

1 **WILLKIE FARR & GALLAGHER LLP**
 2 BENEDICT Y. HUR (SBN: 224018)
 3 bhur@willkie.com
 4 SIMONA AGNOLUCCI (SBN: 246943)
 5 sagnolucci@willkie.com
 6 EDUARDO E. SANTACANA (SBN: 281668)
 7 esantacana@willkie.com
 8 LORI C. ARAKAKI (SBN: 315119)
 9 larakaki@willkie.com
 10 ARGEMIRA FLOREZ (SBN: 331153)
 11 aflorez@willkie.com
 12 HARRIS MATEEN (SBN: 335593)
 13 hmatten@willkie.com
 14 One Front Street, 34th Floor
 15 San Francisco, CA 94111
 16 Telephone: (415) 858-7400
 17 Facsimile: (415) 858-7599

18 Attorneys for Defendant
 19 GOOGLE LLC

20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 21 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 22 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

23 ANIBAL RODRIGUEZ, et al. individually and
 24 on behalf of all others similarly situated,

25 Plaintiff,

26 vs.

27 GOOGLE LLC,

28 Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-CV-04688-RS

**DEFENDANT GOOGLE LLC'S
 OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
 MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A
 FOURTH AMENDED COMPLAINT**

The Honorable Richard Seeborg
 Date: December 8, 2022
 Time: 1:30 p.m.
 Place: Courtroom 3 - 17th Floor

Action Filed: July 14, 2020
 Trial Date: Not Yet Set

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

	<u>Page(s)</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RELEVANT BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY.....	3
A. This case has always been about app measurement data sent by third-party apps to Google.	3
1. Plaintiffs’ initial complaint accused Google’s software for third-party app developers.	3
2. Plaintiffs’ First Amended Complaint did not change their fundamental allegations about third-party apps.	3
3. Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint advanced a similar theory about third-party apps.	4
4. Plaintiffs’ Third Amended Complaint was more of the same.	5
B. There has been extensive discovery and motion practice based on the factual allegations in the Second and Third Amended Complaints.	6
C. Plaintiffs propose to modify classes and add a <i>new</i> Google Search Class.	7
III. LEGAL STANDARD.....	8
IV. ARGUMENT	9
A. Plaintiffs’ proposed amendment to the Class 1 and 2 definitions includes one word the Court should strike.....	9
B. Plaintiffs’ proposed amendment to add a Google Search Class and a Search-Related legal theory should be denied.	10
1. Google will be prejudiced if Plaintiffs are allowed leave to amend. ...	10
2. Plaintiffs’ counsel have always known that Google uses anonymized Search data for product improvement purposes, but inexcusably delayed in suing over it until now.....	16
3. The Other <i>Foman</i> Factors Including Bad Faith, Futility, and Number of Amendments Each Support Denying Plaintiff’s Motion.....	19
V. CONCLUSION.....	22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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(s)

Cases

Aguilar v. Boulder Brands, Inc.,
2014 WL 4352169 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 2, 2014).....13

AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Dialysist W., Inc.,
465 F.3d 946 (9th Cir. 2006)16, 17

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007).....9

Briseno v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.,
844 F.3d 1121 (9th Cir. 2017)10

Brown v. Google LLC,
2022 WL 2289057 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 18, 2022).....12, 13

California v. Neville Chem. Co.,
358 F.3d 661 (9th Cir. 2004)21

Callan v. Amdahl Corp.,
1995 WL 261420 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 1995)12

Circle Click Media LLC v. Regus Mgmt. Grp. LLC,
2016 WL 586975820

City of L.A. v. San Pedro Boat Works,
635 F.3d 440 (9th Cir. 2011)8

Dep’t of Fair Emp. & Hous. v. L. Sch. Admission Council, Inc.,
2013 WL 485830 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2013)10

Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.,
316 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir. 2003)10

Foman v. Davis,
371 U.S. 178 (1962).....2, 8, 10, 19

Hightower v. City & Cty. of San Francisco,
2015 WL 926541 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2015).....12

Jackson v. Bank of Hawaii,
902 F.2d 1385 (9th Cir. 1990)8, 10, 12, 16

Jackson v. Laureate, Inc.,
186 F.R.D. 605 (E.D. Cal. 1999)22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONTINUED)

	<u>Page(s)</u>
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	

Johnson v. Buckley,
 356 F.3d 1067 (9th Cir. 2004)8
Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.,
 975 F.2d 604 (9th Cir. 1992)8
Jordan v. Los Angeles Cty.,
 669 F.2d 1311 (9th Cir.)16
Kittel v. City of Oxnard,
 2018 WL 6004522 (C.D. Cal. July 9, 2018).....8
Koch v. Koch Indus.,
 127 F.R.D. 206 (D. Kan. 1989).....19
Lockheed Martin Corp. v. Network Sols., Inc.,
 194 F.3d 980 (9th Cir. 1999)11
McCabe v. Six Continents Hotels, Inc.,
 2013 WL 12306494 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2013).....13
McGlinchy v. Shell Chem. Co.,
 845 F.2d 802 (9th Cir. 1988)16
Menendez-Gonzalez v. Kelly,
 2017 WL 11632799 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2017).....19
Moore v. Kayport Package Exp., Inc.,
 885 F.2d 53121
Muench Photography, Inc. v. Pearson Educ., Inc.,
 2013 WL 4426493 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 15, 2013)11
Nunes v. Ashcroft,
 348 F.3d 805 (9th Cir. 2004)10
Oracle Am., Inc. v. Hewlett Packard Enter. Co.,
 2017 WL 3149297 (N.D. Cal. July 25, 2017).....13
Pinterest, Inc. v. Pintrips, Inc.,
 2014 WL 12611300 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2014)15
Platt Elec. Supply, Inc. v. EOFF Elec., Inc.,
 522 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 2008)21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (CONTINUED)

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(s)

Risher v. Adecco Inc.,
2021 WL 9182421 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 17, 2021)13

Sisseton-Wahpeton Sioux Tribe of Lake Traverse Indian Reservation v. United States,
90 F.3d 351 (9th Cir. 1996)10, 22

Solomon v. N. Am. Life & Cas. Ins. Co.,
151 F.3d 1132 (9th Cir. 1998)12

Stambanis v. TBWA Worldwide, Inc.,
2020 WL 4060171 (C.D. Cal. July 20, 2020).....11, 15

Synchronoss Techs., Inc. v. Dropbox Inc.,
2019 WL 95927 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2019).....13

*United Ass’n of Journeyman & Apprentices of the Plumbing & Pipe Fitting Indus.,
Underground Util./Landscape Loc. Union No. 355 v. Maniglia Landscape, Inc.*,
2019 WL 7877822 (N.D. Cal. July 22, 2019).....20

Wash. St. Repub. Party v. Wash. St. Grange,
676 F. 3d 784 (9th Cir. 2012)8

Wheeler v. Estee Lauder Companies, Inc.,
2013 WL 12121543 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2013).....10

Zivkovic v. S. Cal. Edison Co.,
302 F.3d 1080 (9th Cir. 2002)12

Other Authorities

Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(a)..... *passim*

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.