

1 HUESTON HENNIGAN LLP  
John C. Hueston, State Bar No. 164921  
2 jhueston@hueston.com  
Douglas J. Dixon, State Bar No. 275389  
3 ddixon@hueston.com  
620 Newport Center Drive, Suite 1300  
4 Newport Beach, CA 92660  
Telephone: (949) 229-8640

5 Joseph A. Reiter, State Bar No. 294976  
6 jreiter@hueston.com  
Michael K. Acquah, State Bar No. 313955  
7 macquah@hueston.com  
William M. Larsen, State Bar No. 314091  
8 wlarsen@hueston.com  
Julia L. Haines, State Bar No. 321607  
9 jhaines@hueston.com  
523 West 6th Street, Suite 400  
10 Los Angeles, CA 90014  
Telephone: (213) 788-4340

11 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Match Group, LLC;*  
12 *Humor Rainbow, Inc.; PlentyofFish Media ULC;*  
13 *and People Media, Inc.*

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
15 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

16 MATCH GROUP, LLC, a Delaware  
corporation; HUMOR RAINBOW, INC.,  
17 a New York corporation;  
PLENTYOFFISH MEDIA ULC, a  
18 Canadian corporation; and PEOPLE  
MEDIA, INC., a Delaware corporation,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 GOOGLE LLC; GOOGLE IRELAND  
22 LIMITED; GOOGLE COMMERCE  
LIMITED; GOOGLE ASIA PACIFIC  
23 PTE. LIMITED; and GOOGLE  
PAYMENT CORP.,

24 Defendants.  
25  
26  
27  
28

Case No.

**COMPLAINT FOR (1) VIOLATIONS  
OF THE SHERMAN ACT;  
(2) VIOLATIONS OF THE  
CARTWRIGHT ACT; (3) UNFAIR  
COMPETITION; (4) TORTIOUS  
INTERFERENCE WITH  
CONTRACT; AND (5) TORTIOUS  
INTERFERENCE WITH  
PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC  
ADVANTAGE**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1 INTRODUCTION .....	1
2 PARTIES .....	13
3 JURISDICTION AND VENUE .....	14
4 DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT .....	15
5 BACKGROUND .....	15
6     A. Match Group Provides Popular Online Dating Services .....	15
7     B. Google Has Monopolized the Marketplace for Mobile and	
8         Licensable Operating Systems .....	19
9     C. Google Has Unlawfully Maintained a Monopoly in the	
10         Market for Distribution of Android Apps .....	21
11     D. Google Also Has Market Power in the Market for Dating	
12         App Distribution.....	25
13     E. Google Devises and Uses Exclusionary Contracts, Illegal	
14         Tying, and Predatory Practices to Block Competitors and	
15         Ensure Google Play’s Dominance .....	28
16         1. Google Uses Exclusionary Contracts with OEMs.....	29
17         2. Google Uses Exclusionary Contracts with App	
18             Developers .....	31
19         3. Google Uses Payment Incentives and Predatory	
20             Practices .....	32
21         4. Google Uses Technological Roadblocks, Contractual	
22             Restrictions, and False Information to Make Direct	
23             App Downloads Impractical .....	36
24         5. Google’s Anti-Competitive Conduct Destroys	
25             Competition in the Android App Distribution Market	
26             or, Alternatively, the Dating App Distribution	
27             Market.....	39
28     F. Google Unlawfully Seized and Maintains a Monopoly in	
the Market for Android App In-App Payment Processors .....	41
1. Google Uses Illegal Ties and Exclusive Contracts to	
Mandate Use of Google Play Billing.....	44
2. Google Abuses Its Monopoly Power by Imposing an	
Arbitrary and Unconscionable Tax on Consumers	
and App Developers.....	46

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 CONTENTS (cont.)

