PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT

VOLUME 8	NUMBER 12	December 2022
Editor's Note: Development Victoria Prussen Spears	ts	393
DOJ Aggressively Pursues Callan G. Stein, Michael S. Frederick J. King	COVID-19 Related Fraud Lowe, Dominyka Plukaite and	396
OFCCP Clarifies Position in Favor of Attorney-Client Privilege in Revised Pay Equity Directive Leann M. Walsh, Craig E. Leen and Kira M. Geary		402
Can the Government Asser Contracts Awarded Based Amanda J. Sherwood and So		Audit Delay and 406
U.S. Government Issues Software Security Procurement Guidance Steven G. Stransky, Francis E. Purcell, Jr., and Mona Adabi		410
	r Heat Nor Gloom of Night Will S g Its Contractor's Trade Secrets?	top the U.S. 414
False Claims Act Damages: D.C. Circuit Says Government Cannot Keep Going Back to the Well Megan Mocho		t Keep Going 417
In the Courts		419



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please call: Email: heidi.a.litman@lexisnexis.com Outside the United States and Canada, please call (973) 820-2000 For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call: (800) 833-9844 Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385 Customer Service Website http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/ For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call (800) 223-1940 Outside the United States and Canada, please call (937) 247-0293

Library of Congress Card Number:

ISBN: 978-1-6328-2705-0 (print)

ISSN: 2688-7290

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt).

Michelle E. Litteken, GAO Holds NASA Exceeded Its Discretion in Protest of FSS Task Order, 1 PRATT'S GOVERNMENT CONTRACTING LAW REPORT 30 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

Because the section you are citing may be revised in a later release, you may wish to photocopy or print out the section for convenient future reference.

This publication is designed to provide authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of RELX Inc. Matthew Bender, the Matthew Bender Flame Design, and A.S. Pratt are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. Originally published in: 2015

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis or Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

Editorial Office 230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW & BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

MARY BETH BOSCO
Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

PABLO J. DAVIS

Of Counsel, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

MERLE M. DELANCEY JR.

Partner, Blank Rome LLP

J. ANDREW HOWARD

Partner, Alston & Bird LLP

KYLE R. JEFCOAT

Counsel, Latham & Watkins LLP

JOHN E. JENSEN

Partner, Pillsbury Winthrop Shaw Pittman LLP

DISMAS LOCARIA

Partner, Venable LLP

MARCIA G. MADSEN

Partner, Mayer Brown LLP

KEVIN P. MULLEN

Partner, Morrison & Foerster LLP

VINCENT J. NAPOLEON

Partner, Nixon Peabody LLP

STUART W. TURNER

Counsel, Arnold & Porter

ERIC WHYTSELL

Partner, Stinson Leonard Street LLP

WALTER A.I. WILSON

Partner Of Counsel, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP

Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report is published 12 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Copyright © 2022 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of LexisNexis. All Rights Reserved. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 9443 Springboro Pike, Miamisburg, OH 45342 or call Customer Support at 1-800-833-9844. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Government Contracting Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 230 Park Ave. 7th Floor, New York NY 10169.

Neither Snow Nor Rain Nor Heat Nor Gloom of Night . . . Will Stop the U.S. Postal Service from Stealing Its Contractor's Trade Secrets?

By Erik W. Weibust*

The U.S. Postal Service ("USPS") allegedly stole Express One's trade secrets to create its own competing e-commerce business and cut Express One out. The author of this article discusses Express One's complaint and notes that if Express One can prove wrongdoing, it could end up costing the USPS more than \$500 million in damages, plus injunctive relief.

It is no secret that the U.S. Postal Service ("USPS") has been struggling financially for well over a decade.¹ One means of combatting its struggles has been to contract with third-party resellers to market USPS services and drive customers to it. Indeed, just one of those resellers, Express One, delivered over \$3 billion in revenue to the USPS in the past 12 months alone. Although the annual operating budget of the USPS is \$77 billion, \$3 billion is still real money—especially since the USPS suffered losses of \$6.9 billion last year.²

The USPS apparently does not ascribe to the idiom "don't bite the hand that feeds you," as it allegedly stole Express One's trade secrets to create its own competing e-commerce business and cut Express One out. That could end up costing the USPS more than \$500 million in damages, plus injunctive relief, if Express One can prove wrongdoing.

