

1 COOLEY LLP
WHITTY SOMVICHIAN (194463)
2 (wsomvichian@cooley.com)
MAX A. BERNSTEIN (305722)
3 (mbernstein@cooley.com)
KELSEY R. SPECTOR (321488)
4 (kspector@cooley.com)
101 California Street, 5th Floor
5 San Francisco, California 94111-5800
Telephone: +1 415 693 2000
6 Facsimile: +1 415 693 2222

7 Attorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE LLC

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
SAN JOSE DIVISION

JOSEPH TAYLOR, EDWARD MLAKAR,
MICK CLEARY, and EUGENE ALVIS,
individually and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 5:20-cv-07956-VKD

**GOOGLE LLC'S MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT**

Date: March 30, 2021
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Judge: Hon. Virginia K. DeMarchi

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

	Page
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION	1
STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT	1
STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED	1
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITY	2
I. INTRODUCTION.....	2
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
A. The Android Operating System.	3
B. Android Data Transfers.....	3
C. The Google Terms and Policies.	4
D. Plaintiffs’ Experiences with Android.....	5
III. LEGAL STANDARD	6
IV. ARGUMENT	6
A. Plaintiffs Lack Standing to Pursue Their Claims.....	7
B. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Facts Sufficient to State A Conversion Claim.....	9
1. Plaintiffs do not have a property interest in their data plans.....	9
a. Plaintiffs’ contractual right to receive cellular data services is not property subject to conversion.....	10
b. Plaintiffs’ interest in their data plans bear none of the other traditional hallmarks of property.....	11
2. Plaintiffs allege no facts to show that passive data transfers interfered with the use of their data plans and caused resulting damages.....	13
a. No interference.....	13
b. No damages.....	15
3. Plaintiffs’ conversion claim fails because they consented to the data transfers at issue.....	16
C. Plaintiffs’ Common Count for Quantum Meruit Also Cannot Survive Dismissal.....	19
V. CONCLUSION.....	19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	6
<i>Bell Atl. Corp v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	6
<i>Birdsong v. Apple, Inc.</i> , 590 F.3d 955 (9th Cir. 2009).....	7
<i>Boon Rawd Trading Int’l Co. v. Paleewong Trading Co.</i> , 688 F. Supp. 2d 940 (N.D. Cal. 2010)	10
<i>Cellco P’ship v. F.C.C.</i> , 700 F.3d 534 (D.C. Cir. 2012)	11
<i>Cellphone Termination Fee Cases</i> , 193 Cal. App. 4th 298 (2011).....	11
<i>DIRECTV, Inc. v. Pahnke</i> , 405 F. Supp. 2d 1182 (E.D. Cal. 2005).....	10
<i>English & Sons, Inc. v. Straw Hat Restaurants, Inc.</i> , 176 F. Supp. 3d 904 (N.D. Cal. 2016)	16
<i>Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Zerin</i> , 53 Cal. App. 4th 445 (1997).....	10, 19
<i>Farrington v. A. Teichert & Son, Inc.</i> , 59 Cal. App. 2d 468 (1943).....	9, 16
<i>In re Forchion</i> , 198 Cal. App. 4th 1284 (2011).....	10, 12
<i>Fremont Indem. Co. v. Fremont Gen. Corp.</i> , 148 Cal. App. 4th 97 (2007).....	9, 13, 15, 19
<i>French v. Smith Booth User Co.</i> , 56 Cal. App. 2d 23 (1942).....	16
<i>G.S. Rasmussen & Assocs., Inc. v. Kalitta Flying Serv., Inc.</i> , 958 F.2d 896 (9th Cir. 1992).....	11
<i>Infutura Global Ltd. v. Sequus Pharms., Inc.</i> , No. C 08-4871, 2009 WL 440477 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 23, 2009).....	10

