

BLEICHMAR FONTI & AULD LLP
 Lesley Weaver (Cal. Bar No.191305)
 Angelica M. Ornelas (Cal. Bar No. 285929)
 Joshua D. Samra (Cal. Bar No. 313050)
 555 12th Street, Suite 1600
 Oakland, CA 94607
 Tel.: (415) 445-4003
 Fax: (415) 445-4020
lweaver@bfalaw.com
aornelas@bfalaw.com
jsamra@bfalaw.com

SIMMONS HANLY CONROY LLC
 Jason 'Jay' Barnes (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 An Truong (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Eric Johnson (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 112 Madison Avenue, 7th Floor
 New York, NY 10016
 Tel.: (212) 784-6400
 Fax: (212) 213-5949
jaybarnes@simmonsfirm.com
atruong@simmonsfirm.com
ejohnson@simmonsfirm.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs

DICELLO LEVITT GUTZLER LLC
 David A. Straite (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 One Grand Central Place
 60 East 42nd Street, Suite 2400
 New York, NY 10165
 Tel.: (646) 933-1000
dstraite@dicellolevitt.com

Amy Keller (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Adam Prom (admitted *pro hac vice*)
 Sharon Cruz (*pro hac vice* pending)
 Ten North Dearborn St., Sixth Floor
 Chicago, IL 60602
 Tel.: (312) 214-7900
akeller@dicellolevitt.com
aprom@dicellolevitt.com
scruz@dicellolevitt.com

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – SAN JOSE DIVISION**

PATRICK CALHOUN, et al., *on behalf
 of themselves and all others similarly
 situated,*

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:20-cv-05146-LHK-SVK

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF MOTION AND
 MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION
 AND APPOINTMENT OF CLASS
 REPRESENTATIVES AND CLASS
 COUNSEL; MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN
 SUPPORT THEREOF**

Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh
 Date: February 17, 2022
 Time: 1:30 pm
 Courtroom: 8, 4th Floor

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT SOUGHT TO BE SEALED

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

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 1

II. STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED 3

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS 3

 A. Google’s Promises in its Contracts and Terms of Services Operate Are Uniform
 And Central to Liability and Google’s Consent Defenses..... 3

 B. Google’s Conduct in Collecting and Using Data Taken From Users Is Subject to
 Common Proof that Predominates 5

IV. LEGAL STANDARD..... 8

V. ARGUMENT 8

 A. The Prerequisites of Rule 23(a) Are Met..... 8

 1. There are Millions of Class Members..... 8

 2. Google’s Conduct Is at the Center of the Claims and Defenses, Creating
 Common Questions for All Claims..... 9

 3. Plaintiffs’ claims are typical of those of the Class..... 10

 4. Plaintiffs and their counsel meet the adequacy requirement. 11

 B. The Requirements of Rule 23(b)(3) Are Met 12

 1. Common issues predominate. 12

 2. Damages Can Be Determined on a Class-Wide Basis..... 19

 3. Class treatment is superior to other forms of adjudication. 23

 C. Class Certification is Appropriate Under Rule 23(b)(2)..... 25

VI. CONCLUSION..... 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

1		
2		
3	<i>Aichele v. City of Los Angeles,</i>	
4	314 F.R.D. 478 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2013)	23
5	<i>Amgen Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans & Tr. Funds,</i>	
6	568 U.S. 455 (2013)	8
7	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.,</i>	
8	2012 WL 2571719 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 30, 2012)	20
9	<i>Astiana v. Kashi Co.,</i>	
10	291 F.R.D. 493 (S.D. Cal. July 30, 2013)	19
11	<i>Avina v. Spurlock,</i>	
12	28 Cal.App.3d 1086 (Ct. App. 1972)	20
13	<i>Bona Fide Conglomerate, Inc. v. SourceAmerica,</i>	
14	2016 WL 3543699 (S.D. Cal. Jun. 29, 2016)	20
15	<i>Briseno v. ConAgra Foods, Inc.,</i>	
16	844 F.3d 1121 (9th Cir. 2017)	24
17	<i>Carey v. Piphus,</i>	
18	435 U.S. 247 (1978)	20
19	<i>Comcast Corp. v. Behrend,</i>	
20	569 U.S. 27 (2013)	19
21	<i>Doe v. Chao,</i>	
22	540 U.S. 614 (2004)	22
23	<i>Ellis v. Costco III,</i>	
24	285 F.R.D. 492 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	23
25	<i>Ellis v. Costco Wholesale Corp. II,</i>	
26	657 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 2011)	23
27	<i>Ellsworth v. U.S. Bank, N.A.,</i>	
28	2014 WL 2734953 (N.D. Cal. Jun. 13, 2014)	9, 10, 13
	<i>Facebook Privacy Litigation,</i>	
	572 Fed. Appx. 494 (9th Cir. 2014)	21
	<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Patel,</i>	
	140 S. Ct. 937 (2020)	20

