

1 COOLEY LLP
 MICHELLE C. DOOLIN (179445)
 2 (mdoolin@cooley.com)
 4401 East Gate Mall
 3 San Diego, California 92121-1909
 Telephone: +1 858 550 6000
 4 Facsimile: +1 858 550 6402

5 WHITTY SOMVICHIAN (194463)
 (wsomvichian@cooley.com)
 6 SHARON SONG (313535)
 (ssong@cooley.com)
 7 3 Embarcadero Center, 20th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94111-4004
 8 Telephone: +1 415 693 2000
 Facsimile: +1 415 693 2222

9 Attorneys for Defendants
 10 ALPHABET, INC., GOOGLE, LLC,
 GOOGLE PAYMENT CORP., and
 11 GOOGLE ARIZONA LLC

12
 13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 14 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 HENK MEYERS and GLENN
 GINOZA, Individually and on Behalf
 17 of All Others Similarly Situated,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

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

22 Defendants.

Case No. 2:21-CV-01767 FMO (MAAx)

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
 ITS MOTION TO DISMISS THE FIRST
 AMENDED COMPLAINT, TRANSFER
 VENUE, AND/OR STRIKE CLASS
 ALLEGATIONS**

Date: 10:00 a.m.
 Time: August 5, 2021
 Dept.: Courtroom 6D, 6th floor
 Judge: Hon. Fernando M. Olguin

Complaint Filed: February 25, 2021

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

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. ARGUMENT	2
A. Plaintiffs’ Claims Should Be Dismissed Under Forum Non Conveniens or Transferred Under 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a)	2
1. Google’s Forum Selection Clause Is Validly Incorporated Into the Gift Card TOS and Thus Enforceable	2
2. The Forum Selection Clause Should Be Enforced Through Either Dismissal or Transfer	6
B. Plaintiffs Fail to State Their Claims Under Rule 12(b)(6), Requiring Dismissal.....	9
1. Plaintiffs’ UCL Claim Under All Three Prongs Is Precluded by an Adequate Remedy at Law.....	9
2. The UCL and Breach of Contract Claims Fail Because Google Play Gift Cards Are Usable With Multiple Sellers.....	11
3. The Fraud-Based UCL Claim Fails For the Additional Reason That it Does Not Meet Rule 9(b)’s Requirements.....	13
4. The Duplicative Claim for Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing Fails.....	14
C. Plaintiffs’ Class Allegations Concerning Bona Fide Google Play Gift Card Purchasers and Holders Should Be Stricken	15
III. CONCLUSION	16

