

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
IN THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION**

EPIC GAMES, INC.,

Plaintiff, Counter-  
defendant,

v.

APPLE INC.,

Defendant,  
Counterclaimant.

IN RE APPLE IPHONE ANTITRUST  
LITIGATION,

DONALD R. CAMERON, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

APPLE INC,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR-TSH

Case No. 4:11-cv-06714-YGR-TSH

Case No. 4:19-cv-03074-YGR-TSH

JOINT DISCOVERY LETTER BRIEF  
REGARDING APPLE'S SUBPOENA TO  
NON-PARTY VALVE CORPORATION

The Honorable Thomas S. Hixson  
San Francisco Courthouse  
Courtroom G, 15th Floor  
450 Golden Gate Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Dear Magistrate Judge Hixson,

Apple Inc. ("Apple") and non-party Valve Corporation ("Valve") respectfully submit this joint letter brief regarding Apple's subpoena requesting the production of documents by Valve.

Counsel for Apple and Valve ("the Parties") have met and conferred telephonically and exchanged correspondence in a good faith effort to resolve outstanding disputes. The Parties have been unable to reach an agreement and therefore submit this joint letter pursuant to Judge Hixson's standing order and Local Rule 37.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

By: /s/ Michelle Lowery  
Michelle Lowery  
*Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.*

FOX ROTHSCHILD LLP

By: /s/ Gavin Skok  
Gavin Skok (*pro hac vice to be submitted*)  
Jaemin Chang  
*Attorneys for Non-Party Valve Corporation*

## **I. Apple's Position:**

### **a. Relevant Background**

As the Court's preliminary injunction ruling makes clear, Epic's various mobile and non-mobile distribution options are central to disputed issues of market definition and market power. *See* Case No. 20-cv-05640-YGR, Dkt. 118 at 18 (observing that Fortnite's "multiplatform nature" suggests other (or all) digital distribution channels "may be economic substitutes"). Valve's digital distribution service, Steam, is the dominant digital game distributor on the PC platform and is a direct competitor to the Epic Game Store. *See* Nick Statt, *Epic vs. Steam: The Console War Reimagined on the PC*, The Verge (Apr. 16, 2019), <https://bit.ly/3oM9uhT>. Epic, like other game developers, could distribute Fortnite on Apple's App Store, the Epic Games Store, Valve's Steam, or through various other digital distribution channels. As a result, in November, Apple served Valve with a document subpoena seeking documents relating to Steam. *See* Ex. 1.

Apple and Valve have engaged in several meet and confers, but Valve has refused to produce information responsive to Requests 2 and 32. Valve admits that the information requested exists in some undisclosed, readily accessible format, but generically claims it won't produce the information because it is confidential or too burdensome to gather *in the manner Apple requested*. Separately, Valve provided a small production of documents (the "Volume 5 Production") which are so heavily redacted that Apple cannot discern what information they might contain and thus are non-responsive and unusable in their current form.<sup>1</sup> Apple respectfully requests that the Court order Valve to: (1) produce information responsive to Requests 2 and 32; and (2) provide unredacted copies of the Volume 5 Production.

### **b. Request 2**

Apple's Request 2 is very narrow. It simply requests documents *sufficient to show* Valve's: (a) total yearly sales of apps and in-app products; (b) annual advertising revenues from Steam; (c) annual sales of external products attributable to Steam; (d) annual revenues from Steam; and (e) annual earnings (whether gross or net) from Steam. Apple has gone as far as requesting this information in any readily accessible format, but Valve refuses to produce it.

Request 2 is crucial for calculating the total size of the market for Epic's available digital distribution channels, which this Court already has found highly relevant to this case. *See* Case No. 4:19-cv-03074-YGR-TSH, Dkt. 125 at 14 (stating that one issue Apple must prove is "the strength of competition for consumers and app developers" among digital distribution platforms). Valve's Steam undoubtedly is a digital distribution platform that competes to distribute games like Fortnite, and its total yearly sales, advertising, and revenue information, uniquely in Valve's possession, are directly relevant to establishing the strength of competition for consumers and app developers for Steam.

Indeed, recognizing the highly relevant nature of Apple's Request, this Court previously ordered third-party Samsung to produce almost identical information. *See Id.* at 14 (ordering third-party Samsung to produce information relating to "revenue from apps, in-app products, and in-app

---

<sup>1</sup> Apple can provide *in camera* copies of the Volume 5 Production to the Court upon request.

advertising”). As this Court recognized with respect to Samsung, this information is “relevant to showing the extent of competition” among digital distribution platforms available to distribute Fortnite, including the Apple App Store. *Id.* at 15. Valve recognizes that Apple has argued that the relevant market includes video games available through any channel, but did not, at the preliminary injunction phase, have the evidence to prove that. That is precisely what Apple is trying to prove now and the information requested from Valve is central to that pursuit. *See* Case No. 20-cv-05640-YGR, Dkt. 118 at 17 n.19.

