

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

Alex Spiro (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)

2 alexspiro@quinnemanuel.com

51 Madison Ave 22nd floor

3 New York, NY 10010

4 Telephone: (212) 849-7000

Facsimile: (212) 849-7100

5 Michael T. Lifrak (Bar No. 210846)

6 michaellifrak@quinnemanuel.com

7 Joseph C. Sarles (Bar No. 254750)

josephsarles@quinnemanuel.com

8 Alex Bergjans (Bar No. 302830)

alexbergjans@quinnemanuel.com

9 Aubrey L. Jones (Bar No. 326793)

aubreyjones@quinnemanuel.com

10 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90017

11 Telephone: (213) 443-3000

12 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

13 *Attorneys for Elon Musk, X HOLDINGS I, INC.,*
14 *and X HOLDINGS II, INC.*

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

17
18 WILLIAM HERESNIAK, on behalf of
19 himself and all others similarly situated,

20 Plaintiff,

21 vs.

22 ELON R. MUSK, X HOLDINGS I, INC., X
23 HOLDINGS II, INC., and TWITTER, INC.,

24 Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:22-CV-03074-CRB (SK)

**DEFENDANTS ELON MUSK, X
HOLDINGS I, INC. AND X HOLDINGS II,
INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION TO EXPEDITE AND
COORDINATE DISCOVERY**

Judge: Hon. Sallie Kim

Courtroom: C, 15th Floor

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

1
2 Plaintiff seeks—without credible justification—overbroad and disruptive discovery from
3 Defendants Elon Musk, X Holdings I, Inc., X Holdings II, Inc. (“Musk Defendants”), and Twitter,
4 Inc. before the scheduled deadline to file motions to dismiss and before the Rule 26 conference
5 has been conducted. Defendants are currently engaged in a complex and compressed action in
6 Delaware Chancery Court over Mr. Musk’s prospective buy-out of Twitter, with discovery set to
7 close in September and an expedited trial set to begin on October 17 (*Twitter, Inc. v. Musk, et al.*,
8 C.A. No. 2022-0613 KSJM (“Delaware Action”)).

9 In an effort to inject himself into the Delaware Action, Plaintiff filed a slap-dash complaint
10 that is unlikely to survive pleading motions, and now seeks premature discovery in a transparent
11 fishing expedition. Plaintiff asks that the Court order Defendants to produce *all discovery*
12 *exchanged* and permit him to participate in *all depositions* in the Delaware Action. (Dkt. 26;
13 Declaration of Joseph Sarles (“Sarles Decl.”) ¶ 2, Ex. 2.) To justify his extraordinary and
14 burdensome request, Plaintiff claims he needs this discovery in order to prepare a potential motion
15 for a preliminary injunction or declaratory judgment before the trial concludes in the Delaware
16 Action or the merger closes. (Dkt. 26 at 2.)

17 Plaintiff’s explanation and sudden claim of urgency are contradicted by the record and his
18 counsel’s admissions in this case. Plaintiff has not sought an injunction or emergency relief in the
19 three months since he filed this case. He is not seeking to block the merger or to obtain any
20 interim relief that will not be available at the conclusion of the Delaware Action—to the contrary,
21 his pleaded theory is that he has been damaged by the decline in Twitter’s stock price following
22 Mr. Musk’s announcement that the merger was temporarily on hold. In fact, Plaintiff has
23 conceded this entire dispute is not even ripe yet, because he will not even know what type of
24 declaratory judgment or injunction he will seek until *after* the Delaware Action is resolved. (Sarles
25 Decl. ¶ 2.) Plaintiff’s request for a declaratory judgment or equitable relief is contingent on the
26 outcome of the Delaware trial and may even be moot if Twitter prevails. (*Id.*) And as Plaintiff’s
27 motion makes clear, he will not suffer any irreparable harm if he is not permitted to conduct
28 discovery before the Delaware Action concludes. (Dkt. 26 at 9.)

1 There is no good cause to grant Plaintiff's request for expedited and coordinated discovery.
2 In the absence of urgency, threat of irreparable harm, or even an explanation of what kind of
3 injunctive relief he intends to seek, Plaintiff's motion is nothing more than a request to ride along
4 on another case's truncated schedule, unbounded by Rule 26's relevance and proportionality
5 requirements. Plaintiff has not even identified any particular witness he must depose or category
6 of documents he needs to review. Nor has Plaintiff demonstrated that his lawsuit can survive a
7 motion to dismiss, which suggests that the real purpose of this motion is to go in search of a viable
8 case theory. On top of all that, Plaintiff's proposal that he participate in the Delaware Action will
9 create an unnecessary distraction and disruptive side show to Defendants as they race to complete
10 discovery and prepare for trial in less than two months. This is the kind of request that the good
11 cause analysis is designed to prevent. It should be denied.

12 **BACKGROUND**

13 **Plaintiff files this lawsuit; does not seek a preliminary injunction or any interim**
14 **relief.** Three months ago, on May 25, 2022, Plaintiff, a purported Twitter shareholder, filed this
15 lawsuit. (Dkt. 1.) Plaintiff did not file a motion for preliminary injunction or seek any emergency
16 or interim relief. Plaintiff did not even serve the Defendants with his Complaint and Summons in
17 the month after he filed this lawsuit. (*See generally*, Dkt.) Instead, Plaintiff filed the FAC on July
18 1, 2022; the parties agreed to a September 9, 2022 deadline to file motions to dismiss and for the
19 motions to be heard on November 21, 2022. (Dkt. 20.)

