

1 PERKINS COIE LLP  
Shylah R. Alfonso, *pro hac vice pending*  
2 SAlfonso@perkinscoie.com  
Tiffany L. Lee, Bar No. 303007  
3 TiffanyLee@perkinscoie.com  
4 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099  
5 Telephone: 206.359.8000  
Facsimile: 206.359.9000  
6

7 Jon B. Jacobs, *pro hac vice pending*  
JBJacobs@perkinscoie.com  
8 700 13th Street, NW  
Suite 800  
9 Washington, D.C. 20005-3960  
Telephone: 202.654.6200  
10 Facsimile: 202.654.6211

11 Elliott J. Joh, Bar No. 264927  
12 EJoh@perkinscoie.com  
Lauren Trambley, Bar No. 340634  
13 LTrambley@perkinscoie.com  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
14 505 Howard Street, Suite 1000  
San Francisco, CA 94105-3204  
15 Telephone: 415.344.7000  
16 Facsimile: 415.344.7050

17 Attorneys for Defendant  
LINKEDIN CORPORATION  
18

19 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

20 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA - OAKLAND DIVISION**

21 TODD CROWDER, KEVIN SCHULTE,  
and GARRICK VANCE, on behalf of  
22 themselves and all others similarly situated,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 LINKEDIN CORPORATION,

26 Defendant.  
27  
28

Case No. 4:22-cv-00237-HSG

**DEFENDANT LINKEDIN CORP.'S  
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION  
TO DISMISS COMPLAINT;  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT**

Judge: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

Date: September 8, 2022

Time: 2:00 p.m.

Crtrm: 2 - 4th Floor

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|    |  | <b>Page</b> |
|----|--|-------------|
| 1  |  |             |
| 2  |  |             |
| 3  | I. INTRODUCTION.....   | 2           |
| 4  | II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....  | 4           |
| 5  | A. LinkedIn Offers a Variety of Social Networking Services.....                  | 4           |
| 6  | B. LinkedIn is an Innovator.....   | 5           |
| 7  | 1. LinkedIn creates greater functionality through API partnerships.....          | 5           |
| 8  | 2. LinkedIn protects its members' control over their own data.....               | 6           |
| 9  | 3. LinkedIn uses cloud computing resources to enhance its offerings.....         | 6           |
| 10 | III. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS THE COMPLAINT FOR FAILURE TO STATE A               |             |
| 11 | CLAIM.....   | 7           |
| 12 | A. Claims That Lack Sufficient Facts To Be Plausible On Their Face Must Be       |             |
| 13 | Dismissed.....   | 7           |
| 14 | B. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Facts Supporting a Viable Theory of Monopolization  |             |
| 15 | Under Section 2.....   | 8           |
| 16 | 1. LinkedIn's success and innovations do not violate antitrust law.....          | 8           |
| 17 | 2. None of LinkedIn's specifically alleged conduct is exclusionary.....          | 10          |
| 18 | a. LinkedIn's API agreements are inclusionary, not exclusionary....              | 10          |
| 19 | b. LinkedIn's alleged refusal to deal with its competitors is not                |             |
| 20 | exclusionary.....  | 11          |
| 21 | c. LinkedIn's use of the same cloud computing resources that are                 |             |
| 22 | readily available to competitors is not exclusionary.....                        | 14          |
| 23 | C. Plaintiffs' Attempted Monopolization Claim Under Section 2 Fails for the Same |             |
| 24 | Reasons as Their Monopolization Claim.....                                       | 17          |
| 25 | D. Plaintiffs' Section 1 Claim Fails as a Matter of Law.....                     | 18          |
| 26 | 1. Plaintiffs have no direct evidence of the alleged agreement between           |             |
| 27 | LinkedIn and Facebook.....   | 18          |
| 28 | 2. None of the alleged circumstantial evidence plausibly indicates an            |             |
|    | agreement.....   | 19          |
|    | a. Facebook's product launch does not plausibly imply an antitrust               |             |
|    | conspiracy.....  | 20          |
|    | b. LinkedIn and Facebook's alleged data reciprocity negotiations do              |             |
|    | not plausibly imply a conspiracy.....  | 22          |
|    | c. Facebook's alleged agreement with Google is irrelevant .....                  | 23          |
|    | 3. Plaintiffs' market-division claim under Section 1 is time-barred.....         | 24          |
|    | CONCLUSION.....  | 24          |

