

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
2 Alex Spiro (*appearing pro hac vice*)
3 alexspiro@quinnemanuel.com
4 Kyle Batter (Bar No. 301803)
5 kylebatter@quinnemanuel.com
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, California 94065
Telephone: (650) 801-5000

6 Michael T. Lifrak (Bar No. 210846)
7 michaellifrak@quinnemanuel.com
8 Jeanine Zalduendo (Bar No. 243374)
jeaninezalduendo@quinnemanuel.com
865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
9 Los Angeles, California 90017-2543
Telephone: (213) 443-3000

11 *Attorneys for Defendants Tesla, Inc., Elon Musk,
Brad W. Buss, Robyn Denholm, Ira Ehrenpreis,
Antonio J. Gracias, James Murdoch, Kimbal Musk,
And Linda Johnson Rice*

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17 IN RE TESLA, INC. SECURITIES
18 LITIGATION

Case No. 3:18-cv-04865-EMC

19
20 **DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL
SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

21 Date: March 10, 2022
22 Time: 1:30 p.m.
23 Location: Courtroom 5, 17th Floor
Judge: Hon. Edward Chen

24 **REDACTED FOR PUBLIC FILING**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
ISSUES TO BE DECIDED.....	2
STATEMENT OF MATERIAL FACTS	3
A. The Public Investment Fund Has Long Desired to Take Tesla Private.	3
B. The PIF Agreed to Fund a Transaction to Take Tesla Private.	5
C. Mr. Musk Discussed Going Private at \$420 with Tesla's Board.	6
D. Mr. Musk Discussed Going Private With His Financial and Legal Advisors.....	7
E. Mr. Musk Disclosed the Potential Go-Private Transaction Publicly on August 7.	7
F. Mr. Musk Spoke with Investors and Advisors.....	9
G. Mr. Musk Confirmed His Understanding that Funding Was Secured in Numerous Communications with Mr. Al-Rumayyan.	11
H. Mr. Musk Updated Shareholders With Additional Information on August 13.....	12
I. Given Shareholder Feedback, Mr. Musk Decided Tesla Should Remain Public.....	13
LEGAL STANDARD	13
ARGUMENT	14
I. SUMMARY JUDGMENT SHOULD BE DENIED AS TO FALSITY.....	14
A. Plaintiff Ignores Material Facts Showing it was Reasonable for Mr. Musk to State "Funding [Was] Secured" and "Investor Support [Was] Confirmed."	14
B. Plaintiff Ignores Material Facts Showing That Mr. Musk's Statement Regarding a "Shareholder Vote" Was Not Misleading.....	17
C. Plaintiff's New Argument that Discussions with the PIF Had Ended as of August 13, 2018 is Baseless.....	18
II. SUMMARY JUDGMENT SHOULD BE DENIED AS TO SCIENTER.....	20
A. Scienter is a Question for the Jury.	20
B. There Is Ample Evidence that Mr. Musk Believed His Statements Were True.	20
III. SUMMARY JUDGMENT SHOULD BE DENIED AS TO RELIANCE.	21

1	A.	There is a Genuine Dispute of Fact Regarding Materiality.	22
2	B.	There is a Genuine Dispute of Fact Regarding Defendants' Ability to Rebut Any Fraud-On-The-Market Presumption.	24
3		CONCLUSION	26
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			

