

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PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished federal district court order; precedential status not identified in the source.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)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-minnesota/2026/sysco-corp-v-agri-stats-inc-et-al-sysco-corp-v-cargill-inc-dtt33va9>