



**ITINERARY FOR THE SEPTEMBER 18, 2013 MEETING OF THE
GEORGE MASON AMERICAN INN OF COURT**

Program Title: "Are you required to plead with particularity in state court?"

(CLE Credits: 1.0 credit hour)

STUDENT PRESENTERS:

Kevin Hill
Sarah

BARRISTER OF THE INN:

Judge Louise DiMatteo
Judge Deborah Welsh
Jay Myerson
Joseph Dailey
Kyle Manikas
Clinton Shaw
Kimberly Murphy
Randall Miller
Rebecca Thacher

- I. Introduction – GMU law students
(7:30 pm - 7:35 pm)
- II. Body of CLE 7:35 - 8:25, with GMU students participating in the presentation of the effects of the U.S. Supreme Court's rulings in the *Twombly* and *Iqbal*.
(7:35-8:25)
- III. Questions
(8:25 pm – 8:30 pm)

abundantly clear that doing justice does not always cause the heavens to fall. The Court would therefore do well to heed Justice KENNEDY's just reminder that "[w]e ought not to take steps which diminish the likelihood that [federal] courts will base their legal decision on an accurate assessment of the facts." *Keeney*, 504 U.S., at 24, 112 S.Ct. 1715 (dissenting opinion).

It may well be true that respondent would have completely waived his right to present mitigating evidence if that evidence had been adequately investigated at the time of sentencing. It may also be true that respondent's mitigating evidence could not outweigh his violent past. What is certainly true, however, is that an evidentiary hearing would provide answers to these questions. I emphatically agree with the majority of judges on the en banc Court of Appeals that it was an abuse of discretion to refuse to conduct such a hearing in this capital case.

Accordingly, I respectfully dissent.



550 U.S. 544, 167 L.Ed.2d 929

BELL ATLANTIC CORPORATION
et al., Petitioners,

v.

William TWOMBLY et al.

No. 05-1126.

Argued Nov. 27, 2006.

Decided May 21, 2007.

Background: Consumers brought putative class action against incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) alleging antitrust conspiracy, in violation of the Sherman Act, both to prevent competitive entry into local telephone and Internet service

markets and to avoid competing with each other in their respective markets. The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, Gerald Lynch, J., 313 F.Supp.2d 174, dismissed complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, 425 F.3d 99, reversed. The Supreme Court granted certiorari.

Holdings: The Supreme Court, Justice Souter, held that:

- (1) stating a claim under Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision requires a complaint with enough factual matter, taken as true, to suggest that an agreement was made;
 - (2) an allegation of parallel business conduct and a bare assertion of conspiracy will not alone suffice to state a claim under the Sherman Act;
 - (3) dismissal for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted does not require appearance, beyond a doubt, that plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of claim that would entitle him to relief, abrogating *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80; and
 - (4) consumers' allegations of parallel conduct were insufficient to state a claim.
- Judgment of the Court of Appeals reversed and remanded.

Justice Stevens filed a dissenting opinion in which Justice Ginsburg joined in part.

1. Antitrust and Trade Regulation

⇌537

Because Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision does not prohibit all unreasonable restraints of trade but only restraints effected by a contract, combination, or conspiracy, the crucial question is whether the challenged anticompetitive

conduct stems from independent decision or from an agreement, tacit or express. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

2. Antitrust and Trade Regulation ⌘975

While a showing of parallel business behavior is admissible circumstantial evidence from which the fact finder may infer agreement, it falls short of conclusively establishing agreement or itself constituting an offense under the Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

3. Antitrust and Trade Regulation ⌘537

Conscious parallelism with respect to business behavior, a common reaction of firms in a concentrated market that recognize their shared economic interests and their interdependence with respect to price and output decisions, is not in itself unlawful under Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

4. Antitrust and Trade Regulation ⌘537

An antitrust conspiracy plaintiff with evidence showing nothing beyond parallel conduct on part of defendants is not entitled to a directed verdict. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

5. Antitrust and Trade Regulation ⌘977(2)

Proof of a conspiracy under Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision must include evidence tending to exclude the possibility of independent action. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

6. Federal Civil Procedure ⌘2484

At the summary judgment stage, an offer of conspiracy evidence by a plaintiff alleging violation of Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision must tend to rule

out the possibility that the defendants were acting independently. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

7. Federal Civil Procedure ⌘673, 1772

While a complaint attacked by a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted does not need detailed factual allegations, a plaintiff's obligation to provide the grounds of his entitlement to relief requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc. Rule 12(b)(6), 28 U.S.C.A.

8. Federal Civil Procedure ⌘1772, 1835

To survive a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level, on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true even if doubtful in fact. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc. Rule 12(b)(6), 28 U.S.C.A.

9. Federal Civil Procedure ⌘673

While, for most types of cases, the Federal Rules eliminated the cumbersome requirement that a claimant set out in detail the facts upon which he bases his claim, the general rule governing pleadings still requires a showing, rather than a blanket assertion, of entitlement to relief; without some factual allegation in the complaint, it is hard to see how a claimant could satisfy the requirement of providing not only fair notice of the nature of the claim, but also grounds on which the claim rests. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc. Rule 8(a)(2), 28 U.S.C.A.

10. Antitrust and Trade Regulation ⌘972(4)

Stating a claim under Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision requires a complaint with enough factual matter, taken as true, to suggest that an agreement

was made; asking for plausible grounds to infer an agreement does not impose a probability requirement at the pleading stage, but simply calls for enough fact to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of illegal agreement. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

11. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨1773

A well-pleaded complaint may proceed even if it strikes a savvy judge that actual proof of those facts is improbable, and that a recovery is very remote and unlikely.

12. Antitrust and Trade Regulation ⇨972(4)

An allegation of parallel business conduct and a bare assertion of conspiracy will not suffice to state a claim under Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision; without more, parallel conduct does not suggest conspiracy, and a conclusory allegation of agreement at some unidentified point does not supply facts adequate to show illegality. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

13. Antitrust and Trade Regulation ⇨972(4)

When allegations of parallel conduct are set out in order to make a claim under the Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision, they must be placed in a context that raises a suggestion of a preceding agreement, not merely parallel conduct that could just as well be independent action. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

14. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨674, 1773

Dismissal for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted does not require appearance, beyond a doubt, that plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of claim that would entitle him to relief, although once a claim has been stated adequately, it may be supported by showing any set of facts consistent with the allegations in the complaint; abrogat-

ing *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc. Rule 12(b)(6), 28 U.S.C.A.

15. Antitrust and Trade Regulation ⇨972(4)

Consumers' allegations that, by virtue of parallel conduct, incumbent local exchange carriers (ILECs) entered into a contract, combination, or conspiracy to prevent competitive entry into their local telephone and Internet service markets, and agreed not to compete with one another, failed to state claim for violation of Sherman Act's restraint of trade provision, as claim essentially rested on descriptions of parallel conduct and not on any independent allegation of actual agreement among the ILECs. Sherman Act, § 1, 15 U.S.C.A. § 1.

16. Evidence ⇨11

Where antitrust complaint quoted portion of statement of one defendant's chief executive officer (CEO) to suggest that defendants conspired together, district court was entitled to take notice of the full contents of the published articles referenced in the complaint, from which the truncated quotations were drawn. Fed. Rules Evid.Rule 201, 28 U.S.C.A.

17. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨31

Broadening of a Federal Rule of Civil Procedure can only be accomplished by the process of amending the Federal Rules, and not by judicial interpretation.

18. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨633.1

On certain subjects understood to raise a high risk of abusive litigation, a plaintiff must state factual allegations with greater particularity than that required by general rule governing pleadings. Fed. Rules Civ.Proc.Rules 8, 9(b-c), 28 U.S.C.A.

§544 *Syllabus* *

The 1984 divestiture of the American Telephone & Telegraph Company's (AT & T) local telephone business left a system of regional service monopolies, sometimes called Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs), and a separate long-distance market from which the ILECs were excluded. The Telecommunications Act of 1996 withdrew approval of the ILECs' monopolies, "fundamentally restructur[ing] local telephone markets" and "subject[ing] [ILECs] to a host of duties intended to facilitate market entry." *AT & T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366, 371, 119 S.Ct. 721, 142 L.Ed.2d 835. It also authorized them to enter the long-distance market. "Central to the [new] scheme [was each ILEC's] obligation . . . to share its network with" competitive local exchange carriers (CLECs). *Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP*, 540 U.S. 398, 402, 124 S.Ct. 872, 157 L.Ed.2d 823.

Respondents (hereinafter plaintiffs) represent a class of subscribers of local telephone and/or high-speed Internet services in this action against petitioner ILECs for claimed violations of § 1 of the Sherman Act, which prohibits "[e]very contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations." The complaint alleges that the ILECs conspired to restrain trade (1) by engaging in parallel conduct in their respective service areas to inhibit the growth of upstart CLECs; and (2) by agreeing to refrain from competing against one another, as indicated by their common failure to pursue attractive business opportunities in contiguous markets and by a statement by one ILEC's chief

executive officer that competing in another ILEC's territory did not seem right. The District Court dismissed the complaint, concluding that parallel business conduct allegations, taken alone, do not state a claim under § 1; plaintiffs must allege additional facts tending to exclude independent self-interested conduct as an explanation for the parallel actions. Reversing, the Second Circuit held that plaintiffs' parallel conduct allegations were sufficient to withstand a motion to dismiss because the ILECs failed to show that there is no set of facts that would permit plaintiffs to demonstrate that the particular parallelism asserted was the product of collusion rather than coincidence.

§545 *Held:*

1. Stating a § 1 claim requires a complaint with enough factual matter (taken as true) to suggest that an agreement was made. An allegation of parallel conduct and a bare assertion of conspiracy will not suffice. Pp. 1963 – 1970.

(a) Because § 1 prohibits "only restraints effected by a contract, combination, or conspiracy," *Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp.*, 467 U.S. 752, 775, 104 S.Ct. 2731, 81 L.Ed.2d 628, "[t]he crucial question" is whether the challenged anticompetitive conduct "stem[s] from independent decision or from an agreement," *Theatre Enterprises, Inc. v. Paramount Film Distributing Corp.*, 346 U.S. 537, 540, 74 S.Ct. 257, 98 L.Ed. 273. While a showing of parallel "business behavior is admissible circumstantial evidence from which" agreement may be inferred, it falls short of "conclusively establish[ing] agreement or . . . itself constitut[ing] a Sherman Act offense." *Id.*, at 540–541, 74 S.Ct. 257. The inadequacy of showing parallel conduct or interdependence, without more,

* The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by the Reporter of Decisions for the convenience of

the reader. See *United States v. Detroit Timber & Lumber Co.*, 200 U.S. 321, 337, 26 S.Ct. 282, 50 L.Ed. 499.

mirrors the behavior's ambiguity: consistent with conspiracy, but just as much in line with a wide swath of rational and competitive business strategy unilaterally prompted by common perceptions of the market. Thus, this Court has hedged against false inferences from identical behavior at a number of points in the trial sequence, *e.g.*, at the summary judgment stage, see *Matsushita Elec. Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538. Pp. 1963–1964.

(b) This case presents the antecedent question of what a plaintiff must plead in order to state a § 1 claim. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,” in order to “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests,” *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80. While a complaint attacked by a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss does not need detailed factual allegations, *ibid.*, a plaintiff's obligation to provide the “grounds” of his “entitle[ment] to relief” requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of a cause of action's elements will not do. Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level on the assumption that all of the complaint's allegations are true. Applying these general standards to a § 1 claim, stating a claim requires a complaint with enough factual matter to suggest an agreement. Asking for plausible grounds does not impose a probability requirement at the pleading stage; it simply calls for enough fact to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of illegal agreement. The need at the pleading stage for allegations plausibly suggesting (not merely consistent with) agreement reflects Rule 8(a)(2)'s threshold requirement that the

“plain statement” possess enough heft to “sho[w] that the pleader is entitled to relief.” A parallel⁵⁴⁶ conduct allegation gets the § 1 complaint close to stating a claim, but without further factual enhancement it stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility. The requirement of allegations suggesting an agreement serves the practical purpose of preventing a plaintiff with “‘a largely groundless claim’” from “‘tak[ing] up the time of a number of other people, with the right to do so representing an *in terrorem* increment of the settlement value.’” *Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336, 347, 125 S.Ct. 1627, 161 L.Ed.2d 577. It is one thing to be cautious before dismissing an antitrust complaint in advance of discovery, but quite another to forget that proceeding to antitrust discovery can be expensive. That potential expense is obvious here, where plaintiffs represent a putative class of at least 90 percent of subscribers to local telephone or high-speed Internet service in an action against America's largest telecommunications firms for unspecified instances of antitrust violations that allegedly occurred over a 7-year period. It is no answer to say that a claim just shy of plausible entitlement can be weeded out early in the discovery process, given the common lament that the success of judicial supervision in checking discovery abuse has been modest. Plaintiffs' main argument against the plausibility standard at the pleading stage is its ostensible conflict with a literal reading of *Conley's* statement construing Rule 8: “a complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief.” 355 U.S., at 45–46, 78 S.Ct. 99. The “no set of facts” language has been questioned, criticized, and explained away long enough by courts and commentators,

and is best forgotten as an incomplete, negative gloss on an accepted pleading standard: once a claim has been stated adequately, it may be supported by showing any set of facts consistent with the allegations in the complaint. *Conley* described the breadth of opportunity to prove what an adequate complaint claims, not the minimum standard of adequate pleading to govern a complaint's survival. Pp. 1964–1970.

2. Under the plausibility standard, plaintiffs' claim of conspiracy in restraint of trade comes up short. First, the complaint leaves no doubt that plaintiffs rest their § 1 claim on descriptions of parallel conduct, not on any independent allegation of actual agreement among the ILECs. The nub of the complaint is the ILECs' parallel behavior, and its sufficiency turns on the suggestions raised by this conduct when viewed in light of common economic experience. Nothing in the complaint invests either the action or inaction alleged with a plausible conspiracy suggestion. As to the ILECs' supposed agreement to disobey the 1996 Act and thwart the CLECs' attempts to compete, the District Court correctly found that nothing in the complaint intimates that resisting the upstarts was anything more than the natural, unilateral reaction of each ⁵⁴⁷ILEC intent on preserving its regional dominance. The complaint's general collusion premise fails to answer the point that there was no need for joint encouragement to resist the 1996 Act, since each ILEC had reason to try to avoid dealing with CLECs and would have tried to keep them out, regardless of the other ILECs' actions. Plaintiffs' second conspiracy theory rests on the competitive reticence among the ILECs themselves in the wake of the 1996 Act to enter into their competitors' territories, leaving the relevant market highly compartmentalized geographically, with minimal competition. This parallel conduct did not suggest con-

spiracy, not if history teaches anything. Monopoly was the norm in telecommunications, not the exception. Because the ILECs were born in that world, doubtless liked it, and surely knew the adage about him who lives by the sword, a natural explanation for the noncompetition is that the former Government-sanctioned monopolists were sitting tight, expecting their neighbors to do the same. Antitrust conspiracy was not suggested by the facts adduced under either theory of the complaint, which thus fails to state a valid § 1 claim. This analysis does not run counter to *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 508, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152 L.Ed.2d 1, which held that “a complaint in an employment discrimination lawsuit [need] not contain specific facts establishing a prima facie case of discrimination.” Here, the Court is not requiring heightened fact pleading of specifics, but only enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face. Because the plaintiffs here have not nudged their claims across the line from conceivable to plausible, their complaint must be dismissed. Pp. 1970–1974.

425 F.3d 99, reversed and remanded.

SOUTER, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which ROBERTS, C. J., and SCALIA, KENNEDY, THOMAS, BREYER, and ALITO, JJ., joined. STEVENS, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which GINSBURG, J., joined, except as to Part IV, *post*, p. 1974.

Stephen M. Shapiro, Kenneth S. Geller, Richard J. Favretto, Mayer, Brown, Rowe & Maw LLP, Washington, D.C., Laura J. Coleman, J. Henry Walker, Marc W.F. Galonsky, Ashley Watson, Atlanta, Georgia, for BellSouth Corporation.

Timothy Beyer, Brownstein Hyatt & Farber, P.C., Denver, Colorado, Cynthia

P. Delaney, Denver, Colorado, Counsel for Qwest Communications International Inc.

Michael K. Kellogg, Mark C. Hansen, Aaron M. Panner, Kellogg, Huber, Hansen, Todd, Evans & Figel, P.L.L.C., Washington, D.C., Javier Aguilar, William M. Schur, San Antonio, Texas, for AT&T Inc. (formerly SBC Communications Inc.).

Richard G. Taranto, Farr & Taranto, Washington, D.C., Paul J. Larkin, Jr., David E. Wheeler, Robert J. Zastrow, Arlington, Virginia, Dan K. Webb, Charles B. Molster III, Winston & Strawn LLP, Chicago, Illinois, for Verizon Communications Inc. (successor-in-interest to Bell Atlantic Corporation).

Marc A. Topaz, Joseph H. Meltzer, Schiffrin & Barroway, LLP, Radnor, PA, J. Douglas Richards, Michael M. Buchman, Milberg Weiss Bershad & Schulman LLP, New York, NY, for Respondents.

For U.S. Supreme Court briefs, see:

2006 WL 2474079 (Pet.Brief)

2006 WL 3089915 (Resp.Brief)

2006 WL 3265610 (Reply.Brief)

Justice SOUTER delivered the opinion of the Court.

548Liability under § 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1, requires a “contract, combination . . . , or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce.” The question in this putative class action is whether a § 1 complaint can survive a motion to dismiss when it alleges that major telecommunications providers engaged in certain parallel conduct unfavorable to 549competition, absent some factual context suggesting agreement, as distinct from identical, independent action. We hold that such a complaint should be dismissed.

I

The upshot of the 1984 divestiture of the American Telephone & Telegraph Compa-

ny’s (AT & T) local telephone business was a system of regional service monopolies (variously called “Regional Bell Operating Companies,” “Baby Bells,” or “Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers” (ILECs)), and a separate, competitive market for long-distance service from which the ILECs were excluded. More than a decade later, Congress withdrew approval of the ILECs’ monopolies by enacting the Telecommunications Act of 1996 (1996 Act), 110 Stat. 56, which “fundamentally restructure[d] local telephone markets” and “subject[ed] [ILECs] to a host of duties intended to facilitate market entry.” *AT & T Corp. v. Iowa Utilities Bd.*, 525 U.S. 366, 371, 119 S.Ct. 721, 142 L.Ed.2d 835 (1999). In recompense, the 1996 Act set conditions for authorizing ILECs to enter the long-distance market. See 47 U.S.C. § 271.

“Central to the [new] scheme [was each ILEC’s] obligation . . . to share its network with competitors,” *Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP*, 540 U.S. 398, 402, 124 S.Ct. 872, 157 L.Ed.2d 823 (2004), which came to be known as “competitive local exchange carriers” (CLECs), Pet. for Cert. 6, n. 1. A CLEC could make use of an ILEC’s network in any of three ways: by (1) “purchas[ing] local telephone services at wholesale rates for resale to end users,” (2) “leas[ing] elements of the [ILEC’s] network ‘on an unbundled basis,’” or (3) “interconnect[ing] its own facilities with the [ILEC’s] network.” *Iowa Utilities Bd.*, *supra*, at 371, 119 S.Ct. 721 (quoting 47 U.S.C. § 251(e)). Owing to the “considerable expense and effort” required to make unbundled network elements available to rivals at wholesale prices, *Trinko*, *supra*, at 410, 124 S.Ct. 872, the ILECs vigorously litigated the scope of the sharing obligation imposed by the 1996 Act, with the result that the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) three times 550revised

its regulations to narrow the range of network elements to be shared with the CLECs. See *Covad Communications Co. v. FCC*, 450 F.3d 528, 533–534 (C.A.D.C. 2006) (summarizing the 10-year-long regulatory struggle between the ILECs and CLECs).

Respondents William Twombly and Lawrence Marcus (hereinafter plaintiffs) represent a putative class consisting of all “subscribers of local telephone and/or high speed internet services . . . from February 8, 1996 to present.” Amended Complaint in No. 02 CIV. 10220(GEL) (SDNY) ¶ 53, App. 28 (hereinafter Complaint). In this action against petitioners, a group of ILECs,¹ plaintiffs seek treble damages and declaratory and injunctive relief for claimed violations of § 1 of the Sherman Act, ch. 647, 26 Stat. 209, as amended, 15 U.S.C. § 1, which prohibits “[e]very contract, combination in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy, in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations.”

The complaint alleges that the ILECs conspired to restrain trade in two ways, each supposedly inflating charges for local telephone and high-speed Internet services. Plaintiffs say, first, that the ILECs “engaged in parallel conduct” in their respective service areas to inhibit the growth of upstart CLECs. Complaint ¶ 47, App. 23–26. Their actions allegedly included making unfair agreements with the CLECs for access to ILEC networks, providing inferior connections to the networks, overcharging, and billing in ways designed to sabotage the CLECs’ relations with their own customers. *Ibid.* According

to the complaint, the ILECs’ “compelling common motivatio[n]” to thwart the CLECs’ competitive efforts naturally led them to form a conspiracy; “[h]ad any one [ILEC] not sought to prevent CLECs . . . from competing effectively . . . , the resulting greater competitive inroads into that [ILEC’s] territory would have revealed the degree to which competitive entry by CLECs would have been successful in the other territories in the absence of such conduct.” *Id.*, ¶ 50, App. 26–27.

Second, the complaint charges agreements by the ILECs to refrain from competing against one another. These are to be inferred from the ILECs’ common failure “meaningfully [to] pursu[e]” “attractive business opportunit[ies]” in contiguous markets where they possessed “substantial competitive advantages,” *id.*, ¶¶ 40–41, App. 21–22, and from a statement of Richard Notebaert, chief executive officer (CEO) of the ILEC Qwest, that competing in the territory of another ILEC “‘might be a good way to turn a quick dollar but that doesn’t make it right,’” *id.*, ¶ 42, App. 22.

The complaint couches its ultimate allegations this way:

“In the absence of any meaningful competition between the [ILECs] in one another’s markets, and in light of the parallel course of conduct that each engaged in to prevent competition from CLECs within their respective local telephone and/or high speed internet services markets and the other facts and market circumstances alleged above, Plaintiffs allege upon information

1. The 1984 divestiture of AT & T’s local telephone service created seven Regional Bell Operating Companies. Through a series of mergers and acquisitions, those seven companies were consolidated into the four ILECs named in this suit: BellSouth Corporation, Qwest Communications International, Inc.,

SBC Communications, Inc., and Verizon Communications, Inc. (successor-in-interest to Bell Atlantic Corporation). Complaint ¶ 21, App. 16. Together, these ILECs allegedly control 90 percent or more of the market for local telephone service in the 48 contiguous States. *Id.*, ¶ 48, App. 26.

and belief that [the ILECs] have entered into a contract, combination or conspiracy to prevent competitive entry in their respective local telephone and/or high speed internet services markets and have agreed not to compete with one another and otherwise allocated customers and markets to one another.” *Id.*, ¶ 51, App. 27.²

¹⁵⁵²The United States District Court for the Southern District of New York dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. The District Court acknowledged that “plaintiffs may allege a conspiracy by citing instances of parallel business behavior that suggest an agreement,” but emphasized that “while [c]ircumstantial evidence of consciously parallel behavior may have made heavy inroads into the traditional judicial attitude toward conspiracy[, . . .] “conscious parallelism” has not yet read conspiracy out of the Sherman Act entirely.’” 313 F.Supp.2d 174, 179 (2003) (quoting *Theatre Enterprises, Inc. v. Paramount Film Distributing Corp.*, 346 U.S. 537, 541, 74 S.Ct. 257, 98 L.Ed. 273 (1954); alterations in original). Thus, the District Court understood that allegations of parallel business conduct, taken alone, do not state a claim under § 1; plaintiffs must allege additional facts that “ten[d] to exclude independent self-interested conduct as an explanation for defendants’ parallel behavior.” 313 F.Supp.2d, at 179. The District Court found plaintiffs’ allegations of parallel ILEC actions to discourage competition inadequate because “the behavior of each ILEC in resisting the incur-

sion of CLECs is fully explained by the ILEC’s own interests in defending its individual territory.” *Id.*, at 183. As to the ILECs’ supposed agreement against competing with each other, the District Court found that the complaint does not “alleg[e] facts . . . suggesting that refraining from competing in other territories as CLECs was contrary to [the ILECs’] apparent economic interests, and consequently [does] not rais[e] an inference that [the ILECs’] actions were the result of a conspiracy.” *Id.*, at 188.

¹⁵⁵³The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit reversed, holding that the District Court tested the complaint by the wrong standard. It held that “plus factors are not *required* to be pleaded to permit an antitrust claim based on parallel conduct to survive dismissal.” 425 F.3d 99, 114 (2005) (emphasis in original). Although the Court of Appeals took the view that plaintiffs must plead facts that “include conspiracy among the realm of ‘plausible’ possibilities in order to survive a motion to dismiss,” it then said that “to rule that allegations of parallel anticompetitive conduct fail to support a plausible conspiracy claim, a court would have to conclude that there is no set of facts that would permit a plaintiff to demonstrate that the particular parallelism asserted was the product of collusion rather than coincidence.” *Ibid.*

We granted certiorari to address the proper standard for pleading an antitrust conspiracy through allegations of parallel conduct, 548 U.S. 903, 126 S.Ct. 2965, 165 L.Ed.2d 949 (2006), and now reverse.

2. In setting forth the grounds for § 1 relief, the complaint repeats these allegations in substantially similar language:

“Beginning at least as early as February 6, 1996, and continuing to the present, the exact dates being unknown to Plaintiffs, Defendants and their co-conspirators engaged in a contract, combination or conspiracy to prevent

competitive entry in their respective local telephone and/or high speed internet services markets by, among other things, agreeing not to compete with one another and to stifle attempts by others to compete with them and otherwise allocating customers and markets to one another in violation of Section 1 of the Sherman Act.” *Id.*, ¶ 64, App. 30–31.

II

A

[1–3] Because § 1 of the Sherman Act “does not prohibit [all] unreasonable restraints of trade . . . but only restraints effected by a contract, combination, or conspiracy,” *Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp.*, 467 U.S. 752, 775, 104 S.Ct. 2731, 81 L.Ed.2d 628 (1984), “[t]he crucial question” is whether the challenged anticompetitive conduct “stem[s] from independent decision or from an agreement, tacit or express,” *Theatre Enterprises*, 346 U.S., at 540, 74 S.Ct. 257. While a showing of parallel “business behavior is admissible circumstantial evidence from which the fact finder may infer agreement,” it falls short of “conclusively establish[ing] agreement or . . . itself constitut[ing] a Sherman Act offense.” *Id.*, at 540–541, 74 S.Ct. 257. Even “conscious parallelism,” a common reaction of “firms in a concentrated market [that] recogniz[e] their shared economic interests and their interdependence with respect to price and output decisions⁵⁵⁴” is “not in itself unlawful.” *Brooke Group Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*, 509 U.S. 209, 227, 113 S.Ct. 2578, 125 L.Ed.2d 168 (1993); see 6 P. Areeda & H. Hovenkamp, *Antitrust Law* ¶ 1433a, p. 236 (2d ed.2003) (hereinafter *Areeda & Hovenkamp*) (“The courts are nearly unanimous in saying that mere interdependent parallelism does not establish the contract, combination, or conspiracy required by Sherman Act § 1”); Turner, *The Definition of Agreement Under the Sherman Act: Conscious Parallelism and Refusals to Deal*, 75 Harv. L.Rev. 655, 672 (1962) (“[M]ere interdependence of basic price decisions is not conspiracy”).

[4–6] The inadequacy of showing parallel conduct or interdependence, without more, mirrors the ambiguity of the behavior: consistent with conspiracy, but just as much in line with a wide swath of rational

and competitive business strategy unilaterally prompted by common perceptions of the market. See, e.g., AEI–Brookings Joint Center for Regulatory Studies, Epstein, *Motions to Dismiss Antitrust Cases: Separating Fact from Fantasy*, Related Publication 06–08, pp. 3–4 (2006) (discussing problem of “false positives” in § 1 suits). Accordingly, we have previously hedged against false inferences from identical behavior at a number of points in the trial sequence. An antitrust conspiracy plaintiff with evidence showing nothing beyond parallel conduct is not entitled to a directed verdict, see *Theatre Enterprises*, *supra*; proof of a § 1 conspiracy must include evidence tending to exclude the possibility of independent action, see *Monsanto Co. v. Spray–Rite Service Corp.*, 465 U.S. 752, 104 S.Ct. 1464, 79 L.Ed.2d 775 (1984); and at the summary judgment stage a § 1 plaintiff’s offer of conspiracy evidence must tend to rule out the possibility that the defendants were acting independently, see *Matsushita Elec. Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538 (1986).

B

[7–9] This case presents the antecedent question of what a plaintiff must plead in order to state a claim under § 1 of the Sherman Act. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2) requires only “a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief,” in order to “give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests,” *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957). While a complaint attacked by a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss does not need detailed factual allegations, *ibid.*; *Sanjuan v. American Bd. of Psychiatry and Neurology, Inc.*, 40 F.3d 247, 251 (C.A.7 1994), a plaintiff’s obligation to provide the

“grounds” of his “entitle[ment] to relief” requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do, see *Papasian v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286, 106 S.Ct. 2932, 92 L.Ed.2d 209 (1986) (on a motion to dismiss, courts “are not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation”). Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level, see 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1216, pp. 235–236 (3d ed.2004) (hereinafter Wright & Miller) (“[T]he pleading must contain something more . . . than . . . a statement of facts that merely creates a suspicion [of] a legally cognizable right of action”),³ on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true (even if doubtful in fact), see, e.g., *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 508, n. 1, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152 L.Ed.2d 1 (2002); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327, 109 S.Ct. 1827, 104 L.Ed.2d 338 (1989) (“Rule 12(b)(6) does not countenance . . . dismiss-

3. The dissent greatly oversimplifies matters by suggesting that the Federal Rules somehow dispensed with the pleading of facts altogether. See *post*, at 1979 (opinion of STEVENS, J.) (pleading standard of Federal Rules “does not require, or even invite, the pleading of facts”). While, for most types of cases, the Federal Rules eliminated the cumbersome requirement that a claimant “set out *in detail* the facts upon which he bases his claim,” *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957) (emphasis added), Rule 8(a)(2) still requires a “showing,” rather than a blanket assertion, of entitlement to relief. Without some factual allegation in the complaint, it is hard to see how a claimant could satisfy the requirement of providing not only “fair notice” of the nature of the claim, but also “grounds” on which the claim rests. See 5 Wright & Miller § 1202, at 94, 95 (Rule 8(a) “contemplate[s] the statement of circumstances, occurrences, and events in support of the claim presented” and does not authorize a pleader’s “bare averment that he wants relief and is entitled to it”).

als based on a judge’s disbelief of a complaint’s factual allegations”); *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 40 L.Ed.2d 90 (1974) (a well-pleaded complaint may proceed even if it appears “that a recovery is very remote and unlikely”).

[10–13] In applying these general standards to a § 1 claim, we hold that stating such a claim requires a complaint with enough factual matter (taken as true) to suggest that an agreement was made. Asking for plausible grounds to infer an agreement does not impose a probability requirement at the pleading stage; it simply calls for enough fact to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of illegal agreement.⁴ And, of course, a well-pleaded complaint may proceed even if it strikes a savvy judge that actual proof of those facts is improbable, and “that a recovery is very remote and unlikely.” *Ibid.* In identifying facts that are suggestive enough to render a § 1 conspiracy plausible, we have the benefit

4. Commentators have offered several examples of parallel conduct allegations that would state a § 1 claim under this standard. See, e.g., 6 Areeda & Hovenkamp ¶ 1425, at 167–185 (discussing “parallel behavior that would probably not result from chance, coincidence, independent responses to common stimuli, or mere interdependence unaided by an advance understanding among the parties”); Blechman, *Conscious Parallelism, Signalling and Facilitating Devices: The Problem of Tacit Collusion Under the Antitrust Laws*, 24 N.Y.L. S. L.Rev. 881, 899 (1979) (describing “conduct [that] indicates the sort of restricted freedom of action and sense of obligation that one generally associates with agreement”). The parties in this case agree that “complex and historically unprecedented changes in pricing structure made at the very same time by multiple competitors, and made for no other discernible reason,” would support a plausible inference of conspiracy. Brief for Respondents 37; see also Reply Brief for Petitioners 12.

of the prior rulings and considered views of leading commentators, already quoted, that lawful parallel conduct fails to bespeak unlawful agreement. It makes sense to say, therefore, that an allegation of parallel conduct and a bare assertion of conspiracy will not suffice. Without ⁵⁵⁷more, parallel conduct does not suggest conspiracy, and a conclusory allegation of agreement at some unidentified point does not supply facts adequate to show illegality. Hence, when allegations of parallel conduct are set out in order to make a § 1 claim, they must be placed in a context that raises a suggestion of a preceding agreement, not merely parallel conduct that could just as well be independent action.

The need at the pleading stage for allegations plausibly suggesting (not merely consistent with) agreement reflects the threshold requirement of Rule 8(a)(2) that the “plain statement” possess enough heft to “sho[w] that the pleader is entitled to relief.” A statement of parallel conduct, even conduct consciously undertaken, needs some setting suggesting the agreement necessary to make out a § 1 claim; without that further circumstance pointing toward a meeting of the minds, an account of a defendant’s commercial efforts stays in neutral territory. An allegation of parallel conduct is thus much like a naked assertion of conspiracy in a § 1 complaint: it gets the complaint close to stating a claim, but without some further factual enhancement it stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of “entitlement] to relief.” Cf. *DM Research, Inc. v. College of Am. Pathologists*, 170 F.3d 53, 56 (C.A.1 1999) (“[T]erms like ‘conspiracy,’ or even ‘agreement,’ are border-line: they might well be sufficient in

conjunction with a more specific allegation—for example, identifying a written agreement or even a basis for inferring a tacit agreement, . . . but a court is not required to accept such terms as a sufficient basis for a complaint”).⁵

We alluded to the practical significance of the Rule 8 entitlement requirement in *Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336, 125 S.Ct. 1627, 161 L.Ed.2d 577 (2005), when we explained that something beyond the mere possibility of loss causation must be ⁵⁵⁸alleged, lest a plaintiff with “‘a largely groundless claim’” be allowed to “‘take up the time of a number of other people, with the right to do so representing an *in terrorem* increment of the settlement value.’” *Id.*, at 347, 125 S.Ct. 1627 (quoting *Blue Chip Stamps v. Manor Drug Stores*, 421 U.S. 723, 741, 95 S.Ct. 1917, 44 L.Ed.2d 539 (1975)). So, when the allegations in a complaint, however true, could not raise a claim of entitlement to relief, “‘this basic deficiency should . . . be exposed at the point of minimum expenditure of time and money by the parties and the court.’” 5 Wright & Miller § 1216, at 233–234 (quoting *Daves v. Hawaiian Dredging Co.*, 114 F.Supp. 643, 645 (D.Hawai 1953)); see also *Dura*, supra, at 346, 125 S.Ct. 1627; *Asahi Glass Co. v. Pentech Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 289 F.Supp.2d 986, 995 (N.D.Ill.2003) (Posner, J., sitting by designation) (“[S]ome threshold of plausibility must be crossed at the outset before a patent antitrust case should be permitted to go into its inevitably costly and protracted discovery phase”).

Thus, it is one thing to be cautious before dismissing an antitrust complaint in advance of discovery, cf. *Poller v. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.*, 368 U.S.

5. The border in *DM Research* was the line between the conclusory and the factual. Here it lies between the factually neutral and

the factually suggestive. Each must be crossed to enter the realm of plausible liability.

464, 473, 82 S.Ct. 486, 7 L.Ed.2d 458 (1962), but quite another to forget that proceeding to antitrust discovery can be expensive. As we indicated over 20 years ago in *Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519, 528, n. 17, 103 S.Ct. 897, 74 L.Ed.2d 723 (1983), “a district court must retain the power to insist upon some specificity in pleading before allowing a potentially massive factual controversy to proceed.” See also *Carriers, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co.*, 745 F.2d 1101, 1106 (C.A.7 1984) (“[T]he costs of modern federal antitrust litigation and the increasing caseload of the federal courts counsel against sending the parties into discovery when there is no reasonable likelihood that the plaintiffs can construct a claim from the events related in the complaint”); Note, *Modeling the Effect of One-Way Fee Shifting on Discovery Abuse in Private Antitrust Litigation*, 78 N.Y. & U. L.Rev. 1887, 1898–1899 (2003) (discussing the unusually high cost of discovery in antitrust cases); *Manual for Complex Litigation*,⁵⁵⁹ Fourth, § 30, p. 519 (2004) (describing extensive scope of discovery in antitrust cases); Memorandum from Paul V. Niemeyer, Chair, Advisory Committee on Civil Rules, to Hon. Anthony J. Scirica, Chair, Committee on Rules of Practice and Procedure (May 11, 1999), 192 F.R.D. 354, 357 (2000) (reporting that discovery accounts for as much as 90 percent of litigation costs when discovery is actively employed). That potential expense is obvious enough in the present case: plaintiffs represent a putative class of at least 90 percent of all subscribers to local telephone or high-speed Internet ser-

vice in the continental United States, in an action against America’s largest telecommunications firms (with many thousands of employees generating reams and gigabytes of business records) for unspecified (if any) instances of antitrust violations that allegedly occurred over a period of seven years.

