

From: David Worthington [REDACTED]
Sent time: 10/17/2025 11:03:51 AM
To: Roger Worthington [REDACTED] >; Bruce McCandless <[REDACTED]>; Randy Torcom <[REDACTED]>; George Stapish [REDACTED] >; Jim Solberg [REDACTED] >; Kevin Prieto <[REDACTED]>; Floyd Landis [REDACTED] >; Max Worthington <[REDACTED]>; Worthington <[REDACTED]>; Vivian [REDACTED] >; Melinda Taylor <[REDACTED]>; Ben Gordon Colw [REDACTED] >; Lisa Sanco <[REDACTED]>; Andy Fecteau <[REDACTED]>; Juniel Worthington <[REDACTED]>; Pete Korstad <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: the article

Another lame attempt to Silence Science.

Would be interesting to inquire in cross-exam, about defendants' billion-dollar funding of psuedo-science and dirty politicians (aka Freedom Fighters).

dw

On Friday, October 17, 2025 at 10:40:39 AM PDT, Bruce McCandless <[REDACTED]> wrote:

I don't think they're going to get very far with this one. The county's response is right on.

B

On Fri, Oct 17, 2025 at 12:29 PM Roger Worthington [REDACTED] > wrote:
Article about Multco's response to Chevron's Motion to strike/smear. Hearing on the 30th.

A nauseating microcosm of Big Oil's multi-headed disinformation campaign.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lesley Clark <[REDACTED]>
Subject: the article
Date: October 17, 2025 at 10:07:20 AM PDT
To: Roger Worthington <[REDACTED]>

Chevron falsely attacked lawyer in \$51B climate case, Oregon county says
Multnomah County attorneys defended their lead counsel after Chevron accused him of hiding his role in climate research papers.



By: Lesley Clark |
10/16/2025 06:13 AM EDT



A scientific paper about a 2020 Oregon wildfire is at the center of a courtroom dispute

in a climate lawsuit brought by Multnomah County. John Locher/AP
CLIMATEWIRE | An Oregon county that's suing the oil and gas industry for \$51 billion over climate-related damages accused Chevron of making "false and unsubstantiated" claims in its effort to strike two scientific studies about rising temperatures from the court record.

The [assertion by lawyers representing Multnomah County](#) came after Chevron asked the Oregon Circuit Court last month to disregard the studies and review whether the research was "supported or otherwise influenced" by the lead attorney for the county's 2023 lawsuit.

The oil company's accusation that Roger Worthington, the county's lawyer, initiated fraud on the court has "no basis in law or in fact," the county told the court in a brief filed last week.

It argues that Chevron's "headline-grabbing accusations" came "at the very moment in time Defendants seek to have legislation enacted granting them immunity from this type of lawsuit."

Chevron asserted last month that Worthington had failed to tell the court about his involvement with two papers in the court record that were published in April and May in the scientific journal *Nature*.

The motion came as the oil and gas industry and its allies, including the Trump administration, step up their efforts to kill nearly two dozen lawsuits filed by cities, counties and states that seek financial compensation from polluters for the rising cost of climate change.

Multnomah County's lawsuit accuses Chevron and hundreds of other defendants of contributing to a deadly 2021 heat wave and deceiving the public about the dangers of burning fossil fuels.

The dustup over the studies began after the [companies filed a motion in July to strike](#) Multnomah's lawsuit under an Oregon statute that allows defendants to seek a quick dismissal of frivolous lawsuits that seek large penalties. The companies argued that the case threatens to violate their right to free speech.

The county said it responded with ["hundreds of pages" of documents](#) to bolster its claims that the companies used deceptive advertising. Chevron then accused Worthington of having "committed fraud on the court" by failing to highlight his alleged role in crafting the two studies, which were submitted to the court as supporting documents for the county.

Yet, Chevron offered "not one shred of evidence to back up this spurious

allegation," the county said.

Chevron noted that early drafts of an April *Nature* article that looked at oil companies "and the scientific case for climate liability" were posted on the website of Worthington's law firm, Worthington & Caron. One bore a watermark stating: "DRAFT; PLEASE DO NOT DISTRIBUTE."

But the county says Worthington "played no role" in producing the study. It added that he "did not fund or support the research that led to the paper; nor did he supervise, write, ghostwrite or edit any portion of the paper or provide comments, thoughts or observations."

