

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: HARD DISK DRIVE  
SUSPENSION ASSEMBLIES  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION

Case No. 19-md-02918-MMC  
Case No. 22-cv-02798-MMC

**ORDER DENYING DEFENDANTS'  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

\_\_\_\_\_  
This Document Relates to:

Flextronics Int'l USA, Inc. v. TDK  
Corporation, Case No. 22-cv-2798

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

Before the Court is defendants' Motion, filed September 9, 2022, "to Dismiss Flex's Amended Complaint." Plaintiff Flextronics International USA, Inc. ("Flex") has filed opposition, to which defendants have replied. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion, the Court rules as follows.<sup>1</sup>

In the operative complaint, the Amended Complaint ("AC"), Flex alleges defendants entered into a conspiracy to "fix, raise, stabilize, and maintain prices of, and allocate market share for, Hard Disk Drive ('HDD') suspension assemblies" from "at least as early as 2003" (see AC ¶ 1) through April 2016 (see AC ¶ 126). Flex alleges it "indirectly purchase[d]" suspension assemblies when it purchased HDDs from Seagate, Toshiba, and Western Digital (see AC ¶¶ 28, 194), which three companies had purchased the suspension assemblies contained in their respective HDD products directly from defendants (see AC ¶ 167). According to Flex, during the period in which the conspiracy was operative, it "purchased (at least) billions of dollars of HDDs incorporating affected suspension assemblies . . . at prices that were artificially inflated as a result of the conspiracy." (See AC ¶ 201.) Based on said allegations, Flex asserts two

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> By order filed October 28, 2022, the Court took the matter under submission.

1 causes of action, namely, Count I, titled "Violation of California and Tennessee Antitrust  
2 Statutes," and Count II, titled "Violation of California Business and Professions Code  
3 § 17200, et. seq. ['UCL']."

4 Flex's initial complaint, in which it raised the same claims as are asserted in the  
5 AC, was filed on May 11, 2022. By the instant motion, defendants argue Flex's claims  
6 accrued "as early as 2016 . . . or at the latest in February 2018" (see Defs.' Mot. at 9:4),  
7 that Flex's claims are barred by the applicable statutes of limitations, which the parties  
8 agree are four years for Flex's California claims and three years for Flex's Tennessee  
9 claim, and that Flex has failed to sufficiently plead any exception to the applicable  
10 statutes of limitations.

11 In opposition, Flex argues its claims are timely under the "discovery rule." (See  
12 AC ¶ 230.)<sup>2</sup> Specifically, Flex relies on its allegation that it "did not discover . . .  
13 [d]efendants entered into a combination and conspiracy to fix prices of, and allocate  
14 markets for, HDD suspension assemblies, until July 29, 2019, when the DOJ  
15 [Department of Justice] filed criminal charges against NHK Spring for violating Section 1  
16 of the Sherman Act." (See AC ¶ 231.) Although Flex acknowledges it "has sophisticated  
17 procedures in place to routinely monitor input costs, including costs of HDDs and other  
18 electronic components," it alleges there was "no indication to Flex as a reasonable  
19 indirect purchaser of [suspension assemblies] that any conspiratorial activity was taking  
20 place which would artificially inflate the prices of HDDs prior to July 29, 2019." (See AC  
21 ¶ 233).

22 The California Supreme Court has held the discovery rule "postpones accrual of a  
23 cause of action until the plaintiff discovers, or has reason to discover, the cause of  
24 action." See Norgart v. Upjohn Co., 21 Cal. 4th 383, 397 (1999). Under California law,  
25

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>2</sup> Flex alternatively alleges the running of the statute of limitations was tolled for  
28 other reasons. (See, e.g., AC ¶¶ 226-29.) In light of the Court's findings as to the  
discovery rule, discussed below, the Court does not address the sufficiency of plaintiff's  
alternative allegations.

1 the plaintiff "has reason to discover the cause of action when he has reason at least to  
 2 suspect a factual basis for its elements" and "has reason to suspect when he has notice  
 3 or information of circumstances to put a reasonable person on inquiry." See id. at 398  
 4 (internal quotations and citation omitted); see also id. at 398 n.2 (citing "uniform California  
 5 rule" that limitations period "begins to run no later than the time the plaintiff learns, or  
 6 should have learned, the facts essential to his claims") (internal quotation, citation, and  
 7 emphasis omitted).<sup>3</sup>

8 The Supreme Court of Tennessee has held "a cause of action accrues when the  
 9 plaintiff knows or in the exercise of reasonable care and diligence should know that an  
 10 injury has been sustained as a result of wrongful or tortious conduct by the defendant."  
 11 See John Kohl & Co. P.C. v. Dearborn & Ewing, 977 S.W. 2d 528, 532 (Tenn. 1998).

12 Under Tennessee law, the "knowledge component" may be actual or constructive, and a  
 13 plaintiff has the requisite constructive knowledge when the plaintiff "becomes aware or  
 14 reasonably should have become aware of facts sufficient to put a reasonable person on  
 15 notice that an injury has been sustained as a result of the defendant's negligent or  
 16 wrongful conduct." See id.

17 In asserting Flex cannot establish its claims are timely under the discovery rule,  
 18 defendants rely on four documents that were published more than four years before Flex  
 19 filed its initial complaint and that, according to defendants, suffice to put a reasonable  
 20 person on notice of the claims Flex asserts.