1	<i>In re iPhone Application Litig.</i> ,	
2	844 F. Supp. 2d 1040 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	12, 13
3	<i>In re iPhone Application Litig.</i> ,	
4	No. 11-MD-02250-LHK, 2011 WL 4403963 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 20, 2011).....	7
5	<i>Jordan v. Talbot</i> ,	
6	55 Cal. 2d 597 (1961)	13, 14, 15
7	<i>Levi Strauss & Co. v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co.</i> ,	
8	184 Cal. App. 3d 1479 (1986).....	17
9	<i>Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife</i> ,	
10	504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	6
11	<i>McAfee v. Francis</i> ,	
12	No. 5:11-cv-00821-LHK, 2011 WL 3293759 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 1, 2011).....	19
13	<i>McBride v. Boughton</i> ,	
14	123 Cal. App. 4th 379 (2004).....	19
15	<i>McKell v. Wash. Mut. Inc.</i> ,	
16	142 Cal. App. 4th 1457 (2006).....	9, 19
17	<i>Monster Energy Co. v. Vital Pharms., Inc.</i> ,	
18	No. EDCV 18-1882 JGB, 2019 WL 2619666 (C.D. Cal. May 20, 2019)	10, 13
19	<i>Moore v. Regents of Univ. of Cal.</i> ,	
20	51 Cal. 3d 120 (1990)	10, 11, 13, 19
21	<i>Navarro v. Block</i> ,	
22	250 F.3d 729 (9th Cir. 2001).....	6
23	<i>Opperman v. Path</i> ,	
24	84 F. Supp. 3d 962 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	8, 9
25	<i>Opperman v. Path</i> ,	
26	87 F. Supp. 3d 1018 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	8
27	<i>PCO, Inc. v. Christen, Miller, Fink, Jacobs, Glaser, Weil & Shapiro, LLP</i> ,	
28	150 Cal. App. 4th 384 (2007).....	15, 16
	<i>In re Section 1031 Exch. Litig.</i> ,	
	716 F. Supp. 2d 415 (D.S.C. 2010).....	10
	<i>Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins</i> ,	
	136 S. Ct. 1540 (2016).....	7
	<i>Steel Co v. Citizens for a Better Env't</i> ,	
	523 U.S. 83 (1998).....	6

1 *Supply Pro Sorbents, LLC v. Ring Central, Inc.*,
 2 No. 16-cv-02113-JSW, 2017 WL 4685705 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2017), *aff'd* 743
 3 F. App'x 124 (9th Cir. 2018) 15

4 *Tsai v. Wang*,
 5 No. 17-cv-00614-DMR, 2017 WL 2587929 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2017) 19

6 *Valley Forge Christian College v. Ams. United for Sep. of Church and State, Inc.*,
 7 454 U.S. 464 (1982)..... 7

8 *Virtanen v. O'Connell*,
 9 140 Cal. App. 4th 688 (2006)..... 9

10 *Voris v. Lampert*,
 11 7 Cal. 5th 1141 (2019) 12

12 *Wade v. Sw. Bank*,
 13 211 Cal. App. 2d 392 (1962)..... 16

14 *Warth v. Seldin*,
 15 422 U.S. 490 (1975)..... 7

16 *White Lightning Co. v. Wolfson*,
 17 68 Cal. 2d 336 (1968) 19

18 *White v. Lee*,
 19 227 F.3d 1214, 1242 (9th Cir. 2000)..... 6

20 *Worldwide Travel, Inc. v. Travelmate US, Inc.*,
 21 No. 14-CV-00155-BAS (DHB), 2015 WL 1013704 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 9, 2015) 18

22 *In re Yahoo Mail Litigation*,
 23 7 F. Supp. 3d 1016 (N.D. Cal. 2014) 17, 18

24 *Yunker v. Pandora Media, Inc.*,
 25 No. 11-cv-03113 JSW, 2013 WL 1282980 (N.D. Cal. 2013)..... 8, 9

26 *Zaslow v. Kroenert*,
 27 29 Cal. 2d 541 (1946) 14

28 **Statutes**

Cal. Civ. Code § 3336 16

///

///

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.