

Climate Accountability Lawsuits

Climate Fraud Cases / Consumer Protection

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>State of Vermont Vermont v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 09/14/2021</p>	<p>Vermont is suing major oil and gas companies – including ExxonMobil, Shell, Sunoco, CITGO, and Energy Transfer – to hold them accountable for “numerous deceptive acts and unfair practices in connection with their marketing, distribution, and sale of gasoline and other fossil fuel products to consumers within the State.”</p>	<p>Consumer Protection</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Vermont state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Vt.), which remanded the case to state court. In state court, Defendants filed motions to dismiss.</p>
<p>City of New York New York City v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 04/22/2021</p>	<p>New York City is suing three of the world’s biggest climate polluters and the American Petroleum Institute, for lying to consumers through false advertising and deceptive trade practices “about the central role their products play in causing the climate crisis.” The lawsuit seeks civil penalties under New York City’s consumer protection law.</p>	<p>Consumer Protection</p>	<p>Complaint filed in New York state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (S.D.N.Y.), which remanded the case to state court.</p>
<p>State of Connecticut Connecticut v. Exxon Mobil Case Filed: 09/14/2020</p>	<p>Connecticut is suing ExxonMobil to hold the corporation accountable for an “ongoing, systematic campaign of lies and deception to hide from the public what ExxonMobil has known for decades—that burning fossil fuels undeniably contributes to climate change” in violation of the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act.</p>	<p>Consumer Protection</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Connecticut state court. Defendant removed the case to federal court (D.Conn.), which remanded the case to state court. Second Circuit affirmed remand. In state court, trial court denied defendant’s motion to dismiss.</p>
<p>District of Columbia District of Columbia v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 06/25/2020</p>	<p>The District of Columbia is suing four of the world’s biggest oil companies for misleading consumers about the role their products play in causing climate change. The lawsuit says the companies violated D.C.’s consumer protection law by engaging in misleading acts and practices around the marketing, promotion, and sale of fossil fuel products.</p>	<p>Consumer Protection</p>	<p>Complaint filed in D.C. Superior Court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.D.C.), which remanded the case to state court. D.C. Circuit affirmed remand. In state court, parties are litigating motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim and anti-SLAPP violations.</p>

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>State of Minnesota Minnesota v. Exxon Mobil, Koch Industries and API Case Filed: 06/24/2020</p>	<p>Minnesota is suing three major architects of climate denial – ExxonMobil, Koch Industries, and the American Petroleum Institute – to hold them accountable for a “campaign of deception” to mislead consumers about the science of climate change and failing to disclose their knowledge that fossil fuel products caused global warming.</p>	<p>Consumer Protection, Fraud, Misrepresentation, Failure to Warn</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Minnesota state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Minn), which remanded the case to state court. Eighth Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, defendants have filed motions to dismiss.</p>
<p>Commonwealth of Massachusetts Massachusetts v. Exxon Mobil Case Filed: 10/24/2019</p>	<p>Massachusetts is suing ExxonMobil to hold the oil giant accountable for systematically and intentionally misleading consumers and investors about its role in causing climate change, in violation of Massachusetts state law.</p>	<p>Consumer Protection</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Massachusetts state court. Defendant removed the case to federal court (D.Mass.), which remanded the case to state court. State court denied defendant’s motions to dismiss, including anti-SLAPP motion. Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court affirmed denial of anti-SLAPP motion. Case is in pre-trial discovery in state court.</p>

Climate Damages Cases / Cost Recovery

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>Bucks County, Pennsylvania Bucks County v. BP PLC et al. Case Filed: 03/25/2024</p>	<p>Bucks County is suing major fossil fuel entities to make them pay for the damages suffered by the county caused by their concerted efforts to lie to and mislead the public about the climate impacts of fossil fuel products. The lawsuit was filed less than a year after seven people, including two young children, were killed in Bucks County during deadly flash floods.</p>	<p>Negligence, Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Civil Conspiracy, Failure to Warn, Trespass</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Pennsylvania state court.</p>
<p>Makah Indian Tribe Makah Indian Tribe v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 12/20/2023</p>	<p>The Makah Indian Tribe, on the Olympic Peninsula in Washington State, seeks to hold major fossil fuel companies “accountable for hiding the truth about climate change and the effects of burning fossil fuels.” Climate change, particularly rising seas and flood, has created “existential threats” to their people, land, and infrastructure, forcing the tribe to relocate to higher ground.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Failure to Warn</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Washington state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (W.D. Wash.). Parties are litigating motion to remand to state court.</p>
<p>Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe v. Exxon Mobil et al Case Filed 12/20/2023</p>	<p>The Shoalwater Bay Indian Tribe, on the Olympic Peninsula in Washington State, seeks to hold major fossil fuel companies accountable for the hundreds of millions of dollars in costs it will take to relocate their community to higher ground and protect their people, property, and heritage from the “existential threats” of climate change, including rising seas and floods.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Failure to Warn</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Washington state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (W.D. Wash.). Parties are litigating motion to remand to state court.</p>

Maui County, Hawai'i

Maui v. Sunoco et al.