21 Two of those four documents pertain to actions taken by the Japan Fair Trade  
 22 Commission ("JFTC"). The first such document is an article posted July 26, 2016, on the

---

23  
 24 <sup>3</sup> In their motion, defendants, in a footnote, assert the discovery rule does not  
 25 apply to plaintiff's UCL claim. As the California Supreme Court has explained, however,  
 26 "the UCL is governed by common law accrual rules," such as "delayed discovery," to "the  
 27 same extent as any other statute." See Aryeh v. Canon Business Solutions, Inc., 55 Cal.  
 28 4th 1185, 1194, 1996 (2013); see also, e.g., In re California Bail Bond Antitrust Litig.,  
 2020 WL 3041316, at \*18-19 (N.D. Cal. April 13, 2020) (rejecting argument discovery rule  
 does not apply "as a matter of law" to price-fixing claim brought under UCL; dismissing  
 UCL claim with leave to amend to afford plaintiff leave to allege facts to support  
 application of discovery rule).

1 Japan Times's website, in which said publication reported that, on such date, the JFTC  
2 had "searched the offices of TDK Corp. and NHK Spring Co. . . . on suspicion they  
3 formed a price cartel for electronic parts for hard disk drives," specifically, "suspensions,  
4 which are used in hard drives in personal computers and gaming consoles" (see Chiu  
5 Decl. Ex. A),<sup>4</sup> and the second is a press release posted February 9, 2018, on the JFTC's  
6 website, in which the JFTC stated it had "issued a cease and desist order and surcharge  
7 payment orders to the manufacturers of suspension for Hard Disk Drives," having "found  
8 that they substantially restrained competition in the field of sales of suspension for the  
9 Japanese customer by agreeing to maintain sales price of suspension" (see id. Ex. D).

10 The remaining two documents on which defendants rely are articles reporting  
11 about a statement made by Hutchinson Technology Inc. ("HTI"), one of the defendants in  
12 the above-titled action. Both articles, one posted July 27, 2016, on Reuter's website (see  
13 id. Ex. B), and the other posted July 29, 2016, on Competition Policy International's  
14 website (see id. Ex. C), reported that HTI had announced it had received a letter from the  
15 Antitrust Division of the DOJ stating the DOJ had "opened an investigation relating to the  
16 sale of suspension assemblies for use in HDDs," that "neither HTI or any HTI employee  
17 [was] currently a subject of the DOJ investigation," and that "HTI intend[ed] to cooperate  
18 with the DOJ's investigation." (See id.; see also id. Ex. B).

19 Under both California and Tennessee law, the issue of whether a plaintiff should  
20 have discovered sufficient facts to cause the applicable limitations period to begin  
21 running ordinarily is an issue of fact. See Broberg v. Guardian Life Ins. Co., 171 Cal.  
22 App. 4th 912, 922 (2009) (holding date "[w]hen a plaintiff reasonably should have  
23 discovered facts for purposes of . . . application of the delayed discovery rule is generally  
24 a question of fact"); Hathaway v. Middle Tennessee Anesthesiology, P.C., 724 S.W. 2d

25 \_\_\_\_\_  
26 <sup>4</sup> Defendants' request, unopposed by Flex, that the Court take judicial notice of the  
27 four documents is hereby GRANTED. See Von Saher v. Norton Simon Museum of Art at  
28 Pasadena, 592 F.3d 954, 960 (9th Cir. 2010) (holding "[c]ourts may take judicial notice of  
29 publications introduced to indicate what was in the public realm at the time," but "not  
30 whether the contents of those articles were in fact true").

1 355, 360 (Tenn. 1986) (holding "[t]he question of whether due diligence under the  
2 circumstances required an examination of public records or any other particular form of  
3 investigation is properly a question for the trier of fact after hearing all the evidence").  
4 Where, however, "the allegations in the complaint and facts properly subject to judicial  
5 notice . . . can support only one reasonable conclusion," the issue is subject to  
6 determination as a matter of law. See Broberg, 171 Cal. App. 4th at 922; see also  
7 Schmank v. Sonic Automotive, Inc., 2008 WL 2078076, at \*3 (Tenn. Ct. App. May 16,  
8 2008) (holding where "no reasonable trier of fact could conclude that a plaintiff did not  
9 know, or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should not have known, that he or she  
10 was injured as a result of the defendant's wrongful conduct, . . . judgment on the  
11 pleadings or dismissal of the complaint is appropriate").

12 Here, assuming, arguendo, Flex was required to engage in a reasonable  
13 investigation, prior to July 2019, to determine whether it been injured by its purchases of  
14 HDDs, the documents on which defendants rely are insufficient to compel a finding that  
15 Flex's claims are, as a matter of law, time-barred.

16 First, although the article discussing the JFTC's investigation, as well as the press  
17 release discussing the JFTC's finding that a price-fixing conspiracy existed, expressly  
18 refer to a conspiracy to fix the prices of suspension assemblies (see Chiu Decl. Exs. A,  
19 D), the press release states the JFTC found the conspiracy restrained competition in  
20 sales "for the Japanese customer" (see id. Ex. D), which qualification suffices to preclude  
21 a finding that Flex, as a matter of law, was on inquiry notice as to its claim that  
22 defendants conspired to restrain trade in California and Tennessee.

23 Next, neither of the articles reporting on the DOJ's "investigation relating to the  
24 sale of suspension assemblies for use in HDDs" (see id. Ex. B, C) states the investigation  
25 pertained to price-fixing and, consequently, a reasonable person could understand the  
26 investigation pertained to some other type of activity. See In re Copper Antitrust Litig.,  
27 436 F.3d 782, 786-87 (9th Cir. 2006) (rejecting argument that plaintiff bringing price-fixing

28 claim against bank was, as matter of law, on inquiry notice based on articles reporting

# 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.