

1 JORDAN ETH (CA SBN 121617)
JEth@mofo.com
2 MARK R.S. FOSTER (CA SBN 223682)
MFoster@mofo.com
3 ROBERT L. CORTEZ WEBB (CA SBN 274742)
RWebb@mofo.com
4 KAREN LEUNG (CA SBN 323029)
KLeung@mofo.com
5 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
425 Market Street
6 San Francisco, California 94105-2482
Telephone: 415.268.7000
7 Facsimile: 415.268.7522

8 Attorneys for Defendants Pivotal Software, Inc.,
Cynthia Gaylor, Egon Durban, Khozema Z. Shipchandler,
9 Marcy S. Klevorn, Michael Dell, Paul Maritz, Robert Mee, and
William D. Green
10

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
14

15
16 IN RE PIVOTAL SECURITIES
LITIGATION
17

Master File No. 3:19-cv-03589-CRB

PIVOTAL DEFENDANTS' NOTICE
OF MOTION AND MOTION TO
DISMISS CONSOLIDATED
AMENDED CLASS ACTION
18 COMPLAINT; MEMORANDUM OF
19 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES
20

21 Date: July 17, 2020
22 Time: 10:00 a.m.
23 Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
Courtroom: 6—17th Floor
24
25
26
27
28

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on July 17, 2020, at 10:00 a.m. (*see* ECF 79), or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in the Courtroom of the Honorable Charles R. Breyer, located at 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, CA 94102, Courtroom 6, 17th Floor, Pivotal Software, Inc. (“Pivotal”), Cynthia Gaylor, Egon Durban, Khozema Z. Shipchandler, Marcy S. Klevorn, Michael Dell, Paul Maritz, Robert Mee, and William D. Green (together with Pivotal, the “Pivotal Defendants”) will, and hereby do, move pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8, 9(b), and 12(b)(6) to dismiss the Consolidated Amended Complaint for Violations of the Federal Securities Laws (the “Complaint”) filed by Lead Plaintiffs Oklahoma City Employee Retirement System (“Oklahoma City”) and Police Retirement System of St. Louis on February 11, 2020.

This Motion is based on this Notice, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Defendants’ Request for Consideration and Judicial Notice, the Declaration of Robert L. Cortez Webb (“Webb Decl.”) and exhibits attached thereto (“Ex. ___”), and such other argument and materials as may be presented before this Motion is taken under submission.

