

1 Karma M. Giulianelli (SBN 184175)  
2 **BARTLIT BECK LLP**  
3 1801 Wewatta St., Suite 1200  
4 Denver, CO 80202  
5 Telephone: (303) 592-3100  
6 Facsimile: (303) 592-3140  
7 karma.giulianelli@bartlitbeck.com

8 Hae Sung Nam (*pro hac vice*)  
9 **KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP**  
10 850 Third Avenue  
11 New York, NY 10022  
12 Telephone: (212) 687-1980  
13 Facsimile: (212) 687-7715  
14 hnam@kaplanfox.com

15 *Interim Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Clas-*  
16 *ses*

17 [Additional Counsel on Signature Page]

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
19 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
20 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

21 **IN RE GOOGLE PLAY CONSUMER**  
22 **ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

23 RELATED ACTIONS:

24 *Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al.,*  
25 Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

26 *In re Google Play Developer Antitrust*  
27 *Litigation, Case No. 3:20-cv-05792-JD*

28 *State of Utah, et al., v. Google LLC, et al.,*  
Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD

*Match Group, LLC, et al. v. Google LLC, et*  
*al., Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD*

No. 3:20-CV-05761-JD

**CONSUMER PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE**  
**OF MOTION, MOTION FOR CLASS**  
**CERTIFICATION, AND**  
**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

Hearing Date: August 4, 2022  
Hearing Time: 10:00 a.m.  
Courtroom: Courtroom 11, 19th Floor  
Judge: The Honorable James Donato

1                   **NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR CLASS CERITIFICATION**

2                   **PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that on August 4, 2022, at 10:00 a.m., before the Honorable  
3 James Donato, of the United States District Court of the Northern District of California, San Fran-  
4 cisco Division, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, Courtroom 11, 19th Floor,  
5 Plaintiffs Mary Carr, Daniel Egerter, Zack Palmer, Serina Moglia, Matthew Atkinson, and Alex  
6 Iwamoto, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, will and do now move the Court  
7 for an order granting Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil  
8 Procedure 23.

9                   Plaintiffs seek entry of an order: (1) certifying a proposed Rule 23(b)(3) class; (2) certifying  
10 a proposed Rule 23(b)(2) class; (3) appointing Plaintiffs Mary Carr, Daniel Egerter, Zack Palmer,  
11 Serina Moglia, Matthew Atkinson, and Alex Iwamoto as representatives of the classes; and (4) ap-  
12 pointing Karma M. Giulianelli of Bartlit Beck LLP and Hae Sung Nam of Kaplan Fox & Kil-  
13 sheimer LLP as Co-Lead Class Counsel for the classes. Plaintiffs propose that the classes for their  
14 Sherman Act Sections 1 and 2 claims (Counts 1-6) as well as their Cartwright Act (Counts 7-10)  
15 and Unfair Competition (Count 11) claims, be defined as follows:

16                   **RULE 23(b)(3) MULTISTATE DAMAGES CLASS:**

17                   All persons in the following U.S. states and territories:

18                   Alabama, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Ohio, Penn-  
19 sylvania, South Carolina, Wisconsin, Wyoming, American Samoa, Guam,  
Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands

20                   who paid for an app through the Google Play Store<sup>1</sup> or paid for in-app digital content  
21 (including subscriptions or ad-free versions of apps) through Google Play Billing on  
or after August 16, 2016, to the present.

22                   **RULE 23(b)(2) MULTISTATE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF CLASS:**

23                   All persons in the following U.S. states and territories:

24                   Alabama, Georgia, Hawaii, Illinois, Kansas, Maine, Michigan, Ohio, Penn-  
25 sylvania, South Carolina, Wisconsin, Wyoming, American Samoa, Guam,  
Northern Mariana Islands, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands

26                   who currently own a mobile phone or tablet with an authorized and preinstalled ver-  
27 sion of Google’s Android OS capable of accessing the Google Play Store.

28 <sup>1</sup> Capitalized terms “Google Play Store,” “Google Play Billing,” and “Defendants” are used in the  
same sense as defined in the operative consumer Complaint. ECF No. 241.

1 Excluded from both Classes are Defendants and their officers, directors, employees,  
2 and successors; any person or entity who has (or had during the class period) a con-  
3 trolling interest in any Defendant; any affiliate, legal representative, heir, or assign of  
4 any Defendant and any person acting on behalf of any Defendant; any judicial officer  
presiding over this action and the members of those officers' immediate families and  
judicial staffs; all governments and their agencies; and any juror assigned to this ac-  
tion.