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	Cases	
4	<i>In re Actimmune Mktg. Litig.</i> ,	
5	No. C 08–02376 MHP, 2009 WL 3740648 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 6,	
6	2009), <i>aff’d</i> , 464 Fed. App’x 651 (9th Cir. 2011).....	13
7	<i>Adams v. I-Flow Corp.</i> ,	
8	No. CV09-09550 R(SSx), 2010 WL 1339948 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 30,	
9	2010).....	10
10	<i>Alt. Marine Const. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for W. Dist. of Texas</i> ,	
11	571 U.S. 49 (2013)	1, 8
12	<i>Am. W. Door & Trim v. Arch Specialty Ins. Co.</i> ,	
13	No. CV 15-00153 BRO SPX, 2015 WL 1266787 (C.D. Cal. Mar.	
14	18, 2015).....	16
15	<i>Arena Rest. & Lounge LLC v. S. Glazer’s Wine & Spirits, LLC</i> ,	
16	No. 17-cv-03805-LHK, 2018 WL 1805516 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 16,	
17	2018).....	14
18	<i>Brazil v. Dell Inc.</i> ,	
19	585 F. Supp. 2d 1158 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....	16
20	<i>Careau & Co. v. Sec. Pac. Bus. Credit, Inc.</i> ,	
21	222 Cal. App. 3d 1371 (1990).....	15
22	<i>Carnival Cruise Lines, Inc. v. Shute</i> ,	
23	499 U.S. 585 (1991)	7
24	<i>Clippercreek, Inc. v. Intelligrated Sys., LLC</i> ,	
25	No. 2:19-cv-01341-WBS KJN, 2020 WL 230179 (E.D. Cal. Jan.	
26	15, 2020).....	8
27	<i>Crum & Forster Indem. Co. v. Robb Rep. Media LLC</i> ,	
28	No. 20-CV-00127-LB, 2021 WL 2531070 (N.D. Cal. June 21,	
	2021).....	5
	<i>In re Facebook Biometric Info. Priv. Litig.</i> ,	
	185 F. Supp. 3d 1155 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	<i>Feldman v. Google, Inc.</i> ,	
4	513 F. Supp. 2d 229 (E.D. Pa. 2007).....	6
5	<i>Fitz v. NCR Corp.</i> ,	
6	118 Cal. App. 4th 702 (2004).....	7
7	<i>Gamayo v. Match.com LLC</i> ,	
8	No. C 11-00762, 2011 WL 3739542 SBA, (N.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2011).....	8
9	<i>Gen. Tel. Co. of Sw. v. Falcon</i> ,	
10	457 U.S. 147 (1982)	15
11	<i>Gibson v. Jaguar Land Rover N. Am., LLC</i> ,	
12	No. CV 20-00769-CJC, 2020 WL 5492990 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 9, 2020).....	10
13	<i>Hadley v. Kellogg Sales Co.</i> ,	
14	243 F. Supp. 3d 1074 (N.D. Cal. 2017).....	13
15	<i>In re Holl</i> ,	
16	925 F.3d 1076 (9th Cir. 2019).....	3, 4, 5
17	<i>Huu Nguyen v. Nissan N. Am., Inc.</i> ,	
18	No. 16-CV-05591-LHK, 2017 WL 1330602 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2017).....	10
19	<i>Integritymessageboards.com v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,	
20	No. 18-cv-05286-PJH, 2020 WL 6544411 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2020).....	11
21	<i>In re JUUL Labs, Inc., Mktg., Sales Pracs., & Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> ,	
22	497 F. Supp. 3d 552 (N.D. Cal. 2020).....	9, 10
23	<i>Kearns v. Ford Motor Co.</i> ,	
24	567 F.3d 1120 (9th Cir. 2009).....	13, 14
25	<i>Long v. Provide Commerce, Inc.</i> ,	
26	245 Cal. App. 4th 855 (2016).....	5
27	<i>Mier v. CVS Pharm., Inc.</i> ,	
28	No. SA CV 20-01979-DOC-ADS, 2021 WL 1559367 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2021)	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(Continued)

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	<i>Miguel v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.</i> ,	
4	No. CV 12-3308 PSG, 2013 WL 452418 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2013).....	3, 7
5	<i>Milliner v. Bock Evans Fin. Counsel, Ltd.</i> ,	
6	114 F. Supp. 3d 871 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	7
7	<i>Nagrampa v. MailCoups, Inc.</i> ,	
8	469 F.3d 1257 (9th Cir. 2006).....	7
9	<i>Net2Phone, Inc. v. Super. Ct.</i> ,	
10	109 Cal. App. 4th 583 (2003).....	3, 7
11	<i>Nguyen v. Barnes & Noble Inc.</i> ,	
12	763 F.3d 1171 (9th Cir. 2014).....	5, 6
13	<i>Reinhardt v. Gemini Motor Transp.</i> ,	
14	879 F. Supp. 2d 1138 (E.D. Cal. 2012).....	14, 15
15	<i>Rice-Sherman v. Big Heart Pet Brands, Inc.</i> ,	
16	No. 19-cv-03613-WHO, 2020 WL 1245130 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 16,	
17	2020).....	13
18	<i>Rothman v. Equinox Holdings, Inc.</i> ,	
19	No. 2:20-CV-09760-CAS-MRWx, 2021 WL 1627490 (C.D. Cal.	
20	Apr. 27, 2021).....	9, 10
21	<i>Salas v. Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc.</i> ,	
22	No. CV 15-8629 FMO (Ex), 2017 WL 11084512 (C.D. Cal. Aug.	
23	7, 2017).....	11
24	<i>Slaught v. Bencomo Roofing Co.</i> ,	
25	25 Cal. App. 4th 744 (1994).....	2
26	<i>Sonner v. Premier Nutrition Corp.</i> ,	
27	971 F.3d 834 (9th Cir. 2020).....	1, 9
28	<i>Tompkins v. 23andMe, Inc.</i> ,	
	No. 5:13-CV-05682-LHK, 2014 WL 2903752 (N.D. Cal. June 25,	
	2014), <i>aff'd</i> , 840 F.3d 1016 (9th Cir. 2016)	6
	<i>Transwestern Pipeline Co. v. 17.19 Acres of Prop.</i> ,	
	627 F.3d 1268 (9th Cir. 2010).....	12

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.