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

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
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	vii
I. BACKGROUND	1
A. Pivotal’s Growing Business During the Class Period.....	1
B. Plaintiffs’ Securities Fraud Allegations	3
II. PLAINTIFFS MUST MEET HEIGHTENED PLEADING STANDARDS.....	4
III. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO PLEAD A MATERIALLY MISLEADING STATEMENT.....	5
A. Plaintiffs Fail to Show Any Challenged Statement Was False When Made.	5
B. Regulation S-K Did Not Impose a Duty to Disclose.	8
C. Plaintiffs Fail to Show the Falsity of the Opinion Statements.....	9
D. Many of the Challenged Statements Are Not Actionable.....	10
1. Expressions of optimism are not actionable.....	10
2. The forward-looking statements are not actionable.....	11
IV. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO PLEAD A “STRONG INFERENCE” OF SCIENTER.....	12
A. The CW Allegations Do Not Support Any Inference of Scierter.....	12
B. The Core Operations Theory Does Not Apply.	14
C. Plaintiffs Do Not Offer a Cogent and Compelling Theory of Fraud.	14
V. PLAINTIFFS’ SECTION 12(a)(2) CLAIM FAILS FOR ANOTHER REASON.	15
VI. PLAINTIFFS’ CONTROL-PERSON CLAIMS FAIL.....	15
VII. CONCLUSION	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Brody v. Transitional Hosps. Corp.</i> , 280 F.3d 997 (9th Cir. 2002).....	8
<i>City of Dearborn Heights Act 345 Police & Fire Ret. Sys. v. Align Tech., Inc.</i> , 856 F.3d 605 (9th Cir. 2017).....	10, 13
<i>City of Sunrise Firefighters' Pension Fund v. Oracle Corp.</i> , No. 18-cv-04844-BLF, 2019 WL 6877195 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 17, 2019).....	8, 11, 13
<i>Coble v. Broadvision</i> , 2002 WL 31093589 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2002)	14
<i>In re Convergent Techs. Sec. Lit.</i> , 948 F.2d 507 (9th Cir. 1991).....	6
<i>In re Cutera Sec. Litig.</i> , 610 F.3d 1103 (9th Cir. 2010).....	11
<i>In re Foundry Networks, Inc.</i> , 2002 WL 32354617 (N.D. Cal. June 6, 2002)	10
<i>In re Fusion-io, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 13-CV-05368-LHK, 2015 WL 661869 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2015).....	7
<i>Greenberg v. Sunrun Inc.</i> , 233 F. Supp. 3d 764 (N.D. Cal. 2017)	4, 11
<i>Hertzberg v. Dignity Partners, Inc.</i> , 191 F.3d 1076 (9th Cir. 1999).....	15
<i>In re LeapFrog Enterprises, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 527 F. Supp. 2d 1033 (N.D. Cal. 2007)	10
<i>In re Lexar Media, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2005 WL 1566534 (N.D. Cal. July 5, 2005).....	14, 15
<i>In re McKesson HBOC Secs. Litig.</i> , 126 F. Supp. 2d 1248 (N.D. Cal. 2000)	15
<i>Metzler Inv. GmbH v. Corinthian Colls.</i> , 540 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 2008).....	5, 8, 14
<i>Norfolk Cty. Ret. Sys. v. Solazyme, Inc.</i> , No. 15-cv-02938-HSG, 2016 WL 7475555 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 29, 2016)	5, 15

1	<i>Nurlybayev v. ZTO Express (Cayman) Inc.</i> ,	
2	2019 WL 3219451 (S.D.N.Y. Jul. 17, 2019)	9
3	<i>Omnicare Inc. v. Laborers Dist. Council Constr. Indus. Pension Fund</i> ,	
4	575 U.S. 175 (2015).....	4, 10
5	<i>Or. Pub. Emps. Ret. Fund v. Apollo Grp.</i> ,	
6	774 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. 2014).....	13
7	<i>Pinter v. Dahl</i> ,	
8	486 U.S. 622 (1988).....	15
9	<i>Police Ret. Sys. of St. Louis v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.</i> ,	
10	759 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 2014).....	11, 13, 14
11	<i>In re Read-Rite Corp.</i> ,	
12	335 F.3d 843 (9th Cir. 2003).....	5
13	<i>In re Rigel Pharm. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
14	697 F.3d 869 (9th Cir. 2012).....	4, 14, 15
15	<i>Ronconi v. Larkin</i> ,	
16	253 F.3d 423 (9th Cir. 2001).....	5, 13
17	<i>Rubke v. Capitol Bancorp Ltd.</i> ,	
18	551 F.3d 1156 (9th Cir. 2009).....	4, 5
19	<i>In re Splash Tech. Holdings Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
20	160 F. Supp. 2d 1059 (N.D. Cal. 2001)	11
21	<i>In re Stac Elecs. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
22	89 F.3d 1399 (9th Cir. 1996).....	12
23	<i>Steckman v. Hart Brewing, Inc.</i> ,	
24	143 F.3d 1293 (9th Cir. 1998).....	9
25	<i>Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.</i> ,	
26	551 U.S. 308 (2007).....	12
27	<i>In re Vantive Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
28	283 F.3d 1079 (9th Cir. 2002).....	vii, 6, 7, 13
	<i>Webb v. Solarcity Corp.</i> ,	
	884 F.3d 844 (9th Cir. 2018).....	14
	<i>Zeid v. Kimberley</i> ,	
	930 F. Supp. 431 (N.D. Cal. 1996)	10
	<i>Zucco Partners, LLC v. Digimarc Corp.</i> ,	
	552 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 2009).....	12, 13

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.