It is no answer to say that a claim just shy of a plausible entitlement to relief can, if groundless, be weeded out early in the discovery process through “careful case management,” *post*, at 1975, given the common lament that the success of judicial supervision in checking discovery abuse has been on the modest side. See, e.g., Easterbrook, *Discovery as Abuse*, 69 B.U.L.Rev. 635, 638 (1989) (“Judges can do little about impositional discovery when parties control the legal claims to be presented and conduct the discovery themselves”). And it is self-evident that the problem of discovery abuse cannot be solved by “careful scrutiny of evidence at the summary judgment stage,” much less “lucid instructions to juries,” *post*, at 1975; the threat of discovery expense will push cost-conscious defendants to settle even anemic cases before reaching those proceedings. Probably, then, it is only by taking care to require allegations that reach the level suggesting conspiracy that we can hope to avoid the potentially enormous expense of discovery in cases with no “‘reasonably founded hope that the [discovery] process will reveal relevant evidence’” to support a § 1 claim. *Dura*, ⁵⁶⁰544 U.S., at 347, 125 S.Ct. 1627, 161 L.Ed.2d 577, (quoting *Blue Chip Stamps*, *supra*, at 741, 95 S.Ct. 1917; alteration in *Dura*).⁶

6. The dissent takes heart in the reassurances of plaintiffs’ counsel that discovery would be “‘phased’” and “‘limited to the existence of the alleged conspiracy and class certification.’” *Post*, at 1987. But determining whether some illegal agreement may have taken place between unspecified persons at

different ILECs (each a multibillion dollar corporation with legions of management level employees) at some point over seven years is a sprawling, costly, and hugely time-consuming undertaking not easily susceptible to the kind of line drawing and case management that the dissent envisions. Perhaps the best

[14] Plaintiffs do not, of course, dispute the requirement of plausibility and the need for something more than merely parallel behavior explained in *Theatre Enterprises*, *Monsanto*, and *Matsushita*, and their main argument against the plausibility standard at the pleading stage is its ostensible ¹⁵⁶¹conflict with an early statement of ours construing Rule 8. Justice Black's opinion for the Court in *Conley v. Gibson* spoke not only of the need for fair notice of the grounds for entitlement to relief but of "the accepted rule that a complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." 355 U.S., at 45-46, 78 S.Ct. 99. This "no set of facts" language can be read in isolation as saying that any statement revealing the theory of

the claim will suffice unless its factual impossibility may be shown from the face of the pleadings; and the Court of Appeals appears to have read *Conley* in some such way when formulating its understanding of the proper pleading standard, see 425 F.3d, at 106, 114 (invoking *Conley's* "no set of facts" language in describing the standard for dismissal).⁷

On such a focused and literal reading of *Conley's* "no set of facts," a wholly conclusory statement of claim would survive a motion to dismiss whenever the pleadings left open the possibility that a plaintiff might later establish some "set of [undisclosed] facts" to support recovery. So here, the Court of Appeals specifically found the prospect of unearthing direct evidence of conspiracy sufficient to preclude dismissal, even though the complaint

answer to the dissent's optimism that antitrust discovery is open to effective judicial control is a more extensive quotation of the authority just cited, a judge with a background in antitrust law. Given the system that we have, the hope of effective judicial supervision is slim:

"The timing is all wrong. The plaintiff files a sketchy complaint (the Rules of Civil Procedure discourage fulsome documents), and discovery is launched. A judicial officer does not know the details of the case the parties will present and in theory *cannot* know the details. Discovery is used to find the details. The judicial officer always knows less than the parties, and the parties themselves may not know very well where they are going or what they expect to find. A magistrate supervising discovery does not—cannot—know the expected productivity of a given request, because the nature of the requester's claim and the contents of the files (or head) of the adverse party are unknown. Judicial officers cannot measure the costs and benefits to the requester and so cannot isolate impositions requests. Requesters have no reason to disclose their own estimates because they gain from imposing costs on rivals (and may lose from an improvement in accuracy). The portions of the Rules of Civil Procedure calling on judges to trim back excessive demands, therefore, have been, and are doomed to be,

hollow. We cannot prevent what we cannot detect; we cannot detect what we cannot define; we cannot define 'abusive' discovery except in theory, because in practice we lack essential information." Easterbrook, *Discovery as Abuse*, 69 B.U.L.Rev. 635, 638-639 (1989) (footnote omitted).

7. The Court of Appeals also relied on Chief Judge Clark's suggestion in *Nagler v. Admiral Corp.*, 248 F.2d 319 (C.A.2 1957), that facts indicating parallel conduct alone suffice to state a claim under § 1. 425 F.3d, at 114 (citing *Nagler*, *supra*, at 325). But *Nagler* gave no explanation for citing *Theatre Enterprises* (which upheld a denial of a directed verdict for plaintiff on the ground that proof of parallelism was not proof of conspiracy) as authority that pleading parallel conduct sufficed to plead a Sherman Act conspiracy. Now that *Monsanto Co. v. Spray-Rite Service Corp.*, 465 U.S. 752, 104 S.Ct. 1464, 79 L.Ed.2d 775 (1984), and *Matsushita Elec. Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538 (1986), have made it clear that neither parallel conduct nor conscious parallelism, taken alone, raise the necessary implication of conspiracy, it is time for a fresh look at adequacy of pleading when a claim rests on parallel action.

does not set forth a single J₅₆₂ fact in a context that suggests an agreement. 425 F.3d, at 106, 114. It seems fair to say that this approach to pleading would dispense with any showing of a “‘reasonably founded hope’” that a plaintiff would be able to make a case, see *Dura*, 544 U.S., at 347, 125 S.Ct. 1627 (quoting *Blue Chip Stamps*, 421 U.S., at 741, 95 S.Ct. 1917); Mr. Micawber’s optimism would be enough.

Seeing this, a good many judges and commentators have balked at taking the literal terms of the *Conley* passage as a pleading standard. See, e.g., *Car Carriers*, 745 F.2d, at 1106 (“*Conley* has never been interpreted literally” and, “[i]n practice, a complaint . . . must contain either direct or inferential allegations respecting all the material elements necessary to sustain recovery under *some* viable legal theory” (internal quotation marks omitted; emphasis and omission in original)); *Ascon Properties, Inc. v. Mobil Oil Co.*, 866 F.2d 1149, 1155 (C.A.9 1989) (tension between *Conley*’s “no set of facts” language and its acknowledgment that a plaintiff must provide the “grounds” on which his claim rests); *O’Brien v. DiGrazia*, 544 F.2d 543, 546, n. 3 (C.A.1 1976) (“[W]hen a plaintiff . . . supplies facts to support his claim, we do not think that *Conley* imposes a duty on the courts to conjure up unpleaded facts that might turn a frivolous claim of unconstitutional . . . action into a substantial one”); *McGregor v. Industrial Excess Landfill, Inc.*, 856 F.2d 39, 42–43 (C.A.6 1988) (quoting *O’Brien’s* analysis); Hazard, From Whom No Secrets Are Hid, 76 Tex. L.Rev. 1665, 1685 (1998) (describing *Conley* as having “turned Rule 8 on its head”); Marcus, The Revival of Fact Pleading Under the Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure, 86 Colum. L.Rev. 433, 463–465 (1986) (noting tension between *Conley* and subsequent understandings of Rule 8).

We could go on, but there is no need to pile up further citations to show that *Conley*’s “no set of facts” language has been questioned, criticized, and explained away long enough. To be fair to the *Conley* Court, the passage should be understood in light of the opinion’s preceding summary of the complaint’s₅₆₃ concrete allegations, which the Court quite reasonably understood as amply stating a claim for relief. But the passage so often quoted fails to mention this understanding on the part of the Court, and after puzzling the profession for 50 years, this famous observation has earned its retirement. The phrase is best forgotten as an incomplete, negative gloss on an accepted pleading standard: once a claim has been stated adequately, it may be supported by showing any set of facts consistent with the allegations in the complaint. See *Sanjuan*, 40 F.3d, at 251 (once a claim for relief has been stated, a plaintiff “receives the benefit of imagination, so long as the hypotheses are consistent with the complaint”); accord, *Swierkiewicz*, 534 U.S., at 514, 122 S.Ct. 992; *National Organization for Women, Inc. v. Scheidler*, 510 U.S. 249, 256, 114 S.Ct. 798, 127 L.Ed.2d 99 (1994); *H.J. Inc. v. Northwestern Bell Telephone Co.*, 492 U.S. 229, 249–250, 109 S.Ct. 2893, 106 L.Ed.2d 195 (1989); *Hishon v. King & Spalding*, 467 U.S. 69, 73, 104 S.Ct. 2229, 81 L.Ed.2d 59 (1984). *Conley*, then, described the breadth of opportunity to prove what an adequate complaint claims, not the minimum standard of adequate pleading to govern a complaint’s survival.⁸

8. Because *Conley*’s “‘no set of facts’” language was one of our earliest statements about pleading under the Federal Rules, it is no surprise that it has since been “cited as authority” by this Court and others. *Post*, at

1978. Although we have not previously explained the circumstances and rejected the literal reading of the passage embraced by the Court of Appeals, our analysis comports with this Court’s statements in the years since *Con-*

1⁵⁶⁴III

[15] When we look for plausibility in this complaint, we agree with the District Court that plaintiffs' claim of conspiracy in restraint of trade comes up short. To begin with, the complaint leaves no doubt that plaintiffs rest their § 1 claim on descriptions of parallel conduct and not on any independent allegation of actual agreement among the ILECs. *Supra*, at 1962–1963. Although in form a few stray statements speak directly of agreement,⁹ on fair reading these are merely legal conclusions resting on the prior allegations. Thus, the

ley. See *Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336, 347, 125 S.Ct. 1627, 161 L.Ed.2d 577(2005) (requiring “‘reasonably founded hope that the [discovery] process will reveal relevant evidence’” to support the claim (quoting *Blue Chip Stamps v. Manor Drug Stores*, 421 U.S. 723, 741, 95 S.Ct. 1917, 44 L.Ed.2d 539 (1975));(alteration in *Dura*)); *Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519, 526, 103 S.Ct. 897, 74 L.Ed.2d 723 (1983) (“It is not . . . proper to assume that [the plaintiff] can prove facts that it has not alleged or that the defendants have violated the antitrust laws in ways that have not been alleged”); *Wilson v. Schmettler*, 365 U.S. 381, 383, 81 S.Ct. 632, 5 L.Ed.2d 620 (1961) (“In the absence of . . . an allegation [that the arrest was made without probable cause] the courts below could not, nor can we, assume that respondents arrested petitioner without probable cause to believe that he had committed . . . a narcotics offense”). Nor are we reaching out to decide this issue in a case where the matter was not raised by the parties, see *post*, at 1979, since both the ILECs and the Government highlight the problems stemming from a literal interpretation of *Conley's* “no set of facts” language and seek clarification of the standard. Brief for Petitioners 27–28; Brief for United States as *Amicus Curiae* 22–25; see also Brief for Respondents 17 (describing “[p]etitioners and their amici” as mounting an “attack on *Conley's* ‘no set of facts’ standard”).

The dissent finds relevance in Court of Appeals precedents from the 1940s, which allegedly gave rise to *Conley's* “no set of facts” language. See *post*, at 1979–1981. Even indulging this line of analysis, these cases do not challenge the understanding that, before

complaint⁵⁶⁵ first takes account of the alleged “absence of any meaningful competition between [the ILECs] in one another’s markets,” “the parallel course of conduct that each [ILEC] engaged in to prevent competition from CLECs,” “and the other facts and market circumstances alleged [earlier]”; “in light of” these, the complaint concludes “that [the ILECs] have entered into a contract, combination or conspiracy to prevent competitive entry into their . . . markets and have agreed not to compete with one another.” Complaint ¶ 51, App. 27.¹⁰ The nub of the

proceeding to discovery, a complaint must allege facts suggestive of illegal conduct. See, e.g., *Leimer v. State Mut. Life Assurance Co. of Worcester, Mass.*, 108 F.2d 302, 305 (C.A.8 1940) (“[I]f, in view of what is alleged, it can reasonably be conceived that the plaintiffs . . . could, upon a trial, establish a case which would entitle them to . . . relief, the motion to dismiss should not have been granted”); *Continental Collieries, Inc. v. Shober*, 130 F.2d 631, 635 (C.A.3 1942) (“No matter how likely it may seem that the pleader will be unable to prove his case, he is entitled, upon averring a claim, to an opportunity to try to prove it”). Rather, these cases stand for the unobjectionable proposition that, when a complaint adequately states a claim, it may not be dismissed based on a district court’s assessment that the plaintiff will fail to find evidentiary support for his allegations or prove his claim to the satisfaction of the factfinder. Cf. *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 40 L.Ed.2d 90 (1974) (a district court weighing a motion to dismiss asks “not whether a plaintiff will ultimately prevail but whether the claimant is entitled to offer evidence to support the claims”).

9. See Complaint ¶¶ 51, 64, App. 27, 30–31 (alleging that ILECs engaged in a “contract, combination or conspiracy” and agreed not to compete with one another).

10. If the complaint had not explained that the claim of agreement rested on the parallel conduct described, we doubt that the complaint’s references to an agreement among the ILECs would have given the notice required by Rule 8. Apart from identifying a 7-

complaint, then, is the ILECs' parallel behavior, consisting of steps to keep the CLECs out and manifest disinterest in becoming CLECs themselves, and its sufficiency turns on the suggestions raised by this conduct when viewed in light of common economic experience.¹¹

¹₅₆₆ We think that nothing contained in the complaint invests either the action or inaction alleged with a plausible suggestion of conspiracy. As to the ILECs' supposed agreement to disobey the 1996 Act and thwart the CLECs' attempts to compete, we agree with the District Court that nothing in the complaint intimates that the resistance to the upstarts was anything more than the natural, unilateral reaction of each ILEC intent on keeping its regional dominance. The 1996 Act did more than just subject the ILECs to competition; it obliged them to subsidize their competitors with their own equipment at wholesale rates. The economic incentive to resist was powerful, but resisting competition is routine market conduct, and even if the ILECs flouted the 1996 Act in all the ways the plaintiffs allege, see *id.*, ¶ 47, App. 23–24, there is no reason to infer that the companies had agreed among themselves to do what was only natural anyway; so natural, in fact, that if

year span in which the § 1 violations were supposed to have occurred (*i. e.*, “[b]eginning at least as early as February 6, 1996, and continuing to the present,” *id.*, ¶ 64, App. 30), the pleadings mentioned no specific time, place, or person involved in the alleged conspiracies. This lack of notice contrasts sharply with the model form for pleading negligence, Form 9, which the dissent says exemplifies the kind of “bare allegation” that survives a motion to dismiss. *Post*, at 1977. Whereas the model form alleges that the defendant struck the plaintiff with his car while plaintiff was crossing a particular highway at a specified date and time, the complaint here furnishes no clue as to which of the four ILECs (much less which of their employees) supposedly agreed, or when and where the illicit agreement took place. A defendant

alleging parallel decisions to resist competition were enough to imply an antitrust conspiracy, pleading a § 1 violation against almost any group of competing businesses would be a sure thing.

The complaint makes its closest pass at a predicate for conspiracy with the claim that collusion was necessary because success by even one CLEC in an ILEC's territory “would have revealed the degree to which competitive entry by CLECs would have been successful in the other territories.” *Id.*, ¶ 50, App. 26–27. But, its logic aside, this general premise still fails to answer the point that there was just no need for joint encouragement to resist the 1996 Act; as the District Court said, “each ILEC has reason to want to avoid dealing with CLECs” and “each ILEC would attempt to keep CLECs out, regardless of the actions of the other ILECs.” 313 F.Supp.2d, at 184; cf. *Kramer v. Pollock–Krasner Foundation*, 890 F.Supp. 250, 256 (S.D.N.Y.1995) (while the plaintiff “may believe the defendants conspired . . . , the defendants' allegedly conspiratorial actions⁵⁶⁷ could equally have been prompted by lawful, independent goals which do not constitute a conspiracy”).¹²

wishing to prepare an answer in the simple fact pattern laid out in Form 9 would know what to answer; a defendant seeking to respond to plaintiffs' conclusory allegations in the § 1 context would have little idea where to begin.

11. The dissent's quotations from the complaint leave the impression that plaintiffs directly allege illegal agreement; in fact, they proceed exclusively via allegations of parallel conduct, as both the District Court and Court of Appeals recognized. See 313 F.Supp.2d 174, 182 (S.D.N.Y.2003); 425 F.3d 99, 102–104 (C.A.2 2005).
12. From the allegation that the ILECs belong to various trade associations, see Complaint ¶ 46, App. 23, the dissent playfully suggests

Plaintiffs' second conspiracy theory rests on the competitive reticence among the ILECs themselves in the wake of the 1996 Act, which was supposedly passed in the "hop[e] that the large incumbent local monopoly companies . . . might attack their neighbors' service areas, as they are the best situated to do so." Complaint ¶ 38, App. 20 (quoting Consumer Federation of America, *Lessons from 1996 Telecommunications Act: Deregulation Before Meaningful Competition Spells Consumer Disaster*, p. 12 (Feb. 2000)). Contrary to hope, the ILECs declined "to enter each other's service territories in any significant way," Complaint ¶ 38, App. 20, and the local telephone and high-speed Internet market remains highly compartmentalized geographically, with minimal competition. Based on this state of affairs, and perceiving the ILECs to be blessed with "especially attractive business opportunities" in surrounding markets dominated by other ILECs, the plaintiffs assert that the ILECs' parallel conduct was "strongly suggestive of conspiracy." *Id.*, ¶ 40, App. 21.

But it was not suggestive of conspiracy, not if history teaches anything. In a traditionally unregulated industry with low barriers to entry, sparse competition among

that they conspired to restrain trade, an inference said to be "buttressed by the common sense of Adam Smith." *Post*, at 1985–1986, 1987–1988. If Adam Smith is peering down today, he may be surprised to learn that his tongue-in-cheek remark would be authority to force his famous pinmaker to devote financial and human capital to hire lawyers, prepare for depositions, and otherwise fend off allegations of conspiracy; all this just because he belonged to the same trade guild as one of his competitors when their pins carried the same price tag.

13. The complaint quoted a reported statement of Qwest's CEO, Richard Notebaert, to suggest that the ILECs declined to compete against each other despite recognizing that it

large firms dominating separate geographical segments of the market could very well signify illegal agreement, but here we have an obvious alternative explanation. In the decade preceding the 1996 Act and well before that, monopoly was the norm in telecommunications, not the exception. See *Verizon Communications Inc. v. FCC*, 535 U.S. 467, 477–478, 122 S.Ct. 1646, 152 L.Ed.2d 701 (2002) (describing telephone service providers as traditional public monopolies). The ILECs were born in that world, doubtless liked the world the way it was, and surely knew the adage about him who lives by the sword. Hence, a natural explanation for the noncompetition alleged is that the former Government-sanctioned monopolists were sitting tight, expecting their neighbors to do the same thing.

[16–18] In fact, the complaint itself gives reasons to believe that the ILECs would see their best interests in keeping to their old turf. Although the complaint says generally that the ILECs passed up "especially attractive business opportunities" by declining to compete as CLECs against other ILECs, Complaint ¶ 40, App. 21, it does not allege that competition as CLECs was potentially any more lucrative than other opportunities being pursued by the ILECs during the same period,¹³ and

"might be a good way to turn a quick dollar." ¶ 42, App. 22 (quoting Chicago Tribune, Oct. 31, 2002, Business Section, p. 1). This was only part of what he reportedly said, however, and the District Court was entitled to take notice of the full contents of the published articles referenced in the complaint, from which the truncated quotations were drawn. See Fed. Rule Evid. 201.

Notebaert was also quoted as saying that entering new markets as a CLEC would not be "a sustainable economic model" because the CLEC pricing model is "just . . . nuts." Chicago Tribune, Oct. 31, 2002, Business Section, p. 1 (cited at Complaint ¶ 42, App. 22). Another source cited in the complaint quotes Notebaert as saying he thought it "unwise" to "base a business plan" on the privileges ac-

the complaint is replete with indications that any CLEC faced nearly insurmountable barriers to profitability owing to the ILECs' flagrant resistance to the network sharing requirements of the 1996 Act, *id.*, ¶ 47, App. 156923–26. Not only that, but even without a monopolistic tradition and the peculiar difficulty of mandating shared networks, “[f]irms do not expand without limit and none of them enters every market that an outside observer might regard as profitable, or even a small portion of such markets.” Areeda & Hovenkamp ¶ 307d, at 155 (Supp.2006) (commenting on the case at bar). The upshot is that Congress may have expected some ILECs to become CLECs in the legacy territories of other ILECs, but the disappointment does not make conspiracy plausible. We agree with the District Court’s assessment that antitrust conspiracy was not suggested by the facts adduced under either theory of the complaint, which thus fails to state a valid § 1 claim.¹⁴

Plaintiffs say that our analysis runs counter to *Swierkiewicz*, 534 U.S., at 508, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152 L.Ed.2d 1, which held that “a complaint in an employment discrimination lawsuit [need] not contain specific facts establishing a prima facie case of discrimination under the framework set forth in *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792[, 93 S.Ct. 1817, 36 L.Ed.2d 668] (1973).” They argue that

corded to CLECs under the 1996 Act because the regulatory environment was too unstable. Chicago Tribune, Dec. 19, 2002, Business Section, p. 2 (cited at Complaint ¶ 45, App. 23).

14. In reaching this conclusion, we do not apply any “heightened” pleading standard, nor do we seek to broaden the scope of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9, which can only be accomplished “by the process of amending the Federal Rules, and not by judicial interpretation.” *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 515, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152

just as the prima facie case is a “flexible evidentiary standard” that “should not be transposed into a rigid pleading standard for discrimination cases,” *Swierkiewicz, supra*, at 512, 122 S.Ct. 992, “transpos[ing] ‘plus factor’ summary judgment analysis woodenly into a rigid Rule 12(b)(6) pleading standard . . . would be unwise,” Brief for Respondents 39. As the District Court 1570correctly understood, however, “*Swierkiewicz* did not change the law of pleading, but simply re-emphasized . . . that the Second Circuit’s use of a heightened pleading standard for Title VII cases was contrary to the Federal Rules’ structure of liberal pleading requirements.” 313 F.Supp.2d, at 181 (citation and footnote omitted). Even though *Swierkiewicz*’s pleadings “detailed the events leading to his termination, provided relevant dates, and included the ages and nationalities of at least some of the relevant persons involved with his termination,” the Court of Appeals dismissed his complaint for failing to allege certain additional facts that *Swierkiewicz* would need at the trial stage to support his claim in the absence of direct evidence of discrimination. *Swierkiewicz*, 534 U.S., at 514, 122 S.Ct. 992. We reversed on the ground that the Court of Appeals had impermissibly applied what amounted to a heightened pleading requirement by insisting that *Swierkiewicz* allege “specific facts” beyond those necessary to state his

L.Ed.2d 1 (2002) (quoting *Leatherman v. Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit*, 507 U.S. 163, 168, 113 S.Ct. 1160, 122 L.Ed.2d 517 (1993)). On certain subjects understood to raise a high risk of abusive litigation, a plaintiff must state factual allegations with greater particularity than Rule 8 requires. Fed. Rules Civ. Proc. 9(b)-(c). Here, our concern is not that the allegations in the complaint were insufficiently “particular[ized],” *ibid.*; rather, the complaint warranted dismissal because it failed *in toto* to render plaintiffs’ entitlement to relief plausible.

claim and the grounds showing entitlement to relief. *Id.*, at 508, 122 S.Ct. 992.

Here, in contrast, we do not require heightened fact pleading of specifics, but only enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face. Because the plaintiffs here have not nudged their claims across the line from conceivable to plausible, their complaint must be dismissed.

* * *

The judgment of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is reversed, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

Justice STEVENS, with whom Justice GINSBURG joins except as to Part IV, dissenting.

In the first paragraph of its 23-page opinion the Court states that the question to be decided is whether allegations that “major telecommunications providers engaged in certain §571 parallel conduct unfavorable to competition” suffice to state a violation of § 1 of the Sherman Act. *Ante*, at 1961. The answer to that question has been settled for more than 50 years. If that were indeed the issue, a summary reversal citing *Theatre Enterprises, Inc. v. Paramount Film Distributing Corp.*, 346 U.S. 537, 74 S.Ct. 257, 98 L.Ed. 273 (1954), would adequately resolve this case. As *Theatre Enterprises* held, parallel conduct is circumstantial evidence admissible on the issue of conspiracy, but it is not itself illegal. *Id.*, at 540–542, 74 S.Ct. 257.

Thus, this is a case in which there is no dispute about the substantive law. If the defendants acted independently, their conduct was perfectly lawful. If, however, that conduct is the product of a horizontal agreement among potential competitors, it

was unlawful. The plaintiffs have alleged such an agreement and, because the complaint was dismissed in advance of answer, the allegation has not even been denied. Why, then, does the case not proceed? Does a judicial opinion that the charge is not “plausible” provide a legally acceptable reason for dismissing the complaint? I think not.

Respondents’ amended complaint describes a variety of circumstantial evidence and makes the straightforward allegation that petitioners

“entered into a contract, combination or conspiracy to prevent competitive entry in their respective local telephone and/or high speed internet services markets and have agreed not to compete with one another and otherwise allocated customers and markets to one another.” Amended Complaint in No. 02 CIV. 10220(GEL) (SDNY) ¶ 51, App. 27 (hereinafter Complaint).

The complaint explains that, contrary to Congress’ expectation when it enacted the 1996 Telecommunications Act, and consistent with their own economic self-interests, petitioner Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers (ILECs) have assiduously avoided infringing upon each other’s markets and have §572 refused to permit nonincumbent competitors to access their networks. The complaint quotes Richard Notebaert, the former chief executive officer of one such ILEC, as saying that competing in a neighboring ILEC’s territory “‘might be a good way to turn a quick dollar but that doesn’t make it right.’” *Id.*, ¶ 42, App. 22. Moreover, respondents allege that petitioners “communicate amongst themselves” through numerous industry associations. *Id.*, ¶ 46, App. 23. In sum, respondents allege that petitioners entered into an agreement that has long been recognized as a classic *per se*

violation of the Sherman Act. See Report of the Attorney General's National Committee to Study the Antitrust Laws 26 (1955).

Under rules of procedure that have been well settled since well before our decision in *Theatre Enterprises*, a judge ruling on a defendant's motion to dismiss a complaint "must accept as true all of the factual allegations contained in the complaint." *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 508, n. 1, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152 L.Ed.2d 1 (2002); see *Overstreet v. North Shore Corp.*, 318 U.S. 125, 127, 63 S.Ct. 494, 87 L.Ed. 656 (1943). But instead of requiring knowledgeable executives such as Notebaert to respond to these allegations by way of sworn depositions or other limited discovery—and indeed without so much as requiring petitioners to file an answer denying that they entered into any agreement—the majority permits immediate dismissal based on the assurances of company lawyers that nothing untoward was afoot. The Court embraces the argument of those lawyers that "there is no reason to infer that the companies had agreed among themselves to do what was only natural anyway," *ante*, at 1971; that "there was just no need for joint encouragement to resist the 1996 Act," *ibid.*; and that the "natural explanation for the non-competition alleged is that the former Government-sanctioned monopolists were sitting tight, expecting their neighbors to do the same thing," *ante*, at 1972.

The Court and petitioners' legal team are no doubt correct that the parallel conduct alleged is consistent with the absence⁵⁷³ of any contract, combination, or conspiracy. But that conduct is also entirely consistent with the *presence* of the illegal agreement alleged in the complaint. And the charge that petitioners "agreed not to compete with one another" is not

just one of "a few stray statements," *ante*, at 1970; it is an allegation describing unlawful conduct. As such, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, our longstanding precedent, and sound practice mandate that the District Court at least require some sort of response from petitioners before dismissing the case.

Two practical concerns presumably explain the Court's dramatic departure from settled procedural law. Private antitrust litigation can be enormously expensive, and there is a risk that jurors may mistakenly conclude that evidence of parallel conduct has proved that the parties acted pursuant to an agreement when they in fact merely made similar independent decisions. Those concerns merit careful case management, including strict control of discovery, careful scrutiny of evidence at the summary judgment stage, and lucid instructions to juries; they do not, however, justify the dismissal of an adequately pleaded complaint without even requiring the defendants to file answers denying a charge that they in fact engaged in collective decisionmaking. More importantly, they do not justify an interpretation of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) that seems to be driven by the majority's appraisal of the plausibility of the ultimate factual allegation rather than its legal sufficiency.

I

Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules requires that a complaint contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." The Rule did not come about by happenstance, and its language is not inadvertent. The English experience with Byzantine special pleading rules—illustrated by the hyper-technical Hilary rules of 15741834¹—made

1. See 9 W. Holdsworth, History of English

Law 324–327 (1926).

obvious the appeal of a pleading standard that was easy for the common litigant to understand and sufficed to put the defendant on notice as to the nature of the claim against him and the relief sought. State-side, David Dudley Field developed the highly influential New York Code of 1848, which required “[a] statement of the facts constituting the cause of action, in ordinary and concise language, without repetition, and in such a manner as to enable a person of common understanding to know what is intended.” An Act to Simplify and Abridge the Practice, Pleadings and Proceedings of the Courts of this State, ch. 379, § 120(2), 1848 N.Y. Laws pp. 497, 521. Substantially similar language appeared in the Federal Equity Rules adopted in 1912. See Fed. Equity Rule 25 (requiring “a short and simple statement of the ultimate facts upon which the plaintiff asks relief, omitting any mere statement of evidence”).

A difficulty arose, however, in that the Field Code and its progeny required a plaintiff to plead “facts” rather than “conclusions,” a distinction that proved far easier to say than to apply. As commentators have noted,

“it is virtually impossible logically to distinguish among ‘ultimate facts,’ ‘evidence,’ and ‘conclusions.’ Essentially any allegation in a pleading must be an assertion that certain occurrences took place. The pleading spectrum, passing from evidence through ultimate facts to conclusions, is largely a continuum varying only in the degree of particularity with which the occurrences are described.” Weinstein & Distler, *Comments on Procedural Reform: Drafting Pleading Rules*, 57 Colum. L.Rev. 518, 520–521 (1957).

See also Cook, *Statements of Fact in Pleading Under the Codes*, 21 Colum. L.Rev. 416, 417 (1921) (hereinafter Cook) (“[T]here is no logical distinction between statements which are grouped by the courts under the phrases ‘statements of fact’ and ‘conclusions of law’”). Rule 8 was directly responsive to this difficulty. Its drafters intentionally avoided any reference to “facts” or “evidence” or “conclusions.” See 5 C. Wright & A. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1216, p. 207 (3d ed.2004) (hereinafter Wright & Miller) (“The substitution of ‘claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief’ for the code formulation of the ‘facts’ constituting a ‘cause of action’ was intended to avoid the distinctions drawn under the codes among ‘evidentiary facts,’ ‘ultimate facts,’ and ‘conclusions’ . . .”).

Under the relaxed pleading standards of the Federal Rules, the idea was not to keep litigants out of court but rather to keep them in. The merits of a claim would be sorted out during a flexible pretrial process and, as appropriate, through the crucible of trial. See *Swierkiewicz*, 534 U.S., at 514, 122 S.Ct. 992 (“The liberal notice pleading of Rule 8(a) is the starting point of a simplified pleading system, which was adopted to focus litigation on the merits of a claim”). Charles E. Clark, the “principal draftsman” of the Federal Rules,² put it thus:

“Experience has shown . . . that we cannot expect the proof of the case to be made through the pleadings, and that such proof is really not their function. We can expect a general statement distinguishing the case from all others, so that the manner and form of trial and remedy expected are clear, and so that a permanent judgment will result.” The

2. *Gulfstream Aerospace Corp. v. Mayacamas Corp.*, 485 U.S. 271, 283, 108 S.Ct. 1133, 99

L.Ed.2d 296 (1988).

New Federal Rules of Civil Procedure: The Last Phase—Underlying Philosophy Embodied in Some of the Basic Provisions of the New Procedure, 23 A.B.A.J. 976, 977 (1937) (hereinafter Clark, New Federal Rules).

The pleading paradigm under the new Federal Rules was well illustrated by the inclusion in the appendix of Form 9, ^{1576a} complaint for negligence. As relevant, the Form 9 complaint states only: “On June 1, 1936, in a public highway called Boylston Street in Boston, Massachusetts, defendant negligently drove a motor vehicle against plaintiff who was then crossing said highway.” Form 9, Complaint for Negligence, Forms App., Fed. Rules Civ. Proc., 28 U.S.C.App., p. 829 (hereinafter Form 9). The complaint then describes the plaintiff’s injuries and demands judgment. The asserted ground for relief—namely, the defendant’s negligent driving—would have been called a “‘conclusion of law’” under the code pleading of old. See, e.g., Cook 419. But that bare allegation suffices under a system that “restrict[s] the pleadings to the task of general notice-giving and invest[s] the deposition-discovery process with a vital role in the preparation for trial.”³ *Hickman v. Taylor*, 329 U.S. 495, 501, 67 S.Ct. 385, 91 L.Ed. 451 (1947); see also *Swierkiewicz*, 534 U.S., at 513, n. 4, 122 S.Ct. 992 (citing Form 9 as an example of “‘the simplicity and brevity of statement which the rules contemplate’”); *Thomson v. Washington*, 362 F.3d 969, 970 (C.A.7 2004) (Posner, J.) (“The federal rules replaced fact pleading with notice pleading”).

II

It is in the context of this history that *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 78 S.Ct. 99,

2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957), must be understood. The *Conley* plaintiffs were black railroad workers who alleged that their union local had refused to protect them against discriminatory discharges, in violation of the National Railway Labor Act. The union sought to dismiss the complaint on the ground that its general allegations of discriminatory treatment by the defendants lacked sufficient specificity. Writing ¹⁵⁷⁷ for a unanimous Court, Justice Black rejected the union’s claim as foreclosed by the language of Rule 8. *Id.*, at 47–48, 78 S.Ct. 99. In the course of doing so, he articulated the formulation the Court rejects today: “In appraising the sufficiency of the complaint we follow, of course, the accepted rule that a complaint should not be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief.” *Id.*, at 45–46, 78 S.Ct. 99.

Consistent with the design of the Federal Rules, *Conley*’s “no set of facts” formulation permits outright dismissal only when proceeding to discovery or beyond would be futile. Once it is clear that a plaintiff has stated a claim that, if true, would entitle him to relief, matters of proof are appropriately relegated to other stages of the trial process. Today, however, in its explanation of a decision to dismiss a complaint that it regards as a fishing expedition, the Court scraps *Conley*’s “no set of facts” language. Concluding that the phrase has been “questioned, criticized, and explained away long enough,” *ante*, at 1969, the Court dismisses it as careless composition.

3. The Federal Rules do impose a “particularity” requirement on “all averments of fraud or mistake,” Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 9(b), neither of which has been alleged in this case. We have recognized that the canon of *expresio unius*

est exclusio alterius applies to Rule 9(b). See *Leatherman v. Tarrant Cty. Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit*, 507 U.S. 163, 168, 113 S.Ct. 1160, 122 L.Ed.2d 517 (1993).

If *Conley's* “no set of facts” language is to be interred, let it not be without a eulogy. That exact language, which the majority says has “puzzl[ed] the profession for 50 years,” *ante*, at 1969, 355 U.S. 41, 2 L.Ed.2d 80, has been cited as authority in a dozen opinions of this Court and four separate writings.⁴ In not one of 157 those 16 opinions was the language “questioned,” “criticized,” or “explained away.” Indeed,

today’s opinion is the first by any Member of this Court to express *any* doubt as to the adequacy of the *Conley* formulation. Taking their cues from the federal courts, 26 States and the District of Columbia utilize as their standard for dismissal of a complaint the very language the majority repudiates: whether it appears “beyond doubt” that “no set of facts” in support of the claim would entitle the plaintiff to relief.⁵

4. *SEC v. Zandford*, 535 U.S. 813, 818, 122 S.Ct. 1899, 153 L.Ed.2d 1 (2002); *Davis v. Monroe County Bd. of Ed.*, 526 U.S. 629, 654, 119 S.Ct. 1661, 143 L.Ed.2d 839 (1999); *Hartford Fire Ins. Co. v. California*, 509 U.S. 764, 811, 113 S.Ct. 2891, 125 L.Ed.2d 612 (1993); *Brower v. County of Inyo*, 489 U.S. 593, 598, 109 S.Ct. 1378, 103 L.Ed.2d 628 (1989); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 10, 101 S.Ct. 173, 66 L.Ed.2d 163 (1980) (*per curiam*); *McLain v. Real Estate Bd. of New Orleans, Inc.*, 444 U.S. 232, 246, 100 S.Ct. 502, 62 L.Ed.2d 441 (1980); *Esielle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106, 97 S.Ct. 285, 50 L.Ed.2d 251 (1976); *Hospital Building Co. v. Trustees of Rex Hospital*, 425 U.S. 738, 746, 96 S.Ct. 1848, 48 L.Ed.2d 338 (1976); *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 236, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 40 L.Ed.2d 90 (1974); *Cruz v. Beto*, 405 U.S. 319, 322, 92 S.Ct. 1079, 31 L.Ed.2d 263 (1972) (*per curiam*); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 521, 92 S.Ct. 594, 30 L.Ed.2d 652 (1972) (*per curiam*); *Jenkins v. McKeithen*, 395 U.S. 411, 422, 89 S.Ct. 1843, 23 L.Ed.2d 404 (1969) (plurality opinion); see also *Cleveland Bd. of Ed. v. Loudermill*, 470 U.S. 532, 554, 105 S.Ct. 1487, 84 L.Ed.2d 494 (1985) (Brennan, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part); *Hoover v. Ronwin*, 466 U.S. 558, 587, 104 S.Ct. 1989, 80 L.Ed.2d 590 (1984) (STEVENS, J., dissenting); *United Air Lines, Inc. v. Evans*, 431 U.S. 553, 561, n. 1, 97 S.Ct. 1885, 52 L.Ed.2d 571 (1977) (Marshall, J., dissenting); *Simon v. Eastern Ky. Welfare Rights Organization*, 426 U.S. 26, 55, n. 6, 96 S.Ct. 1917, 48 L.Ed.2d 450 (1976) (Brennan, J., concurring in judgment).

