

1 John E. Schmidlein (CA State Bar No. 163520)  
 Carol J. Pruski (CA State Bar No. 275953)  
 2 WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP  
 725 Twelfth Street, N.W.  
 3 Washington, D.C. 20005  
 Telephone: (202) 434-5000  
 4 Facsimile: (202) 434-5029  
 Email: jschmidlein@wc.com  
 5 Email: cpruski@wc.com

6 *Attorneys for Defendants Google LLC, Alphabet Inc.,  
 XXVI Holdings, Inc., Sundar Pichai, and Eric Schmidt*

7 Steven C. Sunshine (*pro hac vice*)  
 8 Jack P. DiCanio (CA State Bar No. 138752)  
 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP  
 9 525 University Avenue  
 Palo Alto, CA 94301  
 10 Telephone: (650) 470-4660  
 Facsimile: (213) 621-5430  
 11 Email: steven.sunshine@skadden.com  
 Email: jack.dicanio@skadden.com

12 *Attorneys for Defendants Apple Inc. and Tim Cook*

13  
 14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
 15 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
 16 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

17 CALIFORNIA CRANE SCHOOL, INC.,  
 on behalf of itself and all others similarly  
 18 situated,

19 Plaintiff,

20 v.

21 GOOGLE LLC, ALPHABET INC., XXVI  
 22 HOLDINGS, INC., APPLE INC., TIM  
 COOK, SUNDAR PICHAI, and ERIC  
 23 SCHMIDT,

24 Defendants.

Case No. 4:21-cv-10001-HSG

**DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF MOTION  
 AND MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S  
 COMPLAINT; MEMORANDUM OF  
 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
 SUPPORT THEREOF**

Hearing Date: August 11, 2022  
 Time: 2:00 p.m.  
 Place: Courtroom 2  
 Judge: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**

**TO THE COURT, ALL PARTIES, AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on August 11, 2022, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as this matter may be heard, either in Courtroom 2 of this Court, located on the 4th Floor of the United States Courthouse, 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California, or by videoconference or teleconference, Defendants Google LLC, Alphabet Inc., XXVI Holdings, Inc., Apple Inc., Tim Cook, Sundar Pichai, and Eric Schmidt (collectively, “Defendants”) will move the Court for an order dismissing Plaintiff California Crane School Inc.’s Class Action Complaint pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

Defendants respectfully request an order dismissing without leave to amend all causes of action brought against them in the above-captioned matter. This Motion is based upon this Notice; the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities; any reply memorandum; the pleadings and files in this action; and such other matters Defendants may present at or before the hearing.

DATED: March 18, 2022

**WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP**

By: /s/ John E. Schmidlein

John E. Schmidlein (CA State Bar No. 163520)  
Carol J. Pruski (CA State Bar No. 275953)  
WILLIAMS & CONNOLLY LLP  
725 Twelfth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-5000  
Facsimile: (202) 434-5029  
Email: jschmidlein@wc.com  
Email: cpruski@wc.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Google LLC, Alphabet Inc.,  
XXVI Holdings Inc., Sundar Pichai, and Eric Schmidt*

Steven C. Sunshine (*pro hac vice*)  
Jack P. DiCanio (CA State Bar No. 138752)  
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM  
LLP  
525 University Avenue  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
Telephone: (650) 470-4660  
Facsimile: (213) 621-5430  
Email: jack.dicanio@skadden.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Apple Inc. and Tim Cook*

**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

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

BACKGROUND ..... 3

LEGAL STANDARD..... 6

ARGUMENT ..... 6

I. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM UNDER SHERMAN ACT SECTION 1 BECAUSE IT DOES NOT ALLEGE FACTS THAT PLAUSIBLY SUGGEST THE EXISTENCE OF A PER SE HORIZONTAL AGREEMENT NOT TO COMPETE. .... 6

    A. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO PLEAD DIRECT EVIDENCE OF A HORIZONTAL CONSPIRACY. .... 7

    B. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO PLEAD CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE OF A HORIZONTAL CONSPIRACY. .... 9

II. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM UNDER SHERMAN ACT SECTION 2 BECAUSE IT DOES NOT ALLEGE FACTS THAT PLAUSIBLY SUGGEST THE EXISTENCE OF A CONSPIRACY TO MONOPOLIZE, A RELEVANT MARKET THAT WAS MONOPOLIZED, OR A SPECIFIC INTENT TO MONOPOLIZE..... 13

    A. THE COMPLAINT DOES NOT ALLEGE FACTS PLAUSIBLY SUGGESTING THE EXISTENCE OF A CONSPIRACY..... 13

    B. THE COMPLAINT DOES NOT ADEQUATELY ALLEGE A RELEVANT MARKET..... 14

    C. PLAINTIFF FAILS TO ALLEGE THAT APPLE POSSESSED THE REQUISITE SPECIFIC INTENT..... 14

III. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO ALLEGE FACTS SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH ANTITRUST STANDING..... 16