Case Filed: 10/12/2020

Maui is suing more than a dozen fossil fuel companies to hold them accountable for lying about climate change damages they knew their products would cause.

Public Nuisance,
Private Nuisance,
Failure to Warn,
Trespass

Complaint filed in Hawai'i state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Haw.), which remanded the case to state court. Ninth Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, parties awaiting decision on defendants' motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Case is in pre-trial discovery on the jurisdictional issue.

**Honolulu (City and County),
Hawai'i**

Honolulu v. Sunoco et al.

Case Filed: 03/09/2020

Honolulu is suing major oil and gas companies to make them pay for the cost of climate damages that the companies long knew their businesses would create and intensify, including rising sea levels, coastal erosion, flooding, supercharged storms, and other extreme weather events.

Public Nuisance,
Private Nuisance,
Failure to Warn,
Trespass

Complaint filed in Hawai'i state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Haw.), which remanded the case to state court. Ninth Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, parties awaiting decision from the Hawai'i Intermediate Court of Appeals on Chevron's anti-SLAPP motion. The Hawai'i Supreme Court affirmed the trial court's denial of defendants' motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim and lack of personal jurisdiction. Defendants filed a cert petition to the Supreme Court, which requested the Solicitor General's views on the issue of federal preemption.

State of Rhode Island

Rhode Island v. Chevron et al.

Case Filed: 07/02/2018

Rhode Island is suing 20 oil and gas companies to hold them accountable and make them pay for climate damages they knew their products would cause, including increased flooding and sea level rise along the state's 400 mile shoreline.

Public Nuisance,
Failure to Warn,
Trespass, Design
Defect, State
Environmental Rights
Act, Impairment
of Public Trust
Resources

Complaint filed in Rhode Island state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.R.I.), which remanded the case to state court. First Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, defendants filed motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction. Case is in pre-trial discovery on the jurisdictional issue.

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>Oakland and San Francisco (City and County), California</p> <p>Oakland et al. v. BP et al.</p> <p>Case Filed: 09/19/2017</p>	<p>Oakland is suing five of the world's biggest climate polluters to hold the companies accountable for the costs to protect residents and infrastructure from sea level rise and other climate damages they knew their fossil fuel products would cause.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance</p>	<p>Complaints filed in California state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (N.D.Cal), which denied plaintiffs' motion to remand to state court. Per Ninth Circuit decision reversing lower court's decision, district court granted plaintiffs' renewed motion to remand. Ninth Circuit affirmed remand. Cases are proceeding in state court in coordination with other cases filed in California. Defendants have filed motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and violations of California's Anti-SLAPP statute.</p>
<p>San Mateo, Santa Cruz, and Marin counties; Cities of Richmond, Imperial Beach, and Santa Cruz, California</p> <p>San Mateo et al. v. Chevron et al.</p> <p>Case Filed: 07/17/2017</p>	<p>San Mateo County is suing 32 fossil fuel companies to hold them accountable for climate deception and make them pay for damages they knowingly caused, including increased flooding, sea level rise, and coastal erosion.</p>	<p>Negligence, Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Trespass, Design Defect</p>	<p>Complaints filed in California state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (N.D.Cal), which denied plaintiffs' motion to remand to state court. Per Ninth Circuit decision reversing lower court's decision, district court granted plaintiffs' renewed motion to remand. Ninth Circuit affirmed remand. Cases are proceeding in state court in coordination with other cases filed in California. Defendants have filed motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and violations of California's Anti-SLAPP statute.</p>

