

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

WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND  
DORR LLP  
SONAL N. MEHTA (SBN 222086)  
sonal.mehta@wilmerhale.com  
2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400  
Palo Alto, CA 94306  
Telephone: (650) 858-6000  
Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

ANDY R. O’LAUGHLIN (*pro hac vice*)  
andy.olaughlin@wilmerhale.com  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
Telephone: (617) 526-6220  
Facsimile: (617) 526-5000

ARI HOLTZBLATT (*pro hac vice*)  
Ari.Holtzblatt@wilmerhale.com  
ALLISON SCHULTZ (*pro hac vice*)  
Allison.Schultz@wilmerhale.com  
ROBIN C. BURRELL (*pro hac vice*)  
robin.burrell@wilmerhale.com  
1875 Pennsylvania Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 663-6000  
Facsimile: (202) 663-6363

CINDY PAN (*pro hac vice*)  
cindy.pan@wilmerhale.com  
250 Greenwich Street  
New York, NY 10007  
Telephone: (212) 937-7275  
Facsimile: (212) 230-8888

Attorneys for Plaintiff/Counterclaim Defendant  
Meta Platforms, Inc.

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
**SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware  
corporation,  
  
Plaintiff/Counterclaim  
Defendant,  
  
v.  
  
BRANDTOTAL LTD., an Israeli corporation, and  
UNIMANIA, INC., a Delaware corporation,  
  
Defendants/  
Counterclaim  
Plaintiffs.

Case No. 3:20-CV-07182-JCS

**PLAINTIFF META PLATFORM  
INC’S NOTICE OF MOTION AND  
MOTION FOR ATTORNEY’S FEES**

Hon. Joseph C. Spero  
Courtroom F – 15th Floor  
Date: October 7, 2022  
Time: 9:30 a.m.

**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**

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR ATTORNEY’S FEES ..... 1

STATEMENT OF REQUESTED RELIEF ..... 1

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ..... 1

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND ..... 2

    A. BrandTotal Scraped Data From Meta’s Platforms Without Authorization ..... 2

    B. BrandTotal Continued Its Unlawful Conduct, Forcing Meta To Litigate ..... 2

    C. BrandTotal’s Conduct Drove Up Litigation Costs ..... 4

    D. Meta Prevailed At Summary Judgment ..... 6

    E. BrandTotal Stopped Its Unlawful Conduct Only After The Court Granted  
    Meta’s Motion For Summary Judgment ..... 7

II. ARGUMENT ..... 7

    A. Meta Is Entitled To Recover All Reasonable Attorney’s Fees ..... 7

    B. The Requested Fee Amount Is Reasonable ..... 11

        1. Meta’s Fee Request Is Reasonable In Light Of Its Significant Success ..... 11

        2. The Fee Rate Is Reasonable ..... 14

        3. Meta’s Fee Request Is Reasonable In Light Of BrandTotal’s Litigation  
        Conduct ..... 15

        4. Meta Is Not Seeking Fees Paid To Hunton Andrews Kurth ..... 16

III. CONCLUSION ..... 16

**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**

*Amphastar Pharmaceuticals Inc. v. Aventis Pharma SA*,  
2020 WL 8680070 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 13, 2020).....14

*Barnes v. AT&T Pension Benefit Plan*,  
963 F. Supp. 2d 950 (N.D. Cal. 2013) .....14

*Bates v. United Parcel Service, Inc.*,  
511 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2007) .....10

*Caplan v. CAN Financial Corp.*,  
573 F. Supp. 2d 1244 (N.D. Cal. 2008) .....13, 14

*Cottle v. Plaid Inc.*,  
2022 WL 2829882 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2022).....14

*Envirosource, Inc. v. Horsehead Resource Development Co.*,  
981 F. Supp. 876 (S.D.N.Y. 1998).....15

*Facebook, Inc. v. Power Ventures, Inc.*,  
2017 WL 3394754 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 8, 2017) .....7

*Facebook, Inc. v. Power Ventures, Inc.*,  
844 F.3d 1058 (9th Cir. 2016) .....9

*Facebook, Inc. v. Sluchevsky*,  
2020 WL 5823277 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2020), *report & recommendation adopted*,  
2020 WL 5816578 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2020) .....7

*Farrar v. Hobby*,  
506 U.S. 103 (1992).....8

*Fleming v. Impax Laboratories Inc.*,  
2022 WL 2789496 (N.D. Cal. July 15, 2022).....14

*Hensley v. Eckerhart*,  
461 U.S. 424 (1983).....7, 9, 12, 13

*Higher Taste, Inc. v. City of Tacoma*,  
717 F.3d 712 (9th Cir. 2013) .....8

*Illumina, Inc. v. BGI Genomics Co.*,  
2022 WL 899421 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2022).....10

1 *Love v. Associated Newspapers, Ltd.*,  
 2 611 F.3d 601 (9th Cir. 2010) .....7, 9  
 3 *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Giganews, Inc.*,  
 4 2015 WL 1746484 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 2015), *aff'd*, 847 F.3d 657 (9th Cir. 2017) .....14  
 5 *Physician’s Surrogacy, Inc. v. German*,  
 6 311 F. Supp. 3d 1190 (S.D. Cal. 2018).....8  
 7 *Rodriguez v. Barrita, Inc.*,  
 8 53 F. Supp. 3d 1268 (N.D. Cal. 2014) .....12  
 9 *Straight Path IP Group, Inc. v. Cisco Systesms, Inc.*,  
 10 2020 WL 2539002 (N.D. Cal. May 19, 2020) .....14  
 11 *Thorne v. City of El Segundo*,  
 12 802 F.2d 1131 (9th Cir. 1986) .....9, 11, 12  
 13 *Watson v. County of Riverside*,  
 14 300 F.3d 1092 (9th Cir. 2002) .....8  
 15 *Webb v. Sloan*,  
 16 330 F.3d 1158 (9th Cir. 2003) .....9, 12  
 17 *Wit v. United Behavioral Health*,  
 18 \_\_ F. Supp. 3d \_\_, 2022 WL 45057 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2022).....15

16 **STATUTES, RULES, AND REGULATIONS**

17 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1).....10  
 18 California Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act (CDAFA)..... passim  
 19 Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (CFAA)..... passim  
 20 Cal. Penal Code § 502(e)(2).....1, 7  
 21 Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(a) .....10  
 22 Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(2).....1, 9  
 23 Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(d)(2)(B) .....9  
 24 Local Rule 54-5.....9, 10

25 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

26 1987 Cal. Legis. Servs. ch. 1499 (S.B. 255) (West).....8  
 27

1 2000 Cal. Legis. Servs. Ch. 635 (A.B. 2727) (West) .....8

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



# 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.