5. See, e.g., *EB Invs., LLC v. Atlantis Development, Inc.*, 930 So.2d 502, 507 (Ala.2005); *Department of Health & Social Servs. v. Native Village of Curyung*, 151 P.3d 388, 396 (Alaska 2006); *Newman v. Maricopa Cty.*, 167 Ariz. 501, 503, 808 P.2d 1253, 1255 (App.1991); *Public Serv. Co. of Colo. v. Van Wyk*, 27 P.3d

377, 385–386 (Colo.2001) (en banc); *Clawson v. St. Louis Post-Dispatch, LLC*, 906 A.2d 308, 312 (D.C.2006); *Hillman Constr. Corp. v. Wainer*, 636 So.2d 576, 578 (Fla.App.1994); *Kaplan v. Kaplan*, 266 Ga. 612, 613, 469 S.E.2d 198, 199 (1996); *Wright v. Home Depot U.S.A., Inc.*, 111 Hawai’i 401, 406, 142 P.3d 265, 270 (2006); *Taylor v. Maile*, 142 Idaho 253, 257, 127 P.3d 156, 160 (2005); *Fink v. Bryant*, 2001–CC–0987, p. 4 (La.11/28/01), 801 So.2d 346, 349; *Gagne v. Cianbro Corp.*, 431 A.2d 1313, 1318–1319 (Me.1981); *Gasior v. Massachusetts Gen. Hospital*, 446 Mass. 645, 647, 846 N.E.2d 1133, 1135 (2006); *Ralph Walker, Inc. v. Gallagher*, 926 So.2d 890, 893 (Miss.2006); *Jones v. Montana Univ. System*, 337 Mont. 1, 7, 155 P.3d 1247, 1252 (2007); *Johnston v. Nebraska Dept. of Correctional Servs.*, 270 Neb. 987, 989, 709 N.W.2d 321, 324 (2006); *Blackjack Bonding v. Las Vegas Munic. Ct.*, 116 Nev. 1213, 1217, 14 P.3d 1275, 1278 (2000); *Shepard v. Oewen Fed. Bank*, 361 N.C. 137, 139, 638 S.E.2d 197, 199 (2006); *Rose v. United Equitable Ins. Co.*, 2001 ND 154, ¶ 10, 632 N.W.2d 429, 434; *State ex rel. Turner v. Houk*, 112 Ohio St.3d 561, 562, 2007–Ohio–814, ¶ 5, 862 N.E.2d 104, 105 (*per curiam*); *Moneypenny v. Dawson*, 2006 OK 53, ¶ 2, 141 P.3d 549, 551; *Gagnon v. State*, 570 A.2d 656, 659 (R.I.1990); *Osloond v. Farrier*, 2003 SD 28, ¶ 4, 659 N.W.2d 20, 22 (*per curiam*); *Smith v. Lincoln Brass Works, Inc.*, 712 S.W.2d 470, 471 (Tenn.1986); *Association of Haystack Property Owners, Inc. v. Sprague*, 145 Vt. 443, 446, 494 A.2d 122, 124 (1985); *In re Coday*, 156 Wash.2d 485, 497, 130 P.3d 809, 815 (2006) (en banc); *Haines v. Hampshire Cty. Comm’n*, 216 W.Va. 499, 502, 607 S.E.2d 828, 831 (2004); *Warren v. Hart*, 747 P.2d 511, 512 (Wyo.1987); see also *Malpiede v. Townson*, 780 A.2d 1075, 1082–1083 (Del.2001) (permitting dismissal only “where the court determines with reasonable certainty that the

¹⁵⁷⁹Petitioners have not requested that the *Conley* formulation be retired, nor have any of the six *amici* who filed briefs in support of petitioners. I would not rewrite the Nation's civil procedure textbooks and call into doubt the pleading rules of most of its States without far more informed deliberation as to the costs of doing so. Congress has established a process—a rulemaking process—for revisions of that order. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 2072–2074 (2000 ed. and Supp. IV).

Today's majority calls *Conley's* “no set of facts” language “an incomplete, negative gloss on an accepted pleading standard: once a claim has been stated adequately, it may be ¹⁵⁸⁰supported by showing any set of facts consistent with the allegations in the complaint.” *Ante*, at 1969. This is not and cannot be what

the *Conley* Court meant. First, as I have explained, and as the *Conley* Court well knew, the pleading standard the Federal Rules meant to codify does not require, or even invite, the pleading of facts.⁶ The “pleading standard” label the majority gives to what it reads into the *Conley* opinion—a statement of the permissible factual support for an adequately pleaded complaint—would not, therefore, have impressed the *Conley* Court itself. Rather, that Court would have understood the majority's remodeling of its language to express an *evidentiary* standard, which the *Conley* Court had neither need nor want to explicate. Second, it is pellucidly clear that the *Conley* Court was interested in what a complaint *must* contain, not what it *may* contain. In fact, the Court said without qualification that it was “appraising the *sufficiency* of

plaintiff could prevail on no set of facts that may be inferred from the well-pleaded allegations in the complaint” (internal quotation marks omitted); *Canel v. Topinka*, 212 Ill.2d 311, 318, 288 Ill.Dec. 623, 818 N.E.2d 311, 317 (2004) (replacing “appears beyond doubt” in the *Conley* formulation with “is clearly apparent”); *In re Young*, 522 N.E.2d 386, 388 (Ind.1988) (*per curiam*) (replacing “appears beyond doubt” with “appears to a certainty”); *Barkema v. Williams Pipeline Co.*, 666 N.W.2d 612, 614 (Iowa 2003) (holding that a motion to dismiss should be sustained “only when there exists no conceivable set of facts entitling the non-moving party to relief”); *Pioneer Village v. Bullitt Cty.*, 104 S.W.3d 757, 759 (Ky.2003) (holding that judgment on the pleadings should be granted “if it appears beyond doubt that the nonmoving party cannot prove any set of facts that would entitle him/her to relief”); *Corley v. Detroit Bd. of Ed.*, 470 Mich. 274, 277, 681 N.W.2d 342, 345 (2004) (*per curiam*) (holding that a motion for judgment on the pleadings should be granted only “if no factual development could possibly justify recovery”); *Oberkramer v. Ellisville*, 706 S.W.2d 440, 441 (Mo. 1986) (en banc) (omitting the words “beyond doubt” from the *Conley* formulation); *Colman v. Utah State Land Bd.*, 795 P.2d 622, 624 (Utah 1990) (holding that a motion to dismiss

is appropriate “only if it clearly appears that [the plaintiff] can prove no set of facts in support of his claim”); *NRC Management Servs. Corp. v. First Va. Bank-Southwest*, 63 Va. Cir. 68, 70, 2003 WL 23540085 (2003) (“The Virginia standard is identical [to the *Conley* formulation], though the Supreme Court of Virginia may not have used the same words to describe it”).

6. The majority is correct to say that what the Federal Rules require is a “‘showing’” of entitlement to relief. *Ante*, at 1965, n. 3. Whether and to what extent that “showing” requires allegations of fact will depend on the particulars of the claim. For example, had the amended complaint in this case alleged *only* parallel conduct, it would not have made the required “showing.” See *supra*, at 1974. Similarly, had the pleadings contained *only* an allegation of agreement, without specifying the nature or object of that agreement, they would have been susceptible to the charge that they did not provide sufficient notice that the defendants may answer intelligently. Omissions of that sort instance the type of “bareness” with which the Federal Rules are concerned. A plaintiff's inability to persuade a district court that the allegations actually included in her complaint are “plausible” is an altogether different kind of failing, and one that should not be fatal at the pleading stage.

the complaint.” 355 U.S., at 45, 78 S.Ct. 99 (emphasis added). It was, to paraphrase today’s majority, describing “the minimum standard of adequate pleading to govern a complaint’s survival,” *ante*, at 1969.

We can be triply sure as to *Conley*’s meaning by examining the three Court of Appeals cases the *Conley* Court cited as support for the “accepted rule” that “a complaint should not ¹⁵⁸¹be dismissed for failure to state a claim unless it appears beyond doubt that the plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief.” 355 U.S., at 45–46, 78 S.Ct. 99. In the first case, *Leimer v. State Mut. Life Assurance Co. of Worcester, Mass.*, 108 F.2d 302 (C.A.8 1940), the plaintiff alleged that she was the beneficiary of a life insurance plan and that the insurance company was wrongfully withholding proceeds from her. In reversing the District Court’s grant of the defendant’s motion to dismiss, the Eighth Circuit noted that court’s own long-standing rule that, to warrant dismissal, “it should appear from the allegations that a cause of action does not exist, rather than that a cause of action has been defectively stated.” *Id.*, at 305 (quoting *Winget v. Rockwood*, 69 F.2d 326, 329 (C.A.8 1934)).

The *Leimer* court viewed the Federal Rules—specifically Rules 8(a)(2), 12(b)(6), 12(e) (motion for a more definite statement), and 56 (motion for summary judgment)—as reinforcing the notion that “there is no justification for dismissing a complaint for insufficiency of statement, except where it appears to a certainty that the plaintiff would be entitled to no relief under any state of facts which could be proved in support of the claim.” 108 F.2d, at 306. The court refuted in the strongest terms any suggestion that the unlikelihood of recovery should determine the fate of a complaint: “No matter how improbable it may be that she can prove her claim, she is

entitled to an opportunity to make the attempt, and is not required to accept as final a determination of her rights based upon inferences drawn in favor of the defendant from her amended complaint.” *Ibid.*

The Third Circuit relied on *Leimer*’s admonition in *Continental Collieries, Inc. v. Shober*, 130 F.2d 631 (1942), which the *Conley* Court also cited in support of its “no set of facts” formulation. In a diversity action the plaintiff alleged breach of contract, but the District Court dismissed the complaint on the ground that the contract appeared to be unenforceable under state law. The Court of Appeals reversed, ¹⁵⁸²concluding that there were facts in dispute that went to the enforceability of the contract, and that the rule at the pleading stage was as in *Leimer*: “No matter how likely it may seem that the pleader will be unable to prove his case, he is entitled, upon averring a claim, to an opportunity to try to prove it.” 130 F.3d, at 635.

The third case the *Conley* Court cited approvingly was written by Judge Clark himself. In *Dioguardi v. Durning*, 139 F.2d 774 (C.A.2 1944), the *pro se* plaintiff, an importer of “tonics,” charged the customs inspector with auctioning off the plaintiff’s former merchandise for less than was bid for it—and indeed for an amount equal to the plaintiff’s own bid—and complained that two cases of tonics went missing three weeks before the sale. The inference, hinted at by the averments but never stated in so many words, was that the defendant fraudulently denied the plaintiff his rightful claim to the tonics, which, if true, would have violated federal law. Writing six years after the adoption of the Federal Rules he held the lead rein in drafting, Judge Clark said that the defendant

“could have disclosed the facts from his point of view, in advance of a trial if he

chose, by asking for a pre-trial hearing or by moving for a summary judgment with supporting affidavits. But, as it stands, we do not see how the plaintiff may properly be deprived of his day in court to show what he obviously so firmly believes and what for present purposes defendant must be taken as admitting.” *Id.*, at 775.

As any civil procedure student knows, Judge Clark’s opinion disquieted the defense bar and gave rise to a movement to revise Rule 8 to require a plaintiff to plead a “‘cause of action.’” See 5 Wright & Miller § 1201, at 86–87. The movement failed, see *ibid.*; *Dioguardi* was explicitly approved in *Conley*; and “[i]n retrospect the case itself seems to be a ¹⁵³³routine application of principles that are universally accepted,” 5 Wright & Miller § 1220, at 284–285.

In light of *Leimer*, *Continental Collieries*, and *Dioguardi*, *Conley*’s statement that a complaint is not to be dismissed unless “no set of facts” in support thereof would entitle the plaintiff to relief is hardly “puzzling,” *ante*, at 1969. It reflects a philosophy that, unlike in the days of code pleading, separating the wheat from the chaff is a task assigned to the pretrial and trial process. *Conley*’s language, in short, captures the policy choice embodied in the Federal Rules and binding on the federal courts.

We have consistently reaffirmed that basic understanding of the Federal Rules in the half century since *Conley*. For example, in *Scheuer v. Rhodes*, 416 U.S. 232, 94 S.Ct. 1683, 40 L.Ed.2d 90 (1974), we reversed the Court of Appeals’ dismissal on the pleadings when the respondents, the Governor and other officials of the State of Ohio, argued that the petitioners’ claims were barred by sovereign immunity. In a unanimous opinion by then-Justice Rehnquist, we emphasized:

“When a federal court reviews the sufficiency of a complaint, before the reception of any evidence either by affidavit or admissions, its task is necessarily a limited one. The issue is not whether a plaintiff will ultimately prevail but whether the claimant is entitled to offer evidence to support the claims. *Indeed it may appear on the face of the pleadings that a recovery is very remote and unlikely but that is not the test.*” *Id.*, at 236, 94 S.Ct. 1683 (emphasis added).

The *Rhodes* plaintiffs had “alleged generally and in conclusory terms” that the defendants, by calling out the National Guard to suppress the Kent State University student protests, “were guilty of wanton, wilful and negligent conduct.” *Krause v. Rhodes*, 471 F.2d 430, 433 (C.A.6 1972). We reversed the Court of Appeals on the ground that “[w]hatever ¹⁵³⁴the plaintiffs may or may not be able to establish as to the merits of their allegations, their claims, as stated in the complaints, given the favorable reading required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure,” were not barred by the Eleventh Amendment because they were styled as suits against the defendants in their individual capacities. 416 U.S., at 238, 94 S.Ct. 1683.

We again spoke with one voice against efforts to expand pleading requirements beyond their appointed limits in *Leatherman v. Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit*, 507 U.S. 163, 113 S.Ct. 1160, 122 L.Ed.2d 517 (1993). Writing for the unanimous Court, Chief Justice Rehnquist rebuffed the Fifth Circuit’s effort to craft a standard for pleading municipal liability that accounted for “the enormous expense involved today in litigation,” *Leatherman v. Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence and Coordination Unit*, 954 F.2d 1054, 1057 (1992) (internal quotation marks omitted), by requiring a plaintiff to “state with factual

detail and particularity the basis for the claim which necessarily includes why the defendant-official cannot successfully maintain the defense of immunity,” 507 U.S., at 167, 113 S.Ct. 1160, 122 L.Ed.2d 517, (internal quotation marks omitted). We found this language inconsistent with Rules 8(a)(2) and 9(b) and emphasized that motions to dismiss were not the place to combat discovery abuse: “In the absence of [an amendment to Rule 9(b)], federal courts and litigants must rely on summary judgment and control of discovery to weed out unmeritorious claims sooner rather than later.” *Id.*, at 168–169, 113 S.Ct. 1160.

Most recently, in *Swierkiewicz*, 534 U.S. 506, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152 L.Ed.2d 1, we were faced with a case more similar to the present one than the majority will allow. In discrimination cases, our precedents require a plaintiff at the summary judgment stage to produce either direct evidence of discrimination or, if the claim is based primarily on circumstantial evidence, to meet the shifting evidentiary burdens imposed under the framework articulated in *McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Green*, 411 U.S. 792, 93 S.Ct. 1817, 36 L.Ed.2d 668 (1973). See, e.g., *Trans World Airlines, Inc. v. Thurston*,⁵⁸⁵ 469 U.S. 111, 121, 105 S.Ct. 613, 83 L.Ed.2d 523 (1985). *Swierkiewicz* alleged that he had been terminated on account of national origin in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The Second Circuit dismissed the suit on the pleadings because he had not pleaded a prima facie case of discrimination under the *McDonnell Douglas* standard.

We reversed in another unanimous opinion, holding that “under a notice pleading

system, it is not appropriate to require a plaintiff to plead facts establishing a prima facie case because the *McDonnell Douglas* framework does not apply in every employment discrimination case.” *Swierkiewicz*, 534 U.S., at 511, 122 S.Ct. 992. We also observed that Rule 8(a)(2) does not contemplate a court’s passing on the merits of a litigant’s claim at the pleading stage. Rather, the “simplified notice pleading standard” of the Federal Rules “relies on liberal discovery rules and summary judgment motions to define disputed facts and issues and to dispose of unmeritorious claims.” *Id.*, at 512, 122 S.Ct. 992; see Brief for United States et al. as *Amici Curiae* in *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, O.T.2001, No. 00–1853, p. 10 (stating that a Rule 12(b)(6) motion is not “an appropriate device for testing the truth of what is asserted or for determining whether a plaintiff has any evidence to back up what is in the complaint” (internal quotation marks omitted)).⁷

As in the discrimination context, we have developed an evidentiary framework for evaluating claims under § 1 of the Sherman Act when those claims rest on entirely circumstantial evidence of conspiracy. See *Matsushita Elec. Industrial*⁵⁸⁶ *Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 106 S.Ct. 1348, 89 L.Ed.2d 538 (1986). Under *Matsushita*, a plaintiff’s allegations of an illegal conspiracy may not, at the summary judgment stage, rest solely on the inferences that may be drawn from the parallel conduct of the defendants. In order to survive a Rule 56 motion, a § 1 plaintiff “must present evidence ‘that tends

7. See also 5 Wright & Miller § 1202, at 89–90 (“[P]leadings under the rules simply may be a general summary of the party’s position that is sufficient to advise the other party of the event being sued upon, to provide some guidance in a subsequent proceeding as to what was decided for purposes of res judicata and

collateral estoppel, and to indicate whether the case should be tried to the court or to a jury. No more is demanded of the pleadings than this; indeed, history shows that no more can be performed successfully by the pleadings” (footnotes omitted)).

to exclude the possibility' that the alleged conspirators acted independently.'” *Id.*, at 588, 106 S.Ct. 1348 (quoting *Monsanto Co. v. Spray-Rite Service Corp.*, 465 U.S. 752, 764, 104 S.Ct. 1464, 79 L.Ed.2d 775 (1984)). That is, the plaintiff “must show that the inference of conspiracy is reasonable in light of the competing inferences of independent action or collusive action.” 475 U.S., at 588, 106 S.Ct. 1348.

Everything today’s majority says would therefore make perfect sense if it were ruling on a Rule 56 motion for summary judgment and the evidence included nothing more than the Court has described. But it should go without saying in the wake of *Swierkiewicz* that a heightened production burden at the summary judgment stage does not translate into a heightened pleading burden at the complaint stage. The majority rejects the complaint in this case because—in light of the fact that the parallel conduct alleged is consistent with ordinary market behavior—the claimed conspiracy is “conceivable” but not “plausible,” *ante*, at 1974. I have my doubts about the majority’s assessment of the plausibility of this alleged conspiracy. See Part III, *infra*. But even if the majority’s speculation is correct, its “plausibility” standard is irreconcilable with Rule 8 and with our governing precedents. As we made clear in *Swierkiewicz* and *Leatherman*, fear of the burdens of litigation does not justify factual conclusions supported only by lawyers’ arguments rather than sworn denials or admissible evidence.

This case is a poor vehicle for the Court’s new pleading rule, for we have observed that “in antitrust cases, where ‘the proof is largely in the hands of the alleged conspirators,’ . . . dismissals prior to giving the plaintiff ample ⁵⁸⁷opportunity for discovery should be granted very sparingly.” *Hospital Building Co. v. Trustees*

of Rex Hospital, 425 U.S. 738, 746, 96 S.Ct. 1848, 48 L.Ed.2d 338 (1976) (quoting *Poller v. Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc.*, 368 U.S. 464, 473, 82 S.Ct. 486, 7 L.Ed.2d 458 (1962)); see also *Knuth v. Erie-Crawford Dairy Cooperative Assn.*, 395 F.2d 420, 423 (C.A.3 1968) (“The ‘liberal’ approach to the consideration of antitrust complaints is important because inherent in such an action is the fact that all the details and specific facts relied upon cannot properly be set forth as part of the pleadings”). Moreover, the fact that the Sherman Act authorizes the recovery of treble damages and attorney’s fees for successful plaintiffs indicates that Congress intended to encourage, rather than discourage, private enforcement of the law. See *Radovich v. National Football League*, 352 U.S. 445, 454, 77 S.Ct. 390, 1 L.Ed.2d 456 (1957) (“Congress itself has placed the private antitrust litigant in a most favorable position . . . In the face of such a policy this Court should not add requirements to burden the private litigant beyond what is specifically set forth by Congress in those laws”). It is therefore more, not less, important in antitrust cases to resist the urge to engage in armchair economics at the pleading stage.

The same year we decided *Conley*, Judge Clark wrote, presciently,

“I fear that every age must learn its lesson that special pleading cannot be made to do the service of trial and that live issues between active litigants are not to be disposed of or evaded on the paper pleadings, i.e., the formalistic claims of the parties. Experience has found no quick and easy short cut for trials in cases generally *and antitrust cases in particular*.” Special Pleading in the “Big Case”? in Procedure—The Handmaid of Justice 147, 148 (C. Wright & H. Reasoner eds.1965) (hereinafter

Clark, Special Pleading in the Big Case) (emphasis added).

¹⁵⁸⁸In this “Big Case,” the Court succumbs to the temptation that previous Courts have steadfastly resisted.⁸ While the majority assures us that it is not applying any “heightened” pleading standard, see *ante*, at 1973, n. 14, I shall now explain why I have a difficult time understanding its opinion any other way.

III

The Court does not suggest that an agreement to do what the plaintiffs allege would be permissible under the antitrust laws, see, e.g., *Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519, 526–527, 103 S.Ct. 897, 74 L.Ed.2d 723 (1983). Nor does the Court hold that these plaintiffs have failed to allege an injury entitling them to sue for damages under those laws, see *Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat, Inc.*, 429 U.S. 477, 489–490, 97 S.Ct. 690, 50 L.Ed.2d 701 (1977). Rather, the theory on which the Court permits⁵⁸⁹ dismissal is that, so far as the Federal Rules are concerned, no agreement has been alleged at all. This is a mind-boggling conclusion.

8. Our decision in *Dura Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336, 125 S.Ct. 1627, 161 L.Ed.2d 577 (2005), is not to the contrary. There, the plaintiffs failed adequately to allege loss causation, a required element in a private securities fraud action. Because it alleged nothing more than that the prices of the securities the plaintiffs purchased were artificially inflated, the *Dura* complaint failed to “provid[e] the defendants with notice of what the relevant economic loss might be or of what the causal connection might be between that loss and the [alleged] misrepresentation.” *Id.*, at 347, 125 S.Ct. 1627. Here, the failure the majority identifies is not a failure of notice—which “notice pleading” rightly condemns—but rather a failure to satisfy the Court that the agreement alleged might plausibly have occurred. That being a question not of *notice* but of *proof*, it should not be

As the Court explains, prior to the enactment of the Telecommunications Act of 1996 the law prohibited the defendants from competing with each other. The new statute was enacted to replace a monopolistic market with a competitive one. The Act did not merely require the regional monopolists to take affirmative steps to facilitate entry to new competitors, see *Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP*, 540 U.S. 398, 402, 124 S.Ct. 872, 157 L.Ed.2d 823 (2004); it also permitted the existing firms to compete with each other and to expand their operations into previously forbidden territory. See 47 U.S.C. § 271. Each of the defendants decided not to take the latter step. That was obviously an extremely important business decision, and I am willing to presume that each company acted entirely independently in reaching that decision. I am even willing to entertain the majority’s belief that any agreement among the companies was unlikely. But the plaintiffs allege in three places in their complaint, ¶¶ 4, 51, 64, App. 11, 27, 30, that the ILECs did in fact agree both to prevent competitors from entering into their local markets and to forgo competition with each other. And as the Court

answered without first hearing from the defendants (as apart from their lawyers).

Similarly, in *Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519, 103 S.Ct. 897, 74 L.Ed.2d 723 (1983), in which we also found an antitrust complaint wanting, the problem was not that the injuries the plaintiffs alleged failed to satisfy some threshold of plausibility, but rather that the injuries *as alleged* were not “the type that the antitrust statute was intended to forestall.” *Id.*, at 540, 103 S.Ct. 897; see *id.*, at 526, 103 S.Ct. 897 (“As the case comes to us, we must assume that the Union can prove the facts alleged in its amended complaint. It is not, however, proper to assume that the Union can prove facts that it has not alleged or that the defendants have violated the antitrust laws in ways that have not been alleged”).

recognizes, at the motion to dismiss stage, a judge assumes “that all the allegations in the complaint are true (even if doubtful in fact).” *Ante*, at 1965.

The majority circumvents this obvious obstacle to dismissal by pretending that it does not exist. The Court admits that “in form a few stray statements in the complaint speak directly of agreement,” but disregards those allegations by saying that “on fair reading these are merely legal conclusions resting on the prior allegations” of parallel conduct. *Ante*, at 1970. The Court’s dichotomy between factual allegations and “legal conclusions” is the stuff of a bygone era, *supra*, at 1976–1977. That distinction was a defining feature of code pleading, see generally Clark, *The Complaint in* §590Code Pleading, 35 *Yale L.J.* 259 (1925–1926), but was conspicuously abolished when the Federal Rules were enacted in 1938. See *United States v. Employing Plasterers Assn. of Chicago*, 347 U.S. 186, 188, 74 S.Ct. 452, 98 L.Ed. 618 (1954) (holding, in an antitrust case, that the Government’s allegations of effects on interstate commerce must be taken into account in deciding whether to dismiss the complaint “[w]hether these charges be called ‘allegations of fact’ or ‘mere conclusions of the pleader’”); *Brownlee v. Conine*, 957 F.2d 353, 354 (C.A.7 1992) (“The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure establish a system of notice pleading rather than of fact pleading, . . . so the happenstance that a complaint is ‘conclusory,’ whatever exactly that over-

used lawyers’ cliché means, does not automatically condemn it”); *Walker Distributing Co. v. Lucky Lager Brewing Co.*, 323 F.2d 1, 3–4 (C.A.9 1963) (“[O]ne purpose of Rule 8 was to get away from the highly technical distinction between statements of fact and conclusions of law . . .”); *Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers Int’l Union v. Delta*, 277 F.2d 694, 697 (C.A.6 1960) (“Under the notice system of pleading established by the Rules of Civil Procedure, . . . the ancient distinction between pleading ‘facts’ and ‘conclusions’ is no longer significant”); 5 *Wright & Miller* § 1218, at 267 (“[T]he federal rules do not prohibit the pleading of facts or legal conclusions as long as fair notice is given to the parties”). “Defendants entered into a contract” is no more a legal conclusion than “defendant negligently drove,” see Form 9; *supra*, at 1977. Indeed it is less of one.⁹

§591Even if I were inclined to accept the Court’s anachronistic dichotomy and ignore the complaint’s actual allegations, I would dispute the Court’s suggestion that any inference of agreement from petitioners’ parallel conduct is “implausible.” Many years ago a truly great economist perceptively observed that “[p]eople of the same trade seldom meet together, even for merriment and diversion, but the conversation ends in a conspiracy against the public, or in some contrivance to raise prices.” A. Smith, *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, in 39 *Great Books of the Western World* 55 (R. Hutchins & M. Adler eds. 1952). I am not so cynical as to accept that sentiment at face value, but I need not do so here. Respondents’ complaint

9. The Court suggests that the allegation of an agreement, even if credited, might not give the notice required by Rule 8 because it lacks specificity. *Ante*, at 1970–1971, n. 10. The remedy for an allegation lacking sufficient specificity to provide adequate notice is, of course, a Rule 12(e) motion for a more definite statement. See *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N. A.*, 534 U.S. 506, 514, 122 S.Ct. 992, 152

L.Ed.2d 1 (2002). Petitioners made no such motion and indeed have conceded that “[o]ur problem with the current complaint is not a lack of specificity, it’s quite specific.” *Tr. of Oral Arg.* 14. Thus, the fact that “the pleadings mentioned no specific time, place, or persons involved in the alleged conspiracies,” *ante*, at 1971, n. 10, is, for our purposes, academic.

points not only to petitioners' numerous opportunities to meet with each other, Complaint ¶ 46, App. 23,¹⁰ but also to Notebaert's curious statement that encroaching on a fellow incumbent's territory "might be a good way to turn a quick dollar but that doesn't make it right," *id.*, ¶ 42, App. 22. What did he mean by that? One possible (indeed plausible) inference is that he meant that while it would be in his company's economic self-interest to compete with its brethren, he had agreed with his competitors not to do so. According to the complaint, that is how the Illinois Coalition for Competitive Telecom construed Notebaert's statement, *id.*, ¶ 44, App. 22 (calling the statement "evidence of potential collusion among regional Bell phone monopolies to not compete⁵⁹² against one another and kill off potential competitors in local phone service"), and that is how Members of Congress construed his company's behavior, *id.*, ¶ 45, App. 23 (describing a letter to the Justice Department requesting an investigation into the possibility that the ILECs' "very apparent non-competition policy" was coordinated).

Perhaps Notebaert meant instead that competition would be sensible in the short term but not in the long run. That's what his lawyers tell us anyway. See Brief for Petitioners 36. But I would think that no

one would know better what Notebaert meant than Notebaert himself. Instead of permitting respondents to ask Notebaert, however, the Court looks to other quotes from that and other articles and decides that what he meant was that entering new markets as a competitive local exchange carrier would not be a "'sustainable economic model.'" *Ante*, at 1972–1973, n. 13. Never mind that—as anyone ever interviewed knows—a newspaper article is hardly a verbatim transcript; the writer selects quotes to package his story, not to record a subject's views for posterity. But more importantly the District Court was required at this stage of the proceedings to construe Notebaert's ambiguous statement in the plaintiffs' favor.¹¹ See *Allen v. Wright*, 468 U.S. 737, 767–768, n. 1, 104 S.Ct. 3315, 82 L.Ed.2d 556 (1984) (Brennan, J., dissenting). The inference the statement supports—that simultaneous decisions by ILECs not even to attempt to poach customers from one another once the law authorized them to do so⁵⁹³ were the product of an agreement—sits comfortably within the realm of possibility. That is all the Rules require.

To be clear, if I had been the trial judge in this case, I would not have permitted the plaintiffs to engage in massive discovery based solely on the allegations in this complaint. On the other hand, I surely would not have dismissed the complaint

10. The Court describes my reference to the allegation that the defendants belong to various trade associations as "playfully" suggesting that the defendants conspired to restrain trade. *Ante*, at 1971–1972, n. 12. Quite the contrary: An allegation that competitors meet on a regular basis, like the allegations of parallel conduct, is consistent with—though not sufficient to prove—the plaintiffs' entirely serious and unequivocal allegation that the defendants entered into an unlawful agreement. Indeed, if it were true that the plaintiffs "rest their § 1 claim on descriptions of parallel conduct and not on any independent allegation of actual agreement among the ILECs," *ante*, at 1970, there would have been no purpose in including a reference to the

trade association meetings in the amended complaint.

11. It is ironic that the Court seeks to justify its decision to draw factual inferences in the defendants' favor at the pleading stage by citing to a rule of evidence, *ante*, at 1972–1973, n. 13. Under Federal Rule of Evidence 201(b), a judicially noticed fact "must be one not subject to reasonable dispute in that it is either (1) generally known within the territorial jurisdiction of the trial court or (2) capable of accurate and ready determination by resort to sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." Whether Notebaert's statements constitute evidence of a conspiracy is hardly beyond reasonable dispute.

without requiring the defendants to answer the charge that they “have agreed not to compete with one another and otherwise allocated customers and markets to one another.”¹² Complaint, ¶ 51, App. 27. Even a sworn denial of that charge would not justify a summary dismissal without giving the plaintiffs the opportunity to take depositions from Notebaert and at least one responsible executive representing each of the other defendants.

12. The Court worries that a defendant seeking to respond to this “conclusory” allegation “would have little idea where to begin.” *Ante*, at 1971, n. 10. A defendant could, of course, begin by either denying or admitting the charge.

13. The potential for “sprawling, costly, and hugely time-consuming” discovery, *ante*, at 1967, n. 6, is no reason to throw the baby out with the bathwater. The Court vastly underestimates a district court’s case-management arsenal. Before discovery even begins, the court may grant a defendant’s Rule 12(e) motion; Rule 7(a) permits a trial court to order a plaintiff to reply to a defendant’s answer, see *Crawford-El v. Britton*, 523 U.S. 574, 598, 118 S.Ct. 1584, 140 L.Ed.2d 759 (1998); and Rule 23 requires “rigorous analysis” to ensure that class certification is appropriate, *General Telephone Co. of Southwest v. Falcon*, 457 U.S. 147, 161, 102 S.Ct. 2364, 72 L.Ed.2d 740 (1982); see *In re Initial Public Offering Securities Litigation*, 471 F.3d 24 (C.A.2 2006) (holding that a district court may not certify a class without ruling that each Rule 23 requirement is met, even if a requirement overlaps with a merits issue). Rule 16 invests a trial judge with the power, backed by sanctions, to regulate pretrial proceedings via conferences and scheduling orders, at which the parties may discuss, *inter alia*, “the elimination of frivolous claims or defenses,” Rule 16(c)(1); “the necessity or desirability of amendments to the pleadings,” Rule 16(c)(2); “the control and scheduling of discovery,” Rule 16(c)(6); and “the need for adopting special procedures for managing potentially difficult or protracted actions that may involve complex issues, multiple parties, difficult legal questions, or unusual proof problems,” Rule 16(c)(12). Subsequently, Rule 26 confers broad discretion to control the combination of interrogatories, requests for admis-

Respondents in this case proposed a plan of “phased discovery” limited to the existence of the alleged conspiracy and class certification. Brief for Respondents 25–26. Two petitioners rejected the plan. *Ibid.* Whether or not respondents’ proposed plan was sensible, it was an appropriate subject for negotiation.¹³ Given the charge in the complaint⁵⁹⁴—buttressed by the common sense of Adam Smith—I cannot say that the possibility that joint dis-

sions, production requests, and depositions permitted in a given case; the sequence in which such discovery devices may be deployed; and the limitations imposed upon them. See 523 U.S., at 598–599, 118 S.Ct. 1584. Indeed, Rule 26(c) specifically permits a court to take actions “to protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense” by, for example, disallowing a particular discovery request, setting appropriate terms and conditions, or limiting its scope.

In short, the Federal Rules contemplate that pretrial matters will be settled through a flexible process of give and take, of proffers, stipulations, and stonewalls, not by having trial judges screen allegations for their plausibility *vel non* without requiring an answer from the defendant. See *Societe Internationale Pour Participations Industrielles Et Commerciales, S.A. v. Rogers*, 357 U.S. 197, 206, 78 S.Ct. 1087, 2 L.Ed.2d 1255 (1958) (“Rule 34 is sufficiently flexible to be adapted to the exigencies of particular litigation”). And should it become apparent over the course of litigation that a plaintiff’s filings bespeak an *in terrorem* suit, the district court has at its call its own *in terrorem* device, in the form of a wide array of Rule 11 sanctions. See Rules 11(b), (c) (authorizing sanctions if a suit is presented “for any improper purpose, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or needless increase in the cost of litigation”); see *Business Guides, Inc. v. Chromatic Communications Enterprises, Inc.*, 498 U.S. 533, 111 S.Ct. 922, 112 L.Ed.2d 1140 (1991) (holding that Rule 11 applies to a represented party who signs a pleading, motion, or other papers, as well as to attorneys); *Atkins v. Fischer*, 232 F.R.D. 116, 126 (D.D.C.2005) (“As possible sanctions pursuant to Rule 11, the court has an arsenal of options at its disposal”).

cussions and perhaps some agreements played a role in petitioners' decisionmaking process is so implausible that dismissing the complaint before any defendant has denied the charge is preferable to granting respondents even a minimal opportunity⁵⁹⁵ to prove their claims. See Clark, *New Federal Rules 977* ("[T]hrough the weapons of discovery and summary judgment we have developed new devices, with more appropriate penalties to aid in matters of *proof*, and do not need to force the pleadings to their less appropriate function").

I fear that the unfortunate result of the majority's new pleading rule will be to invite lawyers' debates over economic theory to conclusively resolve antitrust suits in the absence of any evidence. It is no surprise that the antitrust defense bar—among whom “lament” as to inadequate judicial supervision of discovery is most “common,” see *ante*, at 1967—should lobby for this state of affairs. But “we must recall that their primary responsibility is to win cases for their clients, not to improve law administration for the public.” Clark, *Special Pleading in the Big Case* 152. As we did in our prior decisions, we should have instructed them that their remedy was to seek to amend the Federal Rules—not our interpretation of them.¹⁴ See *Swierkiewicz*, 534 U.S., at 515, 122 S.Ct. 992; *Crawford-El v. Britton*, 523 U.S. 574, 595, 118 S.Ct. 1584, 140 L.Ed.2d

759 (1998); *Leatherman*, 507 U.S., at 168, 113 S.Ct. 1160.