THE COMPLAINT

According to a 42-page complaint³ it filed in the U.S. District Court in Utah, Express One was the first reseller to contract with the USPS in 2009, and "[o]ver the last 13 years, Express One has invested a massive amount of time, effort and resources establishing relationships with its platform partners and building its reseller business, to the exclusion of other business opportunities."

^{*} Erik W. Weibust is a member of Epstein Becker & Green, P.C., representing clients in trade secret, non-compete, and commercial litigation. He may be contacted at eweibust@ebglaw.com.

https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-21-479sp.pdf.

² https://about.usps.com/newsroom/national-releases/2021/1110-usps-reports-fiscal-year-2021-results.htm.

³ https://www.law360.com/articles/1533706/attachments/0.

In 2019, however, Express One alleges that the USPS decided to steal its trade secrets and use them to set up a competing e-commerce platform:

[T]he USPS devised a plan by which it would convince Express One to share its confidential customer, pricing and business information with the USPS so that the USPS could develop its own competing platform. The ultimate goal was to implement a competing USPS platform, terminate the reseller program, including Express One's reseller contract, and take control of Express One's business and profit margin. In order to execute that plan, the USPS made numerous promises and misrepresentations to Express One to induce Express One to trust the USPS, continue investing in and building its reseller network, agree to a new contract, and share its confidential customer, pricing and business information with the USPS.

In May 2022, the USPS announced the launch of a new e-commerce platform called "USPS Connect eCommerce" and promptly terminated its relationship with Express One. According to Express One, the USPS's conduct, "if allowed to stand, will not only cost Express One hundreds of millions of dollars in damages, but will force the company out of business altogether."

Express One asserts claims for breach of contract, fraudulent inducement, and trade secret misappropriation under the Defend Trade Secrets Act and the Utah Uniform Trade Secrets Act, among other things. Interestingly, it also asserts a claim for "Misappropriation of Trade Secrets—Constitutional Takings," which, of course, could only be brought against the government and implicates the takings clause of the Fifth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution⁵ ("nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation").

Express One is seeking damages in excess of \$500 million, as well as declaratory and/or injunctive relief prohibiting the USPS from terminating its contract with Express One and misappropriating its confidential and proprietary business information.

In another interesting twist, Express One also seeks a declaration and/or injunction prohibiting the USPS from engaging in unfair competition in violation of the federal Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 20066 ("PAEA"). The PAEA only applies to the USPS, and the claim adds another noteworthy aspect to the dispute. Among other things, the PAEA prohibits the USPS from:

⁴ https://www.usps.com/business/connect-ecommerce.htm.

⁵ https://constitution.congress.gov/constitution/amendment-5/.

⁶ https://www.congress.gov/109/plaws/publ435/PLAW-109publ435.pdf.

- (1) establish[ing] any rule or regulation (including any standard) the effect of which is to preclude competition or establish the terms of competition unless the Postal Service demonstrates that the regulation does not create an unfair competitive advantage for itself or any entity funded (in whole or in part) by the Postal Service;
- (2) compel[ling] the disclosure, transfer, or licensing of intellectual property to any third party (such as patents, copyrights, trademarks, trade secrets, and proprietary information); or
- (3) obtain[ing] information from a person that provides (or seeks to provide) any product, and then offer[ing] any postal service that uses or is based in whole or in part on such information, without the consent of the person providing that information, unless substantially the same information is obtained (or obtainable) from an independent source or is otherwise obtained (or obtainable).

STAY TUNED

This lawsuit is sure to deliver some fascinating takeaways as it progresses, in particular because the alleged wrongdoer is a federal agency and the plaintiff asserts claims under the Fifth Amendment and the PAEA.