

1 Bobbie J. Wilson, Bar No. 148317
2 *BWilson@perkinscoie.com*
3 Sunita Bali, Bar No. 274108
4 *SBali@perkinscoie.com*
5 **PERKINS COIE LLP**
6 505 Howard Street, Suite 1000
7 San Francisco, CA 94105
8 Telephone: 415.344.7000
9 Facsimile: 415.344.7050

6 Attorneys for Defendants
GOOGLE LLC and ALPHABET INC.

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 IN RE GOOGLE ASSISTANT PRIVACY
13 LITIGATION

Case No. 5:19-cv-04286-BLF

**DEFENDANTS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS'
CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS
ACTION COMPLAINT**

Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

Date: April 9, 2020

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: Courtroom 3 - 5th Floor

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | | | |
|----|-----|--|-------------|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | Page |
| 3 | I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 4 | II. | ARGUMENT | 1 |
| 5 | A. | Plaintiffs’ Wiretap Act Claims Should be Dismissed | 1 |
| 6 | | 1. Plaintiffs have not alleged the requisite intent. | 1 |
| 7 | | 2. Plaintiffs have not alleged any “oral communications.” | 2 |
| 8 | | 3. Plaintiffs’ allegations establish the ordinary course of business exception. | 3 |
| 9 | | 4. Plaintiffs have not alleged an unlawful use or disclosure. | 4 |
| 10 | B. | Plaintiffs’ SCA Claims Should be Dismissed. | 4 |
| 11 | | 1. Plaintiffs fail to state a claim under Section 2701. | 4 |
| 12 | | 2. Plaintiffs fail to state a claim under Section 2702. | 5 |
| 13 | C. | Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim under CIPA | 6 |
| 14 | | 1. Plaintiffs cannot state a claim under Section 631(a). | 6 |
| 15 | | 2. Plaintiffs have not stated a claim under Section 632. | 7 |
| 16 | D. | Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim for Intrusion Upon Seclusion or Invasion of Privacy | 7 |
| 17 | E. | Plaintiffs Have Not Alleged a Breach of Contract Claim | 8 |
| 18 | | 1. Plaintiffs fail to adequately identify the contract Google allegedly breached. | 8 |
| 19 | | 2. The conduct alleged by Plaintiffs is not a breach of the TOS or Privacy Policy. | 9 |
| 20 | | 3. Plaintiffs fail to allege damages | 10 |
| 21 | F. | Plaintiffs Kumandan and Spurr Fail to Allege Breach of Any Warranty | 10 |
| 22 | | 1. Plaintiffs have not and cannot allege the existence or breach of any express warranty | 10 |
| 23 | | 2. Plaintiffs do not allege breach of the implied warranty of merchantability | 11 |
| 24 | | a. Google’s disclaimer of the implied warranty of merchantability in its Terms of Service is valid and enforceable. | 11 |
| 25 | | | |
| 26 | | | |
| 27 | | | |
| 28 | | | |