IV

Just a few weeks ago some of my colleagues explained that a strict interpretation of the literal text of statutory language⁵⁹⁶ is essential to avoid judicial decisions that are not faithful to the intent of Congress. *Zuni Public School Dist. No. 89 v. Department of Education*, *ante*, p. 108, 127 S.Ct. 1534, 167 L.Ed.2d 449, (2007) (SCALIA, J., dissenting). I happen to believe that there are cases in which other tools of construction are more reliable than text, but I agree of course that congressional intent should guide us in matters of statutory interpretation. *Ante*, at 106, 127 S.Ct. 1534, 167 L.Ed.2d 449, (STEVENS, J., concurring). This is a case in which the intentions of the drafters of three important sources of law—the Sherman Act, the Telecommunications Act of 1996, and the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure—all point unmistakably in the same direction, yet the Court marches resolutely the other way. Whether the Court's actions will benefit only defendants in antitrust treble-damages cases, or whether its test for the sufficiency of a complaint will inure to the benefit of all civil defendants, is a question that the future will answer. But that the Court has announced a significant new rule that does not even purport to respond to any

14. Given his “background in antitrust law,” *ante*, at 1968, n. 6, Judge Easterbrook has recognized that the most effective solution to discovery abuse lies in the legislative and rulemaking arenas. He has suggested that the remedy for the ills he complains of requires a revolution in the rules of civil procedure:

“Perhaps a system in which judges pare away issues and focus [on] investigation is too radical to contemplate in this country—al-

though it prevailed here before 1938, when the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure were adopted. The change could not be accomplished without abandoning notice pleading, increasing the number of judicial officers, and giving them more authority If we are to rule out judge-directed discovery, however, we must be prepared to pay the piper. Part of the price is the high cost of unnecessary discovery—impositional and otherwise.” *Discovery as Abuse*, 69 B.U.L.Rev. 635, 645 (1989).

congressional command is glaringly obvious.

The transparent policy concern that drives the decision is the interest in protecting antitrust defendants—who in this case are some of the wealthiest corporations in our economy—from the burdens of pretrial discovery. *Ante*, at 1966–1967. Even if it were not apparent that the legal fees petitioners have incurred in arguing the merits of their Rule 12(b) motion have far exceeded the cost of limited discovery, or that those discovery costs would burden respondents as well as petitioners,¹⁵ that concern would not provide an adequate justification for this law-changing decision. For in the final analysis it is only a lack of confidence in the ability of trial judges to control discovery, buttressed by appellate judges' independent appraisal of the plausibility of profoundly⁵⁹⁷ serious factual allegations, that could account for this stark break from precedent.

If the allegation of conspiracy happens to be true, today's decision obstructs the congressional policy favoring competition that undergirds both the Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the Sherman Act itself. More importantly, even if there is abundant evidence that the allegation is untrue, directing that the case be dismissed without even looking at any of that evidence marks a fundamental—and unjustified—change in the character of pretrial practice.

Accordingly, I respectfully dissent.



15. It would be quite wrong, of course, to assume that dismissal of an antitrust case after discovery is costless to plaintiffs. See Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 54(d)(1) (“[C]osts other

550 U.S. 609, 167 L.Ed.2d 974

LOS ANGELES COUNTY,
CALIFORNIA, et al.

v.

Max RETTELE et al.

No. 06–605.

Decided May 21, 2007.

Background: Residents brought suit against city, sheriff's department, and department officers, alleging that officers conducted unlawful and unreasonable search and detention. The United States District Court for the Central District of California, Dale S. Fischer, J., granted qualified immunity to officers on motion for summary judgment, and residents appealed. The Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, 186 Fed.Appx. 765, reversed and remanded.

Holding: On grant of certiorari, the Supreme Court held that officers acted reasonably while executing search warrant. Reversed.

Justice Stevens filed opinion, concurring in the judgment, with which Justice Ginsburg joined.

1. Searches and Seizures ⇌147.1

Law enforcement officers acted reasonably for Fourth Amendment purposes while executing valid warrant to search residence when they ordered naked residents out of their bed, and held them at gunpoint for one to two minutes, while they verified that no weapons were present and that other persons were not close by; although the residents were Caucasian, and the criminal suspects were African-American, based on warrant, officers be-

than attorneys' fees shall be allowed as of course to the prevailing party unless the court otherwise directs”).

**John D. ASHCROFT, Former Attorney
General, et al., Petitioners,**

v.

Javaid IQBAL et al.

No. 07–1015.

Argued Dec. 10, 2008.

Decided May 18, 2009.

Background: Muslim Pakistani pretrial detainee brought action against current and former government officials, alleging that they took series of unconstitutional actions against him in connection with his confinement under harsh conditions after separation from the general prison population. The United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York, John Gleeson, J., 2005 WL 2375202, denied in part defendants’ motions to dismiss on ground of qualified immunity. Defendants appealed. The United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, Jon O. Newman, Circuit Judge, 490 F.3d 143, affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded. Certiorari was granted.

Holdings: The Supreme Court, Justice Kennedy, held that:

- (1) Second Circuit had subject matter jurisdiction to affirm district court’s order denying officials’ motion to dismiss on grounds of qualified immunity, and
- (2) detainee’s complaint failed to plead sufficient facts to state claim for purposeful and unlawful discrimination.

Reversed and remanded.

Justice Souter filed dissenting opinion in which Justices Stevens, Ginsburg, and Breyer joined.

Justice Breyer filed dissenting opinion.

1. Federal Courts ⇌30, 31

Subject matter jurisdiction cannot be forfeited or waived and should be considered when fairly in doubt.

2. Federal Courts ⇌572.1

Under “collateral-order doctrine,” limited set of district court orders are reviewable though short of final judgment; orders within this narrow category are immediately appealable because they finally determine claims of right separable from, and collateral to, rights asserted in action, too important to be denied review and too independent of cause itself to require that appellate consideration be deferred until whole case is adjudicated. 28 U.S.C.A. § 1291.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

3. Federal Courts ⇌574

District court decision denying Government officer’s claim of qualified immunity can fall within narrow class of appealable orders despite the absence of a final judgment. 28 U.S.C.A. § 1291.

4. Civil Rights ⇌1376(1, 2)

“Qualified immunity,” which shields Government officials from liability for civil damages insofar as their conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights, is both a defense to liability and limited entitlement not to stand trial or face the other burdens of litigation.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

5. Federal Courts ⇌574

Provided it turns on issue of law, district court order denying qualified immunity can fall within narrow class of prejudgment orders reviewable under collateral order doctrine; such an order conclusively determines that defendant must bear burdens of discovery, conceptually distinct from merits of plaintiff’s claim, and would prove effectively unreviewable on appeal from final judgment. 28 U.S.C.A. § 1291.

6. Federal Courts ⇨589

Second Circuit had subject matter jurisdiction to affirm district court's order denying government officials' motion to dismiss Muslim Pakistani pretrial detainee's *Bivens* action on grounds of qualified immunity; because the order turned on issue of law and rejected qualified immunity defense, it was a "final decision" subject to immediate appeal. 28 U.S.C.A. § 1291.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

7. United States ⇨50.1

Bivens recognizes implied private action for damages against federal officers alleged to have violated a citizen's constitutional rights.

8. Civil Rights ⇨1355, 1394**United States** ⇨50.2

Government officials may not be held liable, under *Bivens* or § 1983, for unconstitutional conduct of their subordinates under theory of respondeat superior; because vicarious liability is inapplicable, plaintiff must plead that each government official-defendant, through his or her own actions, has violated Constitution. 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983.

9. Constitutional Law ⇨1150, 3040**United States** ⇨50.20

Factors necessary to establish *Bivens* violation will vary with constitutional provision at issue, and where claim is invidious discrimination in contravention of First and Fifth Amendments, plaintiff must plead and prove that defendant acted with discriminatory purpose; under extant precedent, "purposeful discrimination" requires more than intent as volition or intent as awareness of consequences and instead involves decisionmaker's undertaking course of action because of, not merely in spite of, action's adverse effects upon

identifiable group. U.S.C.A. Const. Amends. 1, 5.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

10. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨673

Requirement that pleading contain a short and plain statement of claim showing that pleader is entitled to relief does not require detailed factual allegations, but demands more than unadorned "the defendant unlawfully harmed me" accusation. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 8(a)(2), 28 U.S.C.A.

11. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨673

Pleading that offers labels and conclusions or formulaic recitation of elements of cause of action will not do, nor does complaint suffice if it tenders naked assertions devoid of further factual enhancement. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 8(a)(2), 28 U.S.C.A.

12. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨1772, 1829

To survive motion to dismiss, complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face; claim has "facial plausibility" when plaintiff pleads factual content that allows court to draw reasonable inference that defendant is liable for misconduct alleged. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 12(b)(6), 28 U.S.C.A.

See publication Words and Phrases for other judicial constructions and definitions.

13. Federal Civil Procedure ⇨1772

"Plausibility" standard, for complaint to survive motion to dismiss for failure to satisfy short and plain statement requirement, is not akin to probability requirement, but asks for more than sheer possibility that defendant has acted unlawfully. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 8(a)(2), 28 U.S.C.A.

14. United States ⇔50.20

Muslim Pakistani pretrial detainee's *Bivens* complaint against government officials failed to plead sufficient facts to state claim for purposeful and unlawful discrimination; complaint challenged neither constitutionality of detainee's arrest nor his initial detention but rather policy of holding post-September 11th detainees once they were categorized as of "high interest," and complaint thus had to contain facts plausibly showing that officials purposefully adopted policy of so classifying detainees because of their race, religion, or national origin. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rule 8(a)(2), 28 U.S.C.A.

15. Officers and Public Employees
⇔119

Basic thrust of qualified immunity doctrine is to free officials from concerns of litigation, including avoidance of disruptive discovery.

16. Federal Civil Procedure ⇔630, 636

Requirement that fraud be pled with particularity does not give party license to evade the less rigid, though still operative, strictures of plain and short statement requirement. Fed.Rules Civ.Proc.Rules 8, 9(b), 28 U.S.C.A.

Syllabus *

Following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, respondent Iqbal, a Pakistani Muslim, was arrested on criminal charges and detained by federal officials under restrictive conditions. Iqbal filed a *Bivens* action against numerous federal officials, including petitioner Ashcroft, the former Attorney General, and petitioner Mueller, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). See *Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents*, 403

U.S. 388, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619. The complaint alleged, *inter alia*, that petitioners designated Iqbal a person "of high interest" on account of his race, religion, or national origin, in contravention of the First and Fifth Amendments; that the FBI, under Mueller's direction, arrested and detained thousands of Arab Muslim men as part of its September–11th investigation; that petitioners knew of, condoned, and willfully and maliciously agreed to subject Iqbal to harsh conditions of confinement as a matter of policy, solely on account of the prohibited factors and for no legitimate penological interest; and that Ashcroft was the policy's "principal architect" and Mueller was "instrumental" in its adoption and execution. After the District Court denied petitioners' motion to dismiss on qualified-immunity grounds, they invoked the collateral order doctrine to file an interlocutory appeal in the Second Circuit. Affirming, that court assumed without discussion that it had jurisdiction and focused on the standard set forth in *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929, for evaluating whether a complaint is sufficient to survive a motion to dismiss. Concluding that *Twombly*'s "flexible plausibility standard" obliging a pleader to amplify a claim with factual allegations where necessary to render it plausible was inapplicable in the context of petitioners' appeal, the court held that Iqbal's complaint was adequate to allege petitioners' personal involvement in discriminatory decisions which, if true, violated clearly established constitutional law.

Held:

1. The Second Circuit had subject-matter jurisdiction to affirm the District

* The syllabus constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court but has been prepared by the Reporter of Decisions for the convenience of

the reader. See *United States v. Detroit Timber & Lumber Co.*, 200 U.S. 321, 337, 26 S.Ct. 282, 50 L.Ed. 499.

Court's order denying petitioners' motion to dismiss. Pp. 1944 – 1947.

(a) Denial of a qualified-immunity claim can fall within the narrow class of prejudgment orders reviewable under the collateral-order doctrine so long as the order “turns on an issue of law.” *Mitchell v. Forsyth*, 472 U.S. 511, 530, 105 S.Ct. 2806, 86 L.Ed.2d 411. The doctrine's applicability in this context is well established; an order rejecting qualified immunity at the motion-to-dismiss stage is a “final decision” under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, which vests courts of appeals with “jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the district courts.” *Behrens v. Pelletier*, 516 U.S. 299, 307, 116 S.Ct. 834, 133 L.Ed.2d 773. Pp. 1945 – 1946.

(b) Under these principles, the Court of Appeals had, and this Court has, jurisdiction over the District Court's order. Because the order turned on an issue of law and rejected the qualified-immunity defense, it was a final decision “subject to immediate appeal.” *Behrens, supra*, at 307, 116 S.Ct. 834. Pp. 1946 – 1947.

2. Iqbal's complaint fails to plead sufficient facts to state a claim for purposeful and unlawful discrimination. Pp. 1947 – 1954.

(a) This Court assumes, without deciding, that Iqbal's First Amendment claim is actionable in a *Bivens* action, see *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250, 254, n. 2, 126 S.Ct. 1695, 164 L.Ed.2d 441. Because vicarious liability is inapplicable to *Bivens* and § 1983 suits, see, e.g., *Monell v. New York City Dept. of Social Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 691, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611, the plaintiff in a suit such as the present one must plead that each Government-official defendant, through his own individual actions, has violated the Constitution. Purposeful discrimination requires more than “intent as volition or intent as awareness of consequences”; it involves a decision-

maker's undertaking a course of action “because of, not merely ‘in spite of,’ [the action's] adverse effects upon an identifiable group.” *Personnel Administrator of Mass. v. Feeney*, 442 U.S. 256, 279, 99 S.Ct. 2282, 60 L.Ed.2d 870. Iqbal must plead sufficient factual matter to show that petitioners adopted and implemented the detention policies at issue not for a neutral, investigative reason, but for the purpose of discriminating on account of race, religion, or national origin. Pp. 1947 – 1949.

(b) Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a complaint must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” “[D]etailed factual allegations” are not required, *Twombly*, 550 U.S., at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955, but the Rule does call for sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face,” *id.*, at 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955. A claim has facial plausibility when the pleaded factual content allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.*, at 556, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Two working principles underlie *Twombly*. First, the tenet that a court must accept a complaint's allegations as true is inapplicable to threadbare recitals of a cause of action's elements, supported by mere conclusory statements. *Id.*, at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Second, determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim is context-specific, requiring the reviewing court to draw on its experience and common sense. *Id.*, at 556, 127 S.Ct. 1955. A court considering a motion to dismiss may begin by identifying allegations that, because they are mere conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth. While legal conclusions can provide the complaint's framework, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are well-

pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief. Pp. 1948 – 1951.

(c) Iqbal’s pleadings do not comply with Rule 8 under *Twombly*. Several of his allegations—that petitioners agreed to subject him to harsh conditions as a matter of policy, solely on account of discriminatory factors and for no legitimate penological interest; that Ashcroft was that policy’s “principal architect”; and that Mueller was “instrumental” in its adoption and execution—are conclusory and not entitled to be assumed true. Moreover, the factual allegations that the FBI, under Mueller, arrested and detained thousands of Arab Muslim men, and that he and Ashcroft approved the detention policy, do not plausibly suggest that petitioners purposefully discriminated on prohibited grounds. Given that the September 11 attacks were perpetrated by Arab Muslims, it is not surprising that a legitimate policy directing law enforcement to arrest and detain individuals because of their suspected link to the attacks would produce a disparate, incidental impact on Arab Muslims, even though the policy’s purpose was to target neither Arabs nor Muslims. Even if the complaint’s well-pleaded facts gave rise to a plausible inference that Iqbal’s arrest was the result of unconstitutional discrimination, that inference alone would not entitle him to relief: His claims against petitioners rest solely on their ostensible policy of holding detainees categorized as “of high interest,” but the complaint does not contain facts plausibly showing that their policy was based on discriminatory factors. Pp. 1950 – 1953.

(d) Three of Iqbal’s arguments are rejected. Pp. 1952 – 1954.

(i) His claim that *Twombly* should be limited to its antitrust context is not supported by that case or the Federal Rules.

Because *Twombly* interpreted and applied Rule 8, which in turn governs the pleading standard “in all civil actions,” Rule 1, the case applies to antitrust and discrimination suits alike, see 550 U.S., at 555–556, and n. 14, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Pp. 1952 – 1953.

(ii) Rule 8’s pleading requirements need not be relaxed based on the Second Circuit’s instruction that the District Court cabin discovery to preserve petitioners’ qualified-immunity defense in anticipation of a summary judgment motion. The question presented by a motion to dismiss for insufficient pleadings does not turn on the controls placed on the discovery process. *Twombly, supra*, at 559, 127 S.Ct. 1955. And because Iqbal’s complaint is deficient under Rule 8, he is not entitled to discovery, cabined or otherwise. Pp. 1952 – 1954.

(iii) Rule 9(b)—which requires particularity when pleading “fraud or mistake” but allows “other conditions of a person’s mind [to] be alleged generally”—does not require courts to credit a complaint’s conclusory statements without reference to its factual context. Rule 9 merely excuses a party from pleading discriminatory intent under an elevated pleading standard. It does not give him license to evade Rule 8’s less rigid, though still operative, strictures. Pp. 1953 – 1954.

(e) The Second Circuit should decide in the first instance whether to remand to the District Court to allow Iqbal to seek leave to amend his deficient complaint. P. 1954.

490 F.3d 143, reversed and remanded.

KENNEDY, J., delivered the opinion of the Court, in which ROBERTS, C.J., and SCALIA, THOMAS, and ALITO, JJ., joined. SOUTER, J., filed a dissenting opinion, in which STEVENS, GINSBURG, and BREYER, JJ., joined. BREYER, J., filed a dissenting opinion.

Gregory G. Garre, Solicitor General, Washington, DC, for Petitioners.

Alexander A. Reinert, for Respondents.

Lauren J. Resnick, Fernando A. Bohorquez, Jr., Baker & Hostetler LLP, New York, NY, Thomas D. Warren Karl Fenter, Baker & Hostetler LLP, Cleveland, OH, for Michael Rolince.

Leslie R. Caldwell, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, New York, NY, Brett M. Schuman, Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, San Francisco, CA, for Kenneth Maxwell.

Michael L. Martinez, David E. Bell, Matthew F. Scarlato, Crowell & Moring LLP, Washington, DC, for Respondent Dennis Hasty.

David J. Ball, Rima J. Oken, Jennifer Brace, Etai Lahav, Well, Gotshal & Manges LLP, New York, New York, Alexander A. Reinert, Joan M. Magoolaghan, Elizabeth L. Koob, Koob & Magoolaghan, Yonkers, New York, for Respondent Javaid Iqbal.

Gregory G. Garre, Acting Solicitor General, Gregory G. Katsas, Assistant Attorney General, Jonathan F. Cohn, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Curtis E. Gannon, Assistant to the Solicitor General, Barbara L. Herwig, Robert M. Loeb, Sarang Vijay Damle, Washington, D.C., for Petitioners.

For U.S. Supreme Court briefs, see:

- 2008 WL 4063957 (Pet.Brief)
- 2008 WL 4734962 (Resp.Brief)
- 2008 WL 4063958 (Resp.Brief)
- 2008 WL 4063959 (Resp.Brief)
- 2008 WL 5009266 (Reply.Brief)
- 2008 WL 5027911 (Reply.Brief)
- 2008 WL 5027912 (Reply.Brief)

Justice KENNEDY delivered the opinion of the Court.

Respondent Javaid Iqbal is a citizen of Pakistan and a Muslim. In the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks he was arrested in the United States on criminal charges and detained by federal officials. Respondent claims he was deprived of various constitutional protections while in federal custody. To redress the alleged deprivations, respondent filed a complaint against numerous federal officials, including John Ashcroft, the former Attorney General of the United States, and Robert Mueller, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Ashcroft and Mueller are the petitioners in the case now before us. As to these two petitioners, the complaint alleges that they adopted an unconstitutional policy that subjected respondent to harsh conditions of confinement on account of his race, religion, or national origin.

In the District Court petitioners raised the defense of qualified immunity and moved to dismiss the suit, contending the complaint was not sufficient to state a claim against them. The District Court denied the motion to dismiss, concluding the complaint was sufficient to state a claim despite petitioners' official status at the times in question. Petitioners brought an interlocutory appeal in the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. The court, without discussion, assumed it had jurisdiction over the order denying the motion to dismiss; and it affirmed the District Court's decision.

Respondent's account of his prison ordeal could, if proved, demonstrate unconstitutional misconduct by some governmental actors. But the allegations and pleadings with respect to these actors are not before us here. This case instead turns on a narrower question: Did respondent, as the plaintiff in the District Court,

plead factual matter that, if taken as true, states a claim that petitioners deprived him of his clearly established constitutional rights. We hold respondent's pleadings are insufficient.

I

Following the 2001 attacks, the FBI and other entities within the Department of Justice began an investigation of vast reach to identify the assailants and prevent them from attacking anew. The FBI dedicated more than 4,000 special agents and 3,000 support personnel to the endeavor. By September 18 "the FBI had received more than 96,000 tips or potential leads from the public." Dept. of Justice, Office of Inspector General, The September 11 Detainees: A Review of the Treatment of Aliens Held on Immigration Charges in Connection with the Investigation of the September 11 Attacks 1, 11–12 (Apr.2003) (hereinafter OIG Report), http://www.usdoj.gov/oig/special/0306/full.pdf?bcsi_scan_61073EC0F74759AD=0&bcsi_scan_filename=full.pdf (as visited May 14, 2009, and available in Clerk of Court's case file).

In the ensuing months the FBI questioned more than 1,000 people with suspected links to the attacks in particular or to terrorism in general. *Id.*, at 1. Of those individuals, some 762 were held on immigration charges; and a 184-member subset of that group was deemed to be "of 'high interest'" to the investigation. *Id.*, at 111. The high-interest detainees were held under restrictive conditions designed to prevent them from communicating with the general prison population or the outside world. *Id.*, at 112–113.

Respondent was one of the detainees. According to his complaint, in November 2001 agents of the FBI and Immigration and Naturalization Service arrested him on charges of fraud in relation to identifica-

tion documents and conspiracy to defraud the United States. *Iqbal v. Hasty*, 490 F.3d 143, 147–148 (C.A.2 2007). Pending trial for those crimes, respondent was housed at the Metropolitan Detention Center (MDC) in Brooklyn, New York. Respondent was designated a person "of high interest" to the September 11 investigation and in January 2002 was placed in a section of the MDC known as the Administrative Maximum Special Housing Unit (ADMAX SHU). *Id.*, at 148. As the facility's name indicates, the ADMAX SHU incorporates the maximum security conditions allowable under Federal Bureau of Prison regulations. *Ibid.* ADMAX SHU detainees were kept in lockdown 23 hours a day, spending the remaining hour outside their cells in handcuffs and leg irons accompanied by a four-officer escort. *Ibid.*

Respondent pleaded guilty to the criminal charges, served a term of imprisonment, and was removed to his native Pakistan. *Id.*, at 149. He then filed a *Bivens* action in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of New York against 34 current and former federal officials and 19 "John Doe" federal corrections officers. See *Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971). The defendants range from the correctional officers who had day-to-day contact with respondent during the term of his confinement, to the wardens of the MDC facility, all the way to petitioners—officials who were at the highest level of the federal law enforcement hierarchy. First Amended Complaint in No. 04–CV–1809 (JG)(JA), ¶¶ 10–11, App. to Pet. for Cert. 157a (hereinafter Complaint).

The 21-cause-of-action complaint does not challenge respondent's arrest or his confinement in the MDC's general prison population. Rather, it concentrates on his

treatment while confined to the ADMAX SHU. The complaint sets forth various claims against defendants who are not before us. For instance, the complaint alleges that respondent's jailors "kicked him in the stomach, punched him in the face, and dragged him across" his cell without justification, *id.*, ¶ 113, App. to Pet. for Cert. 176a; subjected him to serial strip and body-cavity searches when he posed no safety risk to himself or others, *id.*, ¶¶ 143–145, App. to Pet. for Cert. 182a; and refused to let him and other Muslims pray because there would be "[n]o prayers for terrorists," *id.*, ¶ 154, App. to Pet. for Cert. 184a.

The allegations against petitioners are the only ones relevant here. The complaint contends that petitioners designated respondent a person of high interest on account of his race, religion, or national origin, in contravention of the First and Fifth Amendments to the Constitution. The complaint alleges that "the [FBI], under the direction of Defendant MUELLER, arrested and detained thousands of Arab Muslim men . . . as part of its investigation of the events of September 11." *Id.*, ¶ 47, at 164a. It further alleges that "[t]he policy of holding post-September-11th detainees in highly restrictive conditions of confinement until they were 'cleared' by the FBI was approved by Defendants ASHCROFT and MUELLER in discussions in the weeks after September 11, 2001." *Id.*, ¶ 69, at 168a. Lastly, the complaint posits that petitioners "each knew of, condoned, and willfully and maliciously agreed to subject" respondent to harsh conditions of confinement "as a matter of policy, solely on account of [his] religion, race, and/or national origin and for no legitimate penological interest." *Id.*, ¶ 96, at 172a–173a. The pleading names Ashcroft as the "principal architect" of the policy, *id.*, ¶ 10, at 157a, and identifies Mueller as "instrumental in [its] adop-

tion, promulgation, and implementation." *Id.*, ¶ 11, at 157a.

Petitioners moved to dismiss the complaint for failure to state sufficient allegations to show their own involvement in clearly established unconstitutional conduct. The District Court denied their motion. Accepting all of the allegations in respondent's complaint as true, the court held that "it cannot be said that there [is] no set of facts on which [respondent] would be entitled to relief as against" petitioners. *Id.*, at 136a–137a (relying on *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957)). Invoking the collateral-order doctrine petitioners filed an interlocutory appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. While that appeal was pending, this Court decided *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007), which discussed the standard for evaluating whether a complaint is sufficient to survive a motion to dismiss.

The Court of Appeals considered *Twombly*'s applicability to this case. Acknowledging that *Twombly* retired the *Conley* no-set-of-facts test relied upon by the District Court, the Court of Appeals' opinion discussed at length how to apply this Court's "standard for assessing the adequacy of pleadings." 490 F.3d, at 155. It concluded that *Twombly* called for a "flexible 'plausibility standard,' which obliges a pleader to amplify a claim with some factual allegations in those contexts where such amplification is needed to render the claim *plausible*." *Id.*, at 157–158. The court found that petitioners' appeal did not present one of "those contexts" requiring amplification. As a consequence, it held respondent's pleading adequate to allege petitioners' personal involvement in discriminatory decisions which, if true, violated clearly established constitutional law. *Id.*, at 174.

Judge Cabranes concurred. He agreed that the majority’s “discussion of the relevant pleading standards reflect[ed] the uneasy compromise . . . between a qualified immunity privilege rooted in the need to preserve the effectiveness of government as contemplated by our constitutional structure and the pleading requirements of Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.” *Id.*, at 178 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted). Judge Cabranes nonetheless expressed concern at the prospect of subjecting high-ranking Government officials—entitled to assert the defense of qualified immunity and charged with responding to “a national and international security emergency unprecedented in the history of the American Republic”—to the burdens of discovery on the basis of a complaint as nonspecific as respondent’s. *Id.*, at 179. Reluctant to vindicate that concern as a member of the Court of Appeals, *ibid.*, Judge Cabranes urged this Court to address the appropriate pleading standard “at the earliest opportunity.” *Id.*, at 178. We granted certiorari, 554 U.S. —, 128 S.Ct. 2931, 171 L.Ed.2d 863 (2008), and now reverse.

II

[1] We first address whether the Court of Appeals had subject-matter jurisdiction to affirm the District Court’s order denying petitioners’ motion to dismiss. Respondent disputed subject-matter jurisdiction in the Court of Appeals, but the court hardly discussed the issue. We are not free to pretermite the question. Subject-matter jurisdiction cannot be forfeited or waived and should be considered when fairly in doubt. *Arbaugh v. Y & H Corp.*, 546 U.S. 500, 514, 126 S.Ct. 1235, 163 L.Ed.2d 1097 (2006) (citing *United States v. Cotton*, 535 U.S. 625, 630, 122 S.Ct. 1781, 152 L.Ed.2d 860 (2002)). According to respondent, the District Court’s order denying petitioners’ motion to dismiss is not

appealable under the collateral-order doctrine. We disagree.

A

[2] With exceptions inapplicable here, Congress has vested the courts of appeals with “jurisdiction of appeals from all final decisions of the district courts of the United States.” 28 U.S.C. § 1291. Though the statute’s finality requirement ensures that “interlocutory appeals—appeals before the end of district court proceedings—are the exception, not the rule,” *Johnson v. Jones*, 515 U.S. 304, 309, 115 S.Ct. 2151, 132 L.Ed.2d 238 (1995), it does not prevent “review of all prejudgment orders.” *Behrens v. Pelletier*, 516 U.S. 299, 305, 116 S.Ct. 834, 133 L.Ed.2d 773 (1996). Under the collateral-order doctrine a limited set of district-court orders are reviewable “though short of final judgment.” *Ibid.* The orders within this narrow category “are immediately appealable because they ‘finally determine claims of right separable from, and collateral to, rights asserted in the action, too important to be denied review and too independent of the cause itself to require that appellate consideration be deferred until the whole case is adjudicated.’” *Ibid.* (quoting *Cohen v. Beneficial Industrial Loan Corp.*, 337 U.S. 541, 546, 69 S.Ct. 1221, 93 L.Ed. 1528 (1949)).

[3–5] A district-court decision denying a Government officer’s claim of qualified immunity can fall within the narrow class of appealable orders despite “the absence of a final judgment.” *Mitchell v. Forsyth*, 472 U.S. 511, 530, 105 S.Ct. 2806, 86 L.Ed.2d 411 (1985). This is so because qualified immunity—which shields Government officials “from liability for civil damages insofar as their conduct does not violate clearly established statutory or constitutional rights,” *Harlow v. Fitzgerald*,

ald, 457 U.S. 800, 818, 102 S.Ct. 2727, 73 L.Ed.2d 396 (1982)—is both a defense to liability and a limited “entitlement not to stand trial or face the other burdens of litigation.” *Mitchell*, *supra*, 472 U.S., at 526, 105 S.Ct. 2806. Provided it “turns on an issue of law,” *id.*, at 530, 105 S.Ct. 2806, a district-court order denying qualified immunity “‘conclusively determine[s]’” that the defendant must bear the burdens of discovery; is “conceptually distinct from the merits of the plaintiff’s claim”; and would prove “effectively unreviewable on appeal from a final judgment.” *Id.*, at 527–528 (citing *Cohen*, *supra*, at 546, 69 S.Ct. 1221). As a general matter, the collateral-order doctrine may have expanded beyond the limits dictated by its internal logic and the strict application of the criteria set out in *Cohen*. But the applicability of the doctrine in the context of qualified-immunity claims is well established; and this Court has been careful to say that a district court’s order rejecting qualified immunity at the motion-to-dismiss stage of a proceeding is a “final decision” within the meaning of § 1291. *Behrens*, 516 U.S., at 307, 116 S.Ct. 834.

B

[6] Applying these principles, we conclude that the Court of Appeals had jurisdiction to hear petitioners’ appeal. The District Court’s order denying petitioners’ motion to dismiss turned on an issue of law and rejected the defense of qualified immunity. It was therefore a final decision “subject to immediate appeal.” *Ibid.* Respondent says that “a qualified immunity appeal based solely on the complaint’s failure to state a claim, and not on the ultimate issues relevant to the qualified immunity defense itself, is not a proper subject of interlocutory jurisdiction.” Brief for Respondent Iqbal 15 (hereinafter Iqbal

Brief). In other words, respondent contends the Court of Appeals had jurisdiction to determine whether his complaint avers a clearly established constitutional violation but that it lacked jurisdiction to pass on the sufficiency of his pleadings. Our opinions, however, make clear that appellate jurisdiction is not so strictly confined.

In *Hartman v. Moore*, 547 U.S. 250, 126 S.Ct. 1695, 164 L.Ed.2d 441 (2006), the Court reviewed an interlocutory decision denying qualified immunity. The legal issue decided in *Hartman* concerned the elements a plaintiff “must plead and prove in order to win” a First Amendment retaliation claim. *Id.*, at 257, n. 5, 126 S.Ct. 1695. Similarly, two Terms ago in *Wilkie v. Robbins*, 551 U.S. 537, 127 S.Ct. 2588, 168 L.Ed.2d 389 (2007), the Court considered another interlocutory order denying qualified immunity. The legal issue there was whether a *Bivens* action can be employed to challenge interference with property rights. 551 U.S., at 549, n. 4, 127 S.Ct. 2588. These cases cannot be squared with respondent’s argument that the collateral-order doctrine restricts appellate jurisdiction to the “ultimate issu[e]” whether the legal wrong asserted was a violation of clearly established law while excluding the question whether the facts pleaded establish such a violation. Iqbal Brief 15. Indeed, the latter question is even more clearly within the category of appealable decisions than the questions presented in *Hartman* and *Wilkie*, since whether a particular complaint sufficiently alleges a clearly established violation of law cannot be decided in isolation from the facts pleaded. In that sense the sufficiency of respondent’s pleadings is both “inextricably intertwined with,” *Swint v. Chambers County Comm’n*, 514 U.S. 35, 51, 115 S.Ct. 1203, 131 L.Ed.2d 60 (1995), and “directly implicated by,” *Hartman*, *supra*, at 257, n.

5, 126 S.Ct. 1695, the qualified immunity defense.

Respondent counters that our holding in *Johnson*, 515 U.S. 304, 115 S.Ct. 2151, 132 L.Ed.2d 238, confirms the want of subject-matter jurisdiction here. That is incorrect. The allegation in *Johnson* was that five defendants, all of them police officers, unlawfully beat the plaintiff. *Johnson* considered “the appealability of a portion of” the District Court’s summary judgment order that, “though entered in a ‘qualified immunity’ case, determine[d] only” that there was a genuine issue of material fact that three of the defendants participated in the beating. *Id.*, at 313, 115 S.Ct. 2151.

In finding that order not a “final decision” for purposes of § 1291, the *Johnson* Court cited *Mitchell* for the proposition that only decisions turning “‘on an issue of law’” are subject to immediate appeal. 515 U.S., at 313, 115 S.Ct. 2151. Though determining whether there is a genuine issue of material fact at summary judgment is a question of law, it is a legal question that sits near the law-fact divide. Or as we said in *Johnson*, it is a “fact-related” legal inquiry. *Id.*, at 314, 115 S.Ct. 2151. To conduct it, a court of appeals may be required to consult a “vast pretrial record, with numerous conflicting affidavits, depositions, and other discovery materials.” *Id.*, at 316, 115 S.Ct. 2151. That process generally involves matters more within a district court’s ken and may replicate inefficiently questions that will arise on appeal following final judgment. *Ibid.* Finding those concerns predominant, *Johnson* held that the collateral orders that are “final” under *Mitchell* turn on “abstract,” rather than “fact-based,” issues of law. 515 U.S., at 317, 115 S.Ct. 2151.

The concerns that animated the decision in *Johnson* are absent when an appellate court considers the disposition of a motion to dismiss a complaint for insufficient

pleadings. True, the categories of “fact-based” and “abstract” legal questions used to guide the Court’s decision in *Johnson* are not well defined. Here, however, the order denying petitioners’ motion to dismiss falls well within the latter class. Reviewing that order, the Court of Appeals considered only the allegations contained within the four corners of respondent’s complaint; resort to a “vast pretrial record” on petitioners’ motion to dismiss was unnecessary. *Id.*, at 316, 115 S.Ct. 2151. And determining whether respondent’s complaint has the “heft” to state a claim is a task well within an appellate court’s core competency. *Twombly*, 550 U.S., at 557, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Evaluating the sufficiency of a complaint is not a “fact-based” question of law, so the problem the Court sought to avoid in *Johnson* is not implicated here. The District Court’s order denying petitioners’ motion to dismiss is a final decision under the collateral-order doctrine over which the Court of Appeals had, and this Court has, jurisdiction. We proceed to consider the merits of petitioners’ appeal.

III

In *Twombly*, *supra*, at 553–554, 127 S.Ct. 1955, the Court found it necessary first to discuss the antitrust principles implicated by the complaint. Here too we begin by taking note of the elements a plaintiff must plead to state a claim of unconstitutional discrimination against officials entitled to assert the defense of qualified immunity.

[7] In *Bivens*—proceeding on the theory that a right suggests a remedy—this Court “recognized for the first time an implied private action for damages against federal officers alleged to have violated a citizen’s constitutional rights.” *Correctional Services Corp. v. Malesko*, 534 U.S. 61, 66, 122 S.Ct. 515, 151 L.Ed.2d 456

(2001). Because implied causes of action are disfavored, the Court has been reluctant to extend *Bivens* liability “to any new context or new category of defendants.” 534 U.S., at 68, 122 S.Ct. 515. See also *Wilkie*, 551 U.S., at 549–550, 127 S.Ct. 2588. That reluctance might well have disposed of respondent’s First Amendment claim of religious discrimination. For while we have allowed a *Bivens* action to redress a violation of the equal protection component of the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, see *Davis v. Passman*, 442 U.S. 228, 99 S.Ct. 2264, 60 L.Ed.2d 846 (1979), we have not found an implied damages remedy under the Free Exercise Clause. Indeed, we have declined to extend *Bivens* to a claim sounding in the First Amendment. *Bush v. Lucas*, 462 U.S. 367, 103 S.Ct. 2404, 76 L.Ed.2d 648 (1983). Petitioners do not press this argument, however, so we assume, without deciding, that respondent’s First Amendment claim is actionable under *Bivens*.

[8] In the limited settings where *Bivens* does apply, the implied cause of action is the “federal analog to suits brought against state officials under Rev. Stat. § 1979, 42 U.S.C. § 1983.” *Hartman*, 547 U.S., at 254, n. 2, 126 S.Ct. 1695. Cf. *Wilson v. Layne*, 526 U.S. 603, 609, 119 S.Ct. 1692, 143 L.Ed.2d 818 (1999). Based on the rules our precedents establish, respondent correctly concedes that Government officials may not be held liable for the unconstitutional conduct of their subordinates under a theory of *respondeat superior*. Iqbal Brief 46 (“[I]t is undisputed that supervisory *Bivens* liability cannot be established solely on a theory of *respondeat superior*”). See *Monell v. New York City Dept. of Social Servs.*, 436 U.S. 658, 691, 98 S.Ct. 2018, 56 L.Ed.2d 611 (1978) (finding no vicarious liability for a municipal “person” under 42 U.S.C. § 1983); see

also *Dunlop v. Munroe*, 7 Cranch 242, 269, 3 L.Ed. 329 (1812) (a federal official’s liability “will only result from his own neglect in not properly superintending the discharge” of his subordinates’ duties); *Robertson v. Sichel*, 127 U.S. 507, 515–516, 8 S.Ct. 1286, 3 L.Ed. 203 (1888) (“A public officer or agent is not responsible for the misfeasances or position wrongs, or for the nonfeasances, or negligences, or omissions of duty, of the subagents or servants or other persons properly employed by or under him, in the discharge of his official duties”). Because vicarious liability is inapplicable to *Bivens* and § 1983 suits, a plaintiff must plead that each Government-official defendant, through the official’s own individual actions, has violated the Constitution.