Page

3. Google’s Conduct Destroys Competition in the Android App IAP Market and Harms Consumers and App Developers .....51

G. Match Group Offers Consumers an Alternative and Competitive In-App Payment Option .....53

H. Google Allows Match Group’s Apps to Remain on Google Play, Recognizing That Match Group’s Payment Options Do Not Violate Google’s Policies.....55

I. Abusing its Monopoly Power, Google Abruptly Changed Its Policies .....58

J. Google’s Anti-Competitive Conduct Has Irreparably Harmed Match Group and its Customers.....64

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION .....66

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION .....68

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION.....69

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....71

FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....73

SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....75

SEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....76

EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....78

NINTH CAUSE OF ACTION.....79

TENTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....81

ELEVENTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....83

TWELFTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....84

THIRTEENTH CAUSE OF ACTION .....86

PRAYER FOR RELIEF .....87

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

1  
2 1. This is a case about the strategic manipulation of markets, broken  
3 promises, and abuse of power that Google LLC<sup>2</sup> has employed to illegally foreclose  
4 competition in the world’s biggest mobile device ecosystem, Android, and become  
5 one of the largest, most powerful companies in the world. Google convinced billions  
6 around the world to use the Android mobile operating system (“Android” or “Android  
7 OS”) on promises of an open ecosystem, flexibility, and a focus on the user. Through  
8 those platitudes and promises and the anticompetitive tactics detailed in this  
9 complaint, Google illegally monopolized the market for distributing apps on Android  
10 devices with its Google Play Store (“Google Play”)—making it today the only viable  
11 choice a mobile application (“app”) developer has to reach Android users. Now,  
12 Google seeks to eliminate user choice of payment services and raise prices on  
13 consumers by extending its dominance to the separate market for in-app payment  
14 (“IAP”) processors on Android. It is conditioning app availability on Google Play  
15 with exclusive use of its own in-app payment processing product, Google Play  
16 Billing, where it can charge supra-competitive prices and monetize the personal data  
17 of billions of digital app users.

18 2. Ten years ago, Match Group was Google’s partner. We are now  
19 its hostage. Google lured app developers to its platform with assurances that we could  
20 offer users a choice over how to pay for the services they want. But once it  
21 monopolized the market for Android app distribution with Google Play by riding the  
22 coattails of the most popular app developers, Google sought to ban alternative in-app  
23

---

24 <sup>1</sup> For the purposes of this complaint, the term “Match Group” includes only the operating entities  
25 named as Plaintiffs. Match Group LLC; Humor Rainbow, Inc.; PlentyofFish Media ULC; and People  
26 Media, Inc. are part of the Match Group family of companies with the ultimate parent company  
27 Match Group, Inc. (“MGI”), a nonoperating holding company. MGI’s other subsidiaries are not  
28 included in the definition of “Match Group” in this complaint. Match Group asserts the allegations  
in this complaint upon personal knowledge as to itself and its own acts and experiences and, as to all  
other matters, upon information and belief, including an investigation conducted by its attorneys.

<sup>2</sup> Unless noted otherwise, throughout this complaint, “Google” refers to Google LLC and all other  
Google entity defendants.

1 payment processing services so it could take a cut of nearly every in-app transaction  
2 on Android. This Complaint lays bare Google's misdeeds that made it possible.

3 3. Google monetizes Android, in part, by operating Google Play and a  
4 separate in-app payment processing service called Google Play Billing. Over the last  
5 decade, through bait and switch tactics that exploited the very app developers it so  
6 ardently courted and claimed to support and by paying off potential competitors not  
7 to compete, Google has grown Google Play into the only viable Android app  
8 marketplace. If a developer wants users to find its app, that app must be on Google  
9 Play.

10 4. But that was not enough for Google. It also wanted to control the much  
11 more lucrative in-app payment processing market on Android. Every year, consumers  
12 spend tens of billions of dollars on Android apps. And that number increases every  
13 year. When those transactions involve the purchase of "digital goods or services"  
14 using Google Play Billing, Google keeps as much as 30% for itself. Google  
15 disingenuously calls this extortionate tax a "fee" even though it is nearly ten times the  
16 actual fees other payment processors charge in competitive marketplaces.

17 5. Further, what constitutes a "digital good or service" is ill-defined and  
18 arbitrarily applied. Clothing and food delivery and ride sharing apps do not qualify.  
19 But Match Group's dating apps do qualify, even though they enable users to meet in  
20 the real world for a date, just like a ride sharing app enables a user to find a driver in  
21 the real world for a ride.

22 6. Google's "fee" also bears no relation to the cost or value of services  
23 Google provides developers. Indeed, all developers with apps on Google Play benefit  
24 from the exact same services, and they all pay Google a \$25.00 registration fee. Yet  
25 only the small handful who sell "digital goods and services," again, as arbitrarily  
26 defined by Google, pay the Google tax, which results in pure non-competitive profit  
27 to Google. It also allows Google to collect massive volumes of user data that Google  
28 can then monetize.

# 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.