

1 LATHAM & WATKINS LLP  
Elizabeth L. Deeley (CA Bar No. 230798)  
2 *elizabeth.deeley@lw.com*  
Melanie M. Blunschi (CA Bar No. 234264)  
3 *melanie.blunschi@lw.com*  
Nicole C. Valco (CA Bar No. 258506)  
4 *nicole.valco@lw.com*  
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000  
5 San Francisco, CA 94111-6538  
Telephone: +1.415.391.0600  
6 Facsimile: +1.415.395.8095

7 Andrew B. Clubok (*pro hac vice*)  
*andrew.clubok@lw.com*  
8 Susan E. Engel (*pro hac vice*)  
*susan.engel@lw.com*  
9 555 Eleventh Street, N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20004-1304  
10 Telephone: +1.202.637.2200  
Facsimile: +1.202.637.2201

11 Hilary H. Mattis (CA Bar No. 271498)  
12 *hilary.mattis@lw.com*  
140 Scott Drive  
13 Menlo Park, CA 94025-1008  
Telephone: +1.650.328.4600  
14 Facsimile: +1.650.463.2600

15 *Attorneys for Defendant Facebook, Inc.*

16  
17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
19 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

20 DZ RESERVE and CAIN MAXWELL (d/b/a  
21 MAX MARTIALIS), individually and on  
22 behalf of all others similarly situated,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 FACEBOOK, INC.,

26 Defendant.

Case No. 3:18-cv-04978 JD

**FACEBOOK, INC.’S CORRECTED  
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS’ MOTION  
FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

Date: June 10, 2021  
Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Court: Courtroom 11, 19th Floor  
Hon. James Donato

27  
28 REDACTED VERSION REFILED PURSUANT TO DKT NO. 350 ORIGINALLY  
FILED AT DKT. 301-4

**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

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. BACKGROUND ..... 4

    A. Potential Reach Estimates Are A Targeting Tool, Not A Budget Tool..... 4

    B. During The Class Period, Facebook Updated The Way Potential Reach Was Estimated But Rejected Some Changes Because They Were Flawed..... 6

    C. Every Ad Campaign Is A Different Product Sold At A Different Price ..... 9

    D. Advertisers Rely On Different Information (Not Potential Reach) In Setting Their Budgets And Measuring Results ..... 11

    E. Plaintiffs’ Conduct and Contemporaneous Documents Contradict Their Claimed Reliance on Potential Reach..... 13

III. LEGAL STANDARD..... 14

IV. PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT DEMONSTRATED TYPICALITY, ADEQUACY, OR UCL STANDING ..... 15

V. PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT DEMONSTRATED PREDOMINANCE BECAUSE THEY HAVE NO COMMON PROOF OF LIABILITY..... 17

    A. No Uniform Material Misstatement Or Omission Was Made To The Class..... 18

    B. Plaintiffs’ Ad Auction Evidence Cannot Prove That Any Potential Reach Statement Caused Classwide Injury..... 22

VI. PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT DEMONSTRATED PREDOMINANCE BECAUSE THEY HAVE NO CLASSWIDE DAMAGES OR RESTITUTION MODEL ..... 24

VII. A CLASS ACTION IS NOT SUPERIOR..... 24

VIII. PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT MET THEIR BURDEN UNDER RULE 23(B)(2)..... 25

IX. CONCLUSION..... 25

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
<b>CASES</b>	
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	

<i>All. Mortg. Co. v. Rothwell</i> , 10 Cal. 4th 1226 (1995) .....	24
<i>Am. Express Co. v. Italian Colors Rest.</i> , 570 U.S. 228 (2013).....	14
<i>Avilez v. Pinkerton Gov't Servs. Inc.</i> , 596 F. App'x 579 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	17
<i>Berger v. Home Depot USA, Inc.</i> , 741 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	18
<i>Brazil v. Dell Inc.</i> , 2010 WL 5387831 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2010).....	16
<i>Brickman v. Fitbit, Inc.</i> , 2017 WL 5569827 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2017) .....	19
<i>Chowning v. Kohl's Dep't Stores, Inc.</i> , 733 F. App'x 404 (9th Cir. 2018).....	24
<i>Comcast Corp. v. Behrend</i> , 569 U.S. 27 (2013).....	15, 20, 24
<i>Ebner v. Fresh, Inc.</i> , 838 F.3d 958 (9th Cir. 2016) .....	22
<i>Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp.</i> , 657 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	15
<i>Fox Test Prep v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 588 F. App'x 733 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	17
<i>Harris v. Vector Mktg., Corp.</i> , 753 F. Supp. 2d 996 (N.D. Cal. 2010) .....	16
<i>Hinesley v. Oakshade Town Ctr.</i> , 135 Cal. App. 4th 289 (2005) .....	22
<i>Hirsch v. USHealth Advisors, LLC</i> , 337 F.R.D. 118 (N.D. Tex. 2020).....	16
<i>In re Facebook, Inc., PPC Advert. Litig.</i> , 282 F.R.D. 446 (N.D. Cal. 2012).....	17