5 This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion, the accompanying Memorandum of  
6 Points and Authorities, all filed supportive declarations and exhibits, the expert reports of Dr. Hal  
7 Singer and Dr. Douglas Schmidt, the records on file in this action, and any argument that may be  
8 presented at or before the hearing on this Motion.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1		
2	TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	i
3	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES .....	1
4	STATEMENT OF COMMON FACTS.....	3
5	I. THE PROPOSED CLASSES AND THE JOINT PROSECUTION	
6	AGREEMENT WITH THE STATES .....	3
7	II. COMMON CLASSWIDE EVIDENCE OF THE RELEVANT MARKET .....	4
8	III. COMMON CLASSWIDE EVIDENCE OF GOOGLE’S UNLAWFUL	
9	CONDUCT .....	4
10	IV. COMMON EVIDENCE OF CLASSWIDE ANTITRUST IMPACT .....	10
11	A. Common Evidence Establishes that Google’s Take Rate Is Supra-	
12	Competitive.....	10
13	B. Common Economic Evidence Shows that All or Virtually All Class	
14	Members Are Injured by Google’s Conduct.....	12
15	C. Aggregate Damages Are Calculated on a Classwide Basis .....	13
16	ARGUMENT .....	14
17	I. THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(a) ARE MET IN THIS CASE .....	14
18	A. Rule 23(a)(1)’s Numerosity Requirement Is Satisfied.....	14
19	B. Rule 23(a)(2)’s Commonality Requirement Is Satisfied .....	14
20	C. Rule 23(a)(3)’s Typicality Requirement Is Satisfied .....	15
21	D. The Rule 23(a)(4) and 23(g) Adequacy Requirements Are Satisfied.....	16
22	II. RULE 23(b)(3)’S REQUIREMENTS ARE SATISFIED IN THIS CASE .....	17
23	A. The Predominance Requirement Is Met .....	17
24	1. Plaintiffs’ Sherman Act Claims Present Common Questions	
25	That Will Predominate.....	18
26	2. Plaintiffs’ State Law Claims Present Common Questions	
27	That Will Predominate.....	20
28	3. Common Questions Predominate on Impact and Damages.....	20
	B. The Superiority Requirement Is Met .....	24
	III. THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(b)(2) ARE SATISFIED IN THIS CASE.....	24
	CONCLUSION.....	25

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Cases**

1		
2	<b>Cases</b>	
3	<i>Alaska Airlines v. United Airlines,</i>	
4	948 F.2d 536 (9th Cir. 1991) .....	18
5	<i>Alcantar v. Hobart Serv.,</i>	
6	800 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	14
7	<i>Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor,</i>	
8	521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	17
9	<i>Apple Inc. v. Pepper,</i>	
10	139 S. Ct. 1514 (2019).....	1
11	<i>B.K., by her next friend Tinsley v. Snyder,</i>	
12	922 F.3d 957 (9th Cir. 2019) .....	15
13	<i>Castellar v. Mayorkas,</i>	
14	No. 17-cv-00491-BAS-AHG, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 170342 (S.D. Cal. Sept. 8, 2021).....	3
15	<i>D&amp;M Farms v. Birdsong Corp.,</i>	
16	Civil Action No. 2:19-cv-463, 2020 WL 7074140 (E.D. Va. Dec. 2, 2020).....	23
17	<i>Ellis v. Salt River Project Agric. Improvement &amp; Power Dist.,</i>	
18	24 F.4th 1262 (9th Cir. 2022) .....	2, 19
19	<i>Flagship Theatres of Palm Desert, LLC v. Century Theatres, Inc.,</i>	
20	55 Cal. App. 5th 381 (2020) .....	20
21	<i>Giuliano v. Sandisk Corp.,</i>	
22	No. C 10-02787 SBA, 2015 WL 10890654 (N.D. Cal. May 14, 2015) .....	19
23	<i>Goldwasser v. Ameritech Corp.,</i>	
24	222 F.3d 390 (7th Cir. 2000) .....	20
25	<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.,</i>	
26	150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	16
27	<i>In re Apple iPhone Antitrust Litig.,</i>	
28	No. 4:11-cv-06714-YGR, 2022 WL 1284104 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2022) .....	18, 23

# 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.