

1 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Eric Meckley, Bar No. 168181
2 eric.meckley@morganlewis.com
Brian D. Berry, Bar No. 229893
3 brian.berry@morganlewis.com
One Market, Spear Street Tower
4 San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: +1.415.442.1000
5 Fax: +1.415.442.1001

6 Attorneys for Defendant
7 TWITTER, INC.
8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
12

13 EMMANUEL CORNET, JUSTINE DE
CAIRES, GRAE KINDEL, ALEXIS
14 CAMACHO, AND JESSICA PAN, on behalf
of themselves and all others similarly situated,

15 Plaintiffs,

16 v.

17 TWITTER, INC.,

18 Defendant.
19

Case No. 3:22-cv-06857-JD

**DEFENDANT TWITTER, INC.'S
OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO AMEND**

Date: January 23, 2023
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Judge: Hon. James Donato

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

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. RELEVANT FACTS	2
A. Procedural History and Current Schedule of Hearings.....	2
B. Pertinent Factual Allegations in the Proposed SAC.	3
III. ARGUMENT	4
A. The Court Should Decide Twitter’s Motion to Compel Arbitration Prior to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Amend.....	4
B. Leave to Amend Should Be Denied Under Rule 15.	6
1. Amendment Should Be Denied Based on Prejudice to Twitter.....	7
2. Amendment Should Be Denied Based on Futility.	8
3. The Cases Cited by Plaintiffs’ Are Inapposite.....	12
IV. CONCLUSION	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Page(s)

Cases

Adema Techs. Inc. v. Wacker Chemie AG,
657 Fed. Appx. 661 (N.D. Cal. 2014)..... 11

AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Dialysist West, Inc.,
465 F.3d 946 (9th Cir. 2006)..... 2, 6

Amparan v. Plaza Home Mortg., Inc.,
No. C 07-4498 JF (RS), 2009 WL 2776486 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 28, 2009) 12

Ashcroft v. Iqbal,
556 U.S. 662 (2009)..... 8

Atlantic Marine Const. Co. v. U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas,
134 S. Ct. 568 (2013)..... 10

Barren v. Harrington,
152 F.3d 1193 (9th Cir. 1998)..... 8

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007)..... 8

Bonin v. Calderon,
59 F.3d 815 (9th Cir. 1995)..... 8

Cafasso v. Gen. Dynamics C4 Sys., Inc.,
637 F.3d 1047 (9th Cir. 2011)..... 6

Carnival Cruise Lines v. Shute,
499 U.S. 585 (1991)..... 10

Coastal Steel Corp. v. Tilghman Wheelabrator Ltd.,
709 F.2d 190 (3d Cir. 1983)..... 10

Comer v. Micor, Inc.,
436 F.3d 1098 (9th Cir. 2006)..... 10

Crispo v. Musk,
CA No. 2022-0666-KSJM, 2022 WL 6693660 (Del. Ch. Oct. 11, 2022) 12

Diamond Multimedia Systems, Inc. v. Superior Court,
19 Cal.4th 1036 (1999) 9

E. & J. Gallo Winery v. Andina Licores S.A.,
446 F.3d 984 (9th Cir. 2006)..... 11

1 *Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*,
 2 316 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir. 2003)..... 7

3 *In re Exodus Communications, Inc. Securities Litigation*,
 4 No. C-01-2661 MMC, 2006 WL 2355071 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2006)..... 4, 5

5 *Fidelity Fin. Corp. v. Fed. Home Loan Bank*,
 6 79 F.3d 1432 (9th Cir. 1986)..... 6

7 *Foman v. Davis*,
 8 371 U.S. 178 (1962)..... 6

9 *Franczak v. Suntrust Mortgage Inc.*,
 10 No. 5:12-01453, 2013 WL 4764327 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 5, 2013)..... 5

11 *Fresno Unified School Dist. V. K.U. ex rel. A.D.U.*,
 12 980 F.Supp.2d 1160 4, 12

13 *Frost v. Diocese of San Bernardino Educ. & Welfare Corp.*,
 14 302 Fed. App'x 729 (9th Cir. 2008)..... 8

15 *Ginoyan v. Barclays Bank Delaware*,
 16 2020 WL 1974030 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2020)..... 5

17 *Ho v. Ernst & Young LLP*,
 18 No. C05-04867 JF, 2007 WL 2070216 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2007)..... 12

19 *Johnson v. Buckley*,
 20 356 F.3d 1067 (9th Cir. 2004)..... 8

21 *Kramer v. Toyota Motor Corp.*,
 22 705 F.3d 1122 10

23 *Lentini v. Kelly Services, Inc.*,
 24 No. C17-03911 WHA, 2017 WL 4354910 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 2, 2017) 11

25 *M/S Bremen v. Zapata Off-Shore Co.*,
 26 407 U.S. 1 (1972)..... 10, 11

27 *McClune v. Shamah*,
 28 593 F.2d 482 (3d Cir. 1979)..... 5

Miller v. Rykoff-Sexton,
 845 F.2d 209 (9th Cir. 1988)..... 8

Morris v. Ernst & Young LLP,
 834 F.3d 975 (9th Cir. 2016)..... 13

Myers v. Intuit, Inc.,
 2018 WL 2287425 (S.D. Cal. May 18, 2018)..... 6

1 *National Security Counselors v. Central Intelligence Agency,*
 2 960 F.Supp.2d 101 (D.D.C. 2013) 7

3 *Nordyke v. King,*
 4 644 F.3d 776 (9th Cir. 2011)..... 8

5 *Norwest Mortgage, Inc. v. Superior Court,*
 6 72 Cal.App.4th 214 (1999)..... 9

7 *O’Connor v. Uber Tech., Inc.,*
 8 Case No. 13-cv-3826 (N.D. Cal.)..... 13

9 *O’Connor, et al. v. Uber Technologies, et al.,*
 10 No. 3:13-cv-03826-EMC (N.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2014) (ECF 193) 13

11 *Osakan v. Apple Am. Grp.,*
 12 2010 WL 1838701 (N.D. Cal. May 5, 2010) 8

13 *Palmer v. Stassinios,*
 14 236 F.R.D. 460 (N.D. Cal. May 18, 2006)..... 12

15 *Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts,*
 16 472 U.S. 797..... 9

17 *Sanchez v. Wal Mart Stores, Inc.,*
 18 2009 WL 2971553 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 11, 2009)..... 7

19 *Soto v. Castlerock Farming and Transport, Inc.,*
 20 No. 1:09-cv-00701-AWI-JLT, 2011 WL 3489876 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2011)..... 6

21 *Sparling v. Hoffman Constr. Co.,*
 22 864 F.2d 635 (9th Cir. 1988)..... 5

23 *Union Pac. Railroad Co. v. Nev. Power Co.,*
 24 950 F.2d 1429 (9th Cir. 1991)..... 6

25 *Warden v. Crown American Realty Trust,*
 26 1998 WL 725946 (W.D. Pa. 1998) 1, 5

27 *Wixon v. Wyndham Resort Development Corp.,*
 28 No. C 07-02361 JSW, 2010 WL 424603 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 27, 2010)..... 12

Yucesoy v. Uber Technologies, Inc., et al.,
 No. 3:15-cv-00262 EMC (N.D. Cal. Mar. 5, 2018) (ECF 287)..... 12

Zero Motorcycles, Inc. v. Pirelli Tyre S.P.A.,
 802 F. Supp. 2d 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2011) (rev’d and remanded on other grounds,
 517 F. App’x 589, 590 (9th Cir. 2013))..... 8

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.