

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
2 Alex Spiro (*pro hac vice* forthcoming)
3 alexspiro@quinnemanuel.com
4 51 Madison Ave 22nd floor
5 New York, NY 10010
6 Telephone: (212) 849-7000
7 Facsimile: (212) 849-7100
8
9 Michael T. Lifrak (Bar No. 210846)
10 michaellifrak@quinnemanuel.com
11 Joseph C. Sarles (Bar No. 254750)
12 josephsarles@quinnemanuel.com
13 Alex Bergjans (Bar No. 302830)
14 alexbergjans@quinnemanuel.com
15 Aubrey L. Jones (Bar No. 326793)
16 aubreyjones@quinnemanuel.com
17 865 S. Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
18 Los Angeles, California 90017
19 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
20 Facsimile: (213) 443-3100
21
22 Attorneys for Defendants Elon Musk, X
23 Holdings I, Inc., and X Holdings II, Inc.

13
14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

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

19 Plaintiff,

20 vs.

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

23 Defendant.

24 CASE NO. 3:22-CV-03074-CRB-SK

25 DEFENDANTS X HOLDINGS I, INC.
26 AND X HOLDINGS II, INC.'S MOTION
27 TO DISMISS THE FIRST AMENDED
28 COMPLAINT AND STAY DISCOVERY

Judge: Hon. Charles R. Breyer
Courtroom: 6, 17th Floor

Hearing Date: December 2, 2022
Time: 10 a.m.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page(s)</u>
ARGUMENT	5
I. THE ACTION WAS FILED IN THE WRONG FORUM	5
A. Twitter's Bylaws Mandate That This Action Be Litigated In Delaware Chancery Court	6
1. Forum-Selection Clauses In Bylaws Are Enforceable Against Shareholders	6
2. Plaintiff's First Claim Falls Within The Bylaws' Forum-Selection Clause	6
3. The Bylaws' Forum-Selection Clause Is Valid and Enforceable	7
4. The Public Interest Weighs In Favor Of Enforcement	8
B. The Court Should Dismiss The Entire Action	9
II. PLAINTIFF'S CLAIMS ARE DERIVATIVE	9
III. PLAINTIFF FAILS TO STATE A CLAIM FOR AIDING AND ABETTING	10
IV. PLAINTIFF LACKS STANDING FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF	10
A. Plaintiff Cannot Enforce An Agreement To Which He Is Not A Party	10
B. Plaintiff's Request For Declaratory Relief Is Not Justiciable	11
V. ALTERNATIVELY, THE COURT SHOULD STAY DISCOVERY	12
A. The Court Should Stay Discovery Pending Resolution Of Related Actions	12
1. A Discovery Stay Would Promote The Orderly Course Of Justice	13
2. Plaintiff Will Not Be Damaged By A Stay	13
3. Defendants Will Suffer Considerable Hardship Absent A Stay	14
B. Alternatively, Discovery Should Be Stayed Pending Pleading Motion Practice	14
CONCLUSION	15

