

1 William P. Donovan, Jr. (SBN 155881)
2 **MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP**
3 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3200
4 Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206
5 Telephone: (310) 277-4110
6 Facsimile: (310) 277-4730
7 wdonovan@mwe.com

8 Daniel R. Campbell (*pro hac vice*)
9 Emilie E. O'Toole (*pro hac vice*)
10 **MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP**
11 444 West Lake Street, Suite 4000
12 Chicago, IL 60606
13 Telephone: (312) 372-2000
14 Facsimile: (312) 984-7700
15 dcampbell@mwe.com
16 eotoole@mwe.com

17 *Counsel for Defendant StubHub, Inc.*

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE STUBHUB REFUND LITIGATION

Case No. 4:20-md-02951-HSG

**DEFENDANT STUBHUB, INC.'S NOTICE
OF MOTION AND COMBINED
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
RENEWED MOTION TO COMPEL
ARBITRATION AND MOTION TO
DISMISS**

[Filed concurrently with Supplemental
Declaration of Todd Northcutt and [Proposed]
Orders]

Judge: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.
Date: May 5, 2022
Time: 2:00 p.m.
Courtroom: 2

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on May 5, 2022, at 2:00 p.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, before the Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr. of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, in Courtroom 2, of the above-entitled Court, located at 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California, Defendant StubHub, Inc. (“StubHub”) will and hereby does renew its motion to the Court for an order compelling arbitration of all non-California statutory causes of action for relief asserted against StubHub by the eight Plaintiffs not previously compelled to arbitration (the “Remaining Plaintiffs”) in the Consolidated Class Action Complaint filed on or about January 8, 2021 (the “Complaint” or “CAC”) based on the valid and binding arbitration clause in the StubHub Marketplace Global User Agreement (“User Agreement” or “StubHub User Agreement”) that Remaining Plaintiffs were on notice of and agreed to by using StubHub. StubHub further moves this Court for an order dismissing Remaining Plaintiffs’ California and non-California statutory causes of action and negligent misrepresentation cause of action for relief asserted against StubHub.

The Renewed Motion to Compel Arbitration should be granted pursuant to the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 1, *et seq.*, because transactions with StubHub are governed by the StubHub User Agreement. Indeed, the operative arbitration clause in the User Agreement has already been upheld by this Court. (ECF No. 62.) The Remaining Plaintiffs who were not previously compelled to arbitration by this Court were clearly notified of the User Agreement and assented to its terms when they created their StubHub accounts and/or signed into their StubHub accounts. Because the User Agreement contains a binding class action waiver and arbitration provision governing the instant dispute, the claims alleged in the Complaint should be sent to arbitration on an individual basis and this lawsuit either dismissed or stayed. Punctuating the appropriateness of compelling arbitration is the fact that the Remaining Plaintiffs expressly sue to enforce the StubHub User Agreement and are therefore estopped from challenging the arbitration provision as unconscionable.


The Motion to Dismiss should be granted for multiple reasons, as set forth in StubHub’s memorandum filed herewith. First, Remaining Plaintiffs Koble and Wutz lack standing to pursue

1 their claims against StubHub as they have not alleged an injury in fact. Second, all Remaining
2 Plaintiffs lack statutory standing to assert their California statutory claims because they fail to plead
3 reliance. The negligent misrepresentation claim fails for the same reason. Third, Remaining
4 Plaintiffs' California Consumers Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA") claim further fails because they do
5 not allege a misrepresentation that existed at the time of sale, as required to state a claim. Finally,
6 Remaining Plaintiffs' reliance on the User Agreement's choice of California law provision precludes
7 their non-California statutory claims.

8 StubHub bases its Renewed Motion to Compel Arbitration and its Motion to Dismiss on this
9 Notice, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, all pleadings and papers filed in
10 this action, the argument of counsel, and any other matters that may come before the Court.

11 Dated: January 24, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

12
13 

14 _____
15 William P. Donovan, Jr. (SBN 155881)
16 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
17 2049 Century Park East, Suite 3200
18 Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206
19 Tel: (310) 277-4111
20 Fax: (310) 277-4730
21 wdonovan@mwe.com

22 Daniel R. Campbell (*pro hac vice*)
23 Emilie E. O'Toole (*pro hac vice*)
24 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP
25 444 West Lake Street
26 Suite 4000
27 Chicago, IL 60606
28 Telephone: (312) 372-2000
Facsimile: (312) 984-7700
dcampbell@mwe.com
eotoole@mwe.com

Counsel for Defendant StubHub, Inc.

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(s)

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 1

III. LEGAL STANDARD..... 2

IV. ARGUMENT 3

 a. The Remaining Plaintiffs Should Be Compelled to Arbitration..... 3

 i. The Remaining Plaintiffs Agreed to and Are Bound by the User Agreement. 3

 ii. The Remaining Plaintiffs All Sued to Enforce the User Agreement and are Estopped from Avoiding Arbitration 8

 b. Most of the Claims in Plaintiffs’ Consolidated Amended Complaint Should Be Dismissed..... 9

 i. Plaintiffs Paul Koble and Benjamin Wutz Lack Standing to Sue StubHub 9

 ii. Plaintiffs Lack Statutory Standing Because They Fail to Plead Actual Reliance on Any Misrepresentation (COAs 1–3) 11

 iii. Plaintiffs Fail to State a CLRA Cause of Action (COA 1)..... 12

 iv. Plaintiffs’ Negligent Misrepresentation Claim Fails (COA 6) 14

 v. Plaintiffs’ Non-California Statutory Claims Should Be Dismissed (COAs 9–31)..... 14

V. CONCLUSION..... 15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Airtourist Holdings LLC v. HNA Group</i> , 2018 WL 3069444 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 27, 2018).....	8
<i>In re Apple and AT&T iPad Unlimited Data Plan Litig.</i> , 802 F. Supp. 2d 1070 (N.D. Cal. 2011)	3
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	3
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	3
<i>Bentley v. The Control Grp. Media Co.</i> , 2020 WL 3639660 (S.D. Cal. July 6, 2020)	9
<i>Cetacean Cmty. v. Bush</i> , 386 F.3d 1169 (9th Cir. 2004)	9
<i>Chevron Prod. Co. v. Advanced Corrosion Techs. & Training, LLC</i> , 2021 WL 2156467 (N.D. Cal. May 27, 2021).....	14
<i>Chiron Corp. v. Ortho Diagnostic Sys., Inc.</i> , 207 F.3d 1126 (9th Cir. 2000)	4
<i>Cooper v. Pickett</i> , 137 F.3d 616 (9th Cir. 1997)	3
<i>Erickson v. Pardus</i> , 551 U.S. 89 (2007) (<i>per curiam</i>)	3
<i>Fraley v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 830 F. Supp. 2d 785 (N.D. Cal. 2011).....	2
<i>G.P.P., Inc. v. Guardian Protection Prods., Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 4879430 (E.D. Cal. Aug. 14, 2015).....	15
<i>Great Pac. Sec. v. Barclays PLC</i> , 2016 WL 11502178 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2016), <i>aff'd sub nom. Great Pac. Sec. v. Barclays Capital, Inc.</i> , 743 F. App'x 780 (9th Cir. 2018)	13
<i>Hall v. Sea World Ent., Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 9659911 (S.D. Cal. Dec. 23, 2015).....	13

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.