1 2 3 4 5 6	Debra I. Grassgreen (CA Bar No. 169978) Jeremy V. Richards (CA Bar No. 102300) John W. Lucas (CA Bar No. 271038) <b>PACHULSKI STANG ZIEHL &amp; JONES L</b> 150 California Street, 15th Fl. San Francisco, CA 94111 Telephone: 415.263.7000 Facsimile: 415.263.7010 Email: dgrassgreen@pszjlaw.com jrichards@pszjlaw.com	LP
7 8 9 10 11	HAMISH P. M. HUME hhume@bsfllp.com (pro hac vice forthcoming JESSICA E. PHILLIPS jphillips@bsfllp.com (pro hac vice forthcomin <b>BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER LLP</b> 1401 New York Avenue, N.W., Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20005 Telephone: (202) 274-1122 Facsimile: (202) 237-2727	
12	Attorneys for Creditor UBER TECHNOLOG	IES, INC.
13	UNITED STATES	S BANKRUPTCY COURT
14	NORTHERN DIS	TRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15		NCISCO DIVISION
16	In re:	Case No. 20-30242 (HLB)
17	ANTHONY SCOTT LEVANDOWSKI,	Chapter 11
18	Debtor.	UBER TECHNOLOGY INC.'S RESPONSE TO ANTHONY
19		LEVANDOWSKI'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO COMPEL
20 21		ARBITRATION; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
21		SUPPORT THEREOF
22		Date: April 30, 2020
		Time: 10:00 a.m. Crtrm: 19
24 25		Judge: Hon. Hannah L. Blumenstiel
26 27		
28		
		ts without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .

1			TABLE OF CONTENTS
2	I.	INT	RODUCTION
3	II.	FAC	TUAL STATEMENT
4 5		A.	To Induce Uber To Acquire His Company And Enter Into The Indemnification Agreement, Levandowski Repeatedly Told Uber He Was Not Bringing Any Google Confidential Information With Him.
6 7		В.	When Google Separately Sued Both Levandowski And Uber, Uber Initially Trusted Levandowski's Explanations Of What Happened
8 9 10		C.	On April 2, 2018, Before The Arbitration Hearing, Uber Notified Levandowski That It Would Not Be Required To Indemnify Levandowski For Any Final Award, And Would Instead Have A Right To Recover Fees From Him.
11 12		D.	Levandowski Was Then Indicted By Federal Prosecutors For Trade Secret Theft, Providing Strong Evidence That He Had Been Lying All Along, And Had Fraudulently Induced Uber To Enter Into The Indemnification
13			Agreement
14 15		E.	Within Three Days of Learning About the Indictment, Uber Notified Levandowski That The Indemnification Agreement Was Rescinded Based On His Fraud And Was Null And Void Based On His Misconduct
16 17		F.	Levandowski's Recent Agreement To Plead Guilty To Trade Secret Theft Proves That Uber's Rescission Was Proper And That The Indemnification Agreement Is Unenforceable
18 19		G.	Furthermore, Even If The Indemnification Agreement Were Enforceable, A Substantial Portion Of The Google Judgment Is Allocable To An Excluded Claim And Hence Not Subject To Indemnification
20	III.	DES	PONSE TO RELIEF REQUESTED
21			I ONSE TO RELIEF REQUESTED
22	IV.	CON	
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	KE R		Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .

1	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	
2	Page(s)	)
3	CASES	
4	Buckley Check Cashing v. Cardegna, 546 U.S. 440	
5	Prima Paint Corp. v. Flood & Conklin Mfg. Co., 388 U.S. 395	
6	388 U.S. 395 8	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
DOC	KET	
ALA	<b>R M</b> Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u> .	

