

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

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

IN RE APPLE PROCESSOR LITIGATION

Case No. 18-cv-00147-EJD

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO  
DISMISS WITH LEAVE TO AMEND**

Re: Dkt. No. 96

Putative class action Plaintiffs (“Plaintiffs”) are purchasers or lessors of certain Apple products (“iDevices”), each containing a processor that Plaintiffs allege suffers from a design defect that allows unauthorized third parties to access sensitive user data. Plaintiffs bring this lawsuit against Defendant Apple Inc. (“Apple”), alleging that they paid more for their iDevices than they were worth because Apple knowingly omitted the defect; the value of Plaintiffs’ products has diminished; and Apple’s attempts to mitigate the defects with patches through software updates materially slowed down the performance of their iDevices.

Apple has filed a renewed motion to dismiss (“Mot.”) Plaintiffs’ second consolidated amended complaint (“SCAC”) with prejudice under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for inadequate pleading of their misrepresentation, omission, restitution, and injunctive relief claims.

**I. BACKGROUND<sup>1</sup>**

**a. The Parties**

Plaintiffs are Jennifer Abrams (CA), Anthony Bartling (NH), Robert Giraldi (NY), and

---

<sup>1</sup> The background is a summary of the allegations in the SCAC and does not rely on any exhibits that Apple has “referenced for background.” Mot. 3 n.2.

1 Jacqueline Olson (NY) (“Plaintiffs”) who, on behalf of themselves and all others similarly  
2 situated, allege that certain Apple products such as iPhones, iPads, and the Apple TV (collectively  
3 “iDevices”) all contain a central processing unit that is defective. SCAC ¶ 1.

4 Plaintiffs bring their class action pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 and seek  
5 to represent a class that consists of:

6 All persons in the United States who purchased or leased from Apple  
7 and/or its authorized retailer sellers one or more iPhones, iPads, Apple  
8 TVs, or other products containing processors designed or modified by  
Apple, at any time since January 1, 2010.

9 *Id.* ¶ 115. Plaintiffs also seek to represent three subclasses: the “California Subclass,” the “New  
10 Hampshire Subclass,” and the “New York Subclass.” *Id.* ¶ 117. These classes are comprised of  
11 members who purchased such iDevices within their respected states. *Id.*

12 Defendant Apple, Inc. is a business incorporated in Delaware with a principal place of  
13 business in Cupertino, California. Apple designs, manufactures, distributes, and sells products  
14 including the iDevices and other computing devices that contain processors. *Id.* ¶ 18.

#### 15 **b. The Alleged Defect**

16 Each of Plaintiffs’ iDevices contains a central processing unit, also referred to as a  
17 processor (“CPU” or “Processor”) that carries out the instructions of programs running on the  
18 iDevices. SCAC ¶ 24. These Processors are based on architecture licensed from engineering firm  
19 ARM Holdings but are uniquely modified and designed by Apple. *Id.* ¶¶ 43-45. As relevant here,  
20 Apple customizes its Processors using two optimization techniques to improve performance:  
21 “speculative execution,” which allows processors to anticipate and execute certain tasks  
22 preemptively; and “out-of-order execution,” which allows a program’s instructions to be executed  
23 in parallel or out of order, as opposed to strictly sequentially. *Id.* ¶ 30-31. These optimization  
24 techniques require specific modifications at the physical hardware level of each Processor. *Id.* ¶  
25 52. Apple’s Processors are used exclusively in Apple products, and the Processor within each  
26 iDevice works with Apple’s operating system (“iOS”) to execute the device’s programs and  
27 instructions. *Id.* ¶¶ 24-25, ¶ 48.

28 Case No. : 18-cv-00147-EJD

1 In 2017, independent security researchers discovered that certain processors contain two  
2 vulnerabilities—referred to by Plaintiffs as “Meltdown” and “Spectre,” and collectively as the  
3 “Defects”—that allow unauthorized third parties to access sensitive user data. *Id.* ¶ 2.  
4 Specifically, Apple’s implementation of speculative and out-of-order execution allegedly allows  
5 bad actors to access sensitive data that would normally need to process through security checks or  
6 require isolation within the OS. *Id.* ¶¶ 36-42, 49-51. The security issues raised by Meltdown and  
7 Spectre are not limited to only Apple Processors but may affect different manufacturers’  
8 processors differently, depending on how they had modified the original ARM processor  
9 architecture. *Id.* ¶¶ 49-51.

10 Plaintiffs allege that Apple was notified of the Defects in June 2017 but did not publicly  
11 disclose them until January 4, 2018, after a New York Times article leaked the vulnerabilities. *Id.*  
12 ¶¶ 83-84. In that public announcement—which was made ahead of a coordinated disclosure date  
13 previously agreed upon by Apple, Intel, Google, Microsoft, Amazon, AMD, and ARM—Apple  
14 addressed speculative execution and Meltdown, disclosing that its December 2, 2017 iOS 11.2  
15 update included a software update to address the vulnerability. *Id.* ¶ 54. On January 8, 2018,  
16 Apple separately released iOS 11.2.2, a software update to address Spectre. *Id.* Plaintiffs assert  
17 that these vulnerabilities are material because, “had they known data stored on their systems  
18 would be compromised and made available to unauthorized third parties,” they would not have  
19 purchased their iDevices or paid the price they did. *Id.* ¶ 68. After Apple made the  
20 announcements, the iDevices allegedly declined in value. *Id.* ¶¶ 71–79.