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

|  | Page(s)       |
|--|---------------|
| <b>CASES</b>   |               |
| <i>Adaptive Power Sols., LLC v. Hughes Missile Sys. Co.</i> ,<br>141 F.3d 947 (9th Cir. 1988).....                       | 10, 23        |
| <i>Aerotec Int'l, Inc. v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc.</i> ,<br>836 F.3d 1171 (9th Cir. 2016).....                              | 12, 13        |
| <i>Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Grp. LP</i> ,<br>592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010).....              | 9, 16         |
| <i>Am. Contractors Supply, LLC v. HD Supply Constr. Supply, Ltd.</i> ,<br>2020 WL 10467232 (N.D. Ga. Feb. 26, 2020)..... | 11            |
| <i>Apple, Inc. v. Psytar Corp.</i> ,<br>586 F. Supp. 2d 1190 (N.D. Cal. 2008).....                                       | 8             |
| <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> ,<br>556 U.S. 662 (2009).....   | 7             |
| <i>Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.</i> ,<br>472 U.S. 585 (1985).....                                    | 9, 12, 13, 14 |
| <i>Associated Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Carpenters</i> ,<br>459 U.S. 519 (1983).....                             | 7             |
| <i>Atl. Richfield Co. v. USA Petroleum Co.</i> ,<br>495 U.S. 328 (1990).....   | 16            |
| <i>Bay Area Surgical Mgmt. LLC v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.</i> ,<br>166 F. Supp. 3d 988 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....                 | 24            |
| <i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> ,<br>550 U.S. 544 (2007).....  | passim        |
| <i>City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders</i> ,<br>20 F.4th 441 (9th Cir. 2021).....   | 16            |
| <i>Complete Ent. Res. LLC v. Live Nation Ent., Inc.</i> ,<br>2016 WL 3457177 (C.D. Cal. May 11, 2016).....               | 15            |
| <i>Datel Holdings Ltd. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,<br>712 F. Supp. 2d 974 (N.D. Cal. 2010).....                             | 6             |
| <i>Evanston Police Pension Fund v. McKesson Corp.</i> ,<br>411 F. Supp. 3d 580 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....                     | 23            |

|    |  |               |
|----|--|---------------|
| 1  | <i>Falstaff Brewing Co. v. Stroh Brewery Co.</i> ,                               |               |
| 2  | 628 F. Supp. 822 (N.D. Cal. 1986).....   | 18            |
| 3  | <i>Feitelson v. Google Inc.</i> ,  |               |
| 4  | 80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....  | 7             |
| 5  | <i>FTC v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> ,  |               |
| 6  | 969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020).....  | 9, 12, 13, 16 |
| 7  | <i>General Commc 'ns Eng 'g, Inc. v. Motorola Commc 'ns &amp; Elecs., Inc.</i> , |               |
| 8  | 421 F. Supp. 274 (N.D. Cal. 1976).....   | 18            |
| 9  | <i>Goldwasser v. Ameritech Corp.</i> ,   |               |
| 10 | 222 F.3d 390 (7th Cir. 2000).....  | 14, 16        |
| 11 | <i>hiQ Labs, Inc. v. LinkedIn Corp.</i> ,  |               |
| 12 | 485 F. Supp. 3d 1137 (N.D. Cal. 2020).....                                       | 3, 13, 14     |
| 13 | <i>Hirsh v. Martindale-Hubbell, Inc.</i> ,                                       |               |
| 14 | 674 F.2d 1343 (9th Cir. 1982).....   | 15            |
| 15 | <i>Howard Hess Dental Lab 'ys Inc. v. Dentsply Int'l, Inc.</i> ,                 |               |
| 16 | 602 F.3d 237 (3d Cir. 2010).....   | 17            |
| 17 | <i>Hunter v. Tarantino</i> ,   |               |
| 18 | 2010 WL 11579019 (C.D. Cal. July 15, 2010).....                                  | 17            |
| 19 | <i>In re Animation Workers Antitrust Litig.</i> ,                                |               |
| 20 | 87 F. Supp. 3d 1195 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....  | 7             |
| 21 | <i>In re Elevator Antitrust Litig.</i> ,   |               |
| 22 | 502 F.3d 47 (2d Cir. 2007).....  | 23            |
| 23 | <i>In re Gilead Scis. Secs. Litig.</i> ,   |               |
| 24 | 536 F.3d 1049 (9th Cir. 2008).....   | 7             |
| 25 | <i>In re Packaged Seafood Antitrust Litig.</i> ,                                 |               |
| 26 | 2017 WL 35571 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 3, 2017).....                                      | 20            |
| 27 | <i>John Doe 1 v. Abbott Lab 'ys</i> ,  |               |
| 28 | 571 F.3d 930 (9th Cir. 2009).....  | 8, 15         |
|    | <i>Jones v. Micron Tech. Inc.</i> ,  |               |
|    | 400 F. Supp. 3d 897 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....  | 19            |
|    | <i>Kendall v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.</i> ,  |               |
|    | 518 F.3d 1042 (9th Cir. 2008).....   | 7, 19, 20     |
|    | <i>Liveuniverse, Inc. v. Myspace, Inc.</i> ,                                     |               |
|    | 2007 WL 6865852 (C.D. Cal. June 4, 2007).....                                    | 16            |