Apple has a substantial need for this information as it is uniquely obtainable from Valve. As the Court previously held, a party establishes substantial need where information is relevant and not reasonably obtainable elsewhere. Apple can only obtain information related to Valve’s app revenue, in-app purchases, and advertising from Valve itself. *See* Case No. 4:19-cv-03074-YGR-TSH, Dkt. 125 at 6 (“[S]ubstantial need’ and ‘undue hardship’ requirements met where documents were relevant and [party] could not reasonably obtain them elsewhere.”); *id.* at 21 (“The Court finds these documents are relevant, and since Apple is only able to obtain them from either Samsung or Google, it has shown a substantial need.”).

Valve’s assertion that multiple databases are needed to extract the information Apple requests is a distraction. Valve has admitted to Apple’s counsel that the information requested exists in the normal course of business, but Valve simply refuses to produce it in any of the formats Apple suggested, yet also refuses to provide any information whatsoever as to the form in which the information exists and is readily accessible. Nor is Valve’s complaint that the information is competitively sensitive a basis for withholding relevant and readily accessible high-level historic sales and revenue information.<sup>2</sup> Request 2 solely seeks information relating to Valve’s historical performance and since “the information sought by this Request does not detail future plans or involve strategic assessments . . . there is no substantial risk of competitive or economic harm” to Valve. *Id.* at 17.

### c. Request 32

Request 32 asks for documents *sufficient to show*: (a) the name of each App on Steam; (b) the date range when the App was available on Steam; and (c) the price of the App and any in-app product available on Steam. This is basic information relating to the identity and availability of games over time on Steam, is necessary to determine the scope and breadth of the digital distribution marketplace, and is “relevant to showing competition” between these platforms. Case No. 4:19-cv-03074-YGR-TSH, Dkt. 125 at 17.

Like the information sought in Request 2, the information sought in Request 32 is historical, and does not involve any “future plans or strategic assessments” and thus does not raise risk of any competitive harm. *Id.* at 14. Further, Request 32 seeks information that is uniquely obtainable from Valve. Apple has therefore demonstrated substantial need for Request 32, because the

---

<sup>2</sup> The Court has already held that the Protective Order in *Pepper* and *Cameron*—which is substantively identical to the Protective Order in *Epic*, *see* (Case No. 20-cv-05640-YGR) (Dkt. 112)—is “sufficient” to protect the confidentiality of third-party Samsung’s competitively sensitive documents. *See* (Case No. 11-cv-06714-YGR) (Dkt. 242 at 22 n.4). The same result is warranted here.

information is both relevant and not reasonably obtainable elsewhere. *Id.* at 6, 21

**d. Redactions from the Volume 5 Production**

Valve made its Volume 5 Production with substantial redactions that cover any information that looks to be potentially responsive. When asked to provide unredacted copies, Valve stated that doing so would be burdensome and intrusive, but did not explain why. There is no apparent burden to unredacting these documents; in fact, redacting them in the first place created a greater burden. The redacted information, which undoubtedly is responsive given that Valve produced it, appears to relate to Apple's requests for commissions. Further, producing it cannot be unduly burdensome given that it already has been produced. This information should be unredacted and, if competitive sensitivity is the real issue, then the information is protected by the protective order in this matter.

**II. Valve's Position:**

Valve is a privately held company with approximately 350 employees that develops PC video games. Valve does not make or sell phones, tablets, or video games for mobile devices, or otherwise compete in the mobile market. Valve also operates Steam, an online platform that lets users purchase and play PC games on their laptops and desktops. Steam users cannot buy or use mobile apps on Steam. Over 30,000+ PC games are available on Steam, over 99% of which were made by third parties other than Valve. Most of these games can also be bought elsewhere, including from developers directly, from brick and mortar retail, or on other PC game platforms. Third party developers that offer their games on Steam control all pricing and content. Valve collects the purchase price from Steam users and remits the proceeds to the third party developer net of a revenue share to Valve. Fortnite is not available on Steam, and Epic has publicly and unequivocally stated it will not offer Fortnite on Steam unless Valve changes its business model.

In response to Apple's 46 documents requests, Valve already produced documents regarding its revenue share, competition with Epic, Steam distribution contracts, and other documents. Apple was not satisfied and demands—without offering to cover Valve's costs, which would be significant—that Valve (i) recreate six years' worth of PC game and item sales for hundreds of third party video games, then (ii) produce a massive amount of confidential information about these games and Valve's revenues. Valve objected. *See* Ex. 2.

Apple wrongly claims those requests are narrow. They are not. Apple gave Valve a list of 436 video games it says are available on the Epic Game Store and Steam, and (a) demanded Valve identify, from 2015 to the present, every version and all digital content or items for each of these games on Steam, then (b) provide exhaustive information about all of them, including:

- The dates on sale, plus every price and price change, from 2015 to the present (RFP 32);
- Gross revenues for each game version and item, broken down individually (RFP 2); and
- All of Valve's revenues related to these versions, content and items (RFP 2).

**A. Apple's Overbroad Demands Impose Too Heavy A Burden On A Non-Party**

Apple's demands would impose an extraordinary burden on Valve to query, process and combine a massive amount of to create the documents Apple seeks—materials that Valve does

# 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.