### 21 c. Apple’s Representations of Its Processors

22 Plaintiffs allege that Apple made various representations to the public through “extensive  
23 and long-term advertising and promotion efforts” regarding the benefits, capabilities, and quality  
24 of Apple Processors and iDevices. SCAC ¶ 86. The SCAC identified various statements from  
25 Apple advertising iPhones 4, 5, 5s, 6, 6 Plus, 6s, 6s Plus, 7, 7 Plus, 8, 8 Plus, X, as well as various  
26 generations of iPads. *Id.* ¶¶ 87-112. These statements included the following assertions regarding  
27 the performance of Apple Processors:

- 1 • A4 Processor: “provides exceptional processor and graphic performance along with  
2 long battery life” (*Id.* ¶ 87);
- 3 • A6 Processor: “maximize performance and power efficiency . . . up to twice the  
4 CPU and graphics performance” (*Id.* ¶ 89);
- 5 • A6X Processor: “delivers up to twice the CPU performance and up to twice the  
6 graphics performance of the A5X chip” (*Id.* ¶ 102);
- 7 • A7 Processor: “brings 64-bit desktop-class architecture to a smartphone . . . up to  
8 twice the CPU and graphics performance” (*Id.* ¶ 90);
- 9 • A8 Processor: “faster performance and is more energy efficient, delivering higher  
10 sustained performance with great battery life” (*Id.* ¶ 91);
- 11 • A8X Processor: “delivers a 40 percent improvement in CPU performance and 2.5  
12 times the graphics performance of iPad Air” (*Id.* ¶ 104);
- 13 • A9 Processor: “70 percent faster CPU and 90 percent faster GPU performance than  
14 the A8, all with gains in energy efficiency for great battery life” (*Id.* ¶ 92);
- 15 • A10 Fusion Processor: “run[s] up to two times faster than iPhone 6. . . [and is]  
16 capable of running at just one-fifth the power of the high-performance cores.  
17 Graphics performance is also more powerful, running up to three times faster than  
18 iPhone 6 at as little as half the power” (*Id.* ¶ 93);
- 19 • A10X Fusion Processor: “up to 30 percent faster CPU performance and 40 percent  
20 graphics performance than the industry-leading A9X chip” (*Id.* ¶¶ 108-09); and
- 21 • A11 Bionic Processor: “features a six-core CPU design with two performance cores  
22 that are 25 percent faster and four efficiency cores that are 70 percent faster than  
23 the A10 Fusion . . . delivering up to 70 percent greater performance for multi-  
24 threaded workloads . . . up to 30 percent faster graphics performance than the  
25 previous generation” (*Id.* ¶ 95).

26 Additionally, Plaintiffs identified two video commercials on YouTube that depict the  
27 iPhone as being more secure and private than other phones, which included the following

28 Case No. : 18-cv-00147-EJD

1 statements in the videos' YouTube descriptions:

- 2 • "Access to the latest updates keeps your iPhone secure. Life's easier when you
- 3 switch to iPhone." (*Id.* ¶ 111); and
- 4 • "We build iPhone with your privacy in mind. Life's easier when you switch to
- 5 iPhone." (*Id.* ¶ 112).

6 **d. Procedural History**

7 On June 8, 2018, Plaintiffs filed a consolidated amended complaint against Apple alleging  
 8 sixteen causes of action. ECF No. 46. On August 7, 2018, Apple filed a motion to dismiss, which  
 9 the Court granted on standing grounds with leave to amend. ECF Nos. 49, 66. On February 21,  
 10 2019, Plaintiffs filed the Second Consolidated Amended Complaint, asserting seven causes of  
 11 action. ECF No. 72. Apple again moved to dismiss Plaintiffs' SCAC for lack of standing or any  
 12 cause of action, which the Court granted again on standing grounds without leave to amend and  
 13 entered judgment in favor of Apple. ECF Nos. 75, 88-89.

14 On appeal, a Ninth Circuit panel held that Plaintiffs had sufficiently pled standing but  
 15 expressly declined to address Apple's Rule 12(b)(6) arguments, leaving that task to this Court in  
 16 the first instance. ECF No. 93. On remand, the parties stipulated to renewed and updated briefing  
 17 on Apple's 12(b)(6) defenses, ECF No. 95, which is presently before the Court.

18 **II. LEGAL STANDARDS**

19 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a) requires a plaintiff to plead each claim with sufficient  
 20 specificity to "give the defendant fair notice of what the . . . claim is and the grounds upon which  
 21 it rests." *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (internal quotations omitted).  
 22 Although particular detail is not generally necessary, the factual allegations "must be enough to  
 23 raise a right to relief above the speculative level" such that the claim "is plausible on its face." *Id.*  
 24 at 555, 570. A complaint which falls short of the Rule 8(a) standard may be dismissed if it fails to  
 25 state a claim upon which relief can be granted. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). Dismissal of a claim  
 26 under Rule 12(b)(6) may be based on a "lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence of  
 27 sufficient facts alleged under a cognizable legal theory." *Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't*, 901

28 Case No. 18-cv-00147-EJD

# 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.