20 The FAC asserts three causes of action for aiding and abetting a breach of fiduciary duty,
21 unjust enrichment, and a declaration of the parties' rights under the purported merger agreement
22 between the Defendants. (FAC ¶¶ 155-69.) The merger agreement contains a mandatory forum
23 selection clause requiring that any action relating to the agreement be brought in Delaware and
24 Twitter's bylaws mandate that "any action asserting a claim of breach of a fiduciary duty owed by
25 any director" likewise be brought in Delaware. (Sarles Decl. Ex. 3, at Art. VIII.)

26 Plaintiff's claim against the Musk Defendants for aiding and abetting a breach of fiduciary
27 duty alleges that two of the eleven directors on Twitter's Board of Directors—not the Board as a
28 whole or even a majority—breached various duties to Twitter in connection with the merger

1 process. (FAC ¶¶ 155-62.) The FAC does not allege that the two directors at issue, Egon Durban
2 and Jack Dorsey, dominated or even influenced the rest of the Board’s unanimous decision to
3 approve the merger agreement. The FAC does not plead any facts to allege that the Musk
4 Defendants created or exploited any breach of fiduciary duty. The FAC does not allege that the
5 Musk Defendants agreed to any side deals with the Board in connection with the merger
6 agreement (the only allegation of any additional transaction is that *after* the execution of the
7 merger agreement, Dorsey and Mr. Musk discussed the possibility that Dorsey might continue to
8 hold equity in the surviving corporation). (*Id.* ¶ 85.) Nor does the FAC allege that Board
9 negotiated an unfair price for the merger.

10 To the contrary, despite being pleaded solely as a direct suit, Plaintiff is not challenging the
11 merger agreement but rather suing to *enforce* it on Twitter’s behalf. (FAC ¶¶ 163-65; Dkt. 26 at
12 9.) Plaintiff does not plead damages beyond the diminution in Twitter’s stock price allegedly
13 caused by Mr. Musk’s post-April 25 statements. (FAC ¶¶ 133-35;140-41.) In his second cause of
14 action, he seeks vague and unspecified declaratory and injunctive relief the scope of which, his
15 counsel admits, is contingent on the outcome in Delaware. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 163-65; Sarles Decl. ¶ 2.)

16 Plaintiff’s third cause of action for unjust enrichment appears to arise from Mr. Musk’s
17 alleged violations of federal securities laws and regulations, principally an alleged failure to timely
18 disclose his purchase of Twitter stock on Form 13D. (FAC ¶¶ 46-52, 62-63, 166-69.)

19 **Plaintiff attempts to insert himself into the Delaware Action.** On July 12, 2022, Twitter
20 sued the Musk Defendants in Delaware Chancery Court for specific performance of the merger
21 agreement; the Musk Defendants answered and filed counterclaims. On July 19, the Chancery
22 Court expedited the Delaware Action, setting trial for October 17 and the close of fact discovery
23 for September 12. Meanwhile, in this case, the Court set the Case Management Conference for
24 September 30 and ordered the parties to submit a joint Case Management Statement by September
25 14. (Dkt. 24.)

26 In late July—after expedited discovery was ordered in the Delaware Action—Plaintiff
27 began demanding that the parties expedite and “coordinate” discovery with the Delaware Action.
28 Specifically, Plaintiff requested that the Defendants provide him with all discovery produced and

1 allow him to participate in all depositions in the Delaware Action. (Sarles Decl. ¶ 2.) When asked
2 to justify this extraordinary and burdensome request, counsel claimed that Plaintiff needed the
3 discovery to prepare a motion for preliminary injunction or declaratory judgment. (*Id.*; Sarles Ex.
4 1.) When pressed to identify the specific declaration or injunction he sought, Plaintiff’s counsel
5 admitted that Plaintiff *did not yet know* and that any request *would be contingent on the outcome*
6 *of the Delaware Action*. (Sarles Decl. ¶ 2.) Any motion for an injunction or declaratory judgment
7 would likely be mooted if Twitter succeeded in the Delaware Action, but Plaintiff could still seek
8 some unspecified remedy should Mr. Musk prevail in Delaware or the Defendants reach some
9 negotiated resolution. (*See id.*) Plaintiff is not contemplating bringing any injunction to block the
10 potential merger: neither the FAC, Plaintiff’s Motion to Expedite Discovery, nor Plaintiff counsel
11 make any reference to such relief. (*Id.* at ¶ 5; Dkt. 7, 26.)

12 On August 10, before the parties conducted a Rule 26(f) conference, Plaintiff served his
13 First Requests for Production. (Sarles Ex. 2.) The RFPs seek “all Discovery produced...by any
14 party or third party in” the Delaware Action, “all transcripts of depositions taken in” the Delaware
15 Action, and “all documents and information” provided to the SEC in connection with acquisition.
16 (*Id.*) To date, Plaintiff has not identified any specific categories of information or witnesses
17 relevant to his hypothetical motion for declaratory or injunctive relief. (*Id.* at ¶ 6.)

18 ARGUMENT

19 **I. THERE IS NO GOOD CAUSE FOR COORDINATED OR EXPEDITED** 20 **DISCOVERY**

21 Plaintiff seeks an order from the Court permitting him to interfere with the Delaware
22 Action and conduct a burdensome fishing expedition months before the Court hears the
23 Defendants’ motions to dismiss his defective FAC and before discovery even formally
24 commences in this action. There is no good cause to grant this request. Because the factors courts
25 consider in whether to grant expedited discovery—“(1) whether a preliminary injunction is
26 pending; (2) the breadth of the discovery requests; (3) the purpose for requesting the expedited
27 discovery; (4) the burden on the defendants to comply with the requests; and (5) how far in
28 advance of the typical discovery process the request was made,” *American LegalNet, Inc. v. Davis*,

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.