

1 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN  
 & DOWD LLP  
 2 JASON A. FORGE (181542)  
 MICHAEL ALBERT (301120)  
 3 J. MARCO JANOSKI GRAY (306547)  
 TING H. LIU (307747)  
 4 NATALIE F. LAKOSIL (322836)  
 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900  
 5 San Diego, CA 92101  
 Telephone: 619/231-1058  
 6 619/231-7423 (fax)  
 jforge@rgrdlaw.com  
 7 malbert@rgrdlaw.com  
 mjanoski@rgrdlaw.com  
 8 tliu@rgrdlaw.com  
 nlakosil@rgrdlaw.com

9 Lead Counsel for Plaintiff

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 12 OAKLAND DIVISION

13 In re ALPHABET, INC. SECURITIES	)	Master File No. 4:18-cv-06245-JSW
14 LITIGATION	)	
	)	<u>CLASS ACTION</u>
15 This Document Relates To:	)	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO
16 ALL ACTIONS.	)	CERTIFY CLASS, APPOINT CLASS
	)	REPRESENTATIVE, AND APPOINT
	)	CLASS COUNSEL; MEMORANDUM OF
	)	POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
	)	THEREOF

19 DATE: November 4, 2022  
 20 TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
 CTRM: 5, 2nd Floor  
 21 JUDGE: Hon. Jeffrey S. White

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  
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. Statement of Facts Common to the Class .....2

III. The Proposed Class Representative .....4

IV. The Proposed Class Satisfies the Standards for Class Certification Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 .....4

    A. The Proposed Class Satisfies the Standards for Class Certification Under Rule 23(a).....6

        1. The Class Is so Numerous that Joinder Is Impracticable.....6

        2. Every Question of Law and Fact Is Common to Each Class Member .....6

        3. Rhode Island’s Claims Are Typical of Those of Each Class Member .....7

        4. Rhode Island Will Fairly and Adequately Protect the Interests of the Class .....8

    B. The Proposed Class Satisfies the Standard for Class Certification Under Rule 23(b) .....9

        1. Common Questions of Law and Fact Predominate .....9

        2. The Class Is Entitled to a Presumption of Reliance Under *Affiliated Ute*.....11

        3. Damages Will Be Calculated in the Same Manner for All Class Members .....12

        4. Superiority Is Established .....14

    C. Robbins Geller Should Be Appointed Class Counsel.....15

V. Conclusion .....15

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>CASES</b>	
<i>Affiliated Ute Citizens of Utah v. United States</i> , 406 U.S. 128 (1972).....	10, 11, 12
<i>Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	9
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans &amp; Tr. Funds</i> , 568 U.S. 455 (2013).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Andrews Farms v. Calcot, Ltd.</i> , 2010 WL 3341963 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 23, 2010).....	9
<i>Basic Inc. v. Levinson</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988).....	14
<i>Binder v. Gillespie</i> , 184 F.3d 1059 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	11
<i>Blackie v. Barrack</i> , 524 F.2d 891 (9th Cir. 1975) .....	12, 14
<i>Blaich v. Emp. Sols., Inc.</i> , 1997 WL 842417 (D. Ariz. Nov. 21, 1997).....	8
<i>Blue Book Servs., Inc. v. Amerihua Produce, Inc.</i> , 337 F. Supp. 3d 802 (N.D. Ill. 2018) .....	13
<i>Conn. Ret. Plans &amp; Tr. Funds v. Amgen Inc.</i> , 660 F.3d 1170 (9th Cir. 2011), <i>aff'd</i> , 568 U.S. 455 (2013) .....	5
<i>Eggleston v. Chi. Journeymen Plumbers' Loc. Union No. 130, U.A.</i> , 657 F.2d 890 (7th Cir. 1981) .....	9
<i>Eisen v. Carlisle &amp; Jacquelin</i> , 417 U.S. 156 (1974).....	5
<i>Epstein v. MCA, Inc.</i> , 50 F.3d 644 (9th Cir. 1995), <i>rev'd on other grounds sub nom.</i> <i>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Epstein</i> , 516 U.S. 367 (1996).....	14
<i>Erica P. John Fund, Inc. v. Halliburton Co.</i> , 563 U.S. 804 (2011).....	10

	<b>Page</b>
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	

  

<i>Freedman v. La.-Pac. Corp.</i> , 922 F. Supp. 377 (D. Or. 1996) .....	14
<i>Gilbert v. MoneyMutual, LLC</i> , 318 F.R.D. 614 (N.D. Cal. 2016).....	6, 7, 8, 9
<i>Gluck v. CellStar Corp.</i> , 976 F. Supp. 542 (N.D. Tex. 1997) .....	8
<i>Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 258 (2014).....	12
<i>Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.</i> , 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998) .....	7, 9
<i>Hodges v. Akeena Solar, Inc.</i> , 274 F.R.D. 259 (N.D. Cal. 2011).....	14
<i>Howard v. Liquidity Servs. Inc.</i> , 322 F.R.D. 103 (D.D.C. 2017).....	5
<i>In re Alphabet, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 1 F.4th 687 (9th Cir. 2021), <i>cert denied</i> , __ U.S. __, 142 S. Ct. 1227 (2022).....	3, 4, 7, 11
<i>In re Celera Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2014 WL 722408 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 25, 2014) .....	8
<i>In re Cooper Cos. Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 254 F.R.D. 628 (C.D. Cal. 2009).....	10, 14
<i>In re Diamond Foods, Inc., Sec. Litig.</i> , 295 F.R.D. 240 (N.D. Cal. 2013).....	5, 12, 13
<i>In re Mattel, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2021 WL 4704578 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 2021).....	5
<i>In re Montage Tech. Grp. Ltd. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2016 WL 1598666 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 21, 2016) .....	10, 11, 12
<i>Mineworkers' Pension Scheme v. First Solar Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 750 (9th Cir. 2018) .....	13
<i>N.Y.C. Emps.' Ret. Sys. v. Berry</i> , 616 F. Supp. 2d 987 (N.D. Cal. 2009) .....	10

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**

*Parsons v. Ryan*,  
754 F.3d 657 (9th Cir. 2014) .....6

*Petrie v. Elec. Game Card, Inc.*,  
308 F.R.D. 336 (C.D. Cal. 2015).....14

*Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts*,  
472 U.S. 797 (1985).....5

*Questrom v. Federated Dep’t Stores, Inc.*,  
84 F. Supp. 2d 483 (S.D.N.Y. 2000),  
*aff’d*, 2 F. Appx. 81 (2d Cir. 2001) .....13

*Rodriguez v. Hayes*,  
591 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir. 2010) .....7, 8

*Stockwell v. City & Cnty. of S.F.*,  
749 F.3d 1107 (9th Cir. 2014) .....6

*Vaquero v. Ashley Furniture Indus., Inc.*,  
824 F.3d 1150 (9th Cir. 2016) .....12

*W. Va. Pipe Trades Health & Welfare Fund v. Medtronic, Inc.*,  
325 F.R.D. 280 (D. Minn. 2018).....11

*Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes*,  
564 U.S. 338 (2011).....6

**STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS**

15 U.S.C.  
§78j(b).....10, 11, 12  
§78t(a).....4  
§78u-4(a)(3)(B).....3

# 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.