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1	Cases	<u>Page</u>
2		
3		
4	<i>In re Allied Cap. Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2003 WL 1964184 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 25, 2003).....	23
5	<i>In re Allstate Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 966 F.3d 595 (7th Cir. 2020).....	24, 25
6	<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986)	13
7	<i>Antonetti v. Skolnik</i> , 2014 WL 1308626 (D. Nev. Mar. 31, 2014).....	15
8	<i>In re Apple Computer Sec. Litig.</i> , 886 F.2d 1109 (9th Cir. 1989).....	20
9	<i>Basic Inc. v. Levinson</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988)	19, 24, 25
10	<i>Brody v. Transitional Hosps. Corp.</i> , 280 F.3d 997 (9th Cir. 2002).....	19
11	<i>Buxbaum v. Deutsche Bank AG</i> , 196 F. Supp. 2d 367 (S.D.N.Y. 2002).....	16, 21
12	<i>City of Dearborn Heights Act 345 Police & Fire Ret. Sys. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 605 (9th Cir. 2017).....	24
13	<i>Davis v. Yelp, Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 4923359 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2021).....	2, 18, 20, 21
14	<i>Durning v. First Bos. Corp.</i> , 815 F.2d 1265 (9th Cir. 1987).....	2, 22
15	<i>Ernst & Ernst v. Hochfelder</i> , 425 U.S. 185 (1976)	20
16	<i>Fecht v. Price Co.</i> , 70 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 1995).....	14
17	<i>U.S. v. Ferguson</i> , 676 F.3d 260 (2d Cir. 2011).....	17
18	<i>Garcia v. J2 Glob., Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 1558331 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2021)	15
19	<i>Gebhart v. S.E.C.</i> , 595 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2010)	21
20	<i>Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 258 (2014)	21, 22, 24
21	<i>Howard v. Everex Sys., Inc.</i> , 228 F.3d 1057 (9th Cir. 2000).....	2, 20
22	<i>Hsingching Hsu v. Puma Biotechnology, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 4945703 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 5, 2018)	24
23	<i>In re Infineon Techs. AG Sec. Litig.</i> , 266 F.R.D. 386 (N.D. Cal. 2009)	24

1	<i>Janus Cap. Grp., Inc. v. First Derivative Traders,</i> 564 U.S. 135 (2011)	25
2	<i>In re JDS Uniphase Corp. Sec. Litig.,</i> 2007 WL 2429593 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 24, 2007).....	14
3	<i>Jelinek v. Am. Nat'l Prop. & Cas. Co.,</i> 747 F. App'x 513 (9th Cir. 2018).....	2, 13
4	<i>Kaplan v. Rose,</i> 49 F.3d 1363 (9th Cir. 1994).....	24
5	<i>Livid Holdings Ltd. v. Salomon Smith Barney, Inc.,</i> 416 F.3d 940 (9th Cir. 2005).....	16
6	<i>Marucci v. Overland Data, Inc.,</i> 1999 WL 1027053 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 2, 1999)	15
7	<i>Matrixx Initiatives, Inc. v. Siracusano,</i> 563 U.S. 27 (2011)	19
8	<i>McCravy v. Elations Co. LLC,</i> 2014 WL 12561600 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 8, 2014)	22, 24
9	<i>McGovney v. Aerohive Networks, Inc.,</i> 2019 WL 8137143 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2019).....	21
10	<i>No. 84 Emp.-Teamster Joint Council Pension Tr. Fund v. Am. W. Holding Corp.,</i> 320 F.3d 920 (9th Cir. 2003).....	17, 23
11	<i>Oran v. Stafford,</i> 226 F.3d 275 (3d Cir. 2000).....	23
12	<i>Reese v. BP Expl. Inc.,</i> 643 F.3d 681 (9th Cir. 2011).....	14
13	<i>In re REMEC Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i> 702 F. Supp. 2d 1202 (S.D. Cal. 2010)	16
14	<i>S.E.C. v. BankAtlantic Bancorp, Inc.,</i> 661 F. App'x 629 (11th Cir. 2016).....	15
15	<i>S.E.C. v. Jasper,</i> 2009 WL 10701938 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 10, 2009)	2, 20, 21
16	<i>S.E.C. v. Phan,</i> 500 F.3d 895 (9th Cir. 2007).....	15, 18, 21
17	<i>S.E.C. v. Platforms Wireless Int'l Corp.,</i> 617 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2010).....	14, 16
18	<i>S.E.C. v. Sourlis,</i> 851 F.3d 139 (2d Cir. 2016).....	16
19	<i>S.E.C. v. Todd,</i> 642 F.3d 1207 (9th Cir. 2011).....	14
20	<i>In re Skechers USA, Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i> 444 F. Supp. 3d 498 (S.D.N.Y. 2020).....	18
21	<i>In re Sun Microsystems Sec. Litigation,</i> 1992 WL 226898 (N.D. Cal. July 10, 1992)	15
22	<i>In re Tesla, Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i> 477 F. Supp. 3d 903 (N.D. Cal. 2020)	17

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.