

1 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN  
& DOWD LLP  
2 SHAWN A. WILLIAMS (213113)  
JOHN H. GEORGE (292332)  
3 Post Montgomery Center  
One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800  
4 San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: 415/288-4545  
5 415/288-4534 (fax)  
shawnw@rgrdlaw.com  
6 jgeorge@rgrdlaw.com

7 Lead Counsel for Lead Plaintiff

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

11 In re ZOOM SECURITIES LITIGATION ) Case No. 3:20-cv-02353-JD

12 \_\_\_\_\_ )  
13 This Document Relates To: ) LEAD PLAINTIFF’S OPPOSITION TO  
14 ALL ACTIONS. ) DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO DISMISS  
THE CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION  
COMPLAINT

15 DATE: August 26, 2021  
16 TIME: 10:00 a.m.  
COURTROOM: 11, 19th Floor  
17 JUDGE: Hon. James Donato  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**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

	<b>Page</b>
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	1
II. LEGAL STANDARD.....	2
III. ARGUMENT .....	3
A. The Complaint Pleads Material Falsity.....	3
1. The Complaint Pleads Material Falsity of Defendants’ Claims that Zoom Enabled End-to-End Encryption and Used AES 256-Bit Encryption.....	4
2. The Complaint Particularly Alleges Material Misrepresentations and Omission in Zoom’s Security Guide and Privacy Policy.....	5
B. The Alleged Misrepresentations and Omissions Were Material, Defendants’ Truth-on-the-Market Defense Is Unavailable on the Motion to Dismiss.....	6
C. The Consolidated Complaint Pleads a Strong Inference of Scienter .....	9
1. The Complaint Alleges Defendants’ Knowledge or Deliberate Disregard that Zoom Meetings Were Not End-to-End or 256-Bit Encrypted .....	9
2. The Complaint Details Defendants’ Knowledge or Deliberate Disregard that Zoom Was Sharing Users’ Personal Data.....	11
D. Defendants’ Late Class Period Admissions and Blog Post Revisions Support Falsity and Scienter .....	11
E. FTC Charges and Settlement Corroborate Allegations of Material Falsity and Scienter.....	12
F. The Complaint Adequately Alleges Loss Causation .....	13
IV. CONCLUSION.....	15

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>CASES</b>	
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	

<i>Basic v. Levinson</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988).....	6
<i>Bos. Ret. Sys. v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 4569846 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 7, 2020) .....	7, 8
<i>Brody v. Transitional Hosps. Corp.</i> , 280 F.3d 997 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	3
<i>City of Monroe Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Bridgestone Corp.</i> , 399 F.3d 651 (6th Cir. 2005) .....	13
<i>Conn. Ret. Plans &amp; Tr. Funds v. Amgen Inc.</i> , 660 F.3d 1170 (9th Cir. 2011), <i>aff'd</i> , 568 U.S. 455 (2013) .....	7
<i>Dura Pharms., Inc. v. Broudo</i> , 544 U.S. 336 (2005).....	13, 14
<i>Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.</i> , 316 F.3d 1048 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	15
<i>Fecht v. Price Co.</i> , 70 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 1995) .....	3
<i>Ganino v. Citizens Utils. Co.</i> , 228 F.3d 154 (2d Cir. 2000).....	8
<i>Glazer Cap. Mgmt. LP v. Magistri</i> , 549 F.3d 736 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	13
<i>In re Allied Nev. Gold Corp. Sec. Litig.</i> , 743 Fed. App'x. 887 (9th Cir. 2018) .....	12
<i>In re Alphabet, Inc., Sec. Litig.</i> , _ F.4th _, 2021 WL 2448223 (9th Cir. June 16, 2021).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Apple Inc., Sec. Litig.</i> , 2020 WL 2857397 (N.D. Cal. June 2, 2020) .....	6
<i>In re Apple Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 2020 WL 6482014 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2020) .....	9, 12

	<b>Page</b>
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	

  