|    |  |        |
|----|--|--------|
| 1  | <i>LiveUniverse, Inc. v. MySpace, Inc.</i> ,                                 |        |
| 2  | 304 F. App'x 554 (9th Cir. 2008).....  | 17     |
| 3  | <i>MCI Commc 'ns Corp v. AT&amp;T</i> ,                                      |        |
| 4  | 708 F.2d 1081 (7th Cir. 1983).....   | 12     |
| 5  | <i>MedioStream, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,                                |        |
| 6  | 869 F. Supp. 2d 1095 (N.D. Cal. 2012).....                                   | 16, 24 |
| 7  | <i>Monsanto Co. v. Trantham</i> ,  |        |
| 8  | 156 F. Supp. 2d 855 (W.D. Tenn. 2001).....                                   | 8      |
| 9  | <i>Moore v. Mars Petcare US, Inc.</i> ,                                      |        |
| 10 | 820 F. App'x 573 (9th Cir. 2020).....  | 21     |
| 11 | <i>Morris Commc 'ns Corp. v. PGA Tour, Inc.</i> ,                            |        |
| 12 | 364 F.3d 1288 (11th Cir. 2004).....  | 12     |
| 13 | <i>N. Star Gas Co. v. Pac. Gas &amp; Electric Co.</i> ,                      |        |
| 14 | 2016 WL 5358590 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2016) (Gilliam, J.).....                | 7      |
| 15 | <i>Name.Space, Inc. v. Internet Corp. for Assigned Names &amp; Numbers</i> , |        |
| 16 | 795 F.3d 1124 (9th Cir. 2015).....   | 20     |
| 17 | <i>Novation Ventures, LLC v. J.G. Wentworth Co., LLC</i> ,                   |        |
| 18 | 2015 WL 12765467 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 21, 2015).....                             | 17     |
| 19 | <i>Oliver v. SD-3C LLC</i> ,   |        |
| 20 | 2016 WL 5950345 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 30, 2016).....                              | 19     |
| 21 | <i>Olympia Equipment Leasing Co. v. Western Union Telegraph Co.</i> ,        |        |
| 22 | 797 F.2d 370 (7th Cir. 1986).....  | 11     |
| 23 | <i>Opperman v. Path, Inc.</i> ,  |        |
| 24 | 84 F. Supp. 3d 962 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....                                     | 6      |
| 25 | <i>Pace Indus., Inc. v. Three Phoenix Co.</i> ,                              |        |
| 26 | 813 F.2d 234 (9th Cir. 1987).....  | 24     |
| 27 | <i>Philadelphia Taxi Ass'n, Inc. v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> ,                  |        |
| 28 | 886 F.3d 332 (3d Cir. 2018).....   | 16     |
|    | <i>PNY Techs., Inc. v. SanDisk Corp.</i> ,                                   |        |
|    | 2012 WL 1380271 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 20, 2012).....                               | 19     |
|    | <i>Rebel Oil Co. v. Atl. Richfield Co.</i> ,                                 |        |
|    | 51 F.3d 1421 (9th Cir. 1995).....  | 8, 17  |
|    | <i>Reveal Chat Holdco, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,                           |        |
|    | 471 F. Supp. 3d 981 (N.D. Cal. 2020).....                                    | 13, 15 |

# 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.