Climate Fraud & Damages Cases

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>Commonwealth of Puerto Rico</p> <p>Puerto Rico v. Exxon Mobil et al.</p> <p>Case Filed: 07/15/2024</p>	<p>The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is suing major oil and gas companies – including BP, Chevron, ConocoPhillips, ExxonMobil, Shell, and Total – to hold them accountable for deceiving the public about their products’ role in the climate crisis and to make them pay for associated damages.</p>	<p>Negligence, Public Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Consumer Protection</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Puerto Rico state court.</p>
<p>City of Chicago</p> <p>City of Chicago v. BP et al.</p> <p>Case Filed: 02/20/2024</p>	<p>The City of Chicago, the third largest city in the United States, is suing major fossil fuel entities to recover damages caused by oil companies lying to the public for decades about their fossil fuel products’ central role in the climate crisis.</p>	<p>Negligence, Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Civil Conspiracy, Failure to Warn, Unjust Enrichment, Consumer Fraud, Consumer Protection</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Illinois state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (N.D. Ill.). Parties are litigating motion to remand to state court.</p>
<p>State of California</p> <p>The People of the State of California v. Exxon Mobil et al.</p> <p>Case Filed: 09/15/2023</p>	<p>California is suing major fossil fuel entities to make them pay for lying to the public for decades about their fossil fuel products’ central role in the climate crisis. The lawsuit seeks to create an abatement fund for climate adaptation projects across the state and was amended in 2024 to add a disgorgement remedy for profits the companies illegally earned while lying to consumers.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Pollution, Impairment, and Destruction of Natural Resources, Misleading Advertising and Environmental Marketing, Unfair Competition</p>	<p>Complaint filed in California state court. Case is proceeding in state court in coordination with other cases filed in California. Defendants have filed motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and violations of California’s Anti-SLAPP statute.</p>

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>Multnomah County, Oregon Multnomah v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 06/22/2023</p>	<p>Multnomah County is suing major oil and gas companies and their enablers, including the American Petroleum Institute, Western States Petroleum Association, and McKinsey & Company, to hold them accountable for decades of climate deception and pollution that fueled the deadly 2021 Pacific Northwest heat dome, which killed 69 county residents, placed enormous strain on municipal resources, and scientists said “was virtually impossible without human-caused climate change.” The lawsuit charges the companies with defrauding the public for decades about the harm caused by the burning of fossil fuels. The county is seeking more than \$51.5 billion in damages to recover from and prepare for past and future climate damages.</p>	<p>Negligence, Public Nuisance, Trespass, Fraud, and Deceit</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Oregon state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D. Or.), which remanded the case to state court.</p>
<p>State of New Jersey Platkin v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 10/18/2022</p>	<p>New Jersey is suing major oil and gas companies and the American Petroleum Institute to hold them accountable for the damages that their climate deception is causing to communities across the state. The lawsuit seeks to recover a range of costs for damages to natural resources, critical infrastructure, and more. It’s also asking the court to order the Big Oil defendants to stop their deceptive practices and disgorge all profits made through their illegal behavior.</p>	<p>Negligence, Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Consumer Protection, Trespass, Impairment of Public Trust Resources</p>	<p>Complaint filed in New Jersey state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.N.J.), which remanded the case to state court. Parties awaiting decision on defendants’ motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim, lack of personal jurisdiction, and violations of anti-SLAPP statutes.</p>
<p>Anne Arundel County, Maryland Anne Arundel County v. BP et al. Case Filed: 04/26/2021</p>	<p>Anne Arundel County is suing major oil and gas companies and the American Petroleum Institute to hold them accountable for lying to the public about their products’ role in climate change and to recover costs associated with sea level rise, flooding, and other local climate damages that the companies knew their products would cause.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Consumer Protection, Trespass, Conspiracy</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Maryland state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Md.), which remanded the case to state court. Fourth Circuit affirmed remand. In state court, trial court denied bulk of defendants’ motions to dismiss. Plaintiff amended complaint to add a claim for conspiracy and will litigate renewed motions to dismiss.</p>

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>Annapolis, Maryland Annapolis v. BP et al. Case Filed: 02/22/2021</p>	<p>The City of Annapolis is suing major oil and gas companies and the American Petroleum Institute to hold them accountable for lying to the public about their products' role in climate change and to recover costs associated with sea level rise, flooding, and other local climate damages that the companies knew their products would cause.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Consumer Protection, Trespass, Conspiracy</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Maryland state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Md.), which remanded the case to state court. Fourth Circuit affirmed remand. In state court, trial court denied bulk of defendants' motions to dismiss. Plaintiff amended complaint to add a claim for conspiracy and will litigate renewed motions to dismiss.</p>
<p>State of Delaware Delaware v. BP et al. Case Filed: 09/10/2020</p>	<p>Delaware is suing 31 fossil fuel companies to hold them accountable for defrauding the public about the climate harms they knew their products would cause. As the nation's lowest-lying state, Delaware's residents and infrastructure face enormous threats from sea level rise, coastal flooding, and other extreme weather events intensified by fossil fuel pollution.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Consumer Protection, Trespass</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Delaware state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Del), which remanded the case to state court. Third Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, trial court denied defendants' motions to dismiss.</p>
<p>Charleston, South Carolina Charleston v. Brabham et al. Case Filed: 09/09/2020</p>	<p>The City of Charleston, South Carolina, is suing 24 fossil fuel companies to hold them accountable and make them pay for lying about climate damages they knew their products would cause.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Consumer Protection, Trespass</p>	<p>Complaint filed in South Carolina state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.S.C.), which remanded the case to state court. Defendants appealed district court's remand decision to the Fourth Circuit. In state court, defendants filed motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim, lack of personal jurisdiction, and violations of anti-SLAPP.</p>

