

Peter R Afrasiabi (SBN 193336)
 pafrasiabi@onellp.com
ONE LLP
 4000 MacArthur Blvd.
 East Tower, Suite 500
 Newport Beach, CA 92660
 Telephone: (949) 502-2870
 Facsimile: (949) 258-5081

John E. Lord (SBN 216111)
 jlord@onellp.com
ONE LLP
 9301 Wilshire Blvd.
 Penthouse Suite
 Beverly Hills, CA 90210
 Telephone: (310) 866-5157
 Facsimile: (310) 943-2085

Samuel J. Salaro, Jr. (*pro hac vice*)
 sam@bayadvocacy.com
BAY ADVOCACY PLLC
 1700 South Mac Dill Avenue
 Suite 300
 Tampa, FL 33629
 Telephone: (813) 251-6262

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
 K.W., a minor through K.W.'s guardian, Jillian Williams,
 and Jillian Williams, individually, on behalf of themselves
 and all others similarly situated

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

K.W., a minor and through K.W.'s guardian,
 Jillian Williams; and JILLIAN WILLIAMS,
 individually, on behalf of themselves and all
 others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

EPIC GAMES, INC., a Maryland corporation,
 Defendant.

Case No. 3:21-cv-00976-CRB

CLASS ACTION

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
 DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS
 OR COMPEL ARBITRATION AND
 REQUEST FOR DISCOVERY**

Hearing Date: April 29, 2021
 Hearing Time: 10:00 AM

Complaint Filed: February 8, 2021
 Trial Date: None Set

Case No. 3:21-cv-00976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
FACTS	3
ARGUMENT	5
I. Ninth Circuit Precedent Prohibits Epic Games’ Attempt to Moot Plaintiffs’ Claims	5
II. Plaintiffs Bought V-Bucks and Virtual Items from Epic Games	8
III. Plaintiffs are Not Required to Arbitrate	9
A. Neither K.W. Nor Ms. Williams are Bound to Arbitrate	9
B. Epic Games Has Waived its Right to Non-Class Arbitration	12
IV. Plaintiffs Request Discovery on Jurisdiction and Arbitration	15
CONCLUSION	15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aviation Data, Inc. v. American Express Travel Related Servs. Co.</i> , 62 Cal.Rptr.3d 396 (Cal. Ct. App. 2007)	14
<i>Berg v. Traylor</i> , 56 Cal. Rptr.3d 140 (Cal. 2007)	7
<i>C.W. v. Epic Games, Inc.</i> , Case No. 4:19-cv-03629-YGR (N.D. Cal.)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Campbell-Ewald v. Gomez</i> , U.S. 136 S. Ct. 663 (2016)	8
<i>Certain Underwriters at Lloyd's of London v. Am. Safety Ins. Servs., Inc.</i> , 702 F. Supp. 2d 1169 (C.D. Cal. 2010)	11
<i>Chen v. Allstate Ins. Co.</i> , 819 F.3d 1136 (9th Cir. 2016)	6
<i>Comedy Club, Inc. v. Omprov West Assocs.</i> , 553 F.3d 1277 (9th Cir. 2009)	11
<i>ConWest Res., Inc. v. Playtime Novelties, Inc.</i> , 2007 WL 1288349 (N.D. Cal. May 1, 2007)	13
<i>Crafty Prods., Inc. v. Fuqing Sanzing Crafts Co. Ltd.</i> , 2016 WL 5720684 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2016)	12
<i>Doctors Assocs., Inc. v. Distajo</i> , 107 F.3d 126 (2d Cir. 1997)	15
<i>Doe v. Epic Games, Inc.</i> , 435 F. Supp. 3d 1024 (N.D. Cal. 2020)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Epic Games, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , Case No. 4:20-cv-5640	1, 3
<i>Hart v. Delta Air Lines, Inc.</i> , 2018 WL 1087846 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 22, 2018)	10
<i>Heidbreder v. Epic Games, Inc.</i> , 438 F. Supp. 3d 591 (E.D.N.C. 2020)	9, 10, 11, 12
<i>Hoffmann Const. Co. v. Active Erectors & Installers, Inc.</i> , 969 F.2d 796 (9th Cir. 1992)	13

