

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Sysco Corp. v. Agri Stats, Inc. et al.; Sysco Corp. v. Cargill Inc. et al.

Sysco Corp. · No. Civil Nos. 18-1776 (JRT/JFD), 22-3031 (JRT/JFD); related Civil Nos. 21-1374 and 22-1750 ·
Decided April 6, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota grants JBS, Sysco, and Carina Ventures LLC leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s prior order enforcing a settlement and dismissing Sysco’s claims against JBS. The Court permits briefing on whether JBS and Sysco formed an enforceable agreement under Minnesota law, following a Seventh Circuit decision concerning issue preclusion and settlement enforceability.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Minnesota
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John R. Tunheim
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Minnesota
DECIDED	April 6, 2026
DOCKET	Civil Nos. 18-1776 (JRT/JFD), 22-3031 (JRT/JFD); related Civil Nos. 21-1374 and 22-1750
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court granted JBS, Sysco, and Carina Ventures LLC leave under Local Rule 7.1(j) to file a motion for reconsideration of the court's prior order enforcing a settlement and dismissing Sysco's claims against JBS.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A motion for reconsideration is limited to correcting manifest errors of law or fact or presenting newly discovered evidence and should be permitted only in extraordinary circumstances; under D. Minn. LR 7.1(j), a party must first obtain the court's permission after demonstrating compelling circumstances.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court order; precedential status not identified in the source.

TOPICS

- motion for reconsideration
- civil procedure
- contract formation
- contracts
- commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

contracts

commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the parties demonstrated sufficient compelling circumstances under D. Minn. LR 7.1(j) to obtain leave to file a motion for reconsideration.
2. Whether the parties should be permitted to brief whether JBS and Sysco entered into an enforceable agreement under Minnesota law.

HOLDINGS

1. Leave to file a motion for reconsideration was granted because the subsequent reversal of the Seventh Circuit decision on which the court's prior issue-preclusion analysis depended created compelling circumstances warranting further briefing.
2. The parties were ordered to brief whether, as a matter of Minnesota law, JBS and Sysco entered into an enforceable agreement; the court did not resolve enforceability in this order.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Motions to reconsider “serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.””

“A motion to reconsider should not be employed to relitigate old issues, but to “afford an opportunity for relief in extraordinary circumstances.””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

JBS and Sysco had entered into a settlement-related arrangement concerning Sysco's claims against JBS. The court previously enforced the settlement and dismissed the claims, but a subsequent Seventh Circuit decision addressing a similar settlement issue led JBS, Sysco, and Carina Ventures LLC to request reconsideration. Sysco had assigned its claims to Carina Ventures LLC as part of a settlement with its litigation funder.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On March 25, 2025, the court granted JBS's motions to enforce a settlement with Sysco and dismissed Sysco's claims against JBS, relying on issue preclusion and Minnesota contract law. After the Seventh Circuit issued *In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litigation*, the parties requested leave to seek reconsideration, asserting that the decision undermined the prior ruling. The court granted leave and ordered briefing on whether JBS and Sysco formed an enforceable agreement under Minnesota law.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litig., 167 F.4th 430 (7th Cir. 2026)
- Hagerman v. Yukon Energy Corp., 839 F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir. 1988)
- Dale & Selby Superette & Deli v. United States Dept. of Agric., 838 F. Supp. 1346, 1348 (D. Minn. 1993)
- Broadway v. Norris, 193 F.3d 987, 990 (8th Cir. 1999)

OPINION

Sysco Corp. v. Agri Stats, Inc. et al.; Sysco Corp. v. Cargill Inc. et al.

PER CURIAM.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

IN RE PORK ANTITRUST LITIGATION Civil No. 18-1776 (JRT/JFD)

IN RE CATTLE AND BEEF ANTITRUST Civil No. 22-3031 (JRT/JFD)

LITIGATION

ORDER GRANTING REQUEST FOR LEAVE

TO FILE MOTION FOR

This Document Relates To:

RECONSIDERATION

Sysco Corp. v. Agri Stats, Inc. et al., Civil No. 21-1374; and Sysco Corp. v. Cargill Inc. et al., Civil No. 22-1750 On March 25, 2025, the Court issued an Order in both the above-captioned cases granting motions by Defendants JBS USA Food Company, JBS Packerland, Inc., Swift Beef Company, and JBS S.A. (collectively “JBS”) to enforce a settlement with Plaintiff Sysco Corporation (“Sysco”) and to dismiss Sysco’s claims against JBS. (Mem Op. & Order Adopting R&R; Civil No. 18-1776, Docket No. 2925; Civil No. 22-3031, Docket No. 1222; March 25, 2025.) On March 20, 2026, in view of a recent Seventh Circuit decision,¹ JBS, Sysco, and Carina Ventures LLC² filed a letter in both of the above-captioned cases ¹ In re Broiler Chicken Antitrust Litig., 167 F.4th 430 (7th Cir. 2026). ² Sysco assigned its claims to Carina Ventures LLC as a result of a settlement between Sysco and its litigation funder, Burford Capital Limited. See *id.* at 436–37. requesting leave to file a motion for reconsideration of the March 25, 2025 Order under Local Rule 7.1(j). (Civil No. 18-1776, Docket No. 3330; Civil No. 22-3031, Docket No. 1548.) Under the Local Rules, after demonstrating compelling circumstances, a party may file a motion to reconsider with the permission of the Court. D. Minn. LR 7.1(j). Motions to reconsider “serve a limited function: to correct manifest errors of law or fact or to present newly discovered evidence.” Hagerman v. Yukon Energy Corp., 839 F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir. 1988) (quotation and citation omitted). A motion to reconsider should not be employed to relitigate old issues, but to “afford an opportunity for relief in extraordinary circumstances.” Dale & Selby Superette & Deli v. United States Dept. of Agric., 838 F. Supp. 1346, 1348 (D. Minn. 1993); see also Broadway v. Norris, 193 F.3d 987, 990 (8th Cir. 1999). The Court will grant the request to file a motion for reconsideration. The Court based its prior decision on issue preclusion and Minnesota contract

law. The decision in Broiler Chicken having been reversed, issue preclusion is no longer applicable. The Court will, therefore, grant the request to allow the parties to brief whether, under Minnesota law, as a matter of law, JBS and Sysco entered into an enforceable agreement.³ In their briefing, the parties should also define the specific relief requested if the Court should decide to vacate its prior Order. ³ The Seventh Circuit, applying Illinois law, concluded that, because JBS and Sysco agreed “in principle on the most important terms but not all material terms,” the settlement agreement was not enforceable. In re Broiler Chicken, 167 F.4th at 444.

ORDER

Based on the foregoing, and all the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Defendants JBS USA Food Company, JBS Packerland, Inc., Swift Beef Company, and JBS S.A. (collectively “JBS”), Plaintiff Sysco Corporation (“Sysco”), and Carina Venture LLC’s Request for Leave to File a Motion for Reconsideration (Civil No. 18-1776, Docket No. [3330]; Civil No. 22-3031, Docket No. [1548]) is GRANTED;
2. The parties shall file a motion for reconsideration and a memorandum in support no later April 21, 2026, addressing whether, under Minnesota law, as a matter of law, JBS and Sysco entered into an enforceable agreement;
3. If any party wishes to file a memorandum in opposition to that motion, such party shall notify the Court no later than April 22, 2026, and shall file such memorandum no later than May 5, 2026;
4. The parties shall follow the page limits and/or word count requirements and filing procedures in accordance with the Local Rules. DATED: April 6, 2026 tothe, (raat at Minneapolis, Minnesota. JOHN R. TUNHEIM United States District Judge -3-