4 h 5 fa 6 fa 7 m 8 9 o	I. INTRODUCTION Uber agrees to arbitrate its indemnification dispute with Levandowski, and therefore does not oppose the ultimate relief sought in the Motion to Compel Arbitration (Dkt #18) (the "Motion <sup>1</sup> "); nowever, it is important that Uber responds to the Motion for two reasons. First, there are many factual inaccuracies asserted by Levandowski in the Motion. In response, Uber has set forth the facts regarding the disputes so that the Court and parties in interest are not misled by the assertions made in the Motion and the Court has a full picture of the nature of the disputes between the parties. Second, Uber rescinded the Indemnification Agreement several months prior to the inception of Levandowski's bankruptcy case because it was procured by his fraud. Accordingly, any determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of the Indemnification Agreement as well as all other issues relating to the indemnification disputes,
3 0 4 h 5 fa 6 fa 7 m 8 9 0	oppose the ultimate relief sought in the Motion to Compel Arbitration (Dkt #18) (the "Motion <sup>1</sup> "); nowever, it is important that Uber responds to the Motion for two reasons. First, there are many factual inaccuracies asserted by Levandowski in the Motion. In response, Uber has set forth the facts regarding the disputes so that the Court and parties in interest are not misled by the assertions made in the Motion and the Court has a full picture of the nature of the disputes between the parties. Second, Uber rescinded the Indemnification Agreement several months prior to the inception of Levandowski's bankruptcy case because it was procured by his fraud. Accordingly, any determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
4 h 5 fa 6 fa 7 m 8 9 o	however, it is important that Uber responds to the Motion for two reasons. First, there are many factual inaccuracies asserted by Levandowski in the Motion. In response, Uber has set forth the facts regarding the disputes so that the Court and parties in interest are not misled by the assertions made in the Motion and the Court has a full picture of the nature of the disputes between the parties. Second, Uber rescinded the Indemnification Agreement several months prior to the inception of Levandowski's bankruptcy case because it was procured by his fraud. Accordingly, any determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
5 fa 6 fa 7 m 8 9 o	factual inaccuracies asserted by Levandowski in the Motion. In response, Uber has set forth the facts regarding the disputes so that the Court and parties in interest are not misled by the assertions made in the Motion and the Court has a full picture of the nature of the disputes between the parties. Second, Uber rescinded the Indemnification Agreement several months prior to the inception of Levandowski's bankruptcy case because it was procured by his fraud. Accordingly, any determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
6 fa 7 n 8 9 o	facts regarding the disputes so that the Court and parties in interest are not misled by the assertions made in the Motion and the Court has a full picture of the nature of the disputes between the parties. Second, Uber rescinded the Indemnification Agreement several months prior to the inception of Levandowski's bankruptcy case because it was procured by his fraud. Accordingly, any determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
7 m 8 9 0	made in the Motion and the Court has a full picture of the nature of the disputes between the parties. Second, Uber rescinded the Indemnification Agreement several months prior to the inception of Levandowski's bankruptcy case because it was procured by his fraud. Accordingly, any determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
8 9 o	Second, Uber rescinded the Indemnification Agreement several months prior to the inception of Levandowski's bankruptcy case because it was procured by his fraud. Accordingly, any determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
9 o	of Levandowski's bankruptcy case because it was procured by his fraud. Accordingly, any determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
	determination about Uber's rescission of the Indemnification Agreement should be fully preserved and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
10 d	and determined in the arbitration. Because Uber agrees to arbitrate the dispute over its rescission of
11 a	he Indemnification Agreement as well as all other issues relating to the indemnification disputes,
12    tł	
13    tł	he Court should enter an order denying Levandowsi's motion as moot.
14	II. FACTUAL STATEMENT
15 A 16	A. To Induce Uber to Acquire His Company and Enter Into the Indemnification Agreement, Levandowski Repeatedly Told Uber He Was Not Bringing any Google Confidential Information With Him.
17	In the fall of 2015, Uber and Levandowski began discussions regarding a potential
18 c	commercial deal between Uber and the new company that Levandowski was planning to form,
19 W	which eventually became Ottomotto LLC ("Otto"). By February 22, 2016, Uber and Levandowski
20 h	had entered into a non-binding term sheet for Uber's acquisition of Otto. Prior to agreeing to the
21    tr	ransaction, Uber and Otto, through their outside lawyers, hired a third-party forensic investigator,
22 S	Stroz Friedberg, to gather facts and documents to confirm and ensure that Levandowski (and others)
23 d	did not bring any proprietary or confidential Google material to Otto, and would not bring any such
24 ir	information to Uber.
25	As part of this Stroz process, Levandowski (and the other diligenced employees at Otto)
26 e	expressly promised that "to my best knowledge I returned to Former Employer and have not retained
27 –	
28	To the extent not otherwise defined herein, all defined terms shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Motion.
	KET

**DOCKET A L A R M** Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

Former Employer confidential or proprietary documents or information or property (including but not limited to hardware and software) after my employment with Former Employer." See Ex. 1 at  $\P 4.^2$  Levandowski further attested that he "provided good faith, complete and truthful responses in all material respects to Stroz's questions" and "that all of the information I have provided to Stroz is true and correct in all material respects." Id. at  $\P$  6.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Once Uber decided to move forward with the acquisition, it required Levandowski to sign a written employment agreement, which provided that "you shall not use or disclose any trade secrets or other proprietary information or intellectual property in which you or any other person has any right title or interest" and that "You represent and warrant to the Company that you have returned or destroyed all property and confidential information belonging to any prior employer." Levandowski also signed a Confidential Information and Invention Assignment Agreement pursuant to which he promised "I will not disclose to the Company or use any inventions, confidential or non-public proprietary information or material belonging to any previous client, employer or other party. I will not induce the Company to use any inventions, confidential or non-public proprietary information, or material belonging to any previous client, employer or any other party."

16 The provisions in these agreements reflected and confirmed Uber's clear understanding that Levandowski and everyone else from Otto had no intention of bringing any confidential Google information to Uber, would never do any such thing, and had taken no steps to do any such thing.

Uber relied on these assurances from Levandowski when it entered into the April 11, 2016, Indemnification Agreement.<sup>3</sup> If Uber had known that Levandowski had deliberately downloaded Google confidential trade secrets to use those secrets while at Uber, then Uber would not have completed the Otto acquisition, and would not have entered into the Indemnification Agreement.

- 2 All exhibits are attached to the Declaration of Hamish Hume.
- <sup>3</sup> The agreement was executed by an Uber subsidiary named Apparate International, which has since been dissolved.

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

## DOCKET A L A R M



# 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.