

1 SONAL N. MEHTA (SBN 222086)
2 Sonal.Mehta@wilmerhale.com
3 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
4 HALE AND DORR LLP
5 950 Page Mill Road
6 Palo Alto, California 94303
7 Telephone: (650) 858-6000
8 Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

9 DAVID Z. GRINGER (*pro hac vice*)
10 David.Gringer@wilmerhale.com
11 ARI HOLTZBLATT (*pro hac vice*)
12 Ari.Holtzblatt@wilmerhale.com
13 MOLLY M. JENNINGS (*pro hac vice*)
14 Molly.Jennings@wilmerhale.com
15 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
16 HALE AND DORR LLP
17 1875 Pennsylvania Ave NW
18 Washington, DC 20006
19 Telephone: (202) 663-6000
20 Facsimile: (202) 663-6363

21 *Attorneys for Defendant*
22 FACEBOOK, INC.

23 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
24 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
25 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

26 REVEAL CHAT HOLDCO, LLC, a Delaware
27 limited liability company, USA TECHNOLOGY
28 AND MANAGEMENT SERVICES, INC. (d/b/a
Lenddo USA), a Delaware corporation, CIR.CL,
INC., a dissolved Delaware corporation, and
BEEHIVE BIOMETRIC, INC., a dissolved
Delaware corporation,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:20-CV-00363-BLF

**DEFENDANT FACEBOOK INC.'S
REPLY IN SUPPORT OF MOTION
TO DISMISS**

Hearing Date: June 11, 2020
Time: 9:00 AM
Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

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

ARGUMENT2

I. Plaintiffs’ Claims Are Time-Barred.....2

 A. Fraudulent Concealment Does Not Save Any of Plaintiffs’ Claims.....2

 B. Counts IV and V are Untimely5

 1. Count IV is Untimely5

 2. Count V Is Untimely7

 C. Laches Bars Plaintiffs’ Claims For Injunctive Relief.....7

II. Plaintiffs Have Not Plausibly Alleged Causal Antitrust Injury8

III. Plaintiffs’ Alleged Relevant Product Markets Are Invalid.....9

 A. “Social Data” Is Not A Valid Product Market.....9

 B. “Social Advertising” Is Not A Valid Product Market10

IV. Plaintiffs Have Failed To State Claims Under The Sherman Act11

 A. Counts I, II and V Do Not State Section 2 Claims11

 B. Count III Does Not State A Section 1 Claim.....13

 C. Counts IV and V Fail To Allege Antitrust Injury15

CONCLUSION.....15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
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>Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Co.</i> , 472 U.S. 585 (1985).....	1, 12, 13
<i>Bourns, Inc. v. Raychem Corp.</i> , 331 F.3d 704 (9th Cir. 2003)	8, 9
<i>Brantley v. NBC Universal, Inc.</i> , 675 F.3d 1192 (9th Cir. 2012)	10, 12, 14, 15
<i>Cargill, Inc. v. Monfort of Colorado, Inc.</i> , 479 U.S. 104 (1986).....	8
<i>Carnero v. Elk Grove Fin., LLC</i> , 2017 WL 1315575 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2017) (Freeman, J.).....	2
<i>City of Anaheim v. Southern California Edison Co.</i> , 955 F.2d 1373 (9th Cir. 1992)	11
<i>City of Groton v. Connecticut Light & Power Co.</i> , 662 F.2d 921 (2d Cir. 1981).....	11
<i>City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders</i> , 2020 WL 2079256 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2020)	9
<i>Complete Entertainment Resources LLC v. Live Nation Entertainment, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 3457177 (C.D. Cal. May 11, 2016)	5, 6, 7
<i>Conmar Corp. v. Mitsui & Co. (U.S.A.), Inc.</i> , 858 F.2d 499 (9th Cir. 1988)	2, 3
<i>Federal Trade Commission v. Wilh. Wilhemsen Holding ASA</i> , 341 F. Supp. 3d 27 (D.D.C. 2018).....	9
<i>Feitelson v. Google Inc.</i> , 80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	15
<i>Foremost Pro Color, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.</i> , 703 F.2d 534 (9th Cir. 1983), <i>overruled on other grounds by Chroma Lighting v. GTE Prods. Corp.</i> , 111 F.3d 653 (9th Cir. 1997).....	12
<i>Free FreeHand Corp. v. Adobe Systems Inc.</i> , 852 F. Supp. 2d 1171 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	6
<i>Frenzel v. AliphCom</i> , 76 F. Supp. 3d 999 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	14

