

1 Bradford K. Newman (State Bar No. 178902)
bradford.newman@bakermckenzie.com

2 Alexander G. Davis (State Bar No. 287840)
alexander.davis@bakermckenzie.com

3 Anne Kelts Assayag (State Bar No. 298710)
anne.assayag@bakermckenzie.com

4 **BAKER & McKENZIE LLP**

5 600 Hansen Way
6 Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone: +1 650 856 2400
Facsimile: +1 650 856 9299

7 Teresa H. Michaud (State Bar No. 296329)
teresa.michaud@bakermckenzie.com

8 **BAKER & McKENZIE LLP**

9 10250 Constellation Blvd., Suite 1850
10 Los Angeles, CA 90067
Telephone: +1 310 201 4728
Facsimile: +1 310 201 4721

11 Attorneys for Defendant
12 GOOGLE LLC

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 JOHN COFFEE, MEI-LING MONTANEZ,
16 and S.M., a minor by MEI-LING
17 MONTANEZ, S.M.'s parent and guardian, on
18 behalf of themselves and all others similarly
19 situated,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 GOOGLE LLC,

23 Defendant.

Case No. 5:20-cv-03901-BLF

Date Action Filed: June 12, 2020

**DEFENDANT GOOGLE LLC'S
MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS'
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Date: July 15, 2021

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Ctrm.: 3 - 5th Floor

Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

**Robert F. Peckham Federal Building &
United States Courthouse
280 South 1st Street
San Jose, CA 95113**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

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

NOTICE OF MOTION AND RELIEF REQUESTED 1

STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED 1

I. INTRODUCTION 2

II. ALLEGED FACTS..... 4

 A. Google Manages the Play Store Platform to Permit Downloads of Third-Party Apps 4

 B. Plaintiffs Download Two Skill-Based Video Games From the Play Store 6

 C. Google Does Not Create or Sell the Loot Boxes Plaintiffs Allegedly Acquired to Enhance Their Enjoyment of Third-Party Video Games..... 7

 D. Plaintiffs Rely on Academic Theory and Regulatory Debate To Try To Impose *Legal* Liability on Google for the Content of Third-Party Video Games 8

 E. Plaintiffs’ Claims Seek To Require Google To Monitor Content-Based Developer Activity in the Play Store and To Recover the Value of Alleged Gambling Losses 9

III. ARGUMENT 10

 A. Despite a Spate of New Conclusory Allegations, Plaintiffs’ Factual Allegations Confirm That Section 230 Protects Google From the Claims in the FAC 10

 1. *Plaintiffs offer mere legal conclusions instead of pleading facts* 10

 2. *Plaintiffs’ attempts to re-characterize old allegations cannot avoid application of Section 230* 12

 3. *Plaintiffs’ new factual allegations describe Google providing content neutral tools and exercising a platform-wide editorial function for all third-party developers* 12

 4. *The FAC confirms that Google is still entitled to Section 230 protections* 14

 a. Google is still an interactive computer service 14

 b. Plaintiffs are still seeking to treat Google as a publisher of third-party content..... 14

 c. The loot box content at issue was created by third-party app developers, not by Google 17

 B. Plaintiffs Still Fail To State Plausible Claims for Relief Under the UCL and CLRA 17

 1. *Plaintiffs cannot solve the fundamental problem that they lack statutory standing*..... 17

 a. Plaintiffs allege no economic loss from purchasing virtual currency on set terms 18

 b. Plaintiffs fail to attribute any alleged loss of virtual currency to Google 19

 2. *Plaintiffs fail to state plausible UCL claims against Google* 19

 a. Loot Boxes do not violate California or federal gambling laws..... 19

 (1) *California prohibits civil recovery for alleged gambling losses* 20

 (2) *Loot boxes do not dispense “thing[s] of value”* 20

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

(3) *The loot boxes at issue are seamlessly incorporated into games predominantly of skill* 22

b. **Loot Boxes Do Not Provide a Basis for a UCL Unfair Practices Claim** 23

3. *Plaintiffs have failed to salvage their CLRA cause of action* 24

C. **Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim for Unjust Enrichment** 24

IV. **CONCLUSION**..... 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alves v. Players Edge, Inc.</i> , No. 05CV1654 WQH (CAB), 2007 WL 6004919 (S.D. Cal. Aug. 8, 2007)	20
<i>Balzer v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> , No. CV 14-9779-JFW, 2015 WL 13828418 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 25, 2015).....	25
<i>Barnes v. Yahoo! Inc.</i> , 570 F.3d 1096 (9th Cir. 2009)	10, 14
<i>Blum v. Caldwell</i> , 446 U.S. 1311 (1980).....	22
<i>Duncan v. Walker</i> , 533 U.S. 167 (2001).....	22
<i>Evans v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. C 13-02477 WHA, 2013 WL 5594717 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2013).....	11, 13
<i>Goddard v. Google, Inc.</i> , No. C 08-2738 JF (PVT), 2008 WL 5245490 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 17, 2008)	19
<i>HomeAway.com v. City of Santa Monica</i> , 918 F.3d 676 (9th Cir. 2018)	15, 16, 17
<i>Kater v. Churchill Downs Inc.</i> , 886 F.3d 784 (9th Cir. 2018)	21
<i>Kelly v. First Astri Corp.</i> , 72 Cal. App. 4th 462 (1999)	2, 4, 20
<i>Letizia v. Facebook Inc.</i> , 267 F. Supp. 3d 1235 (N.D. Cal. 2017).....	25
<i>Mason v. Mach. Zone, Inc.</i> , 140 F. Supp. 3d 457 (D. Md. 2015).....	8, 20, 23
<i>Merandette v. City & Cty. of S.F.</i> , 88 Cal. App. 3d 105 (1979)	22
<i>Peterson v. Cellco P'ship</i> , 164 Cal. App. 4th 1583 (2008)	25
<i>Phillips v. Double Down Interactive LLC</i> , 173 F. Supp. 3d 731 (N.D. Ill. 2016)	23

1 *Ristic v. Mach. Zone, Inc.*,
 No. 15-cv-8996, 2016 WL 4987943 (N.D. Ill. Sep. 19, 2016).....23

2

3 *Rizo v. Yovino*,
 950 F.3d 1217 (9th Cir. 2020)21

4

5 *Soto v. Sky Union, LLC*,
 159 F. Supp. 3d 871 (N.D. Ill. 2016)9, 20, 21

6 *Taylor v. Apple*,
 No. 20-cv-03906-RS (N.D. Cal. Mar. 19, 2021)16

7

8 *West v. Palo Alto Hous. Corp.*,
 No. 17-CV-00238-LHK, 2019 WL 2549218 (N.D. Cal. June 20, 2019)24

9 **Statutes / Other Authorities**

10 18 U.S.C. § 1955.....20

11 31 U.S.C. § 5361-536720

12 47 U.S.C. § 230 (2018)..... *passim*

13 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.* *passim*

14 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 19800, *et seq.*20

15 Cal. Consumers Legal Remedies Act *passim*

16 Cal. Civ. Code § 17611

17 Cal. Civ. Code § 1770(a)(14).....20

18 Cal. Pen. Code § 330.2.....22

19 Cal. Pen. Code § 330a(a)20, 21

20 Cal. Pen. Code § 330b(f).....20, 22, 23

21 Cal. Pen. Code § 337j(a)(1)-(3)20

22 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6)1

23

24

25

26

27

28

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.