<i>In re BofI Holding, Inc., Sec. Litig.,</i> 977 F.3d 781 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	12, 14, 15
<i>In re LendingClub Sec. Litig.,</i> 254 F. Supp. 3d 1107 (N.D. Cal. 2017) .....	6
<i>In re Musical Instruments &amp; Equip. Antitrust Litig.,</i> 798 F.3d 1186 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	13
<i>In re Rigel Pharms., Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i> 697 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	6
<i>In re Tesla, Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i> 477 F. Supp. 3d 903 (N.D. Cal 2020) .....	13
<i>In Re Twitter, Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i> 2020 WL 4187915 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 17, 2020) .....	11
<i>In re VeriFone Holdings, Inc. Sec. Litig.,</i> 704 F.3d 694 (9th Cir. 2012) .....	3
<i>Kairalla v. Advanced Med. Optics, Inc.,</i> 2008 WL 2879087 (C.D. Cal. June 6, 2008) .....	6
<i>Kelly v. Elec. Arts, Inc.,</i> 2015 WL 1967233 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2015) .....	5, 6
<i>Khoja v. Orexigen Therapeutics, Inc.,</i> 899 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2018) .....	3, 6, 12
<i>Lloyd v. CVB Fin. Corp.,</i> 811 F.3d 1200 (9th Cir. 2016) .....	13
<i>Loos v. Immersion Corp.,</i> 762 F.3d 880 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	14
<i>Nguyen v. Endologix, Inc.,</i> 962 F.3d 405 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	9
<i>No. 84 Employer-Teamster Joint Council Pension Tr. Fund v. Am. W. Holding Corp.,</i> 320 F.3d 920 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	9
<i>Nuveen Mun. High Income Opportunity Fund v. City of Alameda,</i> 730 F.3d 1111 (9th Cir. 2013) .....	14

1		
2		<b>Page</b>
3		
4	<i>Perlman v. Zell</i> ,	
	938 F. Supp. 1327 (N.D. Ill. 1996), <i>aff'd</i> , 185 F.3d 850 (7th Cir. 1999) .....	10
5	<i>Provenz v. Miller</i> ,	
6	102 F. 3d 1478 (9th Cir. 1996) .....	8
7	<i>Purple Mountain Tr. v. Wells Fargo &amp; Co.</i> ,	
	432 F. Supp. 3d 1095 (N.D. Cal. 2020) .....	15
8	<i>Reese v. Malone</i> ,	
9	747 F.3d 557 (9th Cir. 2014) .....	9, 10, 11, 12
10	<i>Retail Wholesale &amp; Dep't Store Union Loc. 338 Ret. Fund v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> ,	
11	845 F.3d 1268 (9th Cir. 2017) .....	3
12	<i>Ronconi v. Larkin</i> ,	
	253 F.3d 423 (9th Cir. 2001) .....	12
13	<i>S.E.C. v. Platforms Wireless Int'l Corp.</i> ,	
14	617 F.3d 1072 (9th Cir. 2010) .....	11
15	<i>Schueneman v. Arena Pharms., Inc.</i> ,	
16	840 F.3d 698 (9th Cir. 2016) .....	11
17	<i>SEC v. Todd</i> ,	
	642 F.3d 1207 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	3
18	<i>Siracusano v. Matrixx Initiatives, Inc.</i> ,	
19	585 F.3d 1167 (9th Cir. 2009), <i>aff'd</i> , 563 U.S. 27 (2011) .....	10
20	<i>Tellabs Inc. v. Makor Issues &amp; Rights, Ltd.</i> ,	
21	551 U.S. 308 (2007).....	3, 9
22	<i>Wochos v Tesla, Inc.</i> ,	
	985 F.3d 1180 (9th Cir. 2021) .....	5
23	<i>Yourish v. Cal. Amplifier</i> ,	
24	191 F.3d 983 (9th Cir. 1999) .....	12
25	<b>STATUTES, RULES AND REGULATIONS</b>	
26	15 U.S.C.	
	§78j(b).....	2, 8
27	§78u-4(b)(1)(B).....	3
28	§78u-4(b)(2)(A) .....	9

# 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.