

1 Ruby H. Kazi (CA 243872)
Lily A. North (CA 260709)
2 Benesch, Friedlander, Coplan & Aronoff LLP
One Montgomery, Suite 2700
3 San Francisco, California 94104-4505
Telephone: 628.600.2250
4 Facsimile: 628.221.5828
rkazi@beneschlaw.com
5 lnorth@beneschlaw.com

6 Emily N. Dillingham (*pro hac vice*)
Lauren C. Tortorella (*pro hac vice*)
7 Benesch, Friedlander, Coplan & Aronoff LLP
71 South Wacker Drive, Suite 1600
8 Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: 312-212-4949
9 edillingham@beneschlaw.com
ltortorella@beneschlaw.com

10 Counsel for Defendant DOORDASH, INC.
11

12 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
13 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
14 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

15 LONA’S LITTLE EATS, LLC, on its own
16 behalf and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

17 Plaintiff,

18 v.

19 DOORDASH, INC.,

20 Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-6703-TSH

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
DOORDASH, INC.’S MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFF’S AMENDED COMPLAINT**

21 Date: January 21, 2021
22 Time: 10:00 a.m.
23 Location: Courtroom G - 15th Floor
24 Judge: The Hon. Thomas S. Hixson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PAGE 2

INTRODUCTION 10

STATEMENT OF FACTS 11

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED (L.R. 7-4(A)(3))..... 12

LEGAL STANDARD..... 12

ARGUMENT..... 13

I. PLAINTIFF FAILS TO STATE A LANHAM ACT CLAIM 13

 A. Plaintiff Has Not Pled a False Statement..... 14

 B. DoorDash Did Not Make the Alleged Statements Within a Commercial Advertisement..... 16

 1. DoorDash’s Checkout Page is not “Commercial Speech” 17

 2. DoorDash Is Not In Competition With Plaintiff..... 17

 3. DoorDash Did Not Make the Alleged Statements to Influence Consumers to Buy Its Product 18

 C. Plaintiff Did Not Adequately Allege That DoorDash’s Purported Statements Actually Deceived Or Had a Tendency to Deceive Customers..... 19

 D. Plaintiff Has Not Sufficiently Alleged Injury 20

II. PLAINTIFF’S FAL CLAIM FAILS 22

 A. Plaintiff’s FAL Claim Fails Because Its Lanham Act Claim Fails..... 22

 B. Plaintiff Lacks Standing to Bring a FAL Claim 23

 C. Plaintiff Has Not Adequately Pled a Claim under the FAL..... 23

 1. Plaintiff has not adequately pled an “untrue or misleading” statement. 24

 2. DoorDash’s statements do not constitute “publicly disseminated advertising.” 25

 3. Plaintiff has failed to allege it actually relied on DoorDash’s purported statements to its detriment. 26

 4. Plaintiff has not sufficiently pled injury. 26

1 III. PLAINTIFF’S UCL CLAIM FAILS 27

2 A. Plaintiff’s UCL Claim Fails Because Its Lanham Act Claim Fails 27

3 B. Plaintiff Lacks Standing to Bring a UCL Claim..... 27

4 C. Plaintiff Has Not Adequately Pled a UCL Claim 28

5 1. Plaintiff Has Not Alleged that DoorDash’s Statements Were

6 “Unlawful” 29

7 2. Plaintiff Has Not Alleged That DoorDash’s Conduct was “Unfair” 29

8 3. Plaintiff Has Not Sufficiently Pled that DoorDash’s Statements Were

9 “Fraudulent” 30

10 IV. PLAINTIFF CANNOT SEEK INJUNCTIVE RELIEF 31

11 CONCLUSION..... 32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>23andMe, Inc. v. Ancestry.com DNA, LLC</i> , 356 F. Supp. 3d 889 (N.D. Cal. 2018), aff'd, 778 F. App'x 966 (Fed. Cir. 2019).....	26
<i>Alfasigma USA, Inc. v. First Databank, Inc.</i> , 398 F. Supp. 3d 578 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	18, 19
<i>AlterG, Inc. v. Boost Treadmills LLC</i> , 388 F. Supp. 3d 1133 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	14, 30
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	11, 12
<i>Azare v. Gateway Genomics, LLC</i> , 2017 WL 1479184 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 25, 2017).....	25
<i>Beasley v. Lucky Stores, Inc.</i> , 400 F. Supp. 3d 942 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	24, 26
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	12
<i>Bernard v. Donat</i> , 2012 WL 525533 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2012).....	17
<i>Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.</i> , 20 Cal. 4th 163 (Cal. 1999).....	29, 30
<i>City of Los Angeles v. Lyons</i> , 461 U.S. 95 (1983).....	31
<i>Cleary v. News Corp.</i> , 30 F.3d 1255 (9th Cir. 1994).....	27
<i>Clorox Co. v. Reckitt Benckiser Grp. PLC</i> , 398 F. Supp. 3d 623 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	23, 26, 28, 30
<i>Coastal Abstract Serv., Inc. v. First Am. Title Ins. Co.</i> , 173 F.3d 725 (9th Cir. 1999).....	16, 17, 19
<i>Cooper v. Pickett</i> , 137 F.3d 616 (9th Cir. 1997).....	13

1 *Davidson v. Kimberly-Clark Corp.*,
 2 873 F.3d 1103 (9th Cir. 2017), *as amended on denial of reh’g en banc*, 889 F.3d 956
 3 (9th Cir. 2018).....14, 30, 31

4 *Deitz v. Comcast Corp.*,
 5 2006 WL 3782903 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 21, 2006).....31

6 *Denbicare U.S.A., Inc. v. Toys “R” Us, Inc.*,
 7 84 F.3d 1143 (9th Cir. 1996)22

8 *Diva Limousine, Ltd. v. Uber Tech. Inc.*,
 9 392 F. Supp. 3d 1074 (N.D. Cal. 2019)21

10 *DNA Sports Performance Lab, Inc. v. Major League Baseball*,
 11 2020 WL 4430793 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2020)21, 26

12 *Erickson v. Pardus*,
 13 551 U.S. 89 (2007).....11

14 *Experian Information Solutions, Inc. v. Lifelock, Inc.*,
 15 633 F. Supp. 2d 1104 (C.D. Cal. 2009)29

16 *Factory Direct Wholesale, LLC v. iTouchless Housewares & Products, Inc.*,
 17 411 F. Supp. 3d 905 (N.D. Cal. 2019)14

18 *Fareed Sephery-Fard v. Santa Clara Court*,
 19 2018 WL 6025606 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2018)13

20 *Halicki v. United Artists Comms., Inc.*,
 21 812 F.2d 1213 (9th Cir. 1987)18

22 *Heartland Payment Sys., Inc. v. Mercury Payment Sys., LLC*,
 23 2015 WL 3377662 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 24, 2015)28

24 *Heartland Payment Systems, Inc. v. Mercury Payment Systems, LLC*,
 25 2016 WL 304764 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 26, 2016).....13

26 *Hodgers -Durgin v. de la Vina*,
 27 199 F.3d 1037 (9th Cir. 1999)31

28 *Homeland Housewares, LLC v. Euro-Pro Operating LLC*,
 2014 WL 6892141 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2014).....22, 27

Jack Russell Terrier Network of N. Ca. v. Am. Kennel Club,
 407 F3d 1027 (9th Cir. 2005)21

Japan Telecom, Inc. v. Japan Telecom Am. Inc.,
 287 F.3d 866 (9th Cir. 2002)27

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.