Chevron also cited a May *Nature* article that examined how "anthropogenic climate change contributes to wildfire particulate matter and related mortality in the United States."

The county acknowledged that Worthington had partially funded the study, and said it was one of several papers cited in court by climate scientist Daniel Swain, who contributed to a report in support of the county.

Swain's paper looked at whether human-caused climate change influenced the likelihood of extreme weather events in northwestern Oregon since 2014, and whether they could be linked to fossil fuel producers, the county said.

The separate *Nature* article related to a 2020 wildfire in Oregon that produced deadly smoke, the county said, adding that Swain testified that the event had likely been intensified by climate change. He was not an author of that paper. Swain included the article, the county said, "to show only one thing the other papers do not: the number of deaths that have been and likely will be caused by worsening wildfire-related pollution."

The county said it is "uncontroverted" that Worthington was a partial funder, noting that his support is disclosed in the paper's acknowledgments. The lawyers also asserted that Chevron failed to provide evidence that the funding influenced the findings of the paper, or that it contains any "false, misleading or inaccurate information."

Lawyer or brewer?

Chevron had previously cited op-eds that Worthington wrote for Oregon newspapers, saying he had failed in one to disclose that he was lead counsel for the climate lawsuit, and instead identified himself as a local brewery owner.

The county argued that he was identified as a business owner, "because, in Deschutes County, he is known as a brewery-restaurant owner, philanthropist and environmentalist, not an attorney."

The county asserted that the guest editorials were not submitted to the court and that Chevron "offered no evidence the court saw or was influenced by the op-eds."

The lawyers also argued that Chevron violated state trial court rules by failing to first make a "good faith effort to confer with the other parties concerning the issues in dispute."

It called Chevron's omission to request such a meeting "odd," noting the county

“made no effort to hide” that Worthington was a partial funder of the *Nature* article on wildfires.

“If Chevron felt the County needed to provide clarification to the Court, the County would have been happy to do so,” the county wrote, noting that Chevron could have pointed out Worthington’s role during oral arguments in the case.

“Instead, Chevron chose to file a motion making headline-grabbing accusations about the conduct of counsel for Plaintiff, allegations unsupported by the law and unsubstantiated by the facts,” the county wrote.

It pointed out that the company’s motion first appeared widely in POLITICO’s E&E News, a “national publication that targets lawmakers and their staff, members of the executive branch, and policy makers in Washington, D.C.,” at the same time the industry and its allies are said to be seeking legislation from Congress giving them immunity from climate change lawsuits.

Chevron’s motion also noted that Worthington’s website featured a pre-publication version of a judicial climate education “module” used by the Environmental Law Institute’s Climate Judiciary Project — a legal education organization that [allies of the oil and gas industry](#) have recently targeted.

Chevron said the appearance of the ELI module raised “significant questions as to whether the law firm is engaged in an effort to prejudice the courts more broadly in its client’s and litigation allies’ favor.”

The county said it did not submit anything from ELI into evidence and said Worthington is not a member of ELI, has not been a speaker at its programs or attended an ELI event.

They called it “even more puzzling” that Chevron filed a motion raising “serious concerns” about ELI’s neutrality when a number of firms involved in defending the companies raise money for the group.

Among the legal firms sponsoring a recent ELI dinner were Perkins Coie, which signed Chevron’s motion, and Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr, counsel for ConocoPhillips, the county said.

The county also argued that if Chevron’s motion is granted, it would “inaugurate a revolutionary change” in lawsuits. Under Chevron’s suggested disclosure, the county wrote, “every party’s counsel must work against their client’s interests and highlight for the court or jury every fact that might aid its opponent.”

The oil companies would be “required to highlight every article cited by their experts that defendants funded, fully or partially, directly or indirectly,” the county wrote, pointing to a 2024 report by Democrats on the House Oversight and Accountability and Senate Budget committees that found oil companies, including Chevron, spent an estimated \$700 million on academic research between 2010 and 2020.

Theodore Boutrous, a lawyer for Chevron, said last month that the county’s attorney had “engaged in activities that harm the integrity of the judicial process and that is why we filed this motion.”

Lesley Clark
Climatewire, E&E News



 C
@lesleyclark

E&E NEWS/POLITICO

1000 Wilson Blvd Rosslyn VA 22209

www.eenews.net | [@EENewsUpdates](#)

Energywire, Climatewire, Greenwire, E&E Daily, E&E News PM