

1 CHRISTINA J. BROWN, Cal. Bar. No. 242130
2 cbrown5@ftc.gov
3 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
4 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
5 Washington, DC 20580
6 Tel: (202) 326-2125

7 JOHN D. JACOBS, Cal. Bar. No. 134154
8 Local Counsel
9 jjacobs@ftc.gov
10 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
11 10990 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 400
12 Los Angeles, CA 90024
13 Tel: (310) 824-4300

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission*

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

17 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

18 Plaintiff,

19 v.

20 SOUTHERN GLAZER'S WINE AND
21 SPIRITS, LLC,

22 Defendant.

23 **Case No. 8:24-cv-02684**

24 **NOTICE OF RELATED CASE**
25 **PURSUANT TO LOCAL**
26 **RULE 83-1.3.1**

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 83-1.3.1, Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission
2 (“FTC”) provides notice of the following related case currently pending in the
3 Central District of California: *Roma Mikha, Inc. v. Southern Glazer’s Wine and*
4 *Spirits, LLC*, Case No. 8:22-cv-01187-FWS-ADS.¹

5 In this action, the FTC alleges that Defendant Southern Glazer’s Wine and
6 Spirits, LLC (“Defendant”) has engaged in illegal price discrimination in violation
7 of the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 13(a), by selling wine and spirits to
8 small, independent retailers at prices that are drastically higher than the prices
9 Defendant charges competing large national and regional chains for the same
10 products. Plaintiffs in the *Roma Mikha* action likewise allege that Defendant has
11 violated the Robinson-Patman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 13(a), by engaging in
12 discriminatory pricing against plaintiffs and members of a proposed class of
13 independent retailers in favor of national chains, and that Defendant has violated
14 15 U.S.C. § 13(e) and California state law. Like the FTC in this action, the *Roma*
15 *Mikha* plaintiffs seek preliminary and permanent injunctive relief against
16 Defendant’s price discrimination, as well as other relief.

17 Both cases thus arise from the same events and call for a determination of
18 the same or substantially similar questions of fact and law—namely, whether
19 Defendant has engaged in illegal price discrimination in violation of the Robinson-
20 Patman Act. *See* L.R. 83-1.3.1(a)-(b). Based on the foregoing, the cases are related
21 within the meaning of Local Rule 83-1.3.1 because the two actions likely “would
22 entail substantial duplication of labor if heard by different judges.” L.R. 83-
23 1.3.1(c).

24
25
26
27 ¹ On December 2, 2024, the *Roma Mikha* action was stayed pending the outcome
28 of certain plaintiffs’ arbitration proceedings. (Case No. 8:22-cv-01187-FWS-ADS,
Doc. 95.)

1 Dated: December 12, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

2 /s/ Christina J. Brown

3 CHRISTINA J. BROWN, Cal. Bar No. 242130

4 cbrown5@ftc.gov

5 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

6 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

7 Washington, DC 20580

8 Tel: (202) 326-2125

9 JOHN D. JACOBS, Cal. Bar. No. 134154

10 Local Counsel

11 jjacobs@ftc.gov

12 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

13 10990 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 400

14 Los Angeles, CA 90024

15 Tel: (310) 824-4300

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission*