . . Some degree of need must be shown.’” *SEC v. NIR Group, LLC*, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 47522 (S.D.N.Y. March 24, 2013).

**A. Request Nos. 126 and 135 Would Reach Documents That Likely have no Bearing on Class Plaintiffs' Claims against Defendants**

It is well established that an administrative agency like the CFTC has far reaching authority pursuant to which it can investigate “merely on suspicion that the law is being violated, **or even just because it wants assurance that it is not.**” *United States v. Morton Salt*, 338 U.S. 632, 642-43 (1950) (emphasis supplied).

Sometime in the second half of 2008, Shell received requests for documents and information from the CFTC as part of the agency’s review of the domestic crude oil markets. In response to the CFTC requests, Shell produced a variety of information, including to the best of Shell’s recollection records related to its crude oil refineries, storage caverns to which the company had access or an ownership stake, pipelines on which Shell transported crude oil and/or had an ownership stake, the company’s use of these assets, *e.g.* pipeline nominations, and Shell’s crude oil trading. To the best of Shell’s recollection, the requests encompassed **all domestic grades of crude oil**, not just WTI and they covered **all of 2007 and much of 2008**. Although Shell was not privy to the CFTC’s deliberative process, over time Shell came to believe that the CFTC’s purpose in requesting such information from Shell was to better understand who had access to / ownership of the physical assets related to the production, transportation and storage of crude oil. Although the CFTC never notified Shell that the inquiry had been completed, at some point the CFTC simply stopped communicating with Shell, leading Shell to conclude that the inquiry had been closed. The CFTC never brought an enforcement action against Shell based on the above referenced inquiries.

To the extent that Shell’s documents were provided in furtherance of the CFTC’s market surveillance and regulatory oversight responsibilities, many of these documents related to the crude oil markets generally, and are not relevant to Class Plaintiffs’ specific claims that the

**Defendants** manipulated the **WTI crude oil market** over a **5-month period in 2008**. Similarly, the documents are not likely to lead to admissible evidence.

**B. The Shell Documents Contain Shell's Proprietary, Commercial information**

Apart from their lack of relevance, the Shell documents contain proprietary information belonging to Shell, much of which continues to be relevant to the company's day to day operations. For example, access to information about the crude oil pipelines Shell owns / has access to, and how the company uses those pipelines provides a valuable insight into how Shell runs its U.S. operations. Shell does not disclose information of this kind outside the company in the normal course and, in fact, takes steps to ensure that such information is not publicly available. As another example, documents and information relating to Shell's trading of domestic crude oil, if disclosed to third parties, would potentially reveal strategies employed by Shell traders. Such disclosure would place Shell at a competitive disadvantage to its counterparts.

**V. Conclusion**

Where, as here, Request Nos. 126 and 135 of the Document Request are overbroad, unduly burdensome, seek information that is not relevant or reasonably calculated to lead to discovery of admissible evidence, and would require the production of Shell's confidential commercial information, Shell objects to the Document Request. Shell respectfully requests that the Court enter an order prohibiting the production of Shell's documents to Class Plaintiffs in response to Request Nos. 126 and 135 of the Document Request and any other request that may call for Shell's documents.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 21, 2013

By: \_\_\_\_\_ s/ Joshua L. Shapiro

Joshua L. Shapiro  
CADWALADER, WICKERSHAM & TAFT LLP  
One World Financial Center  
New York, NY 10281  
Telephone: (212) 504-5575  
Facsimile: (212) 504-6666  
joshua.shapiro@cwt.com

Anthony M. Mansfield  
(*pro hac vice* application to be filed)  
CADWALADER, WICKERSHAM & TAFT LLP  
700 Sixth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 862-2321  
Facsimile: (202) 862-2400  
anthony.mansfield@cwt.com

*Attorneys for Third Party Shell Oil  
Company*