1 *Garrison v. Oracle Corp.*,
 2 159 F. Supp. 3d 1044 (N.D. Cal. 2016)4

3 *Hexcel Corp. v. Ineos Polymers, Inc.*,
 4 681 F.3d 1055 (9th Cir. 2012)4

5 *Hicks v. PGA Tour, Inc.*,
 6 897 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2018)10, 11

7 *Hoang v. Bank of America, N.A.*,
 8 910 F.3d 1096 (9th Cir. 2018)2

9 *Image Tech. Servs. Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.*,
 10 125 F.3d 1195 (9th Cir. 1997)10

11 *In re Glumetza Antitrust Litigation*,
 12 2020 WL 1066934 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2020).....3

13 *In re Musical Instruments and Equipment Antitrust Litigation*,
 14 798 F.3d 1186 (2015).....14

15 *Knevelbaard Dairies v. Kraft Foods, Inc.*,
 16 232 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2000)8

17 *Matsushita Electric Industrial Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.*,
 18 475 U.S. 574 (1986).....15

19 *MetroNet Services Corp. v. Qwest Corp.*,
 20 383 F.3d 1124 (9th Cir. 2004)13

21 *Midwestern Machinery Co., Inc. v. Northwest Airlines, Inc.*,
 22 392 F.3d 265 (8th Cir. 2004)5, 6, 7

23 *NorthBay Healthcare Group, Inc. v. Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, Inc.*,
 24 305 F. Supp. 3d 1065 (N.D. Cal. 2018)8

25 *Novell, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,
 26 731 F.3d 1064 (10th Cir. 2013)13

27 *NYNEX Corp. v. Discon, Inc.*,
 28 525 U.S. 128 (1998).....14

Oliver v. SD-3C LLC,
 751 F.3d 1081 (9th Cir. 2014)5, 7

Oltz v. St. Peter’s Community Hospital,
 861 F.2d 1440 (9th Cir. 1988)9

Planet Drum Foundation v. Hart,
 2017 WL 4236932 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 24, 2017)8

1	<i>Pool Water Products v. Olin Corp.</i> ,	
2	258 F.3d 1024 (9th Cir. 2001)	15
3	<i>Rutledge v. Boston Woven Hose and Rubber Co.</i> ,	
4	576 F.2d 248 (9th Cir. 1978)	4
5	<i>Ryan v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	
6	147 F. Supp. 3d 868 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	4
7	<i>Sambreel Holdings LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,	
8	906 F. Supp. 2d 1070 (S.D. Cal. 2012).....	13
9	<i>Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. v. Panasonic Corp.</i> ,	
10	747 F.3d 1199 (9th Cir. 2014)	6, 7
11	<i>SD3 II LLC v. Black & Decker (U.S.) Inc.</i> ,	
12	888 F.3d 98 (4th Cir. 2018)	4
13	<i>Tele Atlas N.V. v. NAVTEQ Corp.</i> ,	
14	2008 WL 4911230 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2008)	11
15	<i>United States v. eBay, Inc.</i> ,	
16	968 F. Supp. 2d 1030 (N.D. Cal. 2013)	14
17	<i>Verizon Communications Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP</i> ,	
18	540 U.S. 398 (2004).....	11, 13
19	<i>Viamedia, Inc. v. Comcast Corp.</i> ,	
20	951 F.3d 429 (7th Cir. 2020)	13
21	<i>Von Saher v. Norton Simon Museum of Art at Pasadena</i> ,	
22	592 F.3d 954 (9th Cir. 2010)	3
23	<i>Warner v. Tinder, Inc.</i> ,	
24	105 F. Supp. 3d 1083 (C.D. Cal. 2015)	14
25	<i>William Inglis v. ITT Continental Baking Co.</i> ,	
26	668 F.2d 1014 (9th Cir. 1981)	3
27	<i>Z Technologies Corp. v. Lubrizol Corp.</i> ,	
28	753 F.3d 594 (6th Cir. 2014)	7
	STATUTES, RULES, AND REGULATIONS	
	15 U.S.C. § 15b.....	2
	OTHER AUTHORITIES	
	Deepa Seetharaman and Elizabeth Dwoskin, <i>Facebook’s Restrictions on User</i> <i>Data Cast a Long Shadow</i> , WALL ST. J. (Sept. 21, 2015)	2, 3

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.