

1 Richard D. McCune (State Bar No. 132124)
rdm@mccunewright.com
2 David C. Wright (State Bar No. 177468)
dcw@mccunewright.com
3 **MCCUNE WRIGHT AREVALO, LLP**
3281 E. Guasti Road, Suite 100
4 Ontario, California 91761
Telephone: (909) 557-1250
5 Facsimile: (909) 557 1275

6 [Additional counsel listed in signature block]

7 *Attorneys for Henk Meyers and Glenn Ginoza*

8

9

10

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11

12

13

14

Henk Meyers and Glenn Ginoza,
Individually and on Behalf of All
Others Similarly Situated,

Case No. 2:21-cv-01767-FMO-MAA

15

Plaintiff,

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO
DISMISS THE COMPLAINT,
TRANSFER VENUE, AND/OR
STRIKE CLASS ALLEGATIONS**

16

vs.

17

18

ALPHABET, INC., GOOGLE, LLC,
GOOGLE PAYMENT CORP., and
GOOGLE ARIZONA LLC,

Date: August 5, 2021

19

Time: 1:00 p.m.

20

Defendants.

Dept: Courtroom 6D, 6th Floor

21

Judge: Hon. Fernando M. Olguin

22

Amended Complaint Filed: May 12, 2021

23

24

25

26

27

28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS 4

LEGAL STANDARDS 6

ARGUMENT..... 6

I. PLAINTIFFS’ CHOICE OF VENUE CONTROLS 6

 A. The Factors Under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) Weigh In Plaintiffs’ Favor..... 6

 B. Plaintiffs Did Not Assent To The Forum Selection Clause At Issue Here ... 8

 C. Alternatively, The Forum Selection Clause Is Unconscionable..... 11

 D. In Any Event, Dismissal Is Not The Proper Remedy Under A Motion To Transfer 11

II. PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS ARE ADEQUATELY PLED..... 12

 A. Plaintiffs’ UCL Claims Are Adequately Pled..... 12

 1. Plaintiffs Have Adequately Pled Claims Under The UCL’s “Unlawful” Prong 12

 2. Plaintiffs Have Adequately Pled Claims Under The UCL’s “Unfair” Prong 15

 3. Plaintiffs Have Adequately Pled Claims Under The UCL’s “Fraudulent” Prong..... 17

 4. Dismissal Under the *Sonner* Doctrine Is Premature at this Juncture 18

 B. Plaintiffs’ Breach of Contract Claims are Adequately Pled 20

 C. Plaintiffs’ Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing Claims Are Adequately Pled..... 22

III. PLAINTIFFS’ CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS SHOULD NOT BE STRICKEN..... 23

IV. ALTERNATIVELY, AMENDMENT SHOULD BE PERMITTED..... 25

CONCLUSION..... 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Am. W. Door & Trim v. Arch Specialty Ins. Co.</i> , 2015 WL 1266787 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2015).....	24
<i>Armendariz v. Foundation Health Psychcare Services, Inc.</i> , 24 Cal.4th 83 (2000)	11
<i>Atl. Marine Const. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for W. Dist. of Texas</i> , 571 U.S. 49 (2013).....	8, 12
<i>Bates v. Bankers Life & Cas. Co.</i> , 993 F. Supp. 2d 1318 (D. Or. 2014)	25
<i>Beyer v. Symantec Corp.</i> , 333 F. Supp. 3d 966 (N.D. Cal. 2018).....	18
<i>Boschma v. Home Loan Ctr., Inc.</i> , 198 Cal. App. 4th 230 (2011)	18
<i>Brazil v. Dell Inc.</i> , 585 F. Supp. 2d 1158 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	25
<i>Bureerong v. Uvawas</i> , 922 F. Supp. 1450 (C.D. Cal. 1996)	24
<i>California Cap. Ins. Co. v. Maiden Reinsurance N. Am., Inc.</i> , 472 F. Supp. 3d 754 (C.D. Cal. 2020)	24
<i>Cappello v. Walmart Inc.</i> , 394 F.Supp.3d 1015 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	16
<i>Careau & Co. v. Sec. Pac. Bus. Credit, Inc.</i> , 222 Cal. App. 3d 1371, 272 Cal. Rptr. 387 (Ct. App. 1990), as modified on denial of <i>reh’g</i>	23
<i>Carma Devs. (Cal.), Inc. v. Marathon Dev. California, Inc.</i> , 2 Cal. 4th 342 (1992)	22
<i>Cel-Tech Commc’n., Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Telephone Co.</i> , 20 Cal.4th 163 (1999)	12, 16, 17