[9] The factors necessary to establish a *Bivens* violation will vary with the constitutional provision at issue. Where the claim is invidious discrimination in contravention of the First and Fifth Amendments, our decisions make clear that the plaintiff must plead and prove that the defendant acted with discriminatory purpose. *Church of Lukumi Babalu Aye, Inc. v. Hialeah*, 508 U.S. 520, 540–541, 113 S.Ct. 2217, 124 L.Ed.2d 472 (1993) (First Amendment); *Washington v. Davis*, 426 U.S. 229, 240, 96 S.Ct. 2040, 48 L.Ed.2d 597 (1976) (Fifth Amendment). Under extant precedent purposeful discrimination requires more than “intent as volition or intent as awareness of consequences.” *Personnel Administrator of Mass. v. Feeney*, 442 U.S. 256, 279, 99 S.Ct. 2282, 60 L.Ed.2d 870 (1979). It instead involves a decisionmaker’s undertaking a course of action “‘because of,’ not merely ‘in spite of,’ [the action’s] adverse effects upon an identifiable group.” *Ibid.* It follows that, to state a claim based on a violation of a clearly established right, respondent must plead sufficient factual matter to show that

petitioners adopted and implemented the detention policies at issue not for a neutral, investigative reason but for the purpose of discriminating on account of race, religion, or national origin.

Respondent disagrees. He argues that, under a theory of “supervisory liability,” petitioners can be liable for “knowledge and acquiescence in their subordinates’ use of discriminatory criteria to make classification decisions among detainees.” Iqbal Brief 45–46. That is to say, respondent believes a supervisor’s mere knowledge of his subordinate’s discriminatory purpose amounts to the supervisor’s violating the Constitution. We reject this argument. Respondent’s conception of “supervisory liability” is inconsistent with his accurate stipulation that petitioners may not be held accountable for the misdeeds of their agents. In a § 1983 suit or a *Bivens* action—where masters do not answer for the torts of their servants—the term “supervisory liability” is a misnomer. Absent vicarious liability, each Government official, his or her title notwithstanding, is only liable for his or her own misconduct. In the context of determining whether there is a violation of clearly established right to overcome qualified immunity, purpose rather than knowledge is required to impose *Bivens* liability on the subordinate for unconstitutional discrimination; the same holds true for an official charged with violations arising from his or her superintendent responsibilities.

IV

A

[10, 11] We turn to respondent’s complaint. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a)(2), a pleading must contain a “short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.” As the Court held in *Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d

929, the pleading standard Rule 8 announces does not require “detailed factual allegations,” but it demands more than an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation. *Id.*, at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (citing *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286, 106 S.Ct. 2932, 92 L.Ed.2d 209 (1986)). A pleading that offers “labels and conclusions” or “a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” 550 U.S., at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Nor does a complaint suffice if it tenders “naked assertion[s]” devoid of “further factual enhancement.” *Id.*, at 557, 127 S.Ct. 1955.

[12, 13] To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to “state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.*, at 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955. A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged. *Id.*, at 556, 127 S.Ct. 1955. The plausibility standard is not akin to a “probability requirement,” but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully. *Ibid.* Where a complaint pleads facts that are “merely consistent with” a defendant’s liability, it “stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of ‘entitlement to relief.’” *Id.*, at 557, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (brackets omitted).

Two working principles underlie our decision in *Twombly*. First, the tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions. Threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice. *Id.*, at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (Although for the purposes of a motion to dismiss we must take all of the factual allegations in the complaint as true, we

“are not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation” (internal quotation marks omitted)). Rule 8 marks a notable and generous departure from the hyper-technical, code-pleading regime of a prior era, but it does not unlock the doors of discovery for a plaintiff armed with nothing more than conclusions. Second, only a complaint that states a plausible claim for relief survives a motion to dismiss. *Id.*, at 556, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Determining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief will, as the Court of Appeals observed, be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense. 490 F.3d, at 157–158. But where the well-pleaded facts do not permit the court to infer more than the mere possibility of misconduct, the complaint has alleged—but it has not “show[n]”—“that the pleader is entitled to relief.” Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 8(a)(2).

In keeping with these principles a court considering a motion to dismiss can choose to begin by identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth. While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are well-pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.

Our decision in *Twombly* illustrates the two-pronged approach. There, we considered the sufficiency of a complaint alleging that incumbent telecommunications providers had entered an agreement not to compete and to forestall competitive entry, in violation of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. Recognizing that § 1 enjoins only anticompetitive conduct “effected by a contract, combination, or conspiracy,” *Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp.*,

467 U.S. 752, 775, 104 S.Ct. 2731, 81 L.Ed.2d 628 (1984), the plaintiffs in *Twombly* flatly pleaded that the defendants “ha[d] entered into a contract, combination or conspiracy to prevent competitive entry . . . and ha[d] agreed not to compete with one another.” 550 U.S., at 551, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (internal quotation marks omitted). The complaint also alleged that the defendants’ “parallel course of conduct . . . to prevent competition” and inflate prices was indicative of the unlawful agreement alleged. *Ibid.* (internal quotation marks omitted).

The Court held the plaintiffs’ complaint deficient under Rule 8. In doing so it first noted that the plaintiffs’ assertion of an unlawful agreement was a “‘legal conclusion’” and, as such, was not entitled to the assumption of truth. *Id.*, at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Had the Court simply credited the allegation of a conspiracy, the plaintiffs would have stated a claim for relief and been entitled to proceed perforce. The Court next addressed the “nub” of the plaintiffs’ complaint—the well-pleaded, nonconclusory factual allegation of parallel behavior—to determine whether it gave rise to a “plausible suggestion of conspiracy.” *Id.*, at 565–566, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Acknowledging that parallel conduct was consistent with an unlawful agreement, the Court nevertheless concluded that it did not plausibly suggest an illicit accord because it was not only compatible with, but indeed was more likely explained by, lawful, unchoreographed free-market behavior. *Id.*, at 567, 127 S.Ct. 1955. Because the well-pleaded fact of parallel conduct, accepted as true, did not plausibly suggest an unlawful agreement, the Court held the plaintiffs’ complaint must be dismissed. *Id.*, at 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955.

B

[14] Under *Twombly*’s construction of Rule 8, we conclude that respondent’s com-

plaint has not “nudged [his] claims” of invidious discrimination “across the line from conceivable to plausible.” *Ibid.*

We begin our analysis by identifying the allegations in the complaint that are not entitled to the assumption of truth. Respondent pleads that petitioners “knew of, condoned, and willfully and maliciously agreed to subject [him]” to harsh conditions of confinement “as a matter of policy, solely on account of [his] religion, race, and/or national origin and for no legitimate penological interest.” Complaint ¶ 96, App. to Pet. for Cert. 173a–174a. The complaint alleges that Ashcroft was the “principal architect” of this invidious policy, *id.*, ¶ 10, at 157a, and that Mueller was “instrumental” in adopting and executing it, *id.*, ¶ 11, at 157a. These bare assertions, much like the pleading of conspiracy in *Twombly*, amount to nothing more than a “formulaic recitation of the elements” of a constitutional discrimination claim, 550 U.S., at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955, namely, that petitioners adopted a policy “‘because of,’ not merely ‘in spite of,’ its adverse effects upon an identifiable group.” *Feeney*, 442 U.S., at 279, 99 S.Ct. 2282. As such, the allegations are conclusory and not entitled to be assumed true. *Twombly, supra*, 550 U.S., at 554–555, 127 S.Ct. 1955. To be clear, we do not reject these bald allegations on the ground that they are unrealistic or nonsensical. We do not so characterize them any more than the Court in *Twombly* rejected the plaintiffs’ express allegation of a “‘contract, combination or conspiracy to prevent competitive entry,’” *id.*, at 551, 127 S.Ct. 1955, because it thought that claim too chimerical to be maintained. It is the conclusory nature of respondent’s allegations, rather than their extravagantly fanciful nature, that disentitles them to the presumption of truth.

We next consider the factual allegations in respondent’s complaint to determine if

they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief. The complaint alleges that “the [FBI], under the direction of Defendant MUELLER, arrested and detained thousands of Arab Muslim men . . . as part of its investigation of the events of September 11.” Complaint ¶ 47, App. to Pet. for Cert. 164a. It further claims that “[t]he policy of holding post–September–11th detainees in highly restrictive conditions of confinement until they were ‘cleared’ by the FBI was approved by Defendants ASHCROFT and MUELLER in discussions in the weeks after September 11, 2001.” *Id.*, ¶ 69, at 168a. Taken as true, these allegations are consistent with petitioners’ purposefully designating detainees “of high interest” because of their race, religion, or national origin. But given more likely explanations, they do not plausibly establish this purpose.

The September 11 attacks were perpetrated by 19 Arab Muslim hijackers who counted themselves members in good standing of al Qaeda, an Islamic fundamentalist group. Al Qaeda was headed by another Arab Muslim—Osama bin Laden—and composed in large part of his Arab Muslim disciples. It should come as no surprise that a legitimate policy directing law enforcement to arrest and detain individuals because of their suspected link to the attacks would produce a disparate, incidental impact on Arab Muslims, even though the purpose of the policy was to target neither Arabs nor Muslims. On the facts respondent alleges the arrests Mueller oversaw were likely lawful and justified by his nondiscriminatory intent to detain aliens who were illegally present in the United States and who had potential connections to those who committed terrorist acts. As between that “obvious alternative explanation” for the arrests, *Twombly, supra*, at 567, 127 S.Ct. 1955, and the purposeful, invidious discrimination respon-

dent asks us to infer, discrimination is not a plausible conclusion.

But even if the complaint's well-pleaded facts give rise to a plausible inference that respondent's arrest was the result of unconstitutional discrimination, that inference alone would not entitle respondent to relief. It is important to recall that respondent's complaint challenges neither the constitutionality of his arrest nor his initial detention in the MDC. Respondent's constitutional claims against petitioners rest solely on their ostensible "policy of holding post-September-11th detainees" in the ADMAX SHU once they were categorized as "of high interest." Complaint ¶ 69, App. to Pet. for Cert. 168a. To prevail on that theory, the complaint must contain facts plausibly showing that petitioners purposefully adopted a policy of classifying post-September-11 detainees as "of high interest" because of their race, religion, or national origin.

This the complaint fails to do. Though respondent alleges that various other defendants, who are not before us, may have labeled him a person of "of high interest" for impermissible reasons, his only factual allegation against petitioners accuses them of adopting a policy approving "restrictive conditions of confinement" for post-September-11 detainees until they were "'cleared' by the FBI." *Ibid.* Accepting the truth of that allegation, the complaint does not show, or even intimate, that petitioners purposefully housed detainees in the ADMAX SHU due to their race, religion, or national origin. All it plausibly suggests is that the Nation's top law enforcement officers, in the aftermath of a devastating terrorist attack, sought to keep suspected terrorists in the most secure conditions available until the suspects could be cleared of terrorist activity. Respondent does not argue, nor can he, that such a motive would violate petitioners' constitu-

tional obligations. He would need to allege more by way of factual content to "nudge[e]" his claim of purposeful discrimination "across the line from conceivable to plausible." *Twombly*, 550 U.S., at 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955.

To be sure, respondent can attempt to draw certain contrasts between the pleadings the Court considered in *Twombly* and the pleadings at issue here. In *Twombly*, the complaint alleged general wrongdoing that extended over a period of years, *id.*, at 551, 127 S.Ct. 1955, whereas here the complaint alleges discrete wrongs—for instance, beatings—by lower level Government actors. The allegations here, if true, and if condoned by petitioners, could be the basis for some inference of wrongful intent on petitioners' part. Despite these distinctions, respondent's pleadings do not suffice to state a claim. Unlike in *Twombly*, where the doctrine of *respondeat superior* could bind the corporate defendant, here, as we have noted, petitioners cannot be held liable unless they themselves acted on account of a constitutionally protected characteristic. Yet respondent's complaint does not contain any factual allegation sufficient to plausibly suggest petitioners' discriminatory state of mind. His pleadings thus do not meet the standard necessary to comply with Rule 8.

It is important to note, however, that we express no opinion concerning the sufficiency of respondent's complaint against the defendants who are not before us. Respondent's account of his prison ordeal alleges serious official misconduct that we need not address here. Our decision is limited to the determination that respondent's complaint does not entitle him to relief from petitioners.

C

Respondent offers three arguments that bear on our disposition of his case, but none is persuasive.

1

Respondent first says that our decision in *Twombly* should be limited to pleadings made in the context of an antitrust dispute. Iqbal Brief 37–38. This argument is not supported by *Twombly* and is incompatible with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Though *Twombly* determined the sufficiency of a complaint sounding in antitrust, the decision was based on our interpretation and application of Rule 8. 550 U.S., at 554, 127 S.Ct. 1955. That Rule in turn governs the pleading standard “in all civil actions and proceedings in the United States district courts.” Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 1. Our decision in *Twombly* expounded the pleading standard for “all civil actions,” *ibid.*, and it applies to antitrust and discrimination suits alike. See 550 U.S., at 555–556, and n. 3, 127 S.Ct. 1955.

2

Respondent next implies that our construction of Rule 8 should be tempered where, as here, the Court of Appeals has “instructed the district court to cabin discovery in such a way as to preserve” petitioners’ defense of qualified immunity “as much as possible in anticipation of a summary judgment motion.” Iqbal Brief 27. We have held, however, that the question presented by a motion to dismiss a complaint for insufficient pleadings does not turn on the controls placed upon the discovery process. *Twombly, supra*, at 559, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (“It is no answer to say that a claim just shy of a plausible entitlement to relief can, if groundless, be weeded out early in the discovery process through careful case management given the common lament that the success of judicial supervision in checking discovery abuse has been on the modest side” (internal quotation marks and citation omitted)).

[15] Our rejection of the careful-case-management approach is especially impor-

tant in suits where Government-official defendants are entitled to assert the defense of qualified immunity. The basic thrust of the qualified-immunity doctrine is to free officials from the concerns of litigation, including “avoidance of disruptive discovery.” *Siegert v. Gilley*, 500 U.S. 226, 236, 111 S.Ct. 1789, 114 L.Ed.2d 277 (1991) (KENNEDY, J., concurring in judgment). There are serious and legitimate reasons for this. If a Government official is to devote time to his or her duties, and to the formulation of sound and responsible policies, it is counterproductive to require the substantial diversion that is attendant to participating in litigation and making informed decisions as to how it should proceed. Litigation, though necessary to ensure that officials comply with the law, exacts heavy costs in terms of efficiency and expenditure of valuable time and resources that might otherwise be directed to the proper execution of the work of the Government. The costs of diversion are only magnified when Government officials are charged with responding to, as Judge Cabranes aptly put it, “a national and international security emergency unprecedented in the history of the American Republic.” 490 F.3d, at 179.

It is no answer to these concerns to say that discovery for petitioners can be deferred while pretrial proceedings continue for other defendants. It is quite likely that, when discovery as to the other parties proceeds, it would prove necessary for petitioners and their counsel to participate in the process to ensure the case does not develop in a misleading or slanted way that causes prejudice to their position. Even if petitioners are not yet themselves subject to discovery orders, then, they would not be free from the burdens of discovery.

We decline respondent’s invitation to relax the pleading requirements on the

ground that the Court of Appeals promises petitioners minimally intrusive discovery. That promise provides especially cold comfort in this pleading context, where we are impelled to give real content to the concept of qualified immunity for high-level officials who must be neither deterred nor detracted from the vigorous performance of their duties. Because respondent's complaint is deficient under Rule 8, he is not entitled to discovery, cabined or otherwise.

3

Respondent finally maintains that the Federal Rules expressly allow him to allege petitioners' discriminatory intent "generally," which he equates with a conclusory allegation. Iqbal Brief 32 (citing Fed. Rule Civ. Proc. 9). It follows, respondent says, that his complaint is sufficiently well pleaded because it claims that petitioners discriminated against him "on account of [his] religion, race, and/or national origin and for no legitimate penological interest." Complaint ¶ 96, App. to Pet. for Cert. 172a–173a. Were we required to accept this allegation as true, respondent's complaint would survive petitioners' motion to dismiss. But the Federal Rules do not require courts to credit a complaint's conclusory statements without reference to its factual context.

[16] It is true that Rule 9(b) requires particularity when pleading "fraud or mistake," while allowing "[m]alice, intent, knowledge, and other conditions of a person's mind [to] be alleged generally." But "generally" is a relative term. In the context of Rule 9, it is to be compared to the particularity requirement applicable to fraud or mistake. Rule 9 merely excuses a party from pleading discriminatory intent under an elevated pleading standard. It does not give him license to evade the less rigid—though still operative—strictures of

Rule 8. See 5A C. Wright & A. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1301, p. 291 (3d ed. 2004) ("[A] rigid rule requiring the detailed pleading of a condition of mind would be undesirable because, absent overriding considerations pressing for a specificity requirement, as in the case of averments of fraud or mistake, the general 'short and plain statement of the claim' mandate in Rule 8(a) . . . should control the second sentence of Rule 9(b)"). And Rule 8 does not empower respondent to plead the bare elements of his cause of action, affix the label "general allegation," and expect his complaint to survive a motion to dismiss.

V

We hold that respondent's complaint fails to plead sufficient facts to state a claim for purposeful and unlawful discrimination against petitioners. The Court of Appeals should decide in the first instance whether to remand to the District Court so that respondent can seek leave to amend his deficient complaint.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals is reversed, and the case is remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

It is so ordered.

Justice SOUTER, with whom Justice STEVENS, Justice GINSBURG, and Justice BREYER join, dissenting.

This case is here on the uncontested assumption that *Bivens v. Six Unknown Fed. Narcotics Agents*, 403 U.S. 388, 91 S.Ct. 1999, 29 L.Ed.2d 619 (1971), allows personal liability based on a federal officer's violation of an individual's rights under the First and Fifth Amendments, and it comes to us with the explicit concession of petitioners Ashcroft and Mueller that an officer may be subject to *Bivens* liability as a supervisor on grounds other than re-

spondeat superior. The Court apparently rejects this concession and, although it has no bearing on the majority's resolution of this case, does away with supervisory liability under *Bivens*. The majority then misapplies the pleading standard under *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007), to conclude that the complaint fails to state a claim. I respectfully dissent from both the rejection of supervisory liability as a cognizable claim in the face of petitioners' concession, and from the holding that the complaint fails to satisfy Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

I

A

Respondent Iqbal was arrested in November 2001 on charges of conspiracy to defraud the United States and fraud in relation to identification documents, and was placed in pretrial detention at the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn, New York. *Iqbal v. Hasty*, 490 F.3d 143, 147–148 (C.A.2 2007). He alleges that FBI officials carried out a discriminatory policy by designating him as a person “‘of high interest’” in the investigation of the September 11 attacks solely because of his race, religion, or national origin. Owing to this designation he was placed in the detention center's Administrative Maximum Special Housing Unit for over six months while awaiting the fraud trial. *Id.*, at 148. As I will mention more fully below, Iqbal contends that Ashcroft and Mueller were at the very least aware of the discriminatory detention policy and condoned it (and perhaps even took part in devising it), thereby violating his First and Fifth Amendment rights.¹

1. Iqbal makes no claim against Ashcroft and Mueller based simply on his right, as a pretrial detainee, to be free from punishment

Iqbal claims that on the day he was transferred to the special unit, prison guards, without provocation, “picked him up and threw him against the wall, kicked him in the stomach, punched him in the face, and dragged him across the room.” First Amended Complaint in No. 04–CV–1809 (JG)(JA), ¶ 113, App. to Pet. for Cert. 176a (hereinafter Complaint). He says that after being attacked a second time he sought medical attention but was denied care for two weeks. *Id.*, ¶¶ 187–188, at 189a. According to Iqbal's complaint, prison staff in the special unit subjected him to unjustified strip and body cavity searches, *id.*, ¶¶ 136–140, at 181a, verbally berated him as a “‘terrorist’” and “‘Muslim killer,’” *id.*, ¶ 87, at 170a–171a, refused to give him adequate food, *id.*, ¶ 91, at 171a–172a, and intentionally turned on air conditioning during the winter and heating during the summer, *id.*, ¶ 84, at 170a. He claims that prison staff interfered with his attempts to pray and engage in religious study, *id.*, ¶¶ 153–154, at 183a–184a, and with his access to counsel, *id.*, ¶¶ 168, 171, at 186a–187a.

The District Court denied Ashcroft and Mueller's motion to dismiss Iqbal's discrimination claim, and the Court of Appeals affirmed. Ashcroft and Mueller then asked this Court to grant certiorari on two questions:

“1. Whether a conclusory allegation that a cabinet-level officer or other high-ranking official knew of, condoned, or agreed to subject a plaintiff to allegedly unconstitutional acts purportedly committed by subordinate officials is sufficient to state individual-capacity claims against those officials under *Bivens*.”

prior to an adjudication of guilt on the fraud charges. See *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 535, 99 S.Ct. 1861, 60 L.Ed.2d 447 (1979).

“2. Whether a cabinet-level officer or other high-ranking official may be held personally liable for the allegedly unconstitutional acts of subordinate officials on the ground that, as high-level supervisors, they had constructive notice of the discrimination allegedly carried out by such subordinate officials.” Pet. for Cert. I.

The Court granted certiorari on both questions. The first is about pleading; the second goes to the liability standard.

In the first question, Ashcroft and Mueller did not ask whether “a cabinet-level officer or other high-ranking official” who “knew of, condoned, or agreed to subject a plaintiff to allegedly unconstitutional acts committed by subordinate officials” was subject to liability under *Bivens*. In fact, they conceded in their petition for certiorari that they would be liable if they had “actual knowledge” of discrimination by their subordinates and exhibited “‘deliberate indifference’” to that discrimination. Pet. for Cert. 29 (quoting *Farmer v. Brennan*, 511 U.S. 825, 837, 114 S.Ct. 1970, 128 L.Ed.2d 811 (1994)). Instead, they asked the Court to address whether Iqbal’s allegations against them (which they call conclusory) were sufficient to satisfy Rule 8(a)(2), and in particular whether the Court of Appeals misapplied our decision in *Twombly* construing that rule. Pet. for Cert. 11–24.

In the second question, Ashcroft and Mueller asked this Court to say whether they could be held personally liable for the actions of their subordinates based on the theory that they had constructive notice of their subordinates’ unconstitutional conduct. *Id.*, at 25–33. This was an odd question to pose, since Iqbal has never claimed that Ashcroft and Mueller are liable on a constructive notice theory. Be that as it may, the second question challenged only one possible ground for impos-

ing supervisory liability under *Bivens*. In sum, both questions assumed that a defendant could raise a *Bivens* claim on theories of supervisory liability other than constructive notice, and neither question asked the parties or the Court to address the elements of such liability.

The briefing at the merits stage was no different. Ashcroft and Mueller argued that the factual allegations in Iqbal’s complaint were insufficient to overcome their claim of qualified immunity; they also contended that they could not be held liable on a theory of constructive notice. Again they conceded, however, that they would be subject to supervisory liability if they “had actual knowledge of the assertedly discriminatory nature of the classification of suspects as being ‘of high interest’ and they were deliberately indifferent to that discrimination.” Brief for Petitioners 50; see also Reply Brief for Petitioners 21–22. Iqbal argued that the allegations in his complaint were sufficient under Rule 8(a)(2) and *Twombly*, and conceded that as a matter of law he could not recover under a theory of *respondeat superior*. See Brief for Respondent Iqbal 46. Thus, the parties agreed as to a proper standard of supervisory liability, and the disputed question was whether Iqbal’s complaint satisfied Rule 8(a)(2).

Without acknowledging the parties’ agreement as to the standard of supervisory liability, the Court asserts that it must *sua sponte* decide the scope of supervisory liability here. *Ante*, at 1947–1949. I agree that, absent Ashcroft and Mueller’s concession, that determination would have to be made; without knowing the elements of a supervisory liability claim, there would be no way to determine whether a plaintiff had made factual allegations amounting to grounds for relief on that claim. See *Twombly*, 550 U.S., at 557–558, 127 S.Ct. 1955. But deciding the scope of superviso-

ry *Bivens* liability in this case is uncalled for. There are several reasons, starting with the position Ashcroft and Mueller have taken and following from it.

First, Ashcroft and Mueller have, as noted, made the critical concession that a supervisor's knowledge of a subordinate's unconstitutional conduct and deliberate indifference to that conduct are grounds for *Bivens* liability. Iqbal seeks to recover on a theory that Ashcroft and Mueller at least knowingly acquiesced (and maybe more than acquiesced) in the discriminatory acts of their subordinates; if he can show this, he will satisfy Ashcroft and Mueller's own test for supervisory liability. See *Farmer, supra*, at 842, 114 S.Ct. 1970 (explaining that a prison official acts with "deliberate indifference" if "the official acted or failed to act despite his knowledge of a substantial risk of serious harm"). We do not normally override a party's concession, see, e.g., *United States v. International Business Machines Corp.*, 517 U.S. 843, 855, 116 S.Ct. 1793, 135 L.Ed.2d 124 (1996) (holding that "[i]t would be inappropriate for us to [e]xamine in this case, without the benefit of the parties' briefing," an issue the Government had conceded), and doing so is especially inappropriate when, as here, the issue is unnecessary to decide the case, see *infra*, at 1958–1959. I would therefore accept Ashcroft and Mueller's concession for purposes of this case and proceed to consider whether the complaint alleges at least knowledge and deliberate indifference.

Second, because of the concession, we have received no briefing or argument on the proper scope of supervisory liability, much less the full-dress argument we normally require. *Mapp v. Ohio*, 367 U.S. 643, 676–677, 81 S.Ct. 1684, 6 L.Ed.2d 1081 (1961) (Harlan, J., dissenting). We consequently are in no position to decide the precise contours of supervisory liability

here, this issue being a complicated one that has divided the Courts of Appeals. See *infra*, at 1957–1959. This Court recently remarked on the danger of "bad decisionmaking" when the briefing on a question is "woefully inadequate," *Pearson v. Callahan*, 555 U.S. —, —, 129 S.Ct. 808, 819, 172 L.Ed.2d 565 (2009), yet today the majority answers a question with no briefing at all. The attendant risk of error is palpable.

Finally, the Court's approach is most unfair to Iqbal. He was entitled to rely on Ashcroft and Mueller's concession, both in their petition for certiorari and in their merits briefs, that they could be held liable on a theory of knowledge and deliberate indifference. By overriding that concession, the Court denies Iqbal a fair chance to be heard on the question.

B

The majority, however, does ignore the concession. According to the majority, because Iqbal concededly cannot recover on a theory of *respondeat superior*, it follows that he cannot recover under any theory of supervisory liability. *Ante*, at 1948–1949. The majority says that in a *Bivens* action, "where masters do not answer for the torts of their servants," "the term 'supervisory liability' is a misnomer," and that "[a]bsent vicarious liability, each Government official, his or her title notwithstanding, is only liable for his or her own misconduct." *Ibid.* Lest there be any mistake, in these words the majority is not narrowing the scope of supervisory liability; it is eliminating *Bivens* supervisory liability entirely. The nature of a supervisory liability theory is that the supervisor may be liable, under certain conditions, for the wrongdoing of his subordinates, and it is this very principle that the majority rejects. *Ante*, at 1952 ("[P]etitioners cannot be held liable unless they themselves

acted on account of a constitutionally protected characteristic”).

The dangers of the majority’s readiness to proceed without briefing and argument are apparent in its cursory analysis, which rests on the assumption that only two outcomes are possible here: *respondeat superior* liability, in which “an employer is subject to liability for torts committed by employees while acting within the scope of their employment,” Restatement (Third) of Agency § 2.04 (2005), or no supervisory liability at all. The dichotomy is false. Even if an employer is not liable for the actions of his employee solely because the employee was acting within the scope of employment, there still might be conditions to render a supervisor liable for the conduct of his subordinate. See, e.g., *Whitfield v. Melendez-Rivera*, 431 F.3d 1, 14 (C.A.1 2005) (distinguishing between *respondeat superior* liability and supervisory liability); *Bennett v. Eastpointe*, 410 F.3d 810, 818 (C.A.6 2005) (same); *Richardson v. Goord*, 347 F.3d 431, 435 (C.A.2 2003) (same); *Hall v. Lombardi*, 996 F.2d 954, 961 (C.A.8 1993) (same).

In fact, there is quite a spectrum of possible tests for supervisory liability: it could be imposed where a supervisor has actual knowledge of a subordinate’s constitutional violation and acquiesces, see, e.g., *Baker v. Monroe Twp.*, 50 F.3d 1186, 1194 (C.A.3 1995); *Woodward v. Worland*, 977 F.2d 1392, 1400 (C.A.10 1992); or where supervisors “‘know about the conduct and facilitate it, approve it, condone it, or turn a blind eye for fear of what they might see,’” *International Action Center v. United States*, 365 F.3d 20, 28 (C.A.D.C. 2004) (Roberts, J.) (quoting *Jones v. Chicago*, 856 F.2d 985, 992 (C.A.7 1988) (Pos-

ner, J.)); or where the supervisor has no actual knowledge of the violation but was reckless in his supervision of the subordinate, see, e.g., *Hall, supra*, at 961; or where the supervisor was grossly negligent, see, e.g., *Lipsett v. University of Puerto Rico*, 864 F.2d 881, 902 (C.A.1 1988). I am unsure what the general test for supervisory liability should be, and in the absence of briefing and argument I am in no position to choose or devise one.

Neither is the majority, but what is most remarkable about its foray into supervisory liability is that its conclusion has no bearing on its resolution of the case. The majority says that all of the allegations in the complaint that Ashcroft and Mueller authorized, condoned, or even were aware of their subordinates’ discriminatory conduct are “conclusory” and therefore are “not entitled to be assumed true.” *Ante*, at 1951. As I explain below, this conclusion is unsound, but on the majority’s understanding of Rule 8(a)(2) pleading standards, even if the majority accepted Ashcroft and Mueller’s concession and asked whether the complaint sufficiently alleges knowledge and deliberate indifference, it presumably would still conclude that the complaint fails to plead sufficient facts and must be dismissed.²

II

Given petitioners’ concession, the complaint satisfies Rule 8(a)(2). Ashcroft and Mueller admit they are liable for their subordinates’ conduct if they “had actual knowledge of the assertedly discriminatory nature of the classification of suspects as being ‘of high interest’ and they were deliberately indifferent to that discrimination.” Brief for Petitioners 50. Iqbal al-

2. If I am mistaken, and the majority’s rejection of the concession is somehow outcome determinative, then its approach is even more unfair to Iqbal than previously explained, see

supra, at 1957, for Iqbal had no reason to argue the (apparently dispositive) supervisory liability standard in light of the concession.

leges that after the September 11 attacks the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) “arrested and detained thousands of Arab Muslim men,” Complaint ¶ 47, App. to Pet. for Cert. 164a, that many of these men were designated by high-ranking FBI officials as being “‘of high interest,’” *id.*, ¶¶ 48, 50, at 164a, and that in many cases, including Iqbal’s, this designation was made “because of the race, religion, and national origin of the detainees, and not because of any evidence of the detainees’ involvement in supporting terrorist activity,” *id.*, ¶ 49. The complaint further alleges that Ashcroft was the “principal architect of the policies and practices challenged,” *id.*, ¶ 10, at 157a, and that Mueller “was instrumental in the adoption, promulgation, and implementation of the policies and practices challenged,” *id.*, ¶ 11. According to the complaint, Ashcroft and Mueller “knew of, condoned, and willfully and maliciously agreed to subject [Iqbal] to these conditions of confinement as a matter of policy, solely on account of [his] religion, race, and/or national origin and for no legitimate penological interest.” *Id.*, ¶ 96, at 172a–173a. The complaint thus alleges, at a bare minimum, that Ashcroft and Mueller knew of and condoned the discriminatory policy their subordinates carried out. Actually, the complaint goes further in alleging that Ashcroft and Muller affirmatively acted to create the discriminatory detention policy. If these factual allegations are true, Ashcroft and Mueller were, at the very least, aware of the discriminatory policy being implemented and deliberately indifferent to it.

Ashcroft and Mueller argue that these allegations fail to satisfy the “plausibility standard” of *Twombly*. They contend that Iqbal’s claims are implausible because such high-ranking officials “tend not to be personally involved in the specific actions of lower-level officers down the bureaucratic

chain of command.” Brief for Petitioners 28. But this response bespeaks a fundamental misunderstanding of the enquiry that *Twombly* demands. *Twombly* does not require a court at the motion-to-dismiss stage to consider whether the factual allegations are probably true. We made it clear, on the contrary, that a court must take the allegations as true, no matter how skeptical the court may be. See *Twombly*, 550 U.S., at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (a court must proceed “on the assumption that all the allegations in the complaint are true (even if doubtful in fact)”); *id.*, at 556, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (“[A] well-pleaded complaint may proceed even if it strikes a savvy judge that actual proof of the facts alleged is improbable”); see also *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327, 109 S.Ct. 1827, 104 L.Ed.2d 338 (1989) (“Rule 12(b)(6) does not countenance . . . dismissals based on a judge’s disbelief of a complaint’s factual allegations”). The sole exception to this rule lies with allegations that are sufficiently fantastic to defy reality as we know it: claims about little green men, or the plaintiff’s recent trip to Pluto, or experiences in time travel. That is not what we have here.

Under *Twombly*, the relevant question is whether, assuming the factual allegations are true, the plaintiff has stated a ground for relief that is plausible. That is, in *Twombly*’s words, a plaintiff must “allege facts” that, taken as true, are “suggestive of illegal conduct.” 550 U.S., at 564, n. 8, 127 S.Ct. 1955. In *Twombly*, we were faced with allegations of a conspiracy to violate § 1 of the Sherman Act through parallel conduct. The difficulty was that the conduct alleged was “consistent with conspiracy, but just as much in line with a wide swath of rational and competitive business strategy unilaterally prompted by common perceptions of the market.” *Id.*, at 554, 127 S.Ct. 1955. We held that in

that sort of circumstance, “[a]n allegation of parallel conduct is . . . much like a naked assertion of conspiracy in a § 1 complaint: it gets the complaint close to stating a claim, but without some further factual enhancement it stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of ‘entitlement to relief.’” *Id.*, at 557, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (brackets omitted). Here, by contrast, the allegations in the complaint are neither confined to naked legal conclusions nor consistent with legal conduct. The complaint alleges that FBI officials discriminated against Iqbal solely on account of his race, religion, and national origin, and it alleges the knowledge and deliberate indifference that, by Ashcroft and Mueller’s own admission, are sufficient to make them liable for the illegal action. Iqbal’s complaint therefore contains “enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.*, at 570, 127 S.Ct. 1955.

I do not understand the majority to disagree with this understanding of “plausibility” under *Twombly*. Rather, the majority discards the allegations discussed above with regard to Ashcroft and Mueller as conclusory, and is left considering only two statements in the complaint: that “the [FBI], under the direction of Defendant MUELLER, arrested and detained thousands of Arab Muslim men . . . as part of its investigation of the events of September 11,” Complaint ¶ 47, App. to Pet. for Cert. 164a, and that “[t]he policy of holding post-September-11th detainees in highly restrictive conditions of confinement until they were ‘cleared’ by the FBI was approved by Defendants ASHCROFT and MUELLER in discussions in the weeks after September 11, 2001,” *id.*, ¶ 69, at 168a. See *ante*, at 1951. I think the majority is right in saying that these allegations suggest only that Ashcroft and Mueller “sought to keep suspected terrorists in the most secure conditions available

until the suspects could be cleared of terrorist activity,” *ante*, at 1952, and that this produced “a disparate, incidental impact on Arab Muslims,” *ante*, at 1951–1952. And I agree that the two allegations selected by the majority, standing alone, do not state a plausible entitlement to relief for unconstitutional discrimination.

But these allegations do not stand alone as the only significant, nonconclusory statements in the complaint, for the complaint contains many allegations linking Ashcroft and Mueller to the discriminatory practices of their subordinates. See Complaint ¶ 10, App. to Pet. for Cert. 157a (Ashcroft was the “principal architect” of the discriminatory policy); *id.*, ¶ 11 (Mueller was “instrumental” in adopting and executing the discriminatory policy); *id.*, ¶ 96, at 172a–173a (Ashcroft and Mueller “knew of, condoned, and willfully and maliciously agreed to subject” Iqbal to harsh conditions “as a matter of policy, solely on account of [his] religion, race, and/or national origin and for no legitimate penological interest”).