1	<i>Hoffmann v. 162 North Wolfe LLC</i> ,	
2	175 Cal.Rptr.3d 820 (Cal. Ct. App. 2014)	11
3	<i>I.C. v. Zynga Inc.</i> ,	
4	2021 WL 51718 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2021)	15
5	<i>In re Larry's Apt., L.L.C.</i> ,	
6	249 F.3d 832 (9th Cir. 2001).....	8
7	<i>Laub v. Dep't, of Interior</i> ,	
8	342 F.3d 1080 (9th Cir. 2003).....	15
9	<i>Martin v. Yasuda</i> ,	
10	829 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2016).....	12, 13, 14, 15
11	<i>Mavris v. RSI Ent's., Inc.</i> ,	
12	303 F.R.D. 561 (D. Ariz. 2014)	6
13	<i>McLaughlin v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> ,	
14	2016 WL 3418337 (N.D. Cal. June 22, 2016)	7
15	<i>Newirth v. Aegis Senior Communities., LLC</i> ,	
16	931 F.3d 935 (9th Cir. 2019).....	12
17	<i>Pitts v. Terrible Herbst, Inc.</i> ,	
18	653 F.3d 1081 (9th Cir. 2011).....	5, 6, 8
19	<i>Prestige Cap. Corp. v. Shorebird Homeowners Ass'n</i> ,	
20	2013 WL 5947135 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2013).....	10
21	<i>R.A. v. Epic Games, Inc.</i> ,	
22	2020 WL 865420 (E.D.N.C. Feb. 20, 2020)	8, 12
23	<i>Reynoso v. Bayside Mgt. Co., LLC</i> ,	
24	2013 WL 6173765 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 25, 2015).....	12
25	<i>T.K. v. Adobe Sys. Inc.</i> ,	
26	2018 WL 1812200 (N.D. Cal. April 17, 2018)	7
27	<i>U.S. v. Park Place Assoc's., Ltd.</i> ,	
28	563 F.3d 907 (9th Cir. 2009).....	12
	<i>U.S. v. Wilson</i> ,	
	631 F.2d 118 (9th Cir. 1980).....	1
	Statutes	
	Federal Arbitration Act	14

INTRODUCTION

If its arguments here reflect reality, the business success of *Fortnite* depends on Epic Games selling virtual stuff to millions of children and then pretending, like Captain Renault in *Casablanca*, that it is “shocked, shocked” to find out it is selling virtual stuff to children. Class action claims first filed here in *C.W. v. Epic Games, Inc.*, Case No. 4:19-cv-03629-YGR, sought to assert legal rights of children taken advantage of in *Fortnite*. As described in our opposition to the motion to stay, Epic Games seeks to evade this Court’s jurisdiction over those class claims so that it might conclude a settlement in North Carolina state court that would not get approved here. (*See* Dkt. 21 at 1-3).

In *C.W.*, a minor *Fortnite* player no different from the plaintiff here brought class claims seeking declaratory, injunctive, and monetary relief from Epic Games on causes of action founded on a minor’s legal right to disaffirm purchases of virtual items made in *Fortnite* and related theories. (*See C.W.* Dkt. 56 ¶¶ 57-61).¹ Epic Games moved to compel arbitration arguing that C.W. accepted license agreements containing arbitration provisions, including one that “required affirmative acceptance by an adult.” (*C.W.* Dkt. 21 at 4). Judge Gonzalez Rogers denied the motion because C.W. had disaffirmed those agreements, thus eliminating any contractual basis upon which he could be made to arbitrate. *See Doe v. Epic Games, Inc.*, 435 F. Supp. 3d 1024, 1038 (N.D. Cal. 2020).

Epic Games later tried a motion to dismiss that argued that because C.W.’s *Fortnite* purchases were concluded in the Apple (iTunes) and Sony (PlayStation) marketplaces, C.W. had no disaffirmation claim directly against Epic Games. (*C.W.* Dkt. 59 at 11; 64 at 7-8). Judge Gonzales Rogers rejected that argument as well, pointing out in the process that it was inconsistent with Epic Games’ judicial admissions in *Epic Games, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, Case No. 4:20-cv-5640, in which it said that the Apple marketplace was “a payment processing platform for selling digital in-app content to consumers from which [Epic Games] collects 70 percent of the consumer’s payment.” *C.W. v. Epic Games, Inc.*, 2020 WL 5257572, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 3, 2020) (cleaned up).

Having survived its motions, *C.W.* was the only class action against Epic Games that was

¹ In this brief, we cite documents filed in the *C.W.* and *Epic v. Apple* cases in this court and accessible through CM/ECF. This court may take judicial notice of those records under Fed. R. Evid. 201, *see U.S. v. Wilson*, 631 F.2d 118, 119 (9th Cir. 1980), and we request that it do so.

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.