

CLEARY GOTTlieb STEEN & HAMILTON LLP

AMERICAS  
NEW YORK  
SAN FRANCISCO  
SÃO PAULO  
SILICON VALLEY  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
ASIA  
HONG KONG  
SEOUL

One Liberty Plaza  
New York, NY 10006-1470  
T: +1 212 225 2000  
F: +1 212 225 3999  
clearygottlieb.com

EUROPE & MIDDLE EAST  
ABU DHABI  
BRUSSELS  
COLOGNE  
LONDON  
MILAN  
PARIS  
ROME

June 19, 2026

**VIA ECF**

Hon. Brian M. Cogan  
United States District Court, Eastern District of New York  
225 Cadman Plaza East  
Brooklyn, New York 11201

Re: *Target Corporation v. Keurig Green Mountain, Inc.*, No. 1:26-cv-03119-BMC – Letter re:  
Request for Extension of Time

Dear Judge Cogan:

I write on behalf of Defendant Keurig Green Mountain, Inc. (“Keurig” or “Defendant”) to request that the Court extend the time for Keurig to move, answer, or otherwise respond to the Complaint, and stay all pretrial deadlines in the above-captioned matter. Plaintiff does not oppose this request. Keurig has not previously requested any adjournments or extensions in this case.

This case was filed in this Court on May 22, 2026. Keurig’s deadline to move, answer, or otherwise respond to the Complaint is currently Tuesday, June 23, 2026. On June 9, 2026, the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation conditionally transferred this action to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York for consolidation with a related case, *In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Antitrust Litigation*, MDL No. 2542.<sup>1</sup>

On June 16, 2026, the TreeHouse plaintiffs, existing plaintiffs in MDL No. 2542, filed a Notice of Opposition to Conditional Transfer (“Notice of Opposition”).<sup>2</sup> The Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation has entered a briefing schedule following that Notice of Opposition that will conclude on July 29, 2026, after which the Panel may hold a hearing.<sup>3</sup> The decision whether to transfer this action will therefore be resolved after Keurig’s deadline to answer the Complaint. Keurig believes it would be more efficient for both the parties and the courts to know which court will oversee this case before making additional filings and setting a pretrial schedule.

---

<sup>1</sup> *In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Antitrust Litigation*, 1:14-md-2542, ECF No. 120.

<sup>2</sup> *Id.* ECF No. 122.

<sup>3</sup> *Id.* ECF No. 123.

Hon. Brian M. Cogan

June 19, 2026

Page 2

In light of the foregoing, Keurig requests that this Court:

- (a) Extend the deadline for Defendant to move, answer, or otherwise respond to the Complaint in the above-captioned matter until 14 days after the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation resolves the Opposition to Conditional Transfer.
- (b) Continue all other pre-trial deadlines, including the time period in which to conduct the parties' conference under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f), until the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation resolves the Opposition to Conditional Transfer.

Keurig submits this request without prejudice to, or waiver of, any defenses that it may have to this action or any motions that Keurig may file in this action or MDL No. 2542.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Rahul Mukhi  
Rahul Mukhi