The majority says that these are “bare assertions” that, “much like the pleading of conspiracy in *Twombly*, amount to nothing more than a ‘formulaic recitation of the elements’ of a constitutional discrimination claim” and therefore are “not entitled to be assumed true.” *Ante*, at 1951 (quoting *Twombly, supra*, at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955). The fallacy of the majority’s position, however, lies in looking at the relevant assertions in isolation. The complaint contains specific allegations that, in the aftermath of the September 11 attacks, the Chief of the FBI’s International Terrorism Operations Section and the Assistant Special Agent in Charge for the FBI’s New York Field Office implemented a policy that discriminated against Arab Muslim men, including Iqbal, solely on account of their race, religion, or national origin. See

Complaint ¶¶ 47–53, App. to Pet. for Cert. 164a–165a. Viewed in light of these subsidiary allegations, the allegations singled out by the majority as “conclusory” are no such thing. Iqbal’s claim is not that Ashcroft and Mueller “knew of, condoned, and willfully and maliciously agreed to subject” him to a discriminatory practice that is left undefined; his allegation is that “they knew of, condoned, and willfully and maliciously agreed to subject” him to a particular, discrete, discriminatory policy detailed in the complaint. Iqbal does not say merely that Ashcroft was the architect of some amorphous discrimination, or that Mueller was instrumental in an ill-defined constitutional violation; he alleges that they helped to create the discriminatory policy he has described. Taking the complaint as a whole, it gives Ashcroft and Mueller “‘fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which it rests.’” *Twombly*, 550 U.S., at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955 (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 47, 78 S.Ct. 99, 2 L.Ed.2d 80 (1957) (omission in original)).

That aside, the majority’s holding that the statements it selects are conclusory cannot be squared with its treatment of certain other allegations in the complaint as nonconclusory. For example, the majority takes as true the statement that “[t]he policy of holding post–September–11th detainees in highly restrictive conditions of confinement until they were ‘cleared’ by the FBI was approved by Defendants ASHCROFT and MUELLER in discussions in the weeks after September 11, 2001.” Complaint ¶ 69, App. to Pet. for Cert. 168a; see *ante*, at 1951. This statement makes two points: (1) after September 11, the FBI held certain detainees in highly restrictive conditions, and (2) Ashcroft and Mueller discussed and approved these conditions. If, as the majority says, these allegations are not conclusory, then I cannot see why the majority deems it

merely conclusory when Iqbal alleges that (1) after September 11, the FBI designated Arab Muslim detainees as being of “‘high interest’” “because of the race, religion, and national origin of the detainees, and not because of any evidence of the detainees’ involvement in supporting terrorist activity,” Complaint ¶¶ 48–50, App. to Pet. for Cert. 164a, and (2) Ashcroft and Mueller “knew of, condoned, and willfully and maliciously agreed” to that discrimination, *id.*, ¶ 96, at 172a. By my lights, there is no principled basis for the majority’s disregard of the allegations linking Ashcroft and Mueller to their subordinates’ discrimination.

I respectfully dissent.

Justice BREYER, dissenting.

I agree with Justice SOUTER and join his dissent. I write separately to point out that, like the Court, I believe it important to prevent unwarranted litigation from interfering with “the proper execution of the work of the Government.” *Ante*, at 1953. But I cannot find in that need adequate justification for the Court’s interpretation of *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007), and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8. The law, after all, provides trial courts with other legal weapons designed to prevent unwarranted interference. As the Second Circuit explained, where a Government defendant asserts a qualified immunity defense, a trial court, responsible for managing a case and “mindful of the need to vindicate the purpose of the qualified immunity defense,” can structure discovery in ways that diminish the risk of imposing unwarranted burdens upon public officials. See *Iqbal v. Hasty*, 490 F.3d 143, 158 (2007). A district court, for example, can begin discovery with lower level government defendants before determining whether a case can be made to allow

discovery related to higher level government officials. See *ibid.* Neither the briefs nor the Court's opinion provides convincing grounds for finding these alternative case-management tools inadequate, either in general or in the case before us. For this reason, as well as for the independently sufficient reasons set forth in Justice SOUTER's opinion, I would affirm the Second Circuit.



AT & T CORPORATION, Petitioner,

v.

Noreen HULTEEN et al.

No. 07-543.

Argued Dec. 10, 2008.

Decided May 18, 2009.

Background: Female employees and their union brought Title VII action against employer alleging sex and pregnancy discrimination in connection with the calculation of their pension benefits. The United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Martin J. Jenkins, J., granted summary judgment for employees. Employer appealed. The United States Court Of Appeals For The Ninth Circuit, Plager, Senior Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit, sitting by designation, 441 F.3d 653, reversed. On rehearing en banc, the Court of Appeals, Wardlow, Circuit Judge, 498 F.3d 1001, affirmed. Certiorari was granted.

Holdings: The Supreme Court, Justice Souter, held that:

- (1) employer does not necessarily violate Title VII when it pays pension benefits calculated in part under an accrual

rule, applied only prior to the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA), that gave less retirement credit for pregnancy leave than for medical leave generally;

- (2) employer's calculation of female employees' pension benefits under such an accrual rule did not violate the PDA; abrogating *Pallas v. Pacific Bell*, 940 F.2d 1324 (C.A.9 1991); and
- (3) PDA did not apply retroactively.

Reversed.

Justice Stevens filed concurring opinion.

Justice Ginsburg filed dissenting opinion joined by Justice Breyer.

1. Civil Rights ⇌1176, 1178

An employer does not necessarily violate the Pregnancy Discrimination Act (PDA) when it pays, pursuant to seniority system, pension benefits calculated in part under an accrual rule, applied only prior to the PDA, that gave less retirement credit for pregnancy leave than for medical leave generally. Civil Rights Act of 1964, §§ 701(k), 703(h), 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 2000e(k), 2000e-2(h).

2. Civil Rights ⇌1141

Seniority systems are afforded special treatment under Title VII, reflecting Congress's understanding that their stability is valuable in its own right. Civil Rights Act of 1964, § 703(h), 42 U.S.C.A. § 2000e-2(h).

3. Civil Rights ⇌1136, 1141

Benefit differentials produced by a bona fide seniority-based pension plan are permitted under Title VII unless they are the result of an intention to discriminate. Civil Rights Act of 1964, § 703(h), 42 U.S.C.A. § 2000e-2(h).

4. Civil Rights ⇌1141

The unmistakable purpose of statute providing that it shall not be an unlawful

Historic Green Springs, Inc. v. Virginia Dept. of..., Not Reported in...

2011 WL 3276225

Only the Westlaw citation is currently available.

UNPUBLISHED OPINION. CHECK
COURT RULES BEFORE CITING.

Court of Appeals of Virginia,
Richmond.

The HISTORIC GREEN SPRINGS, INC.,
Reginald Murphy and Jane Stuart Murphy

v.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY ex rel. VIRGINIA STATE WATER
CONTROL BOARD, David K. Paylor, Director
and Executive Secretary, and Louisa County
ex rel. Louisa County Water Authority.

Record No. 2082-10-2. | Aug. 2, 2011.

From the Circuit Court of Louisa County, [Timothy K. Sanner](#),
Judge.

Attorneys and Law Firms

[David S. Bailey](#) ([Tammy L. Belinsky](#); The Environmental
Law Group, PLLC, on brief), for appellants.

[J. Tracy Walker, IV](#) ([Kenneth T. Cuccinelli, II](#), Attorney
General; [David C. Grandis](#), Assistant Attorney General;
[David E. Evans](#); [Darin K. Waylett](#); [Richard H. Sedgley](#);
McGuireWoods, LLP; AquaLaw, P.C., on brief), for
appellees.

Present: [FELTON](#), C.J., and [McCLANAHAN](#)^{*}, J., and
[CLEMENTS](#), S.J.

Opinion

MEMORANDUM OPINION^{**}

[FELTON](#), Chief Judge.

^{*1} The Historic Green Springs, Inc. and Reginald and Jane
Murphy (collectively “appellants”) appeal from a judgment
of the Circuit Court of Louisa County (“circuit court”) dismissing their petition for appeal challenging the State

Water Control Board’s (“SWCB”) decision to reissue a
Virginia Pollution Discharge Elimination System (“VPDES”) permit to the Louisa County Water Authority (“the Water Authority”).

Appellants contend the circuit court erred in granting the demurrers of SWCB, the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (“DEQ”), Louisa County, and the Water Authority (collectively “appellees”) to appellants’ petition for appeal, arguing that (1) they were entitled to an evidentiary hearing on the matter of standing, and (2) they pleaded sufficient facts to establish standing to challenge the reissued VPDES permit. For the following reasons, we affirm in part, reverse in part, and remand for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.¹

I. BACKGROUND

Reginald and Jane Murphy (“the Murphys”) own approximately 218 acres of land in Louisa County known as Aspen Hill Farm. Aspen Hill Farm is the first working farm downstream of the Zion Crossroads Wastewater Treatment Plant (“the Plant”). The Plant serves residential and commercial connections in the Zion Crossroads area of Louisa County. The Murphys’ farm is located approximately 400 yards downstream of a lake impoundment at Camp Creek into which the treated wastewater from the Plant is dispersed, before being discharged into Camp Creek itself. Camp Creek itself bisects and runs through Aspen Hill Farm for approximately one quarter of a mile.

The Historic Green Springs, Inc. (“HGS”) is a non-profit corporation dedicated to environmental conservation in the Green Springs National Historic Landmark District. HGS holds at least two conservation easements on parcels through which Camp Creek flows, one of which is located on the Murphys’ Aspen Hill Farm.

In 2002, SWCB issued a VPDES permit to the Water Authority allowing it to discharge treated wastewater effluent from the Plant first into an existing small lake impoundment formed by a dam across Camp Creek, and then into Camp Creek itself. In 2003, the Water Authority began discharging treated wastewater effluent from the Plant into the lake impoundment and then into Camp Creek. In December 2008,

Historic Green Springs, Inc. v. Virginia Dept. of..., Not Reported in...

SWCB reissued the VPDES permit to the Water Authority for the Plant. The reissued VPDES permit imposed, for the first time, limits for total recoverable dissolved copper and zinc in the treated effluent and established a four-year timeframe to comply with those limits. Appellants participated in the public comment period as part of the permit reissuance process and argued against reissuance of the VPDES permit. SWCB, on the recommendation of DEQ, reissued the VPDES permit to the Water Authority on December 4, 2008.

On January 28, 2009, appellants appealed the decision of SWCB to the Circuit Court of Louisa County. Appellants contended that in the five years since SWCB issued the original VPDES permit to the Water Authority, the Water Authority discharged excessive levels of dissolved metals in the treated effluent from the Plant into the lake impoundment at Camp Creek, and thereafter into the creek itself. Appellants asserted the reissued VPDES permit, which for the first time imposed limits on dissolved zinc and copper in the treated wastewater effluent, failed to remedy what they contended was an excessive level of dissolved metals in the treated effluent. Appellants asserted the new metals limits imposed were insufficient to protect water quality and the beneficial uses of Camp Creek as it flowed through the Murphys' Aspen Hill Farm, on which appellants "ha[d] a right to rely." Appellants specifically contended that SWCB erred in: a) failing to provide notice to downstream riparian owners of receipt of the VPDES permit application, b) finding there was no need to impose a sewage discharge limit for hardness, c) calculating effluent limitations for toxic metals without accounting for the hardness of the surface waters, d) granting a four-year compliance schedule, and e) conveying defective notice of plans for increased water supply in the area of Louisa County served by the Plant, as well as two water withdrawals upstream of the lake impoundment at Camp Creek, to the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") for its required review and comment. Appellants requested that the circuit court set aside the reissued VPDES permit as void and without effect, and remand the case to DEQ for further proceedings, if any, in accordance with law.

*2 Appellees demurred to appellants' petition for appeal and filed motions to dismiss. Appellees contended that appellants failed under [Code § 62.1-44.29](#) to plead sufficient facts to establish standing to challenge SWCB's decision to reissue the VPDES permit to the Water Authority. On July 31, 2009, after hearing argument on the motions, the circuit court

sustained appellees' demurrers and granted appellants leave to amend the petition for appeal. On the same date, appellants filed the amended petition for appeal, re-alleging the second through fifth assignments of error in their original petition for appeal.²

Appellants Murphy asserted in their amended petition for appeal that they use Camp Creek and Aspen Hill Farm for various recreational, aesthetic, and agricultural purposes, including crop and livestock watering. In affidavits filed in support of their amended petition for appeal, the Murphys asserted that they often saw a "brown foamy scum" on the surface of Camp Creek that bisects their property, which scum first appeared after the Water Authority commenced discharging the treated wastewater effluent from the Plant in 2003. The Murphys contended in their affidavits that the water of Camp Creek was not as clear as it had been prior to the commencement of the discharge of treated effluent from the Plant. They asserted that Camp Creek dried up altogether during the summer of 2008 to the detriment of Aspen Hill Farm's agricultural uses. The Murphys further stated they were concerned about the impact of the dissolved metals on aquatic life in Camp Creek. They stated they would hesitate to let their cattle drink from Camp Creek if other water sources were unavailable in the future. Reginald Murphy stated in his affidavit that he previously took "cool dips" in Camp Creek, but had not taken a "cool dip" since the Plant began to discharge treated wastewater effluent. In its affidavit filed in support of the amended petition, HGS stated that it had standing to challenge SWCB's reissuance of the permit because it held conservation easements on multiple properties on Camp Creek, including Aspen Hill Farm.

Appellees filed demurrers to the amended petition for appeal, as well as motions to dismiss, contending that appellants failed to plead sufficient facts to establish standing under [Code § 62.1-44.29](#). The circuit court heard oral argument on the demurrers and motions to dismiss on January 6, 2010.³ On August 31, 2010, the circuit court entered an order sustaining appellees' demurrers and dismissed with prejudice appellants' amended petition for appeal. The circuit court found that appellants failed to meet the standard for obtaining judicial review under [Code § 62.1-44.29](#) because appellants failed to demonstrate that their alleged injuries were fairly traceable to the reissued VPDES permit, and failed to show

Historic Green Springs, Inc. v. Virginia Dept. of..., Not Reported in...

that their alleged injuries would be redressed by a favorable decision of the circuit court. This appeal followed.

II. EVIDENTIARY HEARING

*3 Appellants contend that the circuit court erred in failing to conduct an evidentiary hearing to determine whether appellants had standing to challenge the reissuance of the VPDES permit to the Water Authority for the Plant. Appellants argue that it was error for the circuit court to decide standing on the pleadings.

A. Standard of Review

The standard of appellate review of a circuit court's grant of a demurrer is well established. "[I]n reviewing the judgment of the circuit court, an appellate court looks solely to the allegations in the pleading to which the demurrer was sustained." *Philip Morris USA, Inc. v. Chesapeake Bay Found., Inc.*, 273 Va. 564, 572, 643 S.E.2d 219, 223 (2007) (citations omitted). "Because our review of a circuit court's decision sustaining a demurrer addresses that same legal question, we review the circuit court's judgment *de novo*." *Chesapeake Bay Found., Inc. & Citizens of Stumpy Lake v. Commonwealth ex rel. State Water Control Bd.*, 46 Va.App. 104, 111, 616 S.E.2d 39, 42 (2005). A demurrer "admits the truth of the facts alleged in the pleading to which it is addressed, as well as any facts that may be reasonably and fairly implied and inferred from those facts." *Philip Morris*, 273 Va. at 572, 643 S.E.2d at 223.

B. Analysis

Appellants assert the circuit court erred in not conducting an evidentiary hearing on the matter of standing. We disagree.

Code § 62.1-44.29 states in pertinent part:

Any owner aggrieved by or any person who has participated, in person or by submittal of written comments, in the public comment process related to a final decision of the [State Water

Control] Board ... is entitled to judicial review thereof in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Process Act ... if such person meets the standard for obtaining judicial review of a case or controversy pursuant to Article III of the United States Constitution. A person shall be deemed to meet such standard if (i) such person has suffered an actual or imminent injury which is an invasion of a legally protected interest and which is concrete and particularized; (ii) such injury is fairly traceable to the decision of the Board and not the result of the independent action of some third party not before the court; and (iii) such injury will likely be redressed by a favorable decision by the court.

Code § 62.1-44.29 explicitly requires that a person asserting injury as a result of a permitting decision of SWCB satisfy Article III standing requirements. "In order to have Article III ... standing, the [petitioner] must have pled facts sufficient to meet the test in *Lujan [v. Defenders of Wildlife]*, 504 U.S. 555 (1992),] and Code § 62.1-44.29." *Philip Morris*, 273 Va. at 581, 643 S.E.2d at 228. "The parties agree that in order for [petitioner] to plead sufficient facts to establish standing ... [petitioner] must meet [the] three-part test [of Code § 62.1-44.29]." *Chesapeake Bay Found., Inc. v. Commonwealth ex rel. State Water Control Bd.*, 48 Va.App. 35, 46, 628 S.E.2d 63, 69 (2006), *aff'd*, *Philip Morris*, 273 Va. 564, 643 S.E.2d 219. "The standing provisions of Code § 62.1-44.29 require persons challenging a final decision by the Board to establish that they meet all three enumerated requirements of the statute before a court will consider the merits of their challenge to a governmental action ." *State Water Control Bd. v. Crutchfield*, 265 Va. 416, 426-27, 578 S.E.2d 762, 767-68 (2003).

*4 Appellants cite this Court's decision in *Clark v. Va. Marine Res. Comm'n*, 55 Va.App. 328, 685 S.E.2d 863 (2009), to support their contention that the circuit court erred in refusing to conduct an evidentiary hearing to determine whether they have standing to challenge the reissuance of

Historic Green Springs, Inc. v. Virginia Dept. of..., Not Reported in...

the VPDES permit. In reversing our decision in *Clark*, the Supreme Court of Virginia stated:

[O]ur cases, including cases considering appeals from agency decisions decided on demurrer, have consistently looked to the pleadings to determine whether the petitioner has pled sufficient facts to establish the petitioner's right or standing to advance the appeal.

The judgment of the Court of Appeals directly contradicts these cases and principles.... The Court of Appeals' judgment ... allows recovery based on facts not pled which is in direct contradiction to the principles set out above.

Va. Marine Res. Comm'n v. Clark, 281 Va. 679, 686, 709 S.E.2d 150, 154 (2011) (citation omitted). Accordingly, we conclude that appellants' reliance on this Court's decision in *Clark* is misplaced.

Because Code § 62.1-44.29 clearly requires appellants to allege sufficient facts in the petition to support their standing to contest the reissuance of the VPDES permit, the circuit court did not err in refusing to hold an evidentiary hearing on standing.

III. STANDING

A. Standard of Review

We review the circuit court's decision to sustain appellees' demurrer *de novo*, and accept as true “the facts alleged in the pleading to which it is addressed, as well as any facts that may be reasonably and fairly implied and inferred from those facts.” *Philip Morris*, 273 Va. at 572, 643 S.E.2d at 223. The requirements for standing to challenge a permitting decision by the SWCB are enumerated in Code § 62.1-44.29. The language of Code § 62.1-44.29 “reiterates the requirements set out [by the United States Supreme Court] in *Lujan*.” *Stumpy Lake*, 46 Va.App. at 115, 616 S.E.2d at 45.

B. Analysis

Here, the circuit court found that appellants failed to plead sufficient facts to establish that their alleged injuries were fairly traceable to an action to which an error of law was

assigned, and failed to establish that such alleged injuries would likely be redressed by a favorable decision of the circuit court. It is true that appellants asserted in their amended petition for appeal that their injuries arose when SWCB issued the original VPDES permit for the Plant in 2003. However, appellants further contended that their actual and ongoing injuries to their legally protected interests in Camp Creek had been perpetuated by SWCB's decision to reissue the Plant's VPDES permit in 2008. These allegations, which we must accept as true in reviewing the circuit court's ruling sustaining the demurrer, succeed in “nudge[ing] [appellants'] claims [in support of appellants' standing] across the line from conceivable to plausible.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007) (ruling on a Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss). Thus we conclude the circuit court here erroneously “ ‘short-circuited litigation pretrial and ... decided the dispute without permitting the parties to reach a trial on the merits.’ ” *CaterCorp, Inc. v. Catering Concepts, Inc.*, 246 Va. 22, 24, 431 S.E.2d 277, 279 (1993) (quoting *Renner v. Stafford*, 245 Va. 351, 352, 429 S.E.2d 218, 219 (1993)).

*5 In the event that appellants could prove their alleged injuries, and prove that those injuries are being caused by the discharge of wastewater from the Plant into Camp Creek in violation of state and/or federal water quality standards under the reissued VPDES permit in question, it is likely that those injuries could be redressed by the circuit court ordering compliance with those standards. *See Philip Morris*, 273 Va. at 580, 643 S.E.2d at 227 (applying redressability prong of *Lujan* test to allegations in petition, and holding that alleged injury was “redressable through a favorable decision by the court”). Accordingly, we conclude the trial court erred in sustaining appellees' demurrer.

IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated above, we hold that the circuit court did not err when it refused to conduct an evidentiary hearing on the matter of standing. However, we hold the circuit court erred when it sustained appellees' demurrer to appellants' amended petition for appeal. Accordingly, we affirm in part, reverse in part, and remand for further proceedings consistent with this opinion.

Historic Green Springs, Inc. v. Virginia Dept. of..., Not Reported in...

Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded.

Footnotes

- * Justice [McClanahan](#) participated in the hearing and decision of this case prior to her investiture as a Justice of the Supreme Court of Virginia.
- ** Pursuant to [Code § 17.1-413](#), this opinion is not designated for publication.
- 1 On November 30, 2009, appellants filed a complaint against the Water Authority in the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia. On June 30, 2011, the district court issued a memorandum opinion in that case addressing The Historic Green Springs, Inc.'s standing to challenge the VPDES permit in the context of a federal cause of action. *See The Historic Green Springs, Inc. v. Louisa County Water Authority*, Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-00079, slip op. (W.D.Va. June 30, 2011) (Moon, J.).
- 2 David and Renee O'Leary, homeowners in the Historic Green Springs district, and Rae H. Ely, president of HGS, were included as petitioners in the original petition for appeal. The O'Learys moved to withdraw as petitioners due to a geographical error that incorrectly showed Camp Creek flowing through the O'Learys' land. The creek flowing through the O'Learys' property was later determined to be Wheeler Creek. On July 31, 2009, the circuit court granted the O'Learys' motion to withdraw and denied the motion for leave to amend the petition as to Ely. Consequently, Ely was not included as a petitioner in the amended petition for appeal.
- 3 Appellants, relying on this Court's decision in [Clark v. Va. Marine Res. Comm'n](#), 55 Va.App. 328, 685 S.E.2d 863 (2009), asserted that they were entitled to an evidentiary hearing on the issue of standing. Appellants declined to argue standing at the January 6, 2010 hearing on the demurrers because of their concern that the argument regarding their right to an evidentiary hearing would thereby be waived on appeal. Appellants instead "rest[ed]" on the pleadings, including the amended petition and attached affidavits and conservation easements. Subsequent to the filing of appellants' petition for appeal for review by this Court, the Supreme Court of Virginia reversed this Court's decision in [Clark v. Va. Marine Res. Comm'n v. Clark](#), 281 Va. 679, 709 S.E.2d 150 (2011); *see also infra* Part II.B.

From: noreply@fastcase.com
To: [Carr, Alfred](#)
Subject: Fastcase Document - Adiscov Llc v. Autonomy Corp..
Date: Friday, September 06, 2013 9:21:11 AM

(This document has been sent to you from [Fastcase](#) by Alfred Carr)

762 F.Supp.2d 826

**ADISCOV, LLC,
v.
AUTONOMY CORP., PLC, FTI Consulting, Inc., and Recommind, Inc.,
Defendants.**

Civil No. 2:10cv218.

United States District Court, E.D. Virginia, Norfolk Division.

Jan. 27, 2011.

[762 F.Supp.2d 828]

Califf Teal Cooper, Edward W. Goldstein, Goldstein & Vowell LLP, Houston, TX, Jonathan David Frieden, Stephen Andrew Cobb, Odin Feldman & Pittleman PC, Fairfax, VA, for Adiscov, LLC. Peter J. Carney, Lucius Bernard Lau, White & Case LLP, Washington, DC, for Autonomy Corp., PLC. Hunter Wilmer Sims, Jr., Stephen Edward Noona, Kaufman & Canoles, P.C., Norfolk, VA, Andrew Thomases, Matthew Paik, Skadden Arps Slate Meagher & Flom LLP, Palo Alto, CA, Daniel Devito, Paramjeet Singh Sammi, Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom LLP, New York, NY, for FTI Consulting, Inc. Brian Adam O'Dea, Jeffrey William Kilduff, Rafik Paul Zeineddin, O'Melveny & Myers LLP, Washington, DC, Brian Berliner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP, Los Angeles, CA, Darin W. Snyder, O'Melveny & Myers LLP, San Francisco, CA, for Recommind, Inc.

MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER

REBECCA BEACH SMITH, District Judge.

This matter comes before the court on defendant Autonomy Corp., PLC's ("Autonomy") Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), as joined by defendant FTI Consulting, Inc. ("FTI") pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(h)(2).¹ For the reasons which follow, this court **GRANTS** the motion and **DISMISSES** the complaint against Autonomy and FTI without prejudice.

I.

Adiscov, LLC ("Adiscov") filed suit in this court on May 17, 2010, seeking declaratory relief and damages for patent infringement by Autonomy, FTI, and Recommind, Inc. ("Recommind").² Adiscov

[762 F.Supp.2d 829]

amended its complaint as a matter of course pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 15(a)(1)(A) on May 21, 2010. In its complaint, Adiscov alleges that each of the defendants are infringing Adiscov's patent entitled, "Method and System for Providing Electronic Discovery on Computer Databases and Archives Using Artificial Intelligence to Recover Legally Relevant Data" ("the ' 760 patent"), by manufacturing, using, and selling products claimed by the ' 760 patent. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 15–17. The ' 760 patent claims a number of methods for conducting electronic discovery on computer systems through the use of algorithms to locate responsive documents and data.

On December 21, 2010, Autonomy filed its Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint for failure to state a claim, which FTI joined on December 31, 2010. Adiscov responded to both FTI and Autonomy on January 3, 2011. Neither Autonomy nor FTI filed a rebuttal brief and the motion to dismiss is now ripe for decision.

II.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) ("Rule 8") provides, in pertinent part, "[a] pleading that states a claim for relief must contain ... a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." The Supreme Court's recent decisions in [Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly](#), 550 U.S. 544, 127 S.Ct. 1955, 167 L.Ed.2d 929 (2007), and [Ashcroft v. Iqbal](#), --- U.S. ----, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 173 L.Ed.2d 868 (2009), have clarified what constitutes sufficient pleading under Rule 8. Therein, the Supreme Court made clear that there are two basic requirements for a pleading to comply with Rule 8: sufficient factual allegations and plausibility of those allegations. First, the complaint need not have detailed factual allegations, but Rule 8 "requires more than labels and conclusions [...] formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do." [Twombly](#), 550 U.S. at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955. What, at base, is insufficient is "an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation." [Iqbal](#), 129 S.Ct. at 1949.

Second, given the facts pled, "[t]o survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a *claim to relief that is plausible on its face*." [Iqbal](#), 129 S.Ct. at 1949 (emphasis added) (citation and internal quotation marks omitted). Thus, the "factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level." [Twombly](#), 550 U.S. at 555, 127 S.Ct. 1955. "A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." [Iqbal](#), 129 S.Ct. at 1949. In other words, the plaintiff must plead "more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlawfully." *Id.*

In considering a motion to dismiss in a patent case, the district court applies to substantive law of the relevant circuit, not that of the Federal Circuit. [McZeal v. Sprint Nextel Corp.](#), 501 F.3d 1354, 1355–56 (Fed.Cir.2007). The Fourth Circuit has not yet considered a motion to dismiss in a patent case with the benefit of the Supreme Court's precedent in [Twombly](#) and [Iqbal](#). The Federal Circuit, however, offered guidance in [McZeal](#), stating that in patent cases, a complaint is sufficiently plead under [Twombly](#) if the complaint "(1) asserts that the plaintiff owns the patent at issue; (2) names the defendants; (3) states that the defendant infringed the patent; (4) describes, in general terms, the means by which the patent was infringed; (5) and identifies the specific parts of patent law that are implicated." [Taltwell, LLC v. Zonet USA Corp.](#), 2007 WL 4562874, at *14 (E.D.Va. Dec. 20, 2007)

(unpublished) (citing

[762 F.Supp.2d 830]

McZeal, 501 F.3d at 1357). Though the Federal Circuit was applying Fifth Circuit law in that case, this district has previously recognized that the decision in *McZeal* may guide the court in considering whether a motion to dismiss in a patent case is well-founded. *Id.* at *13.

The Supreme Court also offered guidance to a court considering a motion to dismiss under the *Twombly* and *Iqbal* standards:

In keeping with these principles a court considering a motion to dismiss can choose to begin by identifying pleadings that, because they are no more than conclusions, are not entitled to the assumption of truth. While legal conclusions can provide the framework of a complaint, they must be supported by factual allegations. When there are well-pleaded factual allegations, a court should assume their veracity and then determine whether they plausibly give rise to an entitlement to relief.

Iqbal, 129 S.Ct. at 1950. Overall, “[d]etermining whether a complaint states a plausible claim for relief will ... be a context-specific task that requires the reviewing court to draw on its judicial experience and common sense.” *Id.*

III.

Autonomy and FTI have moved to dismiss Adiscov's amended complaint on the grounds that it has failed to meet the *Twombly* and *Iqbal* standards because the amended complaint fails to “identify with any particularity (a) any specific product or service offered by Autonomy [or FTI] that is alleged to infringe, or (b) how Autonomy [or FTI] has allegedly infringed the patent-in-suit.” Mem. in Supp. Mot. to Dismiss Am. Compl. 5. In particular, Autonomy argues that Adiscov's merely repeating that each defendant “manufactures, uses and sells products and services that infringe at least Claim 1 of the '760 patent, including, ... legal discovery software and services, as well as any other legal discovery software or services acting or capable of acting in the manner described and claimed in the '760 patent,” Am. Compl. ¶¶ 15–18, is not specific enough to provide the defendants with sufficient notice as to the subject of the suit and how to respond.

Adiscov responds that it has met the pleading requirements of Rule 8 because the specification in the patent and the language of the complaint sufficiently put Autonomy and FTI on notice as to the subject of the suit. Adiscov argues that because Autonomy manufactures electronic discovery services, it is on notice as to which of its products is the subject of the suit.³ Furthermore, its complaint meets the five requirements suggested in *McZeal*, Adiscov argues, such that it is sufficient under Rule 8.

This court does not agree with Adiscov, and finds that its conclusory allegations in the complaint neither give Autonomy or FTI notice of the substance of the suit against them, nor raise the “right to relief above the speculative level.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555, [127 S.Ct. 1955](#). As stated above, this court does not yet have the benefit of guidance from the Fourth Circuit on this issue, but it is aided by the opinions of other district courts which have considered the application of *Twombly* and *Iqbal* to patent litigation. One such case, which is quite similar to the facts before the court, is [Realtime Data, LLC v. Stanley](#), [721 F.Supp.2d 538](#)

[\(E.D.Tex.2010\)](#). In that case, Realtime Data ("Realtime") sued twenty-one defendants, including Morgan Stanley, Bank of America, and The Goldman Sachs Group, alleging a violation of its patents claiming

[762 F.Supp.2d 831]

systems and methods of data encryption and compression. In the complaint, Realtime alleged:

Defendants have been and are now directing infringing and/or indirectly infringing by inducement and/or contributing to infringement of the [Realtime patent] in this District and elsewhere in violation of 35 U.S.C. § 271 including *making, using, selling, and/or offering for sale, one or more data compression products and/or services*, covered by at least one claim of the [Realtime patent].

Id. at 541 (emphasis added). The district court ultimately held that Realtime had failed to comply with Rule 8 because "they do not specifically identify any accused products or services" that were the subject of the infringement claim, and merely referring to data compression products and/or services did not cure the defect.⁴ *Id.* at 543.

Similarly, in [Eidos Communications LLC v. Skype Technologies SA, 686 F.Supp.2d 465 \(D.Del.2010\)](#), the district court dismissed the plaintiff's complaint for failure to identify the products or methodologies alleged to infringe the patent. In particular, the court found that the "[p]laintiffs were obligated to specify, at a minimum, a general class of products or a general identification of the infringing methods." *Id.* at 467. In that case, the plaintiff did neither, alleging only that Skype Technologies was infringing its patent by selling or importing of "communication system products and/or methodologies" that infringe the claims of the patent. *Id.*

Precedent in this district in [Taltwell, LLC v. Zonet USA Corp., 2007 WL 4562874](#) (E.D.Va. Dec. 20, 2007) (unpublished), however, initially appears to contradict the conclusions reached in *Realtime Data* and *Eidos Communications*. In that case, Taltwell sued Zonet USA alleging infringement of its patent for its Automatic Dialing System. *Id.* at *1. In the complaint, Taltwell alleged that Zonet USA infringed "directly or under the doctrine of equivalents, one or more claims of the '660 patent by making, using, offering for sale, and/or selling the communication devices in the United States that are within the scope of the claims of the '660 patent." *Id.* at *14. Thus, at first glance, it appears that in this district, pleading a general category of infringing products or services is sufficient to meet the requirements of Rule 8.

There are two important caveats to consider when relying on the court's decision in *Taltwell*. First, the *Taltwell* court was operating only with the benefit of the *Twombly* decision, not with the further clarification of pleading requirements in *Iqbal*. Second, the complaint in *Taltwell* pled other important facts concerning the infringing products which are missing here. In its complaint, Taltwell alleged that Zonet USA's "PCMCIA Hardware Modem and/or PCMCIA Wireless Network Adapter include all elements of one or more claims of the '660 patent." *Taltwell*, 2007 WL at *2. Thus, though the cause of action pled only that the infringing products were "communication devices," within the larger context of the complaint Zonet USA could clearly determine which of its products were alleged to be infringing.

This court is persuaded by the precedent in this district and from other district courts to consider the issue that Adiscov has not met its burden under Rule 8. First,

Adiscov never identifies any particular products or services that are alleged to be

[762 F.Supp.2d 832]

infringing. Rather, with regard to each defendant, the complaint merely states:

[The defendant] manufactures, uses, and sells *products* and *services* that infringe at least Claim 1 of the '760 patent, including, for example and without limitation, [the defendant's] *legal discovery software and services*, as well as any other legal discovery software or services acting or capable of acting in the manner described and claimed in the '760 patent.

Compl. ¶¶ 15–18 (emphasis added). Nowhere does the complaint further identify what legal discovery software or services are alleged to be infringing with regard to any defendant. Furthermore, the complaint does not, as did the complaint in *Taltwell*, provide sufficient detail about the defendants and their products such that the defendants would be on notice as to which products or services are the subject of the suit. “Legal discovery software and services” does not describe either a category or specific products and services with the specificity required by Rule 8. Thus, in failing to plead sufficient factual content, the complaint is akin to “an unadorned, the-defendant-unlawfully-harmed-me accusation.” *Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. at 1949.

Moreover, Adiscov fails the plausibility test set forth by the Supreme Court in *Iqbal*. “A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Iqbal*, 129 S.Ct. at 1949. Here, no such inference may be drawn as there is both insufficient evidence concerning what product or service infringes that patent and how it does so. Instead, what the court is left with is “a sheer possibility” that one of Autonomy's and FTI's numerous products or services infringes that '760 patent in one way or another.

IV.

Accordingly, the court **GRANTS** Autonomy's and FTI's Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint and therefore **DISMISSES** the action against those defendants without prejudice.⁵ The court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Memorandum Opinion and Order to all counsel in this case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Notes:

¹ In its answer and counterclaim filed on September 13, 2010, FTI initially raised the defense of failure to state a claim on which relief could be granted.

² Adiscov initially brought suit against four defendants: Autonomy, FTI, Recommind, and Stroz Friedberg, LLC. The complaint against Stroz Friedberg, LLC and its counterclaim against Adiscov, see ECF # 11, were dismissed with prejudice upon agreement of the parties on October 4, 2010. See ECF # 52. Defendant Recommind answered the complaint on August 11, 2010, and is not party to this motion.

3. Adiscov makes no such assertion as regards FTI.

4. This court does note that the court in *Realtime Data* had the benefit of clear Fifth Circuit precedent which held that claims of infringement in patent cases had to identify the infringing product or service with specificity. *Realtime Data*, 721 F.Supp.2d at 543.

5. In its brief, Adiscov requested that if the court found that dismissal was proper, that instead of dismissing the action, Adiscov be afforded the opportunity to provide a more definite statement pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(e). Adiscov correctly notes that a court may *sua sponte* request a more definite statement; however, such a request is to be used when a claim is unclear or "too vague or ambiguous that the party cannot reasonably prepare a response." Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(e). As such, because this case involves not an unclear or vague claim but rather one which fails to meet the Rule 8 pleading requirements, allowing Adiscov to file a more definite statement is not the proper remedy. In any event the court dismisses the case without prejudice, and Adiscov, if it so chooses, may refile against Autonomy and FTI.



1-866-77-FASTCASE (866.773.2782)
support@fastcase.com

From: noreply@fastcase.com
To: [Carr, Alfred](#)
Subject: Fastcase Document - Ali v. Allergan USA, Inc.
Date: Friday, September 06, 2013 9:11:08 AM

(This document has been sent to you from [Fastcase](#) by Alfred Carr)

SARA ALI, et al., Plaintiffs
v.
ALLERGAN USA, INC., Defendant.

NO. 1:12-CV-115 (GBL/TRJ)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

Date: August 23, 2012

MEMORANDUM OPINION

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Defendant Allergan USA, Inc.'s ("Allergan") Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint. This case is brought by a medical patient against the manufacturer of a medical device for an alleged malfunction of the device and for alleged misrepresentations in marketing materials for the device.

There are four issues before the Court. The first issue is whether Plaintiffs Sara and Daniel Ali's ("Plaintiffs") Amended Complaint contains sufficient pleading of claims under Virginia law that are not preempted by the Medical Device Amendments ("MDA") of the federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act ("FDCA"). The Court holds that Plaintiffs' state law claims as pled in the Amended Complaint cannot avoid preemption by the MDA. The Amended Complaint does not present factual allegations demonstrating that the manufacturer, Allergan, violated federal law in the manufacture, labeling, or marketing of the device at issue in this case. Such pleading is required to state "parallel" claims based on state law that do not impose duties

Page 2

different from or in addition to the federal requirements on the device and thereby avoid preemption. For these reasons, the Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint as to all causes of action.

