

1 Steve W. Berman (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
2 1301 Second Avenue, Suite 2000
3 Seattle, WA 98101
4 Telephone: (206) 623-7292
5 Facsimile: (206) 623-0594
6 Email: steve@hbsslaw.com

7 Rio S. Pierce (SBN 298297)
HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP
8 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202
9 Berkeley, CA 94710
10 Telephone: (510) 725-3000
11 Facsimile: (510) 725-3001
12 Email: riop@hbsslaw.com

13 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 MISTY SNOW, individually and on behalf of
17 others similarly situated,
18
19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 ALIGN TECHNOLOGY, INC.,
22
23 Defendant.

No.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

JURY TRIAL DEMANDED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. NATURE OF THE CASE.....1

II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE.....5

III. PARTIES.....6

IV. FACTS.....6

 A. Algin’s profits largely derive from its domination of the Aligner Market.....6

 B. The expiration of Algin’s Intellectual Property Exposed it to Competition9

 C. Algin implemented a closed system of scanners and aligners that would protect its monopolies in the respective markets.....10

 D. Algin terminated its interoperability agreement with 3Shape, sacrificing short-term profits in order to gain long term profits from the anticompetitive effects of its refusal to deal.11

 E. Algin signed exclusive dealing contracts with Dental Service Organizations to entrench its monopoly power.....15

 F. Algin’s “Fusion Program” Tied Together iTero Links, iTero Prices and Invisalign Sales.....16

 G. Algin’s set of actions substantially foreclosed competition in the aligner and scanner markets.17

V. INTERSTATE COMMERCE19

VI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS.....19

VII. RELEVANT MARKETS.....23

VIII. ANTITRUST INJURY.....25

IX. CAUSES OF ACTION.....26

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF MONOPOLIZATION OF THE ALIGNER MARKET (15 U.S.C. §2).....26

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF MONOPOLIZATION OF THE SCANNER MARKET (15 U.S.C. §2).....27

1 THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF (VIOLATIONS OF THE CARTWRIGHT ACT,
2 CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 16700, *ET SEQ.*).....28

3 FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (VIOLATIONS OF CALIFORNIA’S UNFAIR
4 COMPETITION LAW, CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200, *ET SEQ.*).....30

5 FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF (VIOLATION OF STATE ANTITRUST AND
6 RESTRAINT OF TRADE LAWS).....31

7 X. REQUEST FOR RELIEF.....31

8 XI. DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL.....33

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1 Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves individually and on behalf of a plaintiff
2 class consisting of all persons and entities who purchased Invisalign Aligners for personal use sold
3 by Align Technology, Inc. (“Align” or “Defendant”) from at least March 15, 2015 until the present
4 (Class Period).

5 **I. NATURE OF THE CASE**

6 1. Aligners are orthodontic devices that, in essence, are a plastic form of dental braces.
7 Over a course of treatment, a patient generally uses a successive series of aligners that slowly realign
8 the teeth. Aligners possess several significant advantages over dental braces. Aligners, unlike braces,
9 can be removed from the mouth for short periods of time, such as for eating, brushing, or flossing.
10 Aligners, made out of clear plastic, are also more visually inconspicuous than dental braces that are
11 usually made out of metal.



22 **Braces**



23 **Invisalign**

24 2. For decades, Align dominated the market for Aligners with its Invisalign products.
25 Align controlled more than 80 percent of the market and earned consistent, durable profit margins.
26 Align used its intellectual property to protect its dominant market position. Align frequently filed
27 litigation, such as patent infringement lawsuits, against potential competitors in the aligner market
28 who threatened Align’s dominance.

1 3. However, by 2017, Align’s intellectual property that had helped drive its market
2 dominance had begun to expire. Align publicly acknowledged the risk that “[w]hen patents expire,
3 we lose the protection and competitive advantages they provided to us, which could negatively
4 impact . . . operating results.”

5 4. Align had been able to charge high prices and earn high profit margins on Invisalign
6 because the product was protected by a thicket of hundreds of patents that Align wielded
7 aggressively to protect its Aligner monopoly. As Align CEO Joe Hogan stated in 2017: We’ve been
8 in business now for almost 20 years, and we’ve had so few competitors and people think it’s because
9 we have this great IP, it’s true we have good intellectual property, but it took 15 years for people to
10 really believe that you can move teeth with plastics[.] ... It gave us this period of time to really iterate
11 and learn *without the outside influence of other competitors coming in*.¹

12 5. Faced with competition from the loss of patent exclusivity, Align implemented a
13 anticompetitive scheme to willfully acquire and maintain its monopoly position. Align’s scheme
14 centered around its efforts to foreclose competition in the linked markets of (1) aligners; and (2) hand-
15 held digital intraoral scanners (“scanners”).

16 6. Dental offices use scanners to take digital images of the jaws, teeth, and bite of a
17 patient. These digital images are then used by aligner manufacturers to create individualized Aligners
18 for patients. During the course of a treatment, patients will generally take regular scans and have a
19 series of individual Aligners manufactured for their usage.

20 7. Align sells a scanner product called the iTero. Align’s primary competitor in the
21 Scanner market is 3Shape, who sells a “Trios” scanner. Digital scanners make it more convenient
22 and efficient for Dental Practices to order Aligners. Align has stated that “Invisalign doctors with an
23 iTero scanner have notably higher utilization rates than non-iTero doctors” i.e. – Invisalign doctors
24 with an iTero scanner order Invisalign Aligners at significantly higher levels than doctors without
25 iTero scanners. Align itself has also emphasized that Dental Practices need a fast and accurate way to
26

27
28

¹ Michela Tindera, *Out of Silicon Valley, A Billion-Dollar Orthodontics Business Built with Plastic and Patents*, Forbes (April 25, 2017) (emphasis added).

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.