

1 COOLEY LLP  
 PATRICK E. GIBBS (183174)  
 2 (pgibbs@cooley.com)  
 JESSICA VALENZUELA SANTAMARIA (220934)  
 3 (jvs@cooley.com)  
 TIJANA BRIEN (286590)  
 4 (tbrien@cooley.com)  
 JENNA C. BAILEY (319302)  
 5 (jbailey@cooley.com)  
 3175 Hanover Street  
 6 Palo Alto, California 94304-1130  
 Telephone: +1 650 843 5000  
 7 Facsimile: +1 650 849 7400

8 CRAIG E. TENBROECK (287848)  
 (ctenbroeck@cooley.com)  
 9 4401 Eastgate Mall  
 San Diego, California 92121  
 10 Telephone: +1 858 550 6000  
 Facsimile: +1 858 550 6420

11 Attorneys for Defendants  
 12 *Zoom Video Communications, Inc., Eric S. Yuan, and*  
 13 *Kelly Steckelberg*

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16  
 17 In re ZOOM SECURITIES LITIGATION,

Case No.: 3:20-cv-02353-JD

18  
 19 This Document Relates To:  
 20 ALL ACTIONS.

**DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS THE  
 CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

Date: August 26, 2021  
 Time: 10:00 a.m.  
 Courtroom: 11, 19th Floor  
 Judge: Hon. James Donato

21  
 22  
 23  
 24  
 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**

	<b>Page</b>
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION .....	v
STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED (LOCAL RULE 7-4(A)(3)).....	v
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES .....	1
I.    INTRODUCTION .....	1
II.   BACKGROUND .....	2
III.  LEGAL STANDARDS.....	5
IV.  ARGUMENT .....	5
A.    Plaintiff Fails to Allege Any False or Misleading Statement .....	5
1.    Because Plaintiff Fails to Allege That There is Only One Possible Meaning of “End to End Encryption,” His Claims Fail .....	5
2.    Zoom’s Privacy Policy Contained No Misstatements or Omissions.....	8
B.    Yuan and Steckelberg Cannot Be Liable for Statements They Did Not “Make.” .....	9
C.    Plaintiff Fails to Plead a Strong Inference of Scierter.....	9
1.    Plaintiff Fails to Plead Scierter as to Yuan and Steckelberg .....	9
a.    Plaintiff Fails to Plead Scierter as to Zoom’s Use of E2E.....	10
b.    Plaintiff Fails to Plead Scierter as to the Alleged Privacy Policy Omissions .....	12
2.    Viewed Holistically, the More Cogent and Compelling Inference is an Innocent One.....	12
D.    Plaintiff Fails to Adequately Plead Loss Causation.....	14
V.    CONCLUSION.....	15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

		<b>Page(s)</b>
1		
2		
3	<b>Cases</b>	
4	<i>In re Adolor Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
5	616 F. Supp. 2d 551 (E.D. Pa. 2009) .....	7
6	<i>In re Advanta Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
7	180 F.3d 525 (3d Cir. 1999).....	11
8	<i>Basic Inc. v. Levinson</i> ,	
9	485 U.S. (1988) .....	8
10	<i>Bodri v. GoPro</i> ,	
11	252 F. Supp. 3d 912 (N.D. Cal. 2017) .....	12
12	<i>In re BofI Holding, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
13	977 F.3d 781 (9th Cir. 2020).....	14, 15
14	<i>Brody v. Transitional Hosps. Corp.</i> ,	
15	280 F.3d 997 (9th Cir. 2002).....	8
16	<i>Cheung v. Keyuan Petrochemicals, Inc.</i> ,	
17	2012 WL 5834894 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 1, 2012).....	10
18	<i>City of Dearborn Heights Act 345 Police &amp; Fire Ret. Sys. v. Waters Corp.</i> ,	
19	632 F.3d 751 (1st Cir. 2011) .....	11
20	<i>Di Donato v. Insys Therapeutics Inc.</i> ,	
21	2017 WL 3268797 (D. Ariz. Aug. 1, 2017) .....	13
22	<i>Ferraro Family Found., Inc. v. Corcept Therapeutics Inc.</i> ,	
23	2020 WL 6822916 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 20, 2020).....	15
24	<i>Glazer Cap. Mgmt., LP v. Magistri</i> ,	
25	549 F.3d 736 (9th Cir. 2008).....	11
26	<i>Janus Cap. Grp., Inc. v. First Derivative Traders</i> ,	
27	564 U.S. 135 (2011) .....	9
28	<i>Jasin v. Vivus, Inc.</i> ,	
	2016 WL 1570164 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 19, 2016), <i>aff'd</i> , 721 F. App'x 665 (9th Cir.	
	2018) .....	13
	<i>Kairalla v. Advanced Med. Optics, Inc.</i> ,	
	2008 WL 2879087 (C.D. Cal. June 6, 2008) .....	8