1 *Feller v. Transamerica Life Ins. Co.*,
2017 WL 6496803 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 11, 2017)..... 9, 10

2 *Fitzhenry-Russell v. Dr. Pepper Snapple Grp., Inc.*,
3 326 F.R.D. 592 (N.D. Cal. 2018) 8

4 *Hanlon v. Chrysler Corp.*,
5 150 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 1998)..... 12, 24

6 *In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.*,
2016 WL 3029783 (N.D. Cal. May 17, 2016) 21

7 *In re Facebook Biometric Info. Priv. Litig.*,
8 326 F.R.D. 535 (N.D. Cal. 2018) 8

9 *In re Facebook Internet Tracking Litig.*,
10 956 F.3d 589 (9th Cir. 2020)..... 14, 21

11 *In re Facebook, Inc. Cons. Priv. User Prof. Litig.*,
402 F. Supp. 3d 767 (N.D. Cal. 2019)..... 16

12 *In re Facebook, Inc., Cons. Priv. User Prof. Litig.*,
13 402 F. Supp. 3d 767 (N.D. Cal. 2019)..... 10

14 *In re Google Cookie*,
15 806 F.3d 125 (2015) 14

16 *In re Tobacco II Cases*,
46 Cal. 4th 298 (Cal. 2009) 18

17 *In re Whirlpool Corp. Front-Loading Washer Products Liab. Litig.*,
18 722 F.3d 838 (6th Cir.2013)..... 18

19 *Ion Equipment Corp. v. Nelson*,
20 110 Cal.App. 3d 868 (1980)..... 20

21 *Jacob v. Duane Reade, Inc.*,
293 F.R.D. 578 (S.D.N.Y. 2013)..... 18

22 *Jacob v. Duane Reade, Inc.*,
23 602 Fed. Appx. 3 (2d Cir. 2015) 18

24 *Jimenez v. Allstate Ins. Co.*,
765 F.3d 1161 (9th Cir. 2014)..... 18, 19

25 *Larson v. John Hancock Life Ins. Co.*,
26 2017 WL 4284163 (Cal. Super. Mar. 23, 2017)..... 11

27

1 *Leyva v. Medline Ind., Inc.*,
 716 F.3d 510 (9th Cir. 2013)..... 19

2 *Lilly v. Jamba Juice Co.*,
 3 308 F.R.D. 231 (N.D. Cal. 2014) 18

4 *Marsu, B.V. v. Walt Disney Co.*,
 5 185 F.3d 932 (9th Cir. 1999)..... 22

6 *Morgan v. U.S. Soccer Fed’n, Inc.*,
 7 2019 WL 7166978 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2019)..... 9

8 *Motors, Inc. v. Times Mirror Co.*,
 9 102 Cal.App.3d 735 (1980)..... 19

10 *Mullins v. Premier Nutrition Corp.*,
 11 2016 WL 1535057 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 15, 2016)..... 24

12 *Opperman v. Path*,
 13 2016 WL 3844326 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 15, 2016)..... 14, 20, 23

14 *Parsons v. Ryan*,
 15 754 F.3d 657 (9th Cir. 2014)..... 25

16 *Patel v. Facebook*,
 17 932 F.3d 1264 (9th Cir. 2019)..... 20

18 *Pulaski & Middleman, LLC v. Google, Inc.*,
 19 802 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2015)..... 18, 19, 22

20 *Raffin v. Medicredit, Inc.*,
 21 2017 WL 131745 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2017)..... 25

22 *Riley v. California*,
 23 573 U.S. 373 (2014) 14

24 *Rodriguez v. City of Los Angeles*,
 25 2014 WL 12515334 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 21, 2014)..... 23

26 *Rodriguez v. Hayes*,
 27 591 F.3d 1105 (9th Cir. 2010)..... 10, 11

Roley v. Google LLC,
 2020 WL 8675968 (N.D. Cal., July 20, 2020)..... 10, 13, 17

Roy v. Cty. of Los Angeles,
 2018 WL 3436887 (C.D. Cal. Jul. 11, 2018) 23

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.