

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. LA CV 20-11444-DOC-MAR

Date: June 9, 2022

Title: R. BRIAN TERENCE v. GOODRX HOLDINGS, INC. ET AL.

PRESENT:

THE HONORABLE DAVID O. CARTER, JUDGE

Karlen Dubon
Courtroom
Clerk

Not Present
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR
PLAINTIFF:
None Present

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR
DEFENDANT:
None Present

**PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS): ORDER GRANTING COUNTER-
DEFENDANT’S MOTION TO
DISMISS [105]**

Before the Court is Defendants GoodRx Holdings, Inc. (“GoodRx”), Douglas Hirsch, Trevor Bezdek, Karsten Voermann, Christopher Adams, Julie Bradley, Dipanjan Deb, Adam Karol, Jacqueline Kosecoff, Stephen LeSieur, Gregory Mondre, and Agnes Rey-Giraud’s (collectively the “Individual Defendants,” and with GoodRx “GoodRx Defendants”) Motion to Dismiss (“Motion” or “Mot.”) (Dkt. 105). The Court finds this matter appropriate for resolution without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; C.D. Cal. R. 7-15. Having reviewed the moving papers submitted by the parties, the Court **GRANTS** the Motion and **VACATES** the hearing scheduled for June 10, 2022.

I. Background

A. Facts

This case is a federal securities class action brought on behalf of purchasers of GoodRx Class A common stock between September 23, 2020 and May 10, 2021. *See*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. LA CV 20-11444-DOC-MAR

Date: June 9, 2022

Page 2

generally First Consolidated Amended Complaint (“FAC”) (Dkt. 100). GoodRx is a healthcare technology platform that provides consumers with price information and discounts on prescription drugs. *Id.* ¶ 2. The company generates money primarily from fees it receives from Pharmacy Benefit Managers who negotiate drug discounts. *Id.* ¶ 3. GoodRx launched an initial public offering (“IPO”) on August 28, 2020. *Id.* ¶ 4. The IPO launched well above its per share offering price, raising \$1 billion in gross proceeds. *Id.*

In connection with the IPO, GoodRx filed a Registration Statement and Prospectus with the Securities and Exchange Commission (“SEC”), which included representations that the company was a “market leader,” was the only “significant direct-to-consumer channel” for many Pharmacy Benefit Managers, and had contract provisions in place to prevent Pharmacy Benefit Managers from “circumventing our platform [or] redirecting volumes outside of our platform.” *Id.* ¶ 5.

However, soon after the IPO, Amazon.com, Inc. (“Amazon”) launched a competitor prescription drug discount program, PrimeRx. *Id.* ¶ 9. Amazon’s program involved partnering with a company named Inside Rx, of which GoodRx was a founding partner. *Id.* ¶¶ 7, 43. Plaintiffs allege that as a result, Defendants knew about the upcoming launch of Amazon’s competitor service at the time of the IPO, but did not disclose that information to investors. *Id.* ¶ 55. GoodRx’s stock price dropped dramatically after PrimeRx’s launch. *Id.* ¶ 9.

Defendants subsequently made representations in investor conference calls that Plaintiffs allege were materially misleading, particularly in that they failed to disclose that Amazon was planning to introduce a drug price comparison tool identical to GoodRx’s. *Id.* ¶ 64. When that tool launched in May 2021, GoodRx’s stock dropped to below its initial IPO price. *Id.*

Plaintiffs bring suit against GoodRx, its directors, and the underwriters of GoodRx’s IPO for failing to disclose the material risk of competition from Amazon at the time of the IPO and for making materially false statements in the Registration Statement and in subsequent investor communications, therefore artificially inflating the price of GoodRx stock. *See generally id.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. LA CV 20-11444-DOC-MAR

Date: June 9, 2022

Page 3

B. Procedural History

On May 6, 2021, Plaintiff Terenzini filed his complaint in this Court on behalf of a class (Dkt. 1). After consolidating cases, the Court appointed the Lead Plaintiffs to lead the class (Dkt. 65). Plaintiffs filed their Consolidated Complaint on June 7, 2021.

The GoodRx Defendants filed a Motion to Dismiss on August 6, 2021. Defendants Morgan Stanley & Co. LLC, Goldman Sachs & Co. LLC, J.P. Morgan Securities LLC, Barclays Capital Inc., BofA Securities Inc., Citigroup Global Markets Inc., Credit Suisse Securities (USA) LLC, RBC Capital Markets, LLC, UBS Securities LLC, Cowen and Company, LLC, Deutsche Bank Securities Inc., Evercore Group L.L.C., Citizens Capital Markets, Inc., KKR Capital Markets LLC, LionTree Advisors LLC, Raymond James & Associates, Inc., SVB Leerink LLC, Academy Securities, Inc., Loop Capital Markets LLC, R. Sealaus & Co., LLC and Samuel A. Ramirez & Company, Inc. (collectively the “Underwriters”) joined the GoodRx Defendants’ Motion (Dkt. 89). On January 6, 2022, the Court granted the Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss with leave to amend (Dkt. 98).

On February 7, 2022, Plaintiffs filed their FAC. The GoodRx Defendants filed a second Motion to Dismiss on March 10, 2022. The Underwriters joined the Motion on March 10, 2022 (Dkt. 108). Plaintiffs opposed the Motion (“Opp’n”) (Dkt. 110) on April 14, 2022, and the GoodRx Defendants filed their Reply (Dkt. 111), joined by the Underwriters (Dkt. 112), on May 4, 2022.