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(continued)**

		<b>Page(s)</b>
1		
2		
3	<i>Kelly v. Elec. Arts, Inc.</i> ,	
4	2015 WL 1967233 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2015) .....	6
5	<i>Kuriakose v. Fed. Home Loan Mortg. Corp.</i> ,	
6	2011 WL 1158028 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 30, 2011) .....	7
7	<i>In re LeapFrog Enters., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
8	527 F. Supp. 2d 1033 (N.D. Cal. 2007) .....	10
9	<i>Loos v. Immersion Corp.</i> ,	
10	762 F.3d 880 (9th Cir. 2014).....	15
11	<i>McGann v. Ernst &amp; Young</i> ,	
12	102 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996).....	13
13	<i>Neborsky v. Valley Forge Composite Techs., Inc.</i> ,	
14	2014 WL 1705522 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 28, 2014) .....	9
15	<i>Or. Pub. Emps. Ret. Fund v. Apollo Grp. Inc.</i> ,	
16	774 F.3d 598 (9th Cir. 2014).....	5, 15
17	<i>In re Pixar Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
18	450 F. Supp. 2d 1096 (N.D. Cal. 2006) .....	12
19	<i>Police Ret. Sys. of St. Louis v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.</i> ,	
20	759 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 2014).....	5
21	<i>In re Rigel Pharms., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
22	697 F.3d 869 (9th Cir. 2012).....	9, 10, 15
23	<i>In re Silicon Graphics Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> ,	
24	183 F.3d 970 (9th Cir. 1999), <i>superseded by statute on other grounds</i> .....	9
25	<i>Tellabs, Inc. v. Makor Issues &amp; Rights, Ltd.</i> ,	
26	551 U.S. 308 (2007).....	9
27	<i>Veal v. LendingClub Corp.</i> ,	
28	423 F. Supp. 3d 785 (N.D. Cal. 2019) .....	8
	<i>In re Verisign, Inc., Derivative Litig.</i> ,	
	531 F. Supp. 2d 1173 (N.D. Cal. 2007) .....	10
	<i>Vess v. Ciba-Geigy Corp. USA</i> ,	
	317 F.3d 1097 (9th Cir. 2003).....	5
	<i>Wochos v. Tesla</i> ,	
	985 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2021) ( <i>Tesla II</i> ).....	6, 15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES  
(continued)**

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)**

*Wochos v. Tesla, Inc.*,  
2019 WL 1332395, at \*6 n.2 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2019) (*Tesla I*) ..... 6

*Wochos v. Tesla, Inc.*,  
2019 WL 1332395 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 25, 2019) (*Tesla I*), *aff'd*, *Wochos v. Tesla*,  
985 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2021) (*Tesla II*)..... 6, 7

*Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier*,  
191 F.3d 983 (9th Cir. 1999)..... 11

*Zucco Partners, LLC v. Digimarc Corp.*,  
552 F.3d 981 (9th Cir. 2009), as amended (Feb. 10, 2009). ..... *passim*

**Statutes**

PSLRA ..... 5

Section 10(b) ..... 5,8

Section 20(a) ..... 15

**Other Authorities**

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure  
Rule 9(b)..... 5

# 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.