1 *In re Hyundai & Kia Fuel Econ. Litig.*,  
 2 926 F.3d 539 (9th Cir. 2019) ..... 25

3 *In re Tobacco II Cases*,  
 4 46 Cal. 4th 298 (2009) ..... 14, 15

5 *In re Vioxx Class Cases*,  
 6 180 Cal. App. 4th 116 (2009) ..... 18

7 *Jones v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.*,  
 8 2014 WL 2702726 (N.D. Cal. June 13, 2014)..... 19

9 *Lanovaz v. Twinings N. Am., Inc.*,  
 10 726 F. App'x 590 (9th Cir. 2018) ..... 25

11 *Lucas v. Berg, Inc.*,  
 12 212 F. Supp. 3d 950 (S.D. Cal. 2016)..... 18

13 *Microsoft Corp. v. Baker*,  
 14 137 S. Ct. 1702 (2017)..... 18

15 *Miller v. RP On-Site, LLC*,  
 16 2020 WL 6940936 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2020) ..... 16

17 *Mirkin v. Wasserman*,  
 18 5 Cal. 4th. 1082 (1993) ..... 17

19 *Olean Wholesale Grocery Coop., Inc. v. Bumble Bee Foods LLC*,  
 20 993 F.3d 774 (9th Cir. 2021) ..... *passim*

21 *Reitman v. Champion Petfoods USA, Inc.*,  
 22 2019 WL 7169792 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2019)..... 19

23 *Reitman v. Champion Petfoods USA, Inc.*,  
 24 830 F. App'x 880 (9th Cir. 2020) ..... 19

25 *Roley v. Google LLC*,  
 26 2020 WL 8675968 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2020)..... 20

27 *Rushing v. Williams Sonoma, Inc.*,  
 28 2020 WL 6787135 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2020)..... 17

*Sali v. Corona Reg'l Med. Ctr.*,  
 909 F.3d 996 (9th Cir. 2018) ..... 15

*Shady Grove Orthopedic Assocs., P.A. v. Allstate Ins. Co.*,  
 559 U.S. 393 (2010)..... 22

*Sonner v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*,  
 971 F.3d 834 (9th Cir. 2020) ..... 1, 22, 24, 25

1 *Spacone v. Sanford, L.P.*,  
 2 2018 WL 4139057 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2018)..... 16

3 *Stearns v. Ticketmaster Corp.*,  
 4 655 F.3d 1013 (9th Cir. 2011) ..... 16, 22

5 *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*,  
 6 586 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2009) ..... 25

7 *Sussex Fin. Enter., Inc. v. Bayerische Hypo-Und Vereinsbank AG*,  
 8 460 F. App’x 709 (9th Cir. 2011) ..... 17

9 *Tucker v. Pac. Bell Mobile Servs.*,  
 10 208 Cal. App. 4th 201 (2012) ..... 18

11 *Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Bouaphakeo*,  
 12 577 U.S. 442 (2016)..... 17, 23

13 *Villiarimo v. Aloha Island Air, Inc.*,  
 14 281 F.3d 1054 (9th Cir. 2002) ..... 15

15 *Walker v. Life Ins. Co. of the Sw.*,  
 16 953 F.3d 624 (9th Cir. 2020) ..... 14, 15, 17, 22

17 *Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*,  
 18 564 U.S. 338 (2011)..... 14

19 *Williams v. Gerber Prods. Co.*,  
 20 552 F.3d 934 (9th Cir. 2008) ..... 17

21 *Zakaria v. Gerber Prod. Co.*,  
 22 755 F. App’x 623 (9th Cir. 2018) ..... 23

23 *Zinser v. Accufix Research Inst., Inc.*,  
 24 253 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2001) ..... 3, 25

**RULES**

25 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23 ..... 2, 14, 21, 22

26 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2)..... 3, 25

27 Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)..... 24

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.