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

4	<i>Arris Enterprises LLC v. Sony Corp.</i> , No. 17-CV-02669-BLF, 2017 WL 3283937 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2017)	14
5	<i>Atl. Marine Const. Co. v. U.S. Dist. Ct. for W. Dist. of Texas</i> , 571 U.S. 49 (2013)	5, 7, 8, 9
6	<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	10
7	<i>Benerofe v. Cha</i> , 1998 WL 83081 (Del. Ch. Feb. 20, 1998).....	11
8	<i>Boilermakers Loc. 154 Ret. Fund v. Chevron Corp.</i> , 73 A.3d 934 (Del. Ch. 2013).....	6
9	<i>City of S. Lake Tahoe v. California Tahoe Reg'l Plan. Agency</i> , 625 F.2d 231 (9th Cir. 1980).....	10
10	<i>CMAX, Inc. v. Hall</i> , 300 F.2d 265 (9th Cir. 1962).....	13
11	<i>Cont'l Grain Co. v. The FBL-585</i> , 364 U.S. 19 (1960)	8
12	<i>Crispo v. Musk et. al.</i> , C.A. No. 2022-0666-KSJM.....	5
13	<i>E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co. v. MacDermid Printing Sols. L.L.C.</i> , 248 F. Supp. 3d 570 (D. Del. 2017)	10
14	<i>Fortis Advisors LLC v. Medicines Co., & Melinta Therapeutics, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 7290945 (Del. Ch. Dec. 18, 2019)	11
15	<i>Fuller v. Amerigas Propane, Inc.</i> , No. 09-2616 TEH, 2009 WL 2390358 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2009)	13
16	<i>Gafcon, Inc. v. Ponsor & Assocs.</i> , 98 Cal. App. 4th 1388 (2002).....	11
17	<i>In re Facebook, Inc. S'holder Derivative Priv. Litig.</i> , 367 F. Supp. 3d 1108 (N.D. Cal. 2019)	2, 6, 7, 8
18	<i>In re Pattern Energy Grp. Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. CV 20-275-MN-JLH, 2022 WL 263312 (D. Del. Jan. 27, 2022), <i>report and recommendation adopted</i> , No. CV 20-275 (MN) (JLH), 2022 WL 957761 (D. Del. Mar. 30, 2022)	6-7
19	<i>In re Rh S'holder Derivative Litig.</i> , No. 18-CV-02452-YGR, 2019 WL 580668 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 23, 2019)	13, 14

1	<i>In re STEC, Inc. Derivative Litig.</i> , No. CV 10-00667-JVS MLGX, 2012 WL 8978155 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 11, 2012)	14
2	<i>In re: CytRx Corp. S'holder Derivative Litig.</i> , No. CV146414GHKPJWX, 2015 WL 9871275 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 30, 2015).....	6, 8
3		
4	<i>Landis v. N. Am. Co.</i> , 299 U.S. 248 (1936)	12
5		
6	<i>Lee v. Fisher</i> , 34 F.4th 777 (9th Cir. 2022).....	6, 7
7		
8	<i>Little v. City of Seattle</i> , 863 F.2d 681 (9th Cir. 1988).....	12
9		
10	<i>Lockman Found. v. Evangelical All. Mission</i> , 930 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1991).....	9
11		
12	<i>M/S Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore Co.</i> , 407 U.S. 1 (1972)	7, 8
13		
14	<i>Malpiede v. Townson</i> , 780 A.2d 1075 (Del. 2001).....	7, 10
15		
16	<i>McKesson HBOC, Inc. v. New York State Common Ret. Fund. Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 1087 (9th Cir. 2003).....	11
17		
18	<i>Minghong Inv., Inc. v. Felix Chac Chuo</i> , No. 2:21-CV-05979-SB-PD, 2022 WL 2189365 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 9, 2022)	9
19		
20	<i>Moretti v. Hertz Corp.</i> , No. C 13-02972 JSW, 2014 WL 1410432 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 11, 2014)	8
21		
22	<i>Pub. Serv. Comm'n of Utah v. Wycoff Co.</i> , 344 U.S. 237 (1952)	12
23		
24	<i>Rasella v. Musk</i> , S.D.N.Y. Case No. 1:22-cv-03026	5
25		
26	<i>Toolev v. Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc.</i> , 845 A.2d 1031 (Del. 2004).....	9
27		
28	<i>Twitter, Inc. v. Musk, et al.</i> , C.A. No. 2022-0613 KSJM	1, 5
24	<i>Vance v. Google LLC</i> , No. 5:20-CV-04696-BLF, 2021 WL 534363 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2021)	12, 13, 14
25		
26	<i>Yei A. Sun v. Advanced China Healthcare, Inc.</i> , 901 F.3d 1081 (9th Cir. 2018).....	5, 7, 8
27		
28	<i>Yiren Huang v. Futurewei Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 18-CV-00534-BLF, 2018 WL 1993503 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 27, 2018).....	15

1 **Rules and Regulations**

2	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1)	1
3	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(3)	1
4	Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)	1
5	Fed. R. Civ. P. 23.1	1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

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.