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| b. Plaintiffs have not alleged a fundamental defect that renders their GAEDs unfit for their intended purpose..... | 11 |
| c. Plaintiffs do not allege they were in vertical privity with Google..... | 12 |
| G. Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim Under the UCL | 13 |
| 1. Plaintiffs fail to allege a tangible, economic loss entitling them to standing..... | 13 |
| 2. Plaintiffs fail to allege that they relied on any misrepresentation or omission..... | 14 |
| 3. Plaintiffs fail to articulate any unfair conduct..... | 15 |
| 4. Plaintiffs do not state a claim for unlawful conduct under the UCL. | 15 |
| III. CONCLUSION | 15 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page |
|---|--------|
| CASES | |
| <i>Alkayali v. Hoed</i> , No. 3:18-cv-777, 2018 WL 3425980 (S.D. Cal. July 16, 2018) | 10 |
| <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009) | 8 |
| <i>Baba v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. C 09-05946 RS, 2010 WL 2486353 (N.D. Cal. June 16, 2010) | 15 |
| <i>Backhaut v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 74 F. Supp. 3d 1033 (N.D. Cal. 2014) | 2 |
| <i>Belluomini v. Citigroup, Inc.</i> , No. CV 13-01743 CRB, 2013 WL 3855589 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2013) | 8 |
| <i>C.M.D. v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , No. C 12-1216 RS, 2014 WL 1266291 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2014), <i>aff'd sub</i> <i>nom. C.M.D. ex rel. De Young v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 621 F. App'x 488 (9th Cir. 2015) | 6 |
| <i>Cardinal Health 301, Inc. v. Tyco Electronics. Corp.</i> , 169 Cal. App. 4th 116 (2008) | 12, 13 |
| <i>Clemens v. DaimlerChrysler Corp.</i> , 534 F.3d 1017, 1022 (9th Cir. 2008) | 11, 12 |
| <i>Cousineau v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 6 F. Supp. 3d 1167 (W.D. Wash. 2014) | 5 |
| <i>Cullen v. Netflix, Inc.</i> , 880 F. Supp. 2d 1017 (N.D. Cal. 2012) | 15 |
| <i>Flanagan v. Flanagan</i> , 27 Cal.4th 766 (2002) | 7 |
| <i>Hauck v. Advanced Micro Devices, Inc.</i> , No. 18-CV00447-LHK, 2019 WL 1493356 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 4, 2019) | 11 |
| <i>Hernandez v. Hillsides, Inc.</i> , 47 Cal.4th 272 (2009) | 8 |
| <i>Hernandez v. Lopez</i> , 180 Cal. App. 4th 932 (2009) | 10 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

| | | Page |
|----|--|-------------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | <i>In re Anthem, Inc. Data Breach Litig.</i> , | |
| 4 | No. 15-MD-02617-LHK, 2016 WL 3029783 (N.D. Cal. May 27, 2016)..... | 14 |
| 5 | <i>In re Carrier IQ, Inc.</i> | |
| 6 | 78 F. Supp. 3d 1051 (2015)..... | 12, 13 |
| 7 | <i>In re Facebook, Inc. Consumer Privacy User Profile Litig.</i> , | |
| 8 | 402 F. Supp. 3d 767 (N.D. Cal. 2019) | 13, 14 |
| 9 | <i>In re Google Android Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , | |
| 10 | No. 11-MD-02264 JSW, 2014 WL 988889 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 10, 2014) | 14 |
| 11 | <i>In re Google Inc. Gmail Litig.</i> , | |
| 12 | No. 13-MD-02430-LHK, 2013 WL 5423918 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 26, 2013)..... | 3, 7 |
| 13 | <i>In re iPhone Application Litig.</i> , | |
| 14 | 844 F. Supp. 2d 1040 (N.D. Cal. 2012) | 5, 15 |
| 15 | <i>In re Nexus 6P Prods. Liab. Litig.</i> , | |
| 16 | 293 F. Supp. 3d 888 (N.D. Cal. 2018) | 11 |
| 17 | <i>In re Nickelodeon Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , | |
| 18 | 827 F.3d 262 (3d Cir. 2016)..... | 8 |
| 19 | <i>In re Pharmatrak, Inc. Privacy Litig.</i> , | |
| 20 | 329 F.3d 9 (1st Cir. 2003) | 2 |
| 21 | <i>In re Yahoo Mail Litig.</i> , | |
| 22 | 7 F. Supp. 3d 1016 (N.D. Cal. 2014) | 8 |
| 23 | <i>Kearns v. Ford Motor Co.</i> , | |
| 24 | 567 F.3d 1120 (9th Cir. 2009)..... | 13, 14 |
| 25 | <i>Kwikset Corp. v. Sup. Ct.</i> , | |
| 26 | 51 Cal. 4th 310 (2011) | 14 |
| 27 | <i>Low v. LinkedIn Corp.</i> , | |
| 28 | 900 F. Supp. 2d 1010 (N.D. Cal. 2012) | 8 |
| | <i>McDonald v. Killoo ApS</i> , | |
| | 385 F. Supp. 3d 1022 (N.D. Cal. 2019) | 8 |
| | <i>Minkler v. Apple, Inc.</i> , | |
| | 65 F. Supp. 3d 810 (N.D. Cal. 2014) | 12 |

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.