The second issue is whether Plaintiffs' fraud claims meet the particularity pleading requirement set forth in Rule 9(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court holds that Plaintiffs' cause of action for fraud by negligent misrepresentation is not supported by sufficient pleading of the particular content and circumstances of the alleged misrepresentations to satisfy Rule 9(b). Thus, Plaintiffs' negligent misrepresentation cause of action must be dismissed for insufficient pleading.

The third issue is whether the Virginia Consumer Protection Act ("VCPA")

provides a private cause of action for Allergan's alleged misrepresentations about the device where the device is regulated by the FDA. The Court holds that the VCPA does not cover federally regulated medical devices and, therefore, dismisses Plaintiffs' VCPA claims with prejudice.

The fourth issue is whether Plaintiffs' adequately plead false advertising claims under Virginia's false advertising statute. The Court holds that Plaintiffs' false advertising cause of action must be dismissed for Plaintiffs' failure to identify a false promise or statement of fact made by Allergan in advertising for the device.

The Court dismisses the causes of action set forth in the Amended Complaint without prejudice, with the exception of the VCPA cause of action, which is dismissed with prejudice. Plaintiffs may seek leave to amend their pleading and submit an amended pleading for the Court's consideration if they are able to provide sufficient factual matter to state their claims in accordance with this opinion.

Page 3

I. BACKGROUND

A. Facts Regarding Premarket Approval of the LAP-BAND by the FDA

Pursuant to Rule 201 of the Federal Rules of Evidence, and upon Allergan's motion, the Court takes judicial notice of several documents issued by the United States Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") and Department of Health and Human Services ("HHS").¹ These documents, presented in Allergan's Exhibits A, C, E, and F, pertain to FDA approval of the LAP-BAND Adjustable Gastric Banding System ("LAP-BAND"),² the medical device at issue in this case. The Court considers the facts presented in these documents in connection with Defendant's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint.

The LAP-BAND is a Class III medical device³ manufactured and marketed by Allergan. "The device is a permanent implant placed around the upper portion of the stomach to reduce the

Page 4

amount of food that can be ingested[,] resulting in reduced calorie intake and weight loss." Def.'s Ex. F at 3; *see also* Def.'s Ex. C at 7. It is "restricted to prescription use" and "indicated for use only in severely obese patients who have failed more conservative weight-reduction alternatives, such as supervised diet, exercise and behavior modification programs." Def.'s Ex. A at 1, 3. In 2001, the CDRH determined that there was sufficient pre-clinical and clinical data establishing the safety and effectiveness of the LAP-BAND to warrant FDA approval. Def.'s Ex. C at 24. The FDA approved the device "for use in weight reduction for severely obese patients ... in accordance with its labeling." *Id.* at 23.

Contemporaneously with its approval of the LAP-BAND, the FDA noted several potential adverse effects of the device on health, including the risk that the band would erode while implanted. *Id.* at 9-10. The FDA determined that 89% of subjects in the United States clinical trial reported at least one adverse event, though "[m]any adverse events were mild and required no intervention." *Id.* at 10. Only 1% of subjects experienced band erosion, which was "resolved with explanation of the

device" in each case. *Id.* at 22; *see also* Def.'s Ex. F at 11 (band erosion as "a potentially serious complication" but "infrequent in occurrence"). The FDA issued several warnings and precautions concerning use of the LAP-BAND, including warnings that "[e]xplant and replacement surgery may be indicated at any time" as well as warnings specifically about the risk of band erosion. Def.'s Ex. C at 2-7. The FDA warned of several ways that the risk of band erosion could be increased, including the use of anti-inflammatory agents by the patient and certain surgical procedures. *Id.*

Pursuant to section 515 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act ("FDCA"), codified at 21 U.S.C. § 360e, the LAP-BAND first obtained FDA premarket approval ("PMA") for commercial distribution on June 5, 2001, subject to certain ongoing conditions. Def.'s Ex. F at 5; *see also*

Page 5

Def.'s Ex. A. These conditions include restrictions on the labeling of the device to that specifically approved by the FDA. Defs.'s Ex. A at 1, 3. The FDA also prohibits advertisements and other descriptive material recommending or implying that the LAP-BAND may be used in any way not included in the FDA-approved labeling for the device. *Id.* at 3. Importantly, the manufacturer is required to submit a PMA supplement for FDA review and approval before making any change or modification to the LAP-BAND, which might affect its safety or effectiveness. *Id.*; *see also* Def.'s Ex. E at 3. The modified device is subjected to testing to determine whether it remains safe and effective. Defs.'s Ex. A at 3; *see also* 21 C.F.R. § 814.82(a)(2) (2012).

The manufacturer is also required to submit annual post-approval reports identifying changes to the device affecting its safety or effectiveness, labeling changes, new indications for use of the device, changes in the performance or design of the device, the use of a different manufacturing or packaging facility, and similar changes. Defs.'s Ex. A at 4; *see also* 21 C.F.R. § 814.39. Published and unpublished reports or studies on the device must be identified and summarized in these annual reports. Defs.'s Ex. A at 4. The manufacturer must also prepare and submit to the FDA reports of adverse reactions, device defects, and any corrective action taken to address such problems. *Id.* at 5, 6; *see also* 21 C.F.R. §§ 803.50-803.52.

Since the initial PMA of the LAP-BAND, the device has obtained FDA approval of PMA supplements, and the conditions of approval remain in effect. *See* Def.'s Ex. E. Allergan has most recently agreed to conduct post-approval studies to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of the LAP-BAND and the incidence of adverse effects. *Id.* at 2.

B. Facts Alleged in the Amended Complaint

Plaintiffs allege the following facts in their Amended Complaint.

Page 6

On December 17, 2009, Sara Ali underwent bariatric surgery at the Inova Fair Oaks Hospital located in Fairfax, Virginia. Am. Compl. ¶ 18. During Ms. Ali's surgery, a LAP-BAND manufactured and marketed by Allergan was surgically inserted in her, and Ms. Ali was discharged on December 21, 2009. *Id.* at ¶ 19. On December 23,

2009, Ms. Ali was admitted to Reston Hospital Center in Reston, Virginia, complaining of difficulty breathing and swallowing, and it was determined that she required a second surgery. *Id.* at ¶ 20. During this second surgery, the original LAP-BAND was explanted and replaced by another LAP-BAND, which was also manufactured and marketed by Allergan. *Id.*

On April 15, 2011, Ms. Ali was admitted to Inova Fair Oaks Hospital again because she was experiencing severe abdominal pain in her lower abdominal quadrant. *Id.* at ¶ 21. On April 19, 2011, an esophagogastroduodenoscopy ("EGD") was performed on Ms. Ali, and it was determined that the LAP-BAND implanted on December 23, 2009, had eroded. *Id.* The LAP-BAND was surgically removed on April 20, 2011, by Dr. Hazim Elariny. *Id.* at ¶ 22. During the surgery, Dr. Elariny discovered a dense extensive inflammatory mass extending from the left upper quadrant to the right lower quadrant surrounding the tubing of the LAP-BAND, phlegmon formation, and multiple abscesses. *Id.* at ¶ 23. Dr. Elariny performed a blunt dissection and electrocautery of the inflammatory mass, a gastrostomy involving removal of the LAP-BAND, and a saline washing and draining of the abdominal cavity. *Id.* at ¶ 24. Ms. Ali suffered and continues to suffer from complications arising from the erosion of the LAP-BAND. *Id.* at ¶ 25.

Plaintiffs allege that, in electing the implantation of the LAP-BAND as a weight loss measure, Ms. Ali and her physician relied upon representations made by Allergan in its labeling and marketing of the device that turned out to be false. *Id.* at ¶ 27. These representations included the following, *inter alia*: the LAP-BAND was tested and found to be safe and effective; the

Page 7

LAP-BAND was the safest and healthiest weight loss surgery; the LAP-BAND had the lowest operative complication rate of all weight loss surgeries; and the LAP-BAND had ten times lower short-term mortality rate than gastric bypass. *Id.* Plaintiffs also allege that Allergan's representations that "the LAP-BAND would be manufactured in accordance with FDA regulations" and "would not malfunction" were "part of the basis of the bargain," but these representations were false. *Id.* at ¶¶ 88-89.

C. Procedural History

On November 9, 2011, Ms. Ali and her husband Daniel Ali brought suit against Allergan in the Supreme Court of New York, County of New York. On December 14, 2011, Allergan removed the case to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York. On February 2, 2012, upon Allergan's motion, the case was transferred to the Eastern District of Virginia. On March 9, 2012, Plaintiffs filed their Amended Complaint, setting forth seven causes of action against Allergan under Virginia law: (1) fraud by negligent misrepresentation; (2) fraud by nondisclosure; (3) negligence; (4) breach of express warranty; (5) breach of implied warranty; (6) violation of Virginia Consumer Protection Act; and (7) violation of Virginia's false advertising statute. On March 12, 2012, Allergan filed its Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which Plaintiffs opposed. The Court heard oral argument on March 23, 2012.

II. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A motion to dismiss a complaint under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure should be granted unless the complaint "states a plausible claim for

relief under Rule 8(a). *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, [556 U.S. 662](#), 679 (2009) (citing *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S.

Page 8

544, 563 (2007)); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1), 12(b)(6). In considering a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the Court must construe the complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff, read the complaint as a whole, and take the facts asserted therein as true. *Mylan Labs., Inc. v. Matkari*, [7 F.3d 1130](#), 1134 (4th Cir. 1993). In addition to the complaint, the court may also examine "documents incorporated into the complaint by reference, and matters of which a court may take judicial notice." *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.*, [551 U.S. 308](#), 322 (2007).

The general pleading standard provided in Rule 8(a) requires that the complaint contain "a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief, in order to give the defendant fair notice of what the... claim is and the grounds upon which it rests." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (quoting *Conley v. Gibson*, [355 U.S. 41](#), 47 (1957)) (internal quotation marks omitted); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2). In *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*, the United States Supreme Court held that the "plain statement" must "possess enough heft"—that is, "factual matter"—to set forth grounds for the plaintiffs entitlement to relief and "to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557, 570. The complaint must contain sufficient factual allegations, taken as true, "to raise a right to relief above the speculative level," *id.* at 555, and "across the line from conceivable to plausible," *id.* at 570. The Court explained further, in *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, that the standard of facial plausibility requires pleading of "factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." [556 U.S. 662](#), 678 (2009) (citing *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556). The complaint must present "enough fact to raise a reasonable expectation that discovery will reveal evidence of [the alleged misconduct]." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 556.

"A pleading that offers labels and conclusions[,] a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action[,] or "naked assertions devoid of further factual enhancement" will not suffice.

Page 9

Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678 (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555, 557) (internal quotation marks omitted). "[T]he tenet that a court must accept as true all of the allegations contained in a complaint is inapplicable to legal conclusions." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678; see also *Labram v. Havel*, [43 F.3d 918](#), 921 (4th Cir. 1995) ("conclusory allegations regarding the legal effect of the facts alleged" need not be accepted as true).

In *Iqbal* and *Twombly*, the Supreme Court demonstrated a two-step approach to assessing the sufficiency of a complaint: (1) "identify[] the allegations in the complaint that are not entitled to the assumption of truth"; and (2) "consider the factual allegations in [the] complaint to determine if they plausibly suggest an entitlement to relief." *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 680-81. Thus, in order to survive a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss, the complaint must present sufficient non-conclusory factual allegations to support reasonable inferences of the plaintiffs entitlement to relief and the defendant's liability for the unlawful act or omission alleged.

Fraud claims are subject to a heightened pleading standard. *Harrison v.*

Westinghouse Savannah River Co., [176 F.3d 776](#), 783-84 (4th Cir. 1999). Under Rule 9(b), "a party [alleging fraud or mistake], must state with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud or mistake." Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). "[T]he 'circumstances' required to be pled with particularity under Rule 9(b) are 'the time, place, and contents of the false representations, as well as the identity of the person making the misrepresentation and what he obtained thereby.'" *Harrison*, 176 F.3d at 784 (quoting 5 Charles Alan Wright & Arthur R. Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 1297 (2d ed. 1990)). Failure to comply with pleading standard set forth in Rule 9(b) where applicable constitutes failure to state a claim and is therefore grounds for dismissal of a fraud claim under Rule 12(b)(6). *Harrison*, 176 F.3d at 783 n.5.

Page 10

III. ANALYSIS

The Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint because Plaintiffs' causes of action, as pled in the Amended Complaint, are preempted by the Medical Device Amendments ("MDA") to the FDCA. The MDA expressly preempt requirements imposed by state law on the safety and effectiveness of a medical device that are "different from, or in addition to, any requirement applicable ... to the device" under the FDCA. 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a) (2012).

In *Riegel v. Medtronic, Inc.*, the Supreme Court considered whether common law claims, brought under New York law, challenging the safety of a premarket approved Class III medical device were preempted under 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a). [552 U.S. 312](#), 321-22 (2008). The Court held first that the FDA's premarket approval ("PMA") process imposes federal "requirements" within the meaning of § 360k(a). *Id.* at 322-23. The Court noted that PMA may only be granted after the FDA determines that the specific device "offers a reasonable assurance of safety and effectiveness" upon extensive review of relevant data and statements describing the device and the manufacturing process in depth. *Id.* at 317-18, 323. Additionally, PMA is granted only upon the condition that the device bear the FDA-approved label containing required disclosures and that the device be manufactured "with almost no deviations from the specifications in its approval application." *Id.* at 322-23. As such, PMA imposes "requirements" that are "specific to individual devices," and therefore preempts requirements established or enforced by a state that differ from or add to requirements imposed through FDA regulation. *Id.*

Second, the Court held that the reference in § 360k(a) to requirements established or enforced by a state includes common-law duties imposed by state law. *Id.* at 324. The Court reasoned that state law that requires a premarket approved Class III device "to be safer, but

Page 11

hence less effective, than the model the FDA has approved disrupts the federal scheme no less than state regulatory law to the same effect." *Id.* at 325. Thus, claims brought under state common law that impose requirements on the manufacture or labeling of a premarket approved medical device that differ from or add to federal requirements on the device imposed through the FDA regulation are preempted under § 360k(a). *Id.* at 330; see also *Walker v. Medtronic, Inc.* (*Walker II*), [670 F.3d 569](#), 577 (4th Cir. 2012).

In *Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr*, however, the Supreme Court held that § 360k(a) does not preclude a state from "provid[ing] a traditional damages remedy for violations of common-law duties when those duties parallel federal requirements." [518 U.S. 470](#), 495 (1996). State-law requirements that are parallel to federal requirements are those that impose "duties equal to, or substantially identical to, requirements imposed under federal law." *Id.* at 496-97 (internal quotation marks omitted), *cited in Riegel*, 522 U.S. at 330. Rather than imposing requirements that differ from or add to federal requirements, parallel claims based on violations of state-law duties are "premised on" violations of federal requirements. *Riegel*, 522 U.S. at 330; *see also Hughes v. Boston Scientific Corp.*, [631 F.3d 762](#), 770 (5th Cir. 2011) (state tort claims "premised entirely on violation of the applicable federal requirements" are not preempted).

In light of *Riegel* and *Lohr*, federal courts in various circuits have held that, in order to adequately plead a parallel state-law claim and avoid § 360k(a) preemption, a plaintiff must allege a violation of federal regulations with sufficient facts to render the alleged violation plausible under *Twombly* and *Iqbal*. *See, e.g., Bass v. Stryker Corp.*, [669 F.3d 501](#), 509 (5th Cir. 2012); *In re Medtronic, Inc., Sprint Fidelis Leads Products Liability Litigation (Medtronic Leads II)*, [623 F.3d 1200](#), 1203 (8th Cir. 2010); *Covert v. Stryker Corp.*, No. 1:08CV447, [2009 WL 2424559](#), at *14 (M.D.N.C. Aug. 5, 2009); *Parker v. Stryker Corp.*, [584 F. Supp. 2d 1298](#), 1301

Page 12

(D. Colo. 2008). Thus, conclusory allegations that the defendant violated FDA regulations in the manufacture, labeling, or marketing of the premarket approved medical device are insufficient to state a parallel state-law claim and thereby avoid preemption under § 360k(a). *Parker*, 584 F.Supp.2d at 1301. *See also Gelber v. Stryker Corp.*, [752 F. Supp. 2d 328](#), 334 (S.D.N.Y. 2010); *In re Medtronic, Inc., Sprint Fidelis Leads Product Liability Litigation (Medtronic Leads I)*, [592 F. Supp. 2d 1147](#), 1158 (D. Minn. 2009), *aff'd*, *Medtronic Leads II*, [623 F.3d 1200](#) ("Plaintiffs cannot simply incant the magic words '[defendant] violated FDA regulations' in order to avoid preemption.").

In this case, Plaintiffs' causes of action, as pled in the Amended Complaint, are preempted under 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a). The LAP-BAND is a Class III medical device that has obtained PMA by the FDA. Under the § 360k(a), Virginia law cannot impose duties on Allergan in the manufacture, labeling, or marketing of the device unless those duties parallel—*i.e.*, are "equal to, or substantially identical to"—requirements imposed on the device by federal regulations. *Lohr*, 518 U.S. at 496-97 (internal quotation marks omitted). Thus, in order to avoid preemption under § 360k(a), Plaintiffs' claims challenging the manufacture, marketing, and labeling of the device as these pertain to the safety and effectiveness of the device must be premised on violations of federal regulations. *Riegel*, 522 U.S. at 330. Plaintiffs fail to plead sufficient facts to show that Allergan violated federal law in the manufacture, labeling, or marketing of the LAP-BAND device. The Amended Complaint offers a series of conclusory allegations that that Allergan violated federal law in the manufacture and marketing of the LAP-BAND. However, without factual enhancement, these statements are insufficient to plead plausible federal violations by Allergan. *See Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. For this reason, Plaintiffs

Page 13

causes of action for negligence, breach of warranty, fraud, and false advertising must be dismissed without prejudice.

Additionally, Plaintiffs' causes of action for fraud, false advertising, and violations of the Virginia Consumer Protection Act ("VCPA") must be dismissed for other reasons as well. The cause of action for fraud by negligent misrepresentation must be dismissed for Plaintiffs failure to plead with particularity the content and circumstances of Allergan's alleged misrepresentations, as required by Rule 9(b). Plaintiffs' false advertising claims must be dismissed because Plaintiffs fail to identify any false promise or statement of fact made by Allergan in advertising the LAP-BAND device. Plaintiffs' VCPA claims are dismissed with prejudice because the statute does not cover transactions in prescription medical devices regulated by the FDA.

A. Negligence and Breach of Implied Warranty

The Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss with respect to Plaintiffs' causes of action for breach of implied warranty and negligence because Plaintiffs fail to plead sufficient facts to support the inference that the LAP-BAND was manufactured in a way that deviated from federal requirements. Without sufficient pleading that Plaintiffs' state-law breach of implied warranty and negligence claims impose duties parallel to federal regulations, these claims are preempted by 21 U.S.C. §360k(a).

Under Virginia law, a plaintiff may recover for personal injuries caused by defective products under either a negligence theory or as a breach of an implied warranty of merchantability. *Abbot by Abbot v. Am. Cyanamid Co.*, [844 F.2d 1108](#), 1114 (4th Cir. 1988). "The essential elements of a negligence claim in Virginia... are (1) the identification of a legal duty of the defendant to the plaintiff; (2) a breach of that duty; and (3) injury to the plaintiff

Page 14

proximately caused by the breach." *Talley v. Danek Med., Inc.*, [179 F.3d 154](#), 157 (4th Cir. 1999). Virginia law imposes a duty on manufacturers to exercise ordinary care in making their products reasonably safe. *Carney v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, [309 F.2d 300](#), 304 (4th Cir. 1962). "The standard of safety of goods imposed on the seller or manufacturer of a product is essentially the same whether the theory of liability is labeled warranty or negligence." *Logan v. Montgomery Ward & Co.*, [219 S.E. 2d 685](#), 687 (Va. 1975).

Under either the warranty theory or the negligence theory[,] the plaintiff must show: (1) that the goods were unreasonably dangerous either for the use to which they would ordinarily be put or for some other reasonably foreseeable purpose; and (2) that the unreasonably dangerous condition existed when the goods left the defendant's hands.

Id. "Products are 'unreasonably dangerous' if they are (1) defective in assembly or manufacture; (2) imprudently designed; or (3) not accompanied by adequate warnings about their hazardous properties." *Austin v. Clark Equip. Co.*, [821 F. Supp. 1130](#), 1133 (W.D. Va. 1993) (citing *Bly v. Otis Elevator Co.*, [713 F.2d 1040](#), 1043 (4th Cir. 1983)).

Claims brought under state law attacking as unsafe the federally approved design and manufacture of Class III medical devices are preempted by the MDA as

imposing requirements that differ from or add to federal requirements. *Riegel*, 522 U.S. at 324-25; see also 12 U.S.C. § 360k(a). In order to recover for injuries caused by a manufacturing defect in a premarket approved medical device on state law grounds, the applicable state law must impose duties on a device manufacturer that are equal or parallel to federal requirements. *Riegel*, 522 U.S. at 330. In order to state such a parallel claim, the plaintiff must allege sufficient facts to support both the inference that the defendant manufactured the device in a way that violated federal regulations and the inference that this violation resulted in the defect that caused the plaintiffs injuries. *Bass v. Stryker Corp.*, [669 F.3d 501](#), 515, 517 (5th Cir. 2012); see also *Wolicki-Gables v. Arrow Int'l, Inc.*, [634 F.3d 1296](#), 1301-02 (11th Cir. 2011).

Page 15

Since the Supreme Court's decision in *Riegel*, federal courts have required plaintiffs asserting state-law claims based on manufacturing defects to plead facts showing violations of federal manufacturing requirements in ways that have resulted in the defect at issue. Recently, in *Bass v. Stryker Corp.*, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit considered whether a complaint adequately pled parallel negligence, implied warranty, and other claims brought under Texas law where the plaintiff allegedly suffered personal injuries as a result of a defective component in a premarket approved hip replacement system. *Bass*, 669 F.3d at 508-18. Citing a number of post-*Riegel* decisions of courts in various federal circuits, the court held that, in order "to plead a parallel claim successfully, a plaintiffs allegations that the manufacturer violated FDA regulations must meet the *Twombly* plausibility standard." *Id.* at 509. Specifically, the court held that the plaintiff meets the plausibility standard with respect to federal violations in manufacturing where the plaintiff identifies "what went wrong in the manufacturing process and cites the relevant FDA manufacturing standards [that were] allegedly violated." *Bass*, 669 F.3d at 510 (quoting *Funk v. Stryker Corp.*, [631 F.3d 777](#), 782 (5th Cir. 2011)). The plaintiff adequately pled parallel negligent manufacturing claims because his allegations supported the inference the defendants violated FDA manufacturing requirements and that these violations resulted in the defect that caused the plaintiffs injuries.⁴ *Id.* at 510, 515.

Page 16

The *Bass* court required pleading with a comparable level of factual support with respect to the plaintiffs breach of implied warranty claims. *Id.* at 561-17. After reviewing several pre-and *post-Riegel* decisions on the issue, the court determined that most *post-Riegel* cases that found preemption "concluded that the claims failed to rely on violations of the FDA's requirements, or the plaintiff pleaded that the defendants complied with the FDA's requirements." *Id.* at 517 (citing, e.g., *Walker v. Medtronic, Inc. (Walker I)*, Civil Action No. 2:07-00317, [2010 WL 4822135](#) (S.D. W.Va. Nov. 24, 2010), *aff'd*, [670 F.3d 569](#) (4th Cir. 2012)). Ultimately, the court held that "an implied warranty claim is not preempted if the plaintiff alleges that the defendant violated federal requirements *and* can ultimately show a causal link between the violation and the breach of the implied warranty." *Bass*, 669 F.3d at 517. The plaintiffs implied warranty claims were not preempted and survived the defendants' motion to dismiss "to the extent that [they were based] on violations of federal requirements," which had been sufficiently pled.⁵ *Id.*

The Fifth Circuit is not alone in applying the *Twombly* plausibility standard to

allegations that a manufacturer has violated the terms of its PMA or other federal requirements applicable to their devices. See, e.g., *Wolicki-Gables*, 634 F.3d at 1301 ("plaintiff must allege that '[the] defendant violated a particular federal specification referring to the device at issue'" (quoting *Ilarraza v. Medtronic, Inc.*, [677 F. Supp. 2d 582](#), 589 (E.D.N.Y. 2009))); *Parker*, 584 F. Supp. 2d at 1301 ("[T]he complaint must set forth facts showing 'action or inaction in defendants' efforts to take part in the PMA process or implement its results.'" (quoting *Heisner ex rel. Heisner v. Genzyme Corp.*, No. 08-C-593, [2008 WL 2940811](#), at *5 (N.D. 111. July 25, 2008))); *Delaney v. Stryker Orthopaedics*, Civil Action No. 08-03210, [2009 WL 564243](#), at *6 (D.N.J.

Page 17

Mar. 5, 2009) (dismissing manufacturing defect claim where "[c]omplaint d[id] not specify in what way [the manufacturer] deviated from the manufacturing process that the FDA approved").

Additionally, like the Fifth Circuit, several courts have held that, in order to adequately plead a parallel claim based on a manufacturing defect, the complaint must contain sufficient facts to support the inference that the defendant's federal violations resulted in the defect that caused the plaintiffs injuries. See, e.g., *Parker*, 584 F.Supp.2d at 1301 (dismissing parallel claims as inadequately pled because the "plaintiff d[id] not allege that [the defendant's] failure to comply with [federal] regulations rendered [the device at issue] defective"); *Gelber*, 752 F. Supp. 2d at 334 (dismissing product liability claims where plaintiffs "have not pointed to evidence of device-specific violations of federal law or alleged how those violations have a cognizable link to [plaintiffs'] injuries"); *Horowitz v. Stryker Corp.*, [613 F. Supp. 2d 271](#), 282 (E.D.N.Y. 2009) ("[I]n order to survive preemption under the MDA[,] a plaintiff must demonstrate a cognizable link between the defendant's federal violations and [the] plaintiffs injury."). Cf. *Wolicki-Gables*, 634 F.3d at 1301-02 (affirming district court's finding of preemption of product defect claims at summary judgment stage where plaintiffs did not show defendant's noncompliance "with any FDA regulation that can be linked to the injury alleged" (quoting *Ilarraza*, 677 F. Supp. 2d at 589)).

In applying the facial plausibility standard, courts have required varying levels of factual detail in the pleading of federal violations in connection with defective manufacturing of premarket approved medical devices. Compare *Medtronic Leads I*, 592 F. Supp. 2d at 1153, 1157-58 (dismissing manufacturing defect claims where plaintiffs identified the defect and the federal standards violated but failed to plead "factual detail about *why*" the defect violated the standards, which the court characterized as flexible and generic), with *Bausch v. Stryker Corp.*,

Page 18

[630 F.3d 546](#), 559-60 (7th Cir. 2010) (pleading "the precise defect [and] the specific federal regulatory requirements that were allegedly violated" was not required where plaintiff alleged that an FDA inspection revealed "numerous deficiencies" in the manufacturing process, an FDA warning letter stated that the device was "adulterated due to manufacturing methods... not in conformity with industry and regulatory standards," and the defective device bore "the same catalogue number as the device allegedly not in compliance with regulations").⁶ However, it is clear from the majority of *post-Riegel* cases that "[p]laintiffs cannot simply incant the magic words '[the defendant] violated FDA regulations' in order to avoid preemption."

Gelber, 752 F. Supp. 2d at 334 (quoting *Medtronic Leads I*, 592 F.Supp.2d at 1158); see also *Parker*, 584 F. Supp. 2d at 1301 ("[C]onclusory allegations standing alone are not sufficient to sustain plaintiffs burden of pleading under *Twombly*"). Plaintiffs asserting state-law claims based on manufacturing defects in premarket approved medical devices must plead sufficient facts to support inferences that the defendant manufacturer violated federal requirements and that these violations were linked to the alleged defect.

Here, Plaintiffs' negligence and implied warranty claims are preempted by the MDA for insufficient pleading of a federal violation by Allergan. Plaintiffs' negligence and implied warranty claims ultimately challenge Allergan's manufacture of a LAP-BAND implant, a Class

Page 19

III medical device that has obtained PMA by the FDA. However, the Amended Complaint does not present sufficient factual content to support an inference that Allergan violated federal law in the manufacture of the LAP-BAND or that any such violation caused Ms. Ali's injuries. Without a federal violation, Plaintiffs' claims impose duties on Allergan, under Virginia law, that differ from or add to federal requirements on the manufacture of the device, and are therefore preempted by 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a).

Plaintiffs allege "[u]pon information and belief that, in manufacturing the device at issue here, Allergan violated various federal statutes, regulations, and standards, including the following: the FDCA and, specifically, 21 U.S.C. § 360k; "any regulations promulgated pursuant to the Act"; the terms and conditions of the PMA secured for the LAP-BAND; and Current Good Manufacturing Practices and Quality Systems Regulation. Am. Compl. ¶¶ 70-79. Identifying the specific provisions of federal law allegedly violated by Allergan would have aided the pleading if Plaintiffs provided facts demonstrating these violations. However, without factual enhancement, Plaintiffs' series of legal conclusions is insufficient to meet the requirements of Rule 8(a).

Even where Plaintiffs' allegations of Allergan's violations appear to acquire some factual matter, they are revealed, upon examination to be simple recitations of regulatory language. For instance, Plaintiffs' allegation that Allergan "failed to establish and maintain procedures for monitoring to control its product that did not conform to specified requirements, in violation of 21 CFR § 820.70 *et seq.*," *id.* at ¶ 75, closely tracks the language of 21 C.F.R. § 820.70(a). Such recitations of regulatory language are no more entitled to the assumption of truth than pure legal conclusions. Similarly, Plaintiffs' allegation that the LAP-BAND was "adulterated," is a naked assertion based on nothing but conclusory allegations of Allergan's failure to comply with

Page 20

"performance standards" and "federal requirements." *Id.* at ¶ 70. This statement, therefore, is not entitled to the assumption of truth.

Setting aside naked assertions and conclusory allegations of federal violations leaves no pleading that Allergan violated the terms of its PMA or any federal law in the manufacture of the medical device at issue in this case. The facts alleged about Ms. Ali's surgeries and injuries provide no indication of any federal violation by

Allergan. First, Plaintiffs allege that, in 2009, a LAP-BAND manufactured by Allergan was implanted in Ms. Ali that ultimately needed to be explanted and replaced by another LAP-BAND, also manufactured by Allergan. *Id.* at ¶¶ 19-20. Second, Plaintiffs allege that, in 2011, Ms. Ali suffered severe abdominal pain caused by the erosion of the second LAP-BAND, which was detected by EDG. *Id.* at ¶ 21. Third, Plaintiffs allege that Ms. Ali underwent a surgical procedure during which the eroded LAP-BAND was removed and her abdominal cavity was treated, but she continues to suffer injuries caused by the eroded LAP-BAND. *Id.* at ¶¶ 22-25. Plaintiffs allege further that that the LAP-BAND that eroded had reached Ms. Ali and her implanting physician "without substantial change in the condition in which it was manufactured and sold by [Allergan]." *Id.* at ¶ 92. These facts are sufficient to support the inference of a causal link between the erosion of the LAP-BAND and Ms. Ali's injuries but are not sufficient to link the erosion or Ms. Ali's injuries to any federal violation by Allergan in the manufacture of the device.

Moreover, the allegation that the second LAP-BAND eroded does not, by itself, suggest that Allergan violated federal requirements in manufacturing this device. At the time the LAP-BAND obtained PMA, the FDA was aware of the LAP-BAND's risk of erosion and the risk that erosion could cause serious complications. Def.'s Ex. C at 22; Def.'s Ex. F at 11. The FDA was also aware that the risk of band erosion could be increased by the patient's use of anti-

Page 21

inflammatory agents and by certain surgical procedures. Def.'s Ex. C at 2-7. Ultimately, the FDA determined that band erosion was a rare occurrence and that serious complication resulting from band erosion was an even rarer occurrence, and approved the device despite these risks. Def.'s Exs. A, E. Plaintiffs' offer no indication that erosion reflects any noncompliance with federal requirements on the manufacture of the LAP-BAND.

No indication of any federal violation by Allergan in connection with the manufacture of the eroded LAP-BAND is offered in Plaintiffs' remaining allegations. Plaintiffs' allegation that, in 2000, initial efforts to obtain PMA for the device failed cannot support an inference of any federal violation in connection with the LAP-BAND at issue in this case. The device obtained PMA more than eight years before it was first implanted in Ms. Ali's body, and the manufacture of the device has been subject to the terms of its PMA since that time. Plaintiffs' allegation that, in 2010, Allergan recalled nine models of the device is also insufficient. They do not allege that the model of the LAP-BAND that allegedly caused Ms. Ali's injuries in 2011 was among the models recalled in 2010 or that these models were recalled due to any manufacturing defect or erosion issue. Thus, Plaintiffs allege no facts supporting the inference of any such federal violation or causal connection to Plaintiffs' injuries, and therefore fail to state facially plausible parallel claims for relief.

The only federal *post-Riegel* case Plaintiffs cite that support of their negligence and implied warranty claims is the decision of the District Court for the Southern District of Indiana in *Hofts v. Howmedica Osteonics Corp.*, [597 F. Supp. 2d 830 \(S.D. Ind. 2009\)](#). Mem. in Opp'n, at 11, 16. In *Hofts*, the district court denied a motion to dismiss defective manufacture, implied warranty, and other state-law claims based on alleged defects in a premarket approved Class III medical device. *Hofts*, 597 F. Supp. 2d at 841. The complaint alleged that the device at issue was

"unreasonably dangerous and defective" and that the manufacturing process for the device "did not satisfy the FDA's PMA standards." *Id.* at 836 (quoting complaint). The plaintiff also alleged that the device had an "impurity, imperfection, and/or another product defect [that] was a deviation from [the defendant's] design and quality manufacturing standards for the [device] approved by the FDA." *Hofts*, 597 F. Supp. 2d at 836 (quoting complaint).

The court held that these conclusory allegations and naked assertions were "sufficient to satisfy [the plaintiffs] obligation to put [the defendant] on notice of the nature of his claim and to plead enough facts to state a plausible claim to relief under *Twombly*." *Hofts*, 597 F. Supp. 2d at 841. Specifically, the *Hofts* court found that the plaintiffs defective manufacture tort claims were based on "allegations that [the defendant] failed in its obligation to meet the FDA's requirements," and rejected the defendant's preemption argument on this basis. *Hofts*, 597 F. Supp. 2d at 838; see also *Riegel*, 522 U.S. at 330 (state-law claims that are "premised on" violations of federal requirements do not impose requirements that differ from or add to federal requirements and, therefore, are not preempted by the MDA). The court also rejected the preemption argument with respect to the plaintiffs breach of implied warranty claim because the defendant failed to demonstrate that the claim was based on "standards other than those permitted by the FDA" and therefore failed to establish MDA preemption. *Hofts*, 597 F. Supp. 2d at 840.

This Court respectfully disagrees with the *Hofts* court's application of the Rule 8 pleading standard. In denying the motion to dismiss as to the plaintiffs defective manufacture claims, the *Hofts* court decried as "an unusually stringent application of *Twombly* and Rule 8" the Minnesota district court's decision in *Medtronic Leads I*. *Id. Compare Medtronic Leads I*, 592 F.Supp.2d at 1158. This Court finds the *Hofts* court unusually lax in its application of the

standard. In assessing the sufficiency of pleadings, district courts should not take conclusory allegations as true but must require factual support for any legal conclusions offered in pleadings. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. Requiring such factual enhancement does not constitute a heightened pleading standard; it is the basic pleading standard established in Rule 8 as interpreted in *Twombly* and *Iqbal*. Without factual allegations supporting inferences of the defendant's liability and the plaintiffs right to relief, pleadings fail to provide adequate notice of the grounds upon which the plaintiffs claim rests. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557,570. In *Hofts*, the district court relaxed the facial plausibility standard out of existence with respect to the plaintiffs allegations that the defendant violated federal requirements. This Court declines to adopt that approach in the context of this case. See *Desabio v. Howmedica Osteonics Corp.*, [817 F.Supp.2d 197](#), 204 (W.D.N. Y. 2011) (disagreeing with *Hofts* regarding the application of *Twombly* and Rule 8).

This Court also respectfully disagrees with the *Hofts* court's approach to the breach of implied warranty claim, where the court placed the burden on the defendant to show that the claim imposed standards different from applicable federal requirements. See *Hofts*, 597 F. Supp. 2d at 840. Rule 8 places the burden of pleading a plausible claim for relief and the grounds for this claim on the claimant. *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. In order to avoid MDA preemption, state-law claims

based on an alleged manufacturing defect in a premarket approved medical device must also be based on a violation of applicable federal manufacturing requirements. *Riegel*, 522 U.S. at 330. Thus, in order to adequately set forth the grounds for such a claim, the claimant must plead a federal violation. This Court agrees with the majority of federal courts in holding, *post-Riegel*, that the facial plausibility standard applies to the pleading of a federal violation in this context and requires facts indicating noncompliance with federal requirements on the

Page 24

manufacture of the device. In applying the facial plausibility standard here, the Court holds that the Amended Complaint fails to set forth sufficient factual allegations to support the inference that Allergan violated federal requirements in a way that resulted in the manufacturing defect or injuries alleged here. Therefore, the Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss as to Plaintiffs' causes of action for negligence and breach of implied warranty based on alleged defective manufacturing of the LAP-BAND.