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>Baltimore, Maryland Baltimore v. BP et al. Case Filed: 07/20/2018</p>	<p>The City of Baltimore is suing 26 oil and gas companies to hold them accountable and make them pay for lying about climate damages they knew their products would cause.</p>	<p>Negligence, Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Failure to Warn, Consumer Protection, Trespass, Design Defect</p>	<p>Complaint filed in Maryland state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Md.), which remanded the case to state court. Fourth Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, trial court granted defendants' motions to dismiss. Plaintiff has expressed intent to appeal.</p>
<p>Boulder (City and County), Colorado Boulder County et al. v. Suncor and Exxon Mobil Case Filed: 04/17/2018</p>	<p>The City and County of Boulder is suing ExxonMobil and Suncor Energy to hold the companies accountable for their decades of deception about their products' role in climate change and to make them pay for the climate damages caused by producing, selling, and promoting fossil fuels at a level they knew would lead to catastrophic harms.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Civil Conspiracy, Unjust Enrichment, Consumer Protection, Trespass</p>	<p>Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Colo.), which remanded the case to state court. Tenth Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, trial court denied defendants' motions to dismiss. Defendants appealed the decision to the Colorado Supreme Court.</p>
<p>San Miguel (County), Colorado San Miguel County v. Suncor and Exxon Mobil Case Filed: 04/17/2018</p>	<p>San Miguel County is suing ExxonMobil and Suncor Energy to hold the companies accountable for their decades of deception about the role of their products in causing climate change and make them pay for the climate damages caused by producing, selling, and promoting fossil fuels.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Civil Conspiracy, Unjust Enrichment, Consumer Protection, Trespass</p>	<p>Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.Colo.), which remanded the case to state court. Tenth Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, parties awaiting decision on defendants' motions to dismiss.</p>

Racketeering Cases

CASE	SUMMARY	LEGAL CLAIMS	PROCEDURAL STATUS
<p>San Juan, Puerto Rico Municipality of San Juan Puerto Rico v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 12/14/2023</p>	<p>San Juan is suing major fossil fuel companies and entities under a variety of claims, including the federal Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act. The lawsuit argues that the companies' coordinated climate deception fueled the 2017 hurricane season that claimed thousands of lives and caused billions of dollars in damage to the U.S. territory. The municipality seeks to hold the companies accountable and recover for the damage suffered.</p>	<p>Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Civil Conspiracy, Failure to Warn, Unjust Enrichment, Consumer Protection, Racketeering, Antitrust, Design Defect, Fraud</p>	<p>Complaint filed in federal court (D.P.R). Defendants filed motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim.</p>
<p>Municipalities of Puerto Rico Municipalities of Puerto Rico v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 11/22/2022</p>	<p>Thirty-seven Puerto Rico municipalities are waging the first-ever class-action lawsuit to charge major fossil fuel entities with violating the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations (RICO) Act. The lawsuit points specifically to the role that the companies' coordinated climate deception played in the 2017 hurricane season that claimed thousands of lives and caused billions of dollars in damage to the U.S. territory.</p>	<p>Private Nuisance, Civil Conspiracy, Failure to Warn, Unjust Enrichment, Consumer Protection, Racketeering, Antitrust, Design Defect, Fraud</p>	<p>Complaint filed in federal court (D.P.R). Defendants filed motions to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction and failure to state a claim.</p>
<p>Hoboken, New Jersey Hoboken v. Exxon Mobil et al. Case Filed: 09/02/2020</p>	<p>Hoboken is suing major fossil fuel entities to hold them accountable for climate fraud and damages. The mile-wide city along the Hudson River argues that the companies' lies about the dangers associated with their products violate the state's laws, including New Jersey's state racketeering law.</p>	<p>Negligence, Public Nuisance, Private Nuisance, Consumer Protection, Trespass, Racketeering</p>	<p>Complaint filed in New Jersey state court. Defendants removed the case to federal court (D.N.J.), which remanded the case to state court. Third Circuit affirmed remand. Supreme Court denied cert. In state court, trial court denied defendants' motion to dismiss, which alleged that the case was duplicative of the case brought by the State of New Jersey. Defendants filed motions to dismiss for failure to state a claim, lack of personal jurisdiction, and violations of anti-SLAPP statutes, which have been withdrawn pending motion to consolidate with the state of New Jersey's case.</p>