



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE



## Ag Groups File Brief Supporting Supreme Court Hearing Glyphosate Case

**Washington, DC. May 9, 2025.** Groups representing farmers across the United States have filed a [brief](#) encouraging the U.S. Supreme Court to hear a case on labeling for glyphosate and other pesticides. The groups, which represent a broad swath of agriculture and cover more than 300 million acres, argue glyphosate is a “once-in-a-century” herbicide given its effectiveness at controlling an array of damaging weeds, affordability and low toxicity. However, uncertainty created by inaccurate interpretations of pesticide labeling requirements has risked farmer access to glyphosate and other indispensable tools.

The question at the center of the case, *Durnell v. Monsanto*, is whether manufacturers of glyphosate or other pesticides are liable under state law for “failure to warn” of alleged cancer or other health risks when federal regulators have thoroughly evaluated the safety of the products and determined their uses are safe. Such state requirements exist despite regulators at EPA and those of the European Union, Canada, Japan, Australia, Korea, and elsewhere repeatedly finding glyphosate does not pose cancer risks. In the brief, the groups argue the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act has long prevented states from imposing labeling requirements different from EPA findings. Additionally, to require a cancer risk warning label despite such strong evidence to the contrary would be “false or misleading,” which is also prohibited by FIFRA.

American Farm Bureau Federation, American Soybean Association, American Sugarbeet Growers Association, International Fresh Produce Association, National Association of Wheat Growers, National Corn Growers Association, National Cotton Council, National Sorghum Producers, North American Blueberry Council, Western Growers and others are among the groups on the brief.

They discuss the continued risks of misinterpreting FIFRA. Among them, pesticide users will lack clear, accurate labels, which could result in accidental misuse of pesticides and potential harm to the public and the environment. Further, with manufacturers placed in the no-win situation of either disregarding state labeling requirements or making false and misleading statements in violation of FIFRA, these companies may exit the market and leave farmers without much-needed tools. U.S. agriculture would then be vulnerable to weeds and other devastating pests, in turn harming the ability of farmers to sustainably feed, clothe, and fuel our country and the world.

The Supreme Court will review the petition to hear the case, as well as briefs from other interested parties that include farmers. It will then decide whether to hear the case in the weeks ahead.

###

*The American Soybean Association (ASA) represents U.S. soybean farmers on domestic and international policy issues important to the soybean industry. ASA has 26 affiliated state associations representing 30 soybean-producing states and nearly 500,000 soybean farmers. More information at [soygrowers.com](http://soygrowers.com).*

**For more information contact:**

Wendy Brannen, [wbrannen@soy.org](mailto:wbrannen@soy.org)

Access this release online at [SoyGrowers.com](http://SoyGrowers.com).

If you no longer want to receive News Releases from the American Soybean Association, [opt out here](#).

[Unsubscribe](#) from all ASA email.