

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 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
12

13 DOORDASH, INC. and GRUBHUB INC.,  
14 Plaintiffs,  
15 vs.  
16 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
17 Defendant.

Case No. 3:21-cv-05502 EMC

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

Hearing Date: December 9, 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 ..... ii

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 ..... 4

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

ARGUMENT ..... 5

    I. THE FAC FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF THE  
     CONTRACT CLAUSE OF THE FEDERAL AND STATE CONSTITUTIONS ..5

        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 FAC FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL  
     TAKING UNDER THE FIFTH AMENDMENT OR FOR INVERSE  
     CONDEMNATION UNDER THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION..... 11

        A. Plaintiffs’ Contracts Do Not Give Rise to a Claim Under the Taking  
         Clause..... 11

        B. Even If Plaintiffs’ Contracts Are Property for the Purposes of the Taking  
         Clause, the FAC Fails to Establish a Regulatory Taking..... 12

    III. THE FAC FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF ARTICLE XI,  
     SECTION 7 OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION ..... 14

    IV. THE FAC FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF DUE  
     PROCESS ..... 16

    V. THE FAC FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR VIOLATION OF EQUAL  
     PROTECTION..... 17

    VI. THE FAC FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR RETALIATION ..... 20

    VII. LEAVE TO AMEND SHOULD BE DENIED ..... 24

CONCLUSION..... 25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**CASES**

1

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

3 53 Cal.2d 141 (1959) .....15

4 *Allied Structural Steel Co. v. Spannaus*

5 438 U.S. 234 (1978).....10

6 *Animal Legal Def. Fund v. Wasden*

7 878 F.3d 1184 (9th Cir. 2018) .....20

8 *Apartment Ass’n of Greater Los Angeles v. City of Los Angeles*

9 No. 220CV04479ODWJEMX, 2021 WL 2460634 (C.D. Cal. June 1, 2021).....7

10 *Apartment Ass’n of Los Angeles Cty., Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*

11 10 F.4th 905 (9th Cir. 2021) .....7

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

13 566 U.S. 673 (2012).....17

14 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*

15 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....4, 24

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

17 18 Cal.3d 582 (1976) .....15

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

19 749 F.2d 1396 (9th Cir. 1984) .....12

20 *Birkenfeld v. City of Berkeley*

21 17 Cal.3d 129 (1976) .....15

22 *Blair v. Bethel Sch. Dist.*

23 608 F.3d 540 (9th Cir. 2010) .....22

24 *Boardman v. Inslee*

25 978 F.3d 1092 (9th Cir. 2020) .....20

26 *Brown v. Hovatter*

27 561 F.3d 357 (4th Cir. 2009) .....17

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

61 Cal.4th 435 (2015) .....8

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

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

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

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

1 *Capp v. Cty. of San Diego*  
 940 F.3d 1046 (9th Cir. 2019) .....21

2 *Chang v. United States*  
 3 859 F.2d 893 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....12, 13, 25

4 *City of Las Vegas v. Foley*  
 5 747 F.2d 1294 (9th Cir. 1984) .....23

6 *Classic Cab, Inc. v. D.C.*  
 288 F. Supp. 3d 218 (D.D.C. 2018).....12

7 *Comm. for Reasonable Regul. of Lake Tahoe v. Tahoe Reg’l Plan. Agency*  
 8 311 F. Supp. 2d 972 (D. Nev. 2004).....25

9 *Concrete Pipe & Prods. of Cal., Inc. v. Constr. Laborers Pension Trust for S. Cal.*  
 10 508 U.S. 602 (1993).....13

11 *Connolly v. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp.*  
 475 U.S. 211 (1986).....11, 12

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).....18, 20, 25

15 *Duquesne Light Co. v. Barasch*  
 16 488 U.S. 299 (1989).....17

17 *Energy Rsrvs. Grp., Inc. v. Kansas Power & Light Co.*  
 18 459 U.S. 400 (1983).....5, 9

19 *Exxon Corp. v. Eagerton*  
 20 462 U.S. 176 (1983).....10

21 *F.C.C. v. Beach Commc’ns, Inc.*  
 508 U.S. 307 (1993).....17, 18

22 *Fayer v. Vaughn*  
 23 649 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 2011) .....4

24 *Fed. Power Comm’n v. Hope Natural Gas Co.*  
 320 U.S. 591 (1944).....17

25 *Fed. Power Comm’n v. Nat. Gas Pipeline Co. of Am.*  
 26 315 U.S. 575 (1942).....16

27 *Fitzgerald v. Racing Ass’n of Cent. Iowa*  
 539 U.S. 103 (2003).....18

1 *Fortune Players Grp., Inc. v. Quint*  
 No. 16-CV-04557-TEH, 2016 WL 7102735 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 6, 2016).....21

2 *Fraternal Ord. of Police Hobart Lodge No. 121, Inc. v. City of Hobart*  
 3 864 F.2d 551 (7th Cir. 1988) .....22

4 *Gallinger v. Becerra*  
 5 898 F.3d 1012 (9th Cir. 2018) .....20, 25

6 *General Motors Corp. v. Romein*  
 503 U.S. 181 (1992).....5

7 *Hawkeye Commodity Promotions, Inc. v. Miller*  
 8 432 F. Supp. 2d 822 (N.D. Iowa 2006).....14

9 *Hell’s Angels Motorcycle Corp. v. Cty. of Monterey*  
 89 F. Supp. 2d 1144 (N.D. Cal. 2000) .....1

10 *Hernandez v. City of Hanford*  
 11 41 Cal.4th 279 (2007) .....8, 19

12 *Hettinga v. United States*  
 13 677 F.3d 471 (D.C. Cir. 2012).....17

14 *Hotel & Motel Ass’n of Oakland v. City of Oakland*  
 15 344 F.3d 959 (9th Cir. 2003) .....19

16 *Huskey v. City of San Jose*  
 204 F.3d 893 (9th Cir. 2000) .....21

17 *In re Seltzer*  
 18 104 F.3d 234 (9th Cir. 1996) .....5

19 *Inman v. Hatton*  
 No. 17-CV-06612-SI, 2018 WL 1100959 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 1, 2018).....21

20 *Kavanau v. Santa Monica Rent Control Bd.*  
 21 16 Cal.4th 761 (1997) .....16

22 *Kawaoka v. City of Arroyo Grande*  
 23 17 F.3d 1227 (9th Cir. 1994) .....23

24 *Keith Fulton & Sons, Inc. v. New England Teamsters & Trucking Indus. Pension Fund*  
 762 F.2d 1124 (1st Cir. 1984).....12

25 *Keystone Bituminous Coal Ass’n v. DeBenedictis*  
 26 480 U.S. 470 (1987).....7, 8, 12

27 *Laurel Park Cmty., LLC v. City of Tumwater*  
 698 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2012) .....13

# 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.