1 *Centon Elecs., Inc. v. Target Corp.*,
 2 2009 WL 10674428 (C.D. Cal. June 18, 2009)..... 9

3 *Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n v. Savage*,
 4 611 F.2d 270 (9th Cir. 1979) 6

5 *Cordon v. Wachovia Mortg., a Div. of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*,
 6 776 F. Supp. 2d 1029 (N.D. Cal. 2011)..... 17

7 *Creative Tech., Ltd. v. Aztech Sys. Pte., Ltd.*,
 8 61 F.3d 696 (9th Cir. 1995) 11

9 *DePuy Synthes Sales Inc. v. Stryker Corp.*,
 10 2019 WL 1601384 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2019) 7

11 *Ecological Rights Found. v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.*,
 12 713 F.3d 502 (9th Cir. 2013) 15

13 *Eminence Cap., LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*,
 14 316 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir. 2003) 25

15 *Feldman v. Google, Inc.*,
 16 513 F. Supp. 2d 229 (E.D. Pa. 2007)..... 10

17 *Fitz v. NCR Corp.*,
 18 118 Cal. App. 4th 702 (2004) 11

19 *Gen. Tel. Co. of Sw. v. Falcon*,
 20 457 U.S. 147 (1982)..... 25

21 *Grayson O Co. v. Agadir Int’l LLC*,
 22 856 F.3d 307 (4th Cir. 2017) 17

23 *Greater Yellowstone Coal. v. Bosworth*,
 24 180 F. Supp. 2d 124 (D.D.C. 2001)..... 10

25 *Gulf Oil Corp. v. Gilbert*,
 26 330 U.S. 501 (1947)..... 10

27 *Hendrix v. Disc. Gold Brokers, Inc.*,
 28 2014 WL 12691620 (C.D. Cal. July 21, 2014)..... 21

1 *In re Adobe Systems, Inc. Privacy Litigation,*
66 F.Supp.3d 1197 (N.D. Cal. 2014)..... 16

2

3 *In re JUUL Labs, Inc., Mktg., Sales Pracs., & Prod. Liab. Litig.,*
497 F. Supp. 3d 552 (N.D. Cal. 2020)..... 20

4

5 *In re Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.,*
505 F.Supp.2d 609 (N.D. Cal. 2007)..... 24

6

7 *In re Zappos.com, Inc., Customer Data Sec. Breach Litig.,*
893 F. Supp. 2d 1058 (D. Nev. 2012)..... 10

8

9 *Indep. Towers of Wash. v. Wash.,*
350 F.3d 925 (9th Cir. 2003) 17

10

11 *Integritymessageboards.com v. Facebook, Inc.,*
2020 WL 6544411 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2020) 20

12

13 *IV Sols. Inc. v. United Healthcare Servs. Inc.,*
2012 WL 12894001 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2012) 6

14

15 *Jones v. GNC Franchising, Inc.,*
211 F.3d 495 (9th Cir. 2000) 7

16

17 *Jordan v. Paul Financial, LLC,*
285 F.R.D. 435 (N.D. Cal. 2012)..... 17

18

19 *Kazemi v. Payless Shoesource Inc., No. C,*
2010 WL 963225 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16, 2010) 24

20

21 *Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.,*
899 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2018) 15

22

23 *Khorrami v. Lexmark Int’l Inc.,*
2007 WL 8031909 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 13, 2007) 24

24

25 *Klein v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.,*
202 Cal.4th 1342, 1376 (2012) (2012) 16

26

27 *Knevelbaard Dairies v. Kraft Foods, Inc.,*
232 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2000) 6

28

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.