Plaintiffs argue that dismissal would be premature without affording them "the opportunity to conduct extensive discovery of Allergan in order to determine what information was provided to the FDA." Mem. in Opp'n at 24. According to the affidavit of Plaintiffs' engineering expert, this discovery would involve, "[a]t a minimum," the following documents and issues: "the complete documentation submitted to the FDA by Allergan in order to obtain its PMA in 2001"; "all subsequent submissions to the FDA"; "any changes to [design and materials] specifications actually made or considered"; "whether there was ever an occasion for the manufacturer ... to address any design or manufacturing issues"; "any complaints or other communications from customers or others ... concerning the LAP-BAND product and any analysis which was made of these complaints or communications, including whether any such communications raised the issue (or should have raised the issue) of revisions in design, manufacturing or Instructions for Use (IFU)"; "any changes to the IFU made or considered after the original IFU was submitted to the FDA"; and the list goes on. Pis.' Ex. 2 at ¶¶ 11-12.

This is precisely the sort of fishing expedition the Supreme Court sought to avoid in requiring the plaintiff to plead facts demonstrating their entitlement to relief and the defendant's liability for misconduct. See *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 559-60 ("[I]t is only by taking care to require allegations reach the level suggesting [the defendant's misconduct] that we can hope to avoid the

Page 25

potentially enormous expense of discovery in cases with no 'reasonably founded hope that the [discovery] process will reveal relevant evidence' to support [the plaintiffs] claim." (quoting *Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo*, [544 U.S. 336](#), 347 (2005)); *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 686 (complainant "is not entitled to discovery" if "complaint is deficient under Rule 8"). "[A] district court must retain power to insist upon some specificity in pleading before allowing a potentially massive factual controversy to proceed." *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 558 (quoting *Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal, Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters*, [459 U.S. 519](#), 528 n.17 (1983)). Plaintiffs cannot be permitted to pursue "extensive discovery" with nothing more than a series of conclusory allegations and an unfounded hope that the process will yield favorable facts. See *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678-79 ("Rule 8 ... does not unlock the doors

of discovery for a plaintiff armed with nothing more than conclusions.").

The Court holds that Plaintiffs fail to adequately plead any federal violation by Allergan in connection with any manufacturing defect in the LAP-BAND. Without sufficient pleading of a federal violation in the manufacture of the device, the Court cannot infer that Plaintiffs' negligence and implied warranty claims are premised on such a violation. Consequently, the Court cannot infer that these claims would not instead impose duties on Allergan in manufacturing the LAP-BAND that differ from or add to their federal requirements. Thus, in challenging as defective the manufacture of the LAP-BAND implant under Virginia law, Plaintiffs fail to plead parallel claims for negligence and breach of implied warranty. These

Page 26

causes of action, as pled in the Amended Complaint, are therefore preempted by 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a) and must be dismissed under Rule 12(b)(6).

B. Breach of Express Warranty

The Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss with respect to Plaintiffs' cause of action for breach of express warranty because Allergan's alleged warranties concern FDA approval of the LAP-BAND and the safety and effectiveness of the device. Without sufficient pleading of a federal violation by Allergan in manufacturing, labeling, or marketing the device, Plaintiffs' breach of express warranty claims are preempted by the MDA.

Under the Uniform Commercial Code, as adopted by statute in Virginia, "[a]ny affirmation of fact or promise made by the seller to the buyer which relates to the goods and becomes part of the basis of the bargain creates an express warranty that the goods shall conform to the affirmation or promise." Va. Code Ann. § 8.2-313(l)(a). Additionally, "[a]ny description of the goods which is made part of the basis of the bargain creates an express warranty that the goods shall conform to the description." Va. Code Ann. § 8.2-313(1)(b); *see also Kraft Foods N. Am., Inc. v. Banner Eng'g Sales, Inc.*, [446 F. Supp. 2d 551](#), 570 (E.D.Va. 2006). Such an express warranty is breached when the goods fail to conform to the affirmation of fact or description. *Kraft Foods*, 446 F. Supp. 2d at 572.

Claims for breach of express warranty are preempted by the MDA when they impose duties on the warrantor that differ from or add to federal requirements on medical devices that have obtained PMA. *See Bass*, 669 F.3d at 515 ("[E]xpress warranty claims cannot be used to impose requirements greater than that provided by the FDA regulations." (citing *Medtronic Leads II*, 623 F.3d at 1207); 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a). "Once a device has received premarket approval, the MDA forbids the manufacturer to make, without FDA permission, changes in [the

Page 27

FDA-approved] design specifications, manufacturing processes, labeling, or any other attribute, that would affect safety and effectiveness." *Riegel*, 552 U.S. at 319 (citing 21 U.S.C. § 360e(d)(6)(A)(i)). The MDA preempts express warranty claims that challenge the safety and effectiveness of a premarket approved device. *Desabio*, 817 F. Supp. 2d at 205; *see also Medtronic Leads II*, 623 F.3d at 1208. An express warranty claim that requires a factual finding that such a device was unsafe is preempted because "the safety and effectiveness of the [device] are matters solely

for the FDA, and ... the FDA determined that the [device was] safe and effective when granting PMA." *Medtronic Leads I*, 592 F. Supp. 2d at 1164; see also *Leonard v. Medtronic, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 1:10-CV-03787, [2011 WL 3652311](#), at * 10 (N.D. Ga. Aug. 19, 2011) (a finding that the device is dangerous and unreliable "would directly conflict with the FDA's premarket approval of the device as reasonably safe and effective").

Similarly, the MDA preempts express warranty claims that challenge "FDA-approved representations made by the manufacturer." *Horowitz*, 613 F. Supp. 2d at 285; see also *Parker*, 584 F. Supp. 2d at 1303. In order to succeed, such express warranty claims require "a finding that a defendant violated state law by not living up to FDA-approved promises," which "would necessarily conflict with the FDA's determination that the label was not false or misleading." *Desabio*, 817 F. Supp. 2d at 206 (citing *Leonard*, [2011 WL 3652311](#), at *11). In this way, express warranty claims would employ state law to "impose additional and different requirements that would necessarily disrupt the federal scheme ..." *Desabio*, 817 F. Supp. 2d at 206; see also *Horowitz*, 613 F. Supp. 2d at 285 (Express warranty claims challenging FDA-approved representations about the device "would contradict the FDA's determination that the representations made on the label were adequate and appropriate and, thus, impose requirements different from or in addition to the federal requirements.").

Page 28

However, a claim for breach of express warranty claim would not be preempted to the extent that it is based on representations made by the manufacturer about the device that were not approved by the FDA. Such a claim would not impose duties or requirements on the manufacturer that differ from or add to federal requirements because the challenged representations would lie beyond the scope of those representations approved by the FDA. Thus, "[i]n order to avoid preemption, the plaintiffs breach of express warranty claim must 'identify representations of the manufacturer which exceed the scope of the FDA approved statements, thereby establishing a contractual obligation voluntarily entered into by the manufacturer.'" *Horowitz*, 613 F. Supp. 2d at 285 (quoting *Lake v. Kardjian*, [22 Misc.3d 960](#), 963 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. 2008)).

Here, Plaintiffs' cause of action for breach of express warranty does not survive MDA preemption because the representations about the LAP-BAND alleged to constitute express warranties all concern the premarket approval of the LAP-BAND and the FDA's determination that the device is safe and effective. Plaintiffs allege that Allergan made four misrepresentations about the LAP-BAND that were "part of the basis of the bargain": (a) "the LAP-BAND would be manufactured in accordance with FDA regulations"; (b) "the LAP-BAND would be safe and effective"; (c) "the LAP-BAND would not deviate materially from the device that received FDA approval"; and (d) "the LAP-BAND would not malfunction while in use." Am. Compl. ¶ 88.

Breach of express warranty claims based on these representations ultimately challenge the FDA's safety and effectiveness determination as well as federal requirements on the manufacture and labeling of the device. The manufacture of the LAP-BAND is subject to FDA regulation and cannot "deviate materially" from the specifications approved by the FDA as part

Page 29

of its PMA. As noted previously, Plaintiffs fail to plead any violation of FDA regulations by Allergan in the manufacture of the LAP-BAND.

Additionally, Plaintiffs do not allege that any of the alleged warranties made by Allergan were made in violation of FDA restrictions on the labeling and marketing of the LAP-BAND. Express warranty claims that challenge FDA-approved representations about the LAP-BAND would employ Virginia law to impose requirements on Allergan that differ from requirements imposed by the FDA. Given the FDA's premarket approval of the LAP-BAND, the Court infers that statements concerning the device's FDA approval, safety, and effectiveness are FDA-approved representations about the device. Therefore, Plaintiffs' express warranty claims, as pled, fall directly within the preemption provision of 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a).

For these reasons, the Court holds that Plaintiffs' express warranty claims are preempted and grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss as to the cause of action for breach of express warranty.

C. Fraud by Negligent Misrepresentation and Failure to Disclose

The Court grants Defendant's Motion to Dismiss with respect to Plaintiffs' causes of action for fraud by negligent misrepresentation and nondisclosure. The negligent misrepresentation claims must be dismissed for Plaintiffs' failure to plead the contents and circumstances of the alleged misrepresentations with particularity. To the extent that it is based on representations that have been approved by the FDA, the cause of action for negligent misrepresentation is preempted by the MDA. The cause of action for fraud by nondisclosure is also preempted by the MDA because it would impose requirements under Virginia law that add to federal requirements on statements Allergan can make concerning the LAP-BAND.

"To prevail on an actual fraud claim under Virginia law, a plaintiff must prove by clear and convincing evidence '(1) a false representation (2) of a material fact (3) made intentionally and knowingly (4) with intent to mislead, (5) reliance by the party misled, and (6) resulting

Page 30

damage to the party misled.'" *Hitachi Credit Am. Corp. v. Signet Bank*, [166 F.3d 614](#), 628 (4th Cir. 1999) (quoting [Evaluation Research Corp. v. Alequin](#), [439 S.E. 2d 387](#), 390 (Va. 1994)). Under Rule 9(b), a party alleging fraud "must state with particularity the circumstances constituting fraud." Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(b). "[T]he 'circumstances' required to be pled with particularity under Rule 9(b) are 'the time, place, and contents of the false representations, as well as the identity of the person making the misrepresentation and what he obtained thereby.'" *Harrison*, 176 F.3d at 784.

Fraud and failure to warn claims based on state law that would impose warning and disclosure duties on manufacturers of medical devices that are different from or in addition to FDA-mandated warnings are preempted by the MDA. See *Riegel*, 552 U.S. at 330. In *Medtronic Leads II*, the Eighth Circuit considered the plaintiffs' contention that the manufacturer of an FDA premarket approved medical device was required by state law to give warnings in addition to those required by the FDA. *Medtronic Leads II*, 623 F.3d at 1204. The court held that this requirement was "precisely the type" of state-law requirement that is different from or in addition to federal requirements, specifically the requirements of the FDA's PMA process, and

was therefore preempted. *Id.* at 1205. In *Horowitz*, the district court assessed a failure to warn claim attacking a premarket approved product label. *Horowitz*, 613 F. Supp. 2d at 286-87. The court explained that "[a]llowing [such a] claim to proceed would permit a jury to find that [the marketer of the device was] required 'to provide warnings above and beyond those on ... a label that was specifically approved by the FDA as part of the PMA process.'" *Id.* (quoting *Medtronic Leads I*, 592 F. Supp. 2d at 1159). Therefore, the failure to warn claim imposed requirements different from or in addition to the federal regulations and was preempted. *Horowitz*, 613 F. Supp. 2d at 287.

Page 31

Here, first, Plaintiffs' cause of action for negligent misrepresentation must be dismissed for their failure to meet pleading requirements for fraud allegations set forth in Rule 9(b). In the Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs fail to allege with particularity the "time, place, and contents of the false representations, [and] the identity of the person making the misrepresentation[s]." *Harrison*, 176 F.3d at 784. Most of Plaintiffs' allegations about Allergan's misrepresentations are made "[u]pon information and belief and fail to state the particular contents of those misrepresentations. Plaintiffs allege that statements made by Allergan in advertising and promotional materials for the LAP-BAND were "false" and "deceptive" and "inadequately informed [Ms. Ali] of potential risks ... related to the LAP-BAND and the LAP-BAND surgery." Am. Compl. at ¶¶ 36-38. The contents of the alleged misrepresentations that support Plaintiffs' negligent misrepresentation claims are never described. Pleading of the circumstances in which these alleged misrepresentations were made is also inadequate. Plaintiffs allege that the misrepresentations were made on "websites,... presented at medical and and professional meetings,... disseminated by sales representatives, [and made in] reports, press releases, advertising campaigns, television commercials, print advertisements," *et cetera*. Am. Compl. at ¶ 45. This allegation fails to provide the particular time and place of the alleged fraud, as required under Rule 9(b), and therefore Plaintiffs' cause of action for negligent misrepresentation must be dismissed. *See Harrison*, 176 F.3d at 784; FED. R. Civ. P. 9(b).

Second, Plaintiffs' negligent misrepresentation cause of action is preempted by the MDA to the extent that it is based on representations approved by the FDA. Any fraud claims that challenge FDA-approved representations about the LAP-BAND would employ Virginia law to impose requirements on Allergan that differ from requirements imposed by the FDA. Such claims for misrepresentation would fall directly within the preemption provision of 21 U.S.C. §

Page 32

360k(a). For this reason, any such negligent misrepresentation claims by Plaintiffs are preempted and cannot survive Allergan's Motion to Dismiss.

Third, Plaintiffs' cause of action for fraudulent nondisclosure is preempted by the MDA as well. Any claim by Plaintiffs that, under Virginia law, Allergan was required to provide disclosures and warnings about the LAP-BAND that were not required by the FDA necessarily adds to federal requirements for disclosures and warnings about the LAP-BAND. Such a claim would impose "precisely the type of state requirement[s] that [are] 'different from or in addition to' the federal requirements] and [are] therefore preempted." *Medtronic Leads II*, 623 F.3d at

1205. This claim must be dismissed.

Finally, any fraud claims by Plaintiffs challenging Allergan's alleged nondisclosure of facts that the LAP-BAND was not safe and effective, or challenging representations that the LAP-BAND was safe and effective, would require a finding that the device was not safe or effective. Any such fraud claims would therefore challenge the FDA's determination, through the rigorous PMA process, that the device was safe and effective, and the FDA's ultimate approval of the device. In order to withstand MDA preemption, such claims must be premised on some violation by Allergan of federal manufacturing requirements on the LAP-BAND, which Plaintiffs fail to plead adequately.⁸ For this reason, any fraud claims challenging the safety and effectiveness of the LAP-BAND are preempted and must be dismissed.

Thus, Plaintiffs' causes of action for fraudulent nondisclosure and negligent misrepresentation, as pled in the Amended Complaint, fail for preemption under 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a) and insufficient pleading under Rule 9(b).

D. Violations of Virginia Consumer Protection Act

Page 33

The Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss as to Plaintiffs' claims brought under the Virginia Consumer Protection Act ("VCPA") for two reasons. First, the VCPA exempts transactions in prescription medical devices regulated by the FDA. Second, recovery on any VCPA claims challenging FDA-approved statements about the LAP-BAND would impose requirements on Allergan different from or in addition to requirements imposed by the FDA. Such claims are expressly preempted by the MDA.

The Virginia General Assembly enacted the VCPA "as remedial legislation to promote fair and ethical standards of dealings between suppliers and the consuming public." Va. Code Ann. § 59.1-197. The Act prohibits suppliers from engaging in various "fraudulent acts or practices," including "[m]isrepresenting that goods or services have certain quantities, characteristics, ingredients, uses, or benefits;" and "[u]sing any other deception, fraud, false pretense, false promise, or misrepresentation in connection with a consumer transaction" Va. Code Ann. § 59.1-200(A)(5), (A)(14). By its own terms, however, the VCPA does not apply to "[a]ny aspect of a consumer transaction which aspect is authorized under laws or regulations of this Commonwealth or the United States, or the formal advisory opinions of any regulatory body or official of this Commonwealth or the United States." VA. CODE ANN. § 59.1-199(A).

Plaintiffs' VCPA claim fails because it challenges conduct that is expressly excluded from the scope of the VCPA. Plaintiffs base their VCPA cause of action on representations made by Allergan about the LAP-BAND in advertisements and other marketing materials concerning the safety and effectiveness of the device. Representations about the LAP-BAND in marketing materials for the device are authorized and regulated by the FDA under federal law. The VCPA, therefore, does not apply to it, *see id.*, and therefore no action challenging Allergan's marketing

Page 34

practices with respect to the LAP-BAND may be brought under the VCPA. For this

reason, Plaintiffs' VCPA claim must be dismissed with prejudice.

Even if the VCPA provided for the cause of action asserted in the Amended Complaint, such a cause of action would be preempted by the MDA to the extent that it is based on representations about the LAP-BAND that have been approved as part of its PMA. Like Plaintiffs' fraud claims, any VCPA claims challenging FDA-approved statements about the LAP-BAND would utilize the statute to impose requirements on Allergan that differ from or add to requirements imposed by the FDA. Such statutory claims fall directly within the preemption provision of 21 U.S.C. § 360k(a) and must be dismissed.

For these reasons, the Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss as to Plaintiffs' VCPA claims and dismisses these claims with prejudice.

E. Violation of Virginia's False Advertising Statute

The Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss with respect to Plaintiffs' cause of action for false advertising because Plaintiffs fail to identify any false promise or statement of fact made in an advertisement by Allergan that was not approved by the FDA. To the extent that Plaintiffs' false advertising cause of action is based on FDA-approved representations about the LAP-BAND, it is preempted by the MDA and must be dismissed.

Section 59.1-68.5 of the Virginia Code provides a private cause of action for "[a]ny person who suffers loss as the result of a violation of Virginia's statute prohibiting false advertising. Va. Code Ann. § 59.1-68.5. Section 18.2-216 prohibits the publication and dissemination of "an advertisement of any sort regarding merchandise ... which advertisement contains any promise, assertion, representation or statement of fact which is untrue, deceptive or

Page 35

misleading" with "the intent to increase the consumption of [the merchandise.]" VA. CODE ANN. § 18.2-216.

Plaintiffs' cause of action for violations of Virginia's false advertising statute fails for inadequate pleading and, to the extent that it challenges FDA-approved representations, preemption by the MDA. The Court recognizes that, in Paragraph 123 of the Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs incorporate into their false advertising cause of action all allegations made in connection with their fraud, warranty, and VCPA causes of action. Throughout the Amended Complaint, Plaintiffs allege that Allergan made many promises and representations about the LAP-BAND that they allege were false. However, the only statements Plaintiffs identify as having been made in advertisements are those set forth in Paragraph 116(a) in connection with Plaintiffs' VCPA cause of action. According to Plaintiffs, Allergan made statements in its advertisements for the LAP-BAND that included the following:

"Now is for *[sic]* putting the yo-yo dieting madness behind you. Now is for *[sic]* LAP-BAND"; "You've been let down by countless diets and weight-loss programs, so no *[sic]* it's time for a tool that can work"; "Diets Fail - The LAP-BAND Works"; LAP-BAND can help you take off weight - and keep it off and that LAP-BAND surgery is "Safe" ...

Am. Compl. at ¶ 116(a). To the extent that the challenged advertising statements

can be construed as promises or statements of fact, such that they fall within the scope of § 18.2-216, they can only be construed as representations that the LAP-BAND is safe and effective. As such, without any pleading to the contrary, the Court infers that these statements have been approved by the FDA as part of its PMA of the LAP-BAND. Any false advertising claims Plaintiffs might assert based on these statements are preempted by the MDA for the same reasons set forth in the

Page 36

Court's analysis of Plaintiffs' express warranty, fraud, and VCPA claims.⁹ Therefore, the Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss as to Plaintiffs' false advertising claims.

IV. CONCLUSION

The Court grants Allergan's Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint. First, the Court dismisses without prejudice Plaintiffs' causes of action for negligence and breach of implied warranty. The Amended Complaint does not contain adequate pleading of any federal violation by Allergan in connection with a manufacturing defect in the premarket approved medical device at issue in this case.

Second, the Court dismisses without prejudice Plaintiffs' claims for breach of express warranty. The express warranties pled in Paragraph 88 of the Amended Complaint concern FDA approval of the device and statements about the device's safety and effectiveness. Without sufficient pleading of any federal violation by Allergan in making these statements or in the manufacture of the device, any claim for breach of express warranty based on these statements is preempted by the MDA.

Third, the Court dismisses without prejudice Plaintiffs' causes of action for negligent misrepresentation and nondisclosure. Plaintiffs fail to plead the contents and circumstances of Allergan's alleged misrepresentations with particularity. To the extent that Plaintiffs' negligent misrepresentation claims are based on FDA-approved statements, these claims are preempted by the MDA because they would impose requirements under Virginia law that differ from federal requirements concerning the LAP-BAND device. The cause of action for fraud by nondisclosure is preempted by the MDA because it would impose requirements under Virginia law that add to federal requirements on statements Allergan can make about the device.

Page 37

Fourth, the Court dismisses with prejudice Plaintiffs' Virginia Consumer Protection Act ("VCPA") cause of action because the VCPA exempts transactions in prescription medical devices regulated by the FDA. Additionally, without sufficient pleading of any federal violation in the manufacture or marketing of the device, recovery on any VCPA claims challenging FDA-approved statements about the LAP-BAND are preempted by the MDA.

Finally, the Court dismisses without prejudice Plaintiffs' cause of action for false advertising under Virginia's false advertising statute. The Court infers that this cause of action, as pled, is based on FDA-approved representations about the safety and effectiveness of the device. Without sufficient pleading of any federal violation in making these representations about the device or in the manufacture of the device, Plaintiffs' false advertising claims are preempted by the MDA.

An appropriate order will issue.

Alexandria, Virginia
August 23, 2012

Gerald Bruce Lee
United States District Judge

Notes:

¹ Rule 201(b)(2) provides that federal courts may take judicial notice of "a fact that is not subject to reasonable dispute because it... can be accurately and readily determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned." FED. R. EviD. 201(b)(2) (2012). Rule 201(c)(2) requires the court to take judicial notice of such a fact "if a party requests it and ... supplie[s the court] with the necessary information." FED. R. EviD. 201(c)(2). A court must consider judicially noticed facts in assessing the sufficiency of a complaint and a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. *Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.*, [551 U.S. 308](#), 322 (2007).

² Exhibit A is a letter from HHS granting premarket approval ("PMA") for the LAP-BAND, which includes the conditions of the PMA. Exhibit C is a Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data prepared by the Center for Devices and Radiological Health ("CDRH") of the FDA. Exhibit E is a letter from HHS to Allergan approving a PMA supplement for the LAP-BAND. Exhibit F is an Executive Summary Memorandum regarding the LAP-BAND for the FDA's Gastroenterology and Urology Devices Advisory Panel.

³ There are three regulatory classes of medical devices intended for human use.

A device is in class III if insufficient information exists to determine that general controls are sufficient to provide reasonable assurance of its safety and effectiveness or that application of special controls . . . would provide such assurance and if, in addition, the device is life-supporting or life-sustaining, or for a use which is of substantial importance in preventing impairment of human health, or if the device presents a potential unreasonable risk of illness or injury.

21 C.F.R. § 860.3(c)(3) (2012); *see also* 21 U.S.C. § 360c(a)(1)(C). Class III devices require premarket approval by the FDA pursuant to section 515 of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act ("FDCA"), codified at 21 U.S.C. § 360e.

⁴ In *Bass*, the plaintiff alleged that the defective component of the device at issue was adulterated in violation of specifically identified federal regulations, and offered facts to support this claim. *Bass*, 669 F.3d at 510. According to the complaint, the FDA had recently issued a warning letter noting the defendant manufacturers' failure to take measures to reduce bioburden (microbial contaminant) at a specific point in the manufacturing process (the final rinse tank). *Id.* More specifically, "[the plaintiff] pleaded that excess bioburden ... and manufacturing residuals on the [component at issue] are known to prevent bony ingrowth, resulting in [the specific injury alleged by the plaintiff]." *Id.* The plaintiff also alleged that the defendants initiated a recall on the component at issue after the FDA issued the warning letter. *Id.* These factual allegations were sufficient to render plausible the plaintiffs claim that the defendants violated FDA regulations in the manufacturing process and that these violations resulted in the defect that caused the plaintiffs injuries. *Id.*

⁵ *See supra* note 4.

⁶ Judge Melloy dissented from the Eighth Circuit's decision in *Medtronic Leads II* to affirm dismissal of the plaintiffs' manufacturing defect claims. *Medtronic Leads II*, [623 F.3d 1200](#) at 1209-10 (Melloy, J., concurring in part and dissenting in part). He argued that "the specificity requirements of *Twombly* must be applied in a practical manner that recognizes the parties' relative access to

information necessary to articulate claims with specificity." *Id.* at 1209. Applying a relaxed *Twombly* standard in this context, Judge Melloy would permit discovery of the confidential PMA files for the device at issue and, after discovery, require the plaintiffs to amend their pleading with more facts. *Id.* at 1209-10. Judge Melloy "emphasiz[ed] that the requested discovery would be quite limited and impose virtually no burden on the defendants." *Id.* at 1210. In *Bausch*, the Seventh Circuit voiced agreement with Judge Melloy's dissent. 630 F.3d at 552-54. Considering the plaintiffs lack of access to the defendant's PMA documents, the court determined that the plaintiff had sufficiently pled parallel tort claims "given the amount of information to which she had access." *Id.* at 561.

⁷ Even in his dissent from the Eighth Circuit's decision to affirm dismissal in *Medtronic Leads II*, Judge Melloy emphasized that the discovery sought, which he would permit, was "quite limited"—specifically limited to the PMA submissions for the device at issue. *Medtronic Leads II*, 623 F.3d at 1209-10 (Melloy, J. concurring in part and dissenting in part). Also, in that case, the plaintiffs had alleged a specific manufacturing defect and identified federal standards that they believed were violated in connection with the defect. See *Medtronic Leads I*, 592 F.Supp.2d at 1153, 1157. Here, Plaintiffs have no comparable level of factual specificity in their pleading or comparable limit to the discovery they seek.

⁸ See discussion *supra* Part I.A.

⁹ See discussion *supra* Parts I.B, I.C, & I.D.



1-866-77-FASTCASE (866.773.2782)

support@fastcase.com

From: noreply@fastcase.com
To: [Carr, Alfred](#)
Subject: Fastcase Document - Baldwin v. Bell
Date: Friday, September 06, 2013 9:13:59 AM

(This document has been sent to you from [Fastcase](#) by Alfred Carr)

**David T. Baldwin, Plaintiff,
v.
K. Bell, et al., Defendants.**

1:11cv180 (CMH/TRJ)

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
VIRGINIA Alexandria Division**

Dated: January 20, 2012

MEMORANDUM OPINION

David T. Baldwin, a Virginia inmate proceeding pro se has filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging violation of his rights under the Eighth Amendment. This matter is before the Court on the defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Defendants filed their Motion along with a supporting memorandum on July 12, 2011. Plaintiff was given the opportunity to file responsive materials, pursuant to [Roseboro v. Garrison, 528 F.2d 309 \(4th Cir. 1975\)](#), and he filed a response on August 3, 2011. On August 8, 2011, defendants filed a Reply. Accordingly, this matter is ripe for disposition. For the reasons that follow, the defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss must be granted, and this action must be dismissed.

I. Background

Plaintiff's complaint chronicles issues he has experienced with his eyes during his incarceration at Hampton Roads Regional Jail. On June 27, 2009, Nurse Jones allegedly prescribed plaintiff the wrong medication. Compl. at 5; ECF No. 1. As a result, plaintiff alleges that he was unable to see the next day when he woke up. Id. Plaintiff alleges that he immediately filed a grievance asking what medication he was given and "complained about

Page 2

Nurse J. Jones giving... the wrong medication." Id. at 5. Plaintiff alleges the grievance went unanswered. Id. On July 13, 2009,¹ plaintiff allegedly submitted another grievance, which was returned to him with the statement "no request submitted." Id. Therefore, plaintiff allegedly filed another grievance on July 14, 2009, which was also returned to plaintiff with the explanation that "no sick call slip or complaint forward[ed]." Id. Plaintiff appealed this decision on September 10, 2009. The appeal was again returned to plaintiff for failure to attach the grievance. Id. Plaintiff alleges that he then began the grievance process from the beginning and finally received a response on March 28, 2010, this time stating that his grievance

was incomplete because plaintiff failed to file a request form with medical. *Id.* at 5-6.

Plaintiff also complains of issues he experienced while trying to schedule an eye exam. Plaintiff alleges that on February 11, 2010, Nurse Bell treated plaintiff and informed him that he "needed an eye exam bad." *Id.* at 6. On February 22, 2011, plaintiff alleges that he put in a request form for an eye exam "because [he] had to really strain [his] eyes to see and everything was a total blur and would hurt constantly." Compl. at 6. Plaintiff alleges that Nurse Bell signed a receipt for plaintiff to see an eye doctor, although it is unclear whether this occurred on February 11, 2010, or February 22, 2010. *Id.* Plaintiff alleges that after three hours Nurse Bell asked plaintiff where he had placed his copy of the receipt. *Id.* Plaintiff told Nurse Bell he thought it was in the trashcan. *Id.* Nurse Bell then allegedly took the receipt out of the trashcan, ripped it up, and said to plaintiff "good, because your broke ass didn't have any money and why you waist [sic] my time." *Id.* Plaintiff alleges that Nurse Bell left plaintiff's cell laughing. Plaintiff alleges that he again filed "forms" on March 1, 2010, asking why he could

Page 3

not see an eye doctor. *Id.* at 7. The form was returned informing plaintiff that he would have to put in a request form if he wanted to see an eye doctor. *Id.* Plaintiff states that the last returned grievance was signed by the superintendent and stated that plaintiff did not have any money in his account and therefore could not be treated. *Id.*

Plaintiff alleges that these actions amount to deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs. Plaintiff names Nurse J. Jones and Nurse K. Bell as defendants. As relief plaintiff seeks one-million dollars in monetary damages.

II. Standard of Review

Rule 12(b)(6) allows a court to dismiss those allegations which fail "to state a claim upon which relief can be granted." Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). When determining whether a motion to dismiss should be granted, the alleged facts are presumed true and the complaint should be dismissed only when "it is clear that no relief could be granted under any set of facts that could be proved consistent with the allegations." [Hishon v. King & Spalding](#), 467 U.S. 69, 73 (1984). To survive a 12(b)(6) motion, "a complaint must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" [Ashcroft v. Iqbal](#), 556 U.S. ---, ---, 129 S. Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009) (quoting [Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly](#), 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). "A claim has facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged." *Id.* However, "[t]hreadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements, do not suffice" to meet this standard, *id.*, and a plaintiff's "[f]actual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level...". [Twombly](#), 550

Page 4

U.S. at 55. Moreover, a court "is not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation." [Iqbal](#), 129 S. Ct. at 1949-1950.

Courts may also consider exhibits attached to the complaint. [United States ex rel, Constructors, Inc. v. Gulf Ins. Co.](#), 313 F. Supp. 2d 593, 596 (E.D. Va. 2004)

(citing 5A Charles A. Wright & Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1357, at 299 (2d ed.1990), cited with approval in Anheuser-Busch v. Schموke, 63 F.3d 1305, 1312 (4th Cir.1995)). Moreover, where a conflict exists between "the bare allegations of the complaint and any attached exhibit, the exhibit prevails." Gulf Ins. Co., 313 F. Supp. 2d. at 596 (citing Fayetteville Investors v. Commercial Builders. Inc., 936 F.2d 1462, 1465 (4th Cir.1991)).

III. Analysis

A. Deliberate Indifference to Serious Medical Needs

To state a claim for deliberate indifference to serious medical needs that rises to the level of a constitutional violation, a plaintiff must allege two distinct elements. First, he must allege a sufficiently serious medical need. See, e.g., Cooper v. Dvke, 814 F.2d 941, 945 (4th Cir. 1987) (determining that intense pain from an untreated bullet wound is sufficiently serious); Loe v. Armistead, 582 F.2d 1291 (4th Cir. 1978) (concluding that the "excruciating pain" of an untreated broken arm is sufficiently serious). Second, he must allege deliberate indifference to that serious medical need. Under this second prong, an assertion of mere negligence or even malpractice is not enough to state an Eighth Amendment violation; instead, plaintiff must allege deliberate indifference "by either actual intent or reckless disregard." Estelle, 429 U.S. at 106; Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327, 328 (1986); Miltierv. Beorn, 896 F.2d 848, 851 (4th Cir. 1990). The prisoner must demonstrate that defendants' actions were "[s]o grossly incompetent,

Page 5

inadequate, or excessive as to shock the conscience or to be intolerable to fundamental fairness." Id. (citations omitted). Significantly, a prisoner's disagreement with medical personnel over the course of his treatment does not make out a cause of action. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 849 (4th Cir. 1985); Russell v. Sheffer, 528 F.2d 318, 319 (4th Cir. 1975) (per curiam); Harris v. Murray, 761 F. Supp. 409, 414 (E.D. Va. 1990).

1. Sufficiently Serious Medical Need

A "serious medical need ... is one that has been diagnosed by a physician as mandating treatment or one that is so obvious the even a lay person would easily recognize the need for a doctor's attention." See Iko v. Shreve, 535 F.2d 225, 241 (4th Cir. 2008). In this case, plaintiff alleges two separate medical needs. First, plaintiff alleges he "couldn't see when [he] woke up" on the morning of June 28, 2009. Compl. at 5. However, it is unclear whether plaintiff was completely blind or was just experiencing difficulty with his vision. Plaintiff does not allege that this vision problem was permanent, nor does he state how long it lasted. Second, plaintiff alleges that that he needed an eye exam because he "had to really strain [his] eyes to see and everything was a total blur and would hurt constantly." Compl. at 5. Although plaintiff alleges he experienced pain and discomfort, he does not allege any lasting injury resulting from the defendants' alleged failure to schedule an eye exam.

It is unclear whether either of these two medical issues constitute "serious medical needs" sufficient to warrant Eighth Amendment protection, as plaintiff alleges no "serious or significant physical or emotional injuries." See Strickler v. Waters, 989 F.3d 1375, 1381 (4th Cir. 1993). However, regardless of whether

plaintiff's medical issues constitute serious medical needs, the complaint still fails to state a claim because plaintiff did not plead facts sufficient to establish

Page 6

deliberate indifference on behalf of either named defendant.

2. Deliberate Indifference on behalf of Nurse J. Jones

Plaintiff fails to establish any deliberate indifference on behalf of Nurse Jones. Plaintiff's only allegation regarding Nurse Jones is that she gave him the wrong medication on June 27, 2009, which resulted in him being unable to see when he awoke on June 28, 2009. Compl. at 5; ECF No. 1. Plaintiff does not allege any facts whatsoever indicating that Nurse Jones intentionally or recklessly gave plaintiff the wrong medication. Furthermore, assuming Nurse Jones did give plaintiff the wrong medication, as is required in adjudicating a 12(b)(6) motion, this error only constitutes negligence, or perhaps malpractice, neither of which become a constitutional violation merely because the plaintiff is a prisoner. Estelle, 429 U.S. at 106; Daniels v. Williams, 474 U.S. 327, 328 (1986); Miltierv. Beorn, 896 F.2d 848, 851 (4th Cir. 1990). Accordingly, plaintiff's claim against Nurse Jones must be dismissed.

3. Deliberate Indifference on behalf of Nurse Bell

Plaintiff also fails to establish deliberate indifference on behalf of Nurse Bell. The only factual allegations against Nurse Bell are that she told plaintiff he "needed an eye exam bad" on February 11, 2011, and that she ripped up a receipt for plaintiff that would have permitted him to see an eye doctor and stated "your broke ass didn't have any money and why you waist [sic] my time." Compl. at 6. Construing plaintiff's complaint liberally, it appears that he believes he should not have been required to pay for the eye exam because his eye problem constituted a serious medical need and Nurse Bell's refusal to permit him to see an eye doctor without payment constitutes deliberate indifference.

Plaintiff's claim against Nurse Bell must fail. First, the complaint does not establish that

Page 7

Nurse Bell had the authority to determine whether plaintiff was permitted to see an eye doctor without the requisite funds in his account. Without facts alleging that Nurse Bell had some ability to control plaintiff's access to an eye doctor, plaintiff cannot establish that Nurse Bell acted specifically and personally to deprive him of his constitutional rights. See Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 850 (4th Cir. 1985) ("In order for an individual to be liable under § 1983, it must be "affirmatively shown that the official charged acted personally in the deprivation of the plaintiff's rights.").

Second, plaintiff's claim is nothing more than a "disagreement between an inmate and [medical staff] over the inmate's proper medical care." Id. at 849. According to the Hampton Roads Regional Jail Handbook, which the plaintiff provides as an exhibit, "eye exams ... are not provided by the Regional Jail, except in cases of serious medical need." See Ex. 1 at ECF No. 20. Furthermore, absent emergency circumstances, inmates are "responsible for paying a portion of the cost of inmate initiated health care services that [they] receive." Id. In this case, plaintiff disagrees

with the decision of Nurse Bell, who found that plaintiff's alleged eye conditions did not rise to the level of a serious medical need warranting an eye exam despite plaintiff's inability to pay for the exam. This disagreement, as a matter of law, does not state a claim for deliberate indifference.

Page 8

IV. Conclusion

For the foregoing reasons, defendants' Joint Motion to Dismiss will be granted, plaintiff's Motion to Deny Defendants Joint Motion to Dismiss will be denied, and this action will be dismissed. An appropriate Order shall issue.

Claude M. Hilton
United States District Judge

Alexandria, Virginia

Notes:

¹ Although plaintiff's complaint states that he filed this grievance on July 13, 2010, the correct filing date is July 13, 2009. See ECF No. 17 at 4.



1-866-77-FASTCASE (866.773.2782)
support@fastcase.com