IV. THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS BARS DAMAGES PREDATING DECEMBER 27, 2017..... 20

V. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS THE COMPLAINT’S REQUEST FOR DISGORGEMENT..... 24

CONCLUSION..... 24

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****CASES****Page(s)**

1		
2		
3		
4	<i>Am. Ad Mgmt., Inc. v. Gen. Tel. Co. of Cal.</i> , 190 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	16, 18
5	<i>AMG Cap. Mgmt., LLC v. Fed. Trade Comm'n</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1341 (2021).....	24
6	<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	6, 24
7	<i>Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters</i> ,	
8	459 U.S. 519 (1983).....	18, 19
9	<i>Auto Sound Inc. v. Audiovox Elecs. Corp.</i> , 2012 WL 12892938 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2012).....	10
10	<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	<i>passim</i>
11	<i>Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat, Inc.</i> , 429 U.S. 477 (1977) .....	16
12	<i>Bus. Elecs. Corp. v. Sharp Elecs. Corp.</i> , 485 U.S. 717 (1988).....	7
13	<i>Cargill, Inc. v. Monfort of Colo., Inc.</i> , 479 U.S. 104 (1986) .....	18
14	<i>City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders</i> , 20 F.4th 441 (9th Cir. 2021).....	18, 19
15	<i>Coal. for ICANN Transparency Inc. v. VeriSign, Inc.</i> ,	
16	771 F. Supp. 2d 1195 (N.D. Cal. 2011) .....	24
17	<i>Conmar Corp. v. Mitsui &amp; Co. (U.S.A.)</i> , 858 F.2d 499 (9th Cir. 1988) .....	23
18	<i>Digital Sun Corp. v. The Toro Co.</i> , 2011 WL 1044502 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 22, 2011).....	3
19	<i>Eagle v. Star-Kist Foods, Inc.</i> , 812 F.2d 538 (9th Cir. 1987).....	19
20	<i>Eclectic Props. E., LLC v. Marcus &amp; Millichap Co.</i> , 751 F.3d 990 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	12
21	<i>Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	17
22	<i>Fonseca v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , 2020 WL 6083448 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2020).....	11
23	<i>G.U.E. Tech, LLC v. Panasonic Avionics Corp.</i> ,	
24	2015 WL 12696203 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2015) .....	17
25	<i>Garrison v. Oracle Corp.</i> , 159 F. Supp. 3d 1044 (N.D. Cal. 2016) .....	22
26	<i>Garrison v. Oracle Corp.</i> , 2015 WL 1849517 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 22, 2015) .....	23
27	<i>Granddad Bread, Inc. v. Continental Baking Co.</i> , 612 F.2d 1105 (9th Cir. 1979) .....	14
28		

1	<i>Hexcel Corp. v. Ineos Polymers, Inc.</i> , 681 F.3d 1055 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	21, 22
2	<i>Hicks v. PGA Tour, Inc.</i> , 897 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2018).....	14
3	<i>Hu Honua Bioenergy, LLC v. Hawaiian Elec. Indus., Inc.</i> ,	
4	2018 WL 5891743 (D. Haw. Nov. 9, 2018) .....	16
5	<i>In re Animation Workers Antitrust Litig.</i> , 87 F. Supp. 3d 1195 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	21, 22
6	<i>In re Baby Food Antitrust Litig.</i> , 166 F.3d 112 (3d Cir. 1999).....	8
7	<i>In re Cal. Bail Bond Antitrust Litig.</i> , 511 F. Supp. 3d 1031 (N.D. Cal. 2021).....	12
8	<i>In re Cal. Title Ins. Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2009 WL 1458025 (N.D. Cal. May 21, 2009).....	11
9	<i>In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
10	2016 WL 3648478 (N.D. Cal. July 7, 2016).....	24
11	<i>In re Citric Acid Litig.</i> , 191 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 1999).....	7, 8, 9
12	<i>In re Flat Glass Antitrust Litig.</i> , 385 F.3d 350 (3rd Cir. 2004) .....	11
13	<i>In re Graphics Processing Units Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
14	2007 WL 2127577 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2007).....	12
15	<i>In re High Fructose Corn Syrup Antitrust Litig.</i> , 295 F.3d 651 (7th Cir. 2002) .....	8, 11
16	<i>In re Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.</i> , 618 F.3d 300 (3d Cir. 2010).....	9
17	<i>In re Musical Instruments &amp; Equip. Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
18	798 F.3d 1186 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	7, 9, 10, 11
19	<i>In re Nat'l Ass'n of Music Merchs., Musical Instruments &amp; Equip. Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
20	2012 WL 3637291 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2012) .....	11
21	<i>In re Online DVD Rental Antitrust Litig.</i> , 2011 WL 1629663 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 29, 2011) .....	18
22	<i>Jacobs v. Tempur-Pedic Int'l, Inc.</i> , 626 F.3d 1327 (11th Cir. 2010).....	13, 14
23	<i>Jacobsen v. Katzer</i> , 2006 WL 3000473 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2006) .....	18
24	<i>Kelsey K. v. NFL Enters., LLC</i> , 254 F. Supp. 3d 1140 (N.D. Cal. 2017) .....	9
25	<i>Kendall v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 518 F.3d 1042 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	7, 10, 12
26	<i>Klehr v. A.O. Smith Corp.</i> , 521 U.S. 179 (1997) .....	21
27	<i>Knevelbaard Dairies v. Kraft Foods, Inc.</i> , 232 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2000) .....	18
28	<i>Lee v. Kitchables Prods.</i> , 2021 WL 3173253 (N.D. Cal. July 27, 2021) .....	24

# 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.