

1 DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669  
 City Attorney  
 2 WAYNE K. SNODGRASS, State Bar #148137  
 JEREMY M. GOLDMAN, State Bar #218888  
 3 Deputy City Attorneys  
 City Hall, Room 234  
 4 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
 San Francisco, California 94102-4682  
 5 Telephone: (415) 554-6762  
 Facsimile: (415) 554-4699  
 6 E-Mail: jeremy.goldman@sfcityatty.org

7 Attorneys for Defendant  
 8 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

9  
 10  
 11  
 12  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20  
 21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 25  
 26  
 27  
 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DOORDASH, INC. and GRUBHUB INC.,  
 Plaintiffs,  
 vs.  
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
 Defendant.

Case No. 3:21-cv-05502 EMC

**DEFENDANT CITY AND COUNTY OF  
 SAN FRANCISCO'S NOTICE AND  
 MOTION TO DISMISS; MEMORANDUM  
 OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

Hearing Date: November 4, 2021  
 Time: 1:30 p.m.  
 Place: Courtroom 5



**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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ..... iii

NOTICE AND MOTION ..... 1

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES ..... 1

ISSUES TO BE DECIDED ..... 1

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS ..... 2

    A.    The Ordinance..... 2

    B.    Plaintiffs’ Business Practices ..... 3

LEGAL STANDARD FOR MOTION TO DISMISS ..... 4

ARGUMENT ..... 4

    I.    THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF THE  
         CONTRACT CLAUSE OF THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS.. 4

        A.    There Is No Substantial Impairment of a Contractual Relationship ..... 5

        B.    The Ordinance Is an Appropriate and Reasonable Way to Advance a  
             Significant and Legitimate Public Purpose..... 7

    II.   THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR AN  
         UNCONSTITUTIONAL TAKING UNDER THE FIFTH AMENDMENT OR  
         FOR INVERSE CONDEMNATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA  
         CONSTITUTION ..... 9

        A.    Plaintiffs’ Contracts Do Not Give Rise to a Claim Under the Taking  
             Clause..... 9

        B.    Even If Plaintiffs’ Contracts Are Property for the Purposes of the Taking  
             Clause, the Complaint Fails to Establish a Regulatory Taking ..... 10

    III.  THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF  
         ARTICLE XI, SECTION 7 OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION ..... 12

    IV.  THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF DUE  
         PROCESS ..... 13

    V.   THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF  
         EQUAL PROTECTION ..... 15

1 VI. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR FIRST  
2 AMENDMENT RETALIATION.....18  
3 A. The Complaint Does Not Satisfy Any Element as to Grubhub .....18  
4 B. The Complaint Does Not Plausibly Allege Facts to Establish the Second  
5 and Third Elements as to DoorDash .....19  
6 VII. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF THE  
7 DORMANT COMMERCE CLAUSE.....22  
8 VIII. LEAVE TO AMEND SHOULD BE DENIED .....24  
9 CONCLUSION.....25  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

1

2 *Allied Properties v. Dep’t of Alcoholic Beverage Control*

3 53 Cal.2d 141 (1959) .....12

4 *Allied Structural Steel Co. v. Spannaus*

5 438 U.S. 234 (1978).....9

6 *Animal Legal Def. Fund v. Wasden*

7 878 F.3d 1184 (9th Cir. 2018) .....17

8 *Armour v. City of Indianapolis, Ind.*

9 566 U.S. 673 (2012).....15

10 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*

11 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....4, 21

12 *Associated Home Builders etc., Inc. v. City of Livermore*

13 18 Cal.3d 582 (1976) .....13

14 *Bd. of Trustees of W. Conf. of Teamsters Pension Tr. Fund v. Thompson Bldg. Materials, Inc.*

15 749 F.2d 1396 (9th Cir. 1984) .....10

16 *Birkenfeld v. City of Berkeley*

17 17 Cal.3d 129 (1976) .....13

18 *Blair v. Bethel Sch. Dist.*

19 608 F.3d 540 (9th Cir. 2010) .....20

20 *Boardman v. Inslee*

21 978 F.3d 1092 (9th Cir. 2020) .....18

22 *Brown v. Hovatter*

23 561 F.3d 357 (4th Cir. 2009) .....14

24 *California Bldg. Indus. Assn. v. City of San Jose*

25 61 Cal.4th 435 (2015) .....7

26 *California Grocers Ass’n v. City of Long Beach*

27 No. 221CV00524ODWASX, 2021 WL 3500960 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2021).....5

28 *Campanelli v. Allstate Life Ins. Co.*

29 322 F.3d 1086 (9th Cir. 2003) .....5

30 *Capp v. Cty. of San Diego*

940 F.3d 1046 (9th Cir. 2019) .....18

31 *Chang v. United States*

859 F.2d 893 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....11, 12, 25

1 *Chinatown Neighborhood Ass’n v. Harris*  
794 F.3d 1136 (9th Cir. 2015) .....24, 25

2 *City of Las Vegas v. Foley*  
3 747 F.2d 1294 (9th Cir. 1984) .....20

4 *Classic Cab, Inc. v. D.C.*  
5 288 F. Supp. 3d 218 (D.D.C. 2018) .....11

6 *Comm. for Reasonable Regul. of Lake Tahoe v. Tahoe Reg’l Plan. Agency*  
311 F. Supp. 2d 972 (D. Nev. 2004).....25

7 *Concrete Pipe & Prods. of Cal., Inc. v. Constr. Laborers Pension Trust for S. Cal.*  
8 508 U.S. 602 (1993).....11

9 *Connolly v. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp.*  
10 475 U.S. 211 (1986).....9, 10, 11

11 *CTS Corp. v. Dynamics Corp. of America*  
481 U.S. 69 (1987).....23

12 *Cycle City, Ltd. v. Harley-Davidson Motor Co.*  
13 81 F. Supp. 3d 993 (D. Haw. 2014) .....8

14 *Desoto CAB Co., Inc. v. Picker*  
228 F. Supp. 3d 950 (N.D. Cal. 2017) .....16, 17, 24

15 *Duquesne Light Co. v. Barasch*  
16 488 U.S. 299 (1989).....14

17 *Energy Rsrvs. Grp., Inc. v. Kansas Power & Light Co.*  
18 459 U.S. 400 (1983).....5, 8

19 *Exxon Corp. v. Eagerton*  
20 462 U.S. 176 (1983).....9

21 *Exxon Corp. v. Governor of Maryland*  
437 U.S. 117 (1978).....22, 23

22 *F.C.C. v. Beach Commc’ns, Inc.*  
23 508 U.S. 307 (1993).....15

24 *Fayer v. Vaughn*  
649 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 2011) .....4

25 *Fed. Power Comm’n v. Hope Natural Gas Co.*  
26 320 U.S. 591 (1944).....14, 15

27 *Fed. Power Comm’n v. Nat. Gas Pipeline Co. of Am.*  
315 U.S. 575 (1942).....14

# 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.