II. Legal Standard

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), a complaint must be dismissed when a plaintiff’s allegations fail to set forth a set of facts that, if true, would entitle the complainant to relief. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 679 (2009); *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (holding that a claim must be facially plausible in order to survive a motion to dismiss). The pleadings must raise the right to relief beyond the speculative level; a plaintiff must provide “more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555 (citing *Papasan v. Allain*, 478 U.S. 265, 286 (1986)). On a motion to dismiss, a court accepts as true a plaintiff’s well-pleaded factual allegations and construes all factual inferences in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *See Manzarek v. St. Paul Fire &*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. LA CV 20-11444-DOC-MAR

Date: June 9, 2022

Page 4

Marine Ins. Co., 519 F.3d 1025, 1031 (9th Cir. 2008). A court is not required to accept as true legal conclusions couched as factual allegations. *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678.

In evaluating a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, review is ordinarily limited to the contents of the complaint and material properly submitted with the complaint. *Van Buskirk v. Cable News Network, Inc.*, 284 F.3d 977, 980 (9th Cir. 2002); *Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard Feiner & Co., Inc.*, 896 F.2d 1542, 1555, n.19 (9th Cir. 1990). Under the incorporation by reference doctrine, the court may also consider documents “whose contents are alleged in a complaint and whose authenticity no party questions, but which are not physically attached to the pleading.” *Branch v. Tunnell*, 14 F.3d 449, 454 (9th Cir. 1994), *overruled on other grounds by Galbraith v. Cty. of Santa Clara*, 307 F.3d 1119, 1121 (9th Cir. 2002). The court may treat such a document as “part of the complaint, and thus may assume that its contents are true for purposes of a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6).” *United States v. Ritchie*, 342 F.3d 903, 908 (9th Cir. 2003).

When a motion to dismiss is granted, the court must decide whether to grant leave to amend. The Ninth Circuit has a liberal policy favoring amendments, and thus leave to amend should be freely granted. *See, e.g., DeSoto v. Yellow Freight Sys., Inc.*, 957 F.2d 655, 658 (9th Cir. 1992). However, a court need not grant leave to amend when permitting a plaintiff to amend would be an exercise in futility. *See, e.g., Rutman Wine Co. v. E. & J. Gallo Winery*, 829 F.2d 729, 738 (9th Cir. 1987) (“Denial of leave to amend is not an abuse of discretion where the pleadings before the court demonstrate that further amendment would be futile.”).

III. Discussion

As in the first Motion to Dismiss, the GoodRx Defendants, joined by the Underwriters, argue that Plaintiffs’ Securities Act claim should be dismissed for lack of damages; that Plaintiffs have not sufficiently pled facts establishing the falsity of the challenged statements; and that Plaintiffs have not sufficiently pled facts evidencing scienter. The Court considers each argument in turn.

A. False or misleading claims

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. LA CV 20-11444-DOC-MAR

Date: June 9, 2022

Page 5

To state a claim under Section 10(b) of the Exchange Act, a plaintiff must allege facts showing (1) a material misrepresentation, (2) scienter, (3) a connection with the purchase or sale of security, (4) reliance, (5) economic loss, and (6) loss causation. *Dura Pharms., Ins. v. Broudo*, 544 U.S. 336, 341 (2005). Under the heightened pleading standards of the Private Securities Litigation Reform Act (“PSLRA”), a securities fraud complaint must identify each alleged misrepresentation, specify the reasons it is misleading, and state with particularity facts giving rise to a strong inference that the defendant who made the misrepresentation acted with fraudulent intent. *Tellabs Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights Ltd.*, 551 U.S. 308, 321 (2007).

Plaintiffs’ initial complaint alleged that GoodRx and Underwriters violated Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (“Exchange Act”) by failing to disclose information about the possibility of Amazon launching a competitor service in both registration materials and their statements after the launch of their IPO, resulting in an artificially inflated IPO. *See generally* FAC. The Court previously dismissed the case with leave to amend, ruling that the claims were not sufficiently pled because of the lack of facts establishing that GoodRx and the Underwriters were aware of Amazon’s plans to launch Amazon Pharmacy when GoodRx announced its IPO. *See generally* Order Granting Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (“Order”) (Dkt. 98).

i. Pre- and post-IPO statements

Plaintiffs’ FAC makes the same allegations, again asserting that GoodRx failed to disclose the material risk of Amazon entering the market as a competitor at the time of the IPO, and continued to misrepresent that risk to investors, thus artificially inflating the price of GoodRx stock. *See generally* FAC. Defendant GoodRx, joined by Underwriters, argues that Plaintiffs’ Amended Complaint fails to provide additional facts, meaning the complaint remains insufficiently pled, and the Court should again dismiss. Mot. at 9.

In Plaintiffs’ first complaint, Plaintiffs challenged various statements made by GoodRx before and after their IPO launch about GoodRx’s market leadership and lack of competition, consumer demand for their services, and their unique business partnerships with PBMs. FAC ¶¶ 59-61. They argued that these statements were materially false and misleading given Amazon’s plans to launch Amazon Pharmacy, a business in the same industry. FAC ¶ 118. The Court previously ruled that Plaintiffs failed to allege facts

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.