

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

ANN RAVEL (62139)
aravel@mcmanislaw.com
McMANIS FAULKNER
a Professional Corporation
50 West San Fernando Street, 10th Floor
San Jose, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 279-8700
Facsimile: (408) 279-3244

GEORGE A. ZELCS (*pro hac vice*)
ROBERT E. LITAN (*pro hac vice*)
RYAN Z. CORTAZAR (*pro hac vice*)
KOREIN TILLERY LLC
205 North Michigan Avenue
Suite 1950
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Telephone: (312) 641-9750
Facsimile: (312) 641-9751

GLEN E. SUMMERS (176402)
glen.summers@bartlitbeck.com
KARMA M. GIULIANELLI (184175)
karma.giulanelli@bartlitbeck.com
ALISON G. WHEELER (180748)
alison.wheeler@bartlitbeck.com
BARTLIT BECK LLP
1801 Wewatta Street, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (303) 592-3100
Facsimile: (303) 592-3140

MICHAEL E. KLENOV (277028)
CAROL O'KEEFE (*pro hac vice*)
KOREIN TILLERY LLC
505 North Seventh Street
Suite 3600
St. Louis, Missouri 63101-1625
Telephone: (314) 241-4844
Facsimile: (314) 241-3525

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs,
Joseph Taylor, Edward Mlakar, Mick Cleary, and
Eugene Alvis*

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,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

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

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

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

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

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES TO BE DECIDED 7

INTRODUCTION 7

THE PLEADED FACTS 10

ARGUMENT..... 12

 I. PLAINTIFFS HAVE STANDING IF THEY ADEQUATELY PLEAD THE
 INVASION OF A LEGAL INTEREST PROTECTED BY CALIFORNIA
 COMMON LAW 12

 II. PLAINTIFFS HAVE ADEQUATELY PLEADED CONVERSION 14

 A. Purchased Bytes of Cellular Data Are Property That Can Be
 Converted..... 14

 1. Plaintiffs’ Interests Bear the Hallmarks of Property 15

 2. Google Incorrectly Characterizes Plaintiffs’ Interest
 as a Contractual Right to Services..... 19

 B. Google’s Interference with Plaintiffs’ Bytes Was Complete
 and Total 21

 C. Plaintiffs Have Adequately Pleaded Conversion Damages 22

 II. PLAINTIFFS DID NOT CONSENT TO THE CONVERSION 24

CONCLUSION 28

ATTESTATION 28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Acme Paper Co. v. Goffstein</i> , 125 Cal. App. 2d 175 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1954).....	23
<i>APL Co. Pte Ltd v. Extreme Linen, LLC</i> , 216CV06885CASFFMX, 2017 WL 3271704 (C.D. Cal. July 31, 2017)	27
<i>Bastanchury v. Times–Mirror Co.</i> 68 Cal.App.2d 217 (Cal. App. 4th Dist. 1945)	17
<i>Bentley v. Mountain</i> , 51 Cal. App. 2d 95 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1942).....	22
<i>Boon Rand Trading Intern. Co., Ltd. v. Paleewong Trading Co., Inc.</i> , 688 F. Supp. 2d 940 (N.D. Cal. 2010)	20
<i>Bradford v. Flagship Facility Services Inc.</i> , 17-CV-01245-LHK, 2017 WL 3130072 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2017)	14
<i>Camp v. Ortega</i> 209 Cal. App. 2d 275 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1962).....	23, 24
<i>Clark v. State</i> , 14 Okla. Crim. 284 (Okla. Crim. App. 1917)	21
<i>Corey v. Struve</i> , 149 P. 48 (Cal. 1915)	23
<i>Crocker-Anglo Nat. Bank v. Kuchman</i> , 224 Cal. App. 2d 490 (Cal. App. 3d Dist. 1964)	27
<i>Csupo v. Alphabet, Inc.</i> , No. 19CV352557 (Cal. Super. Ct. Aug. 24, 2020)	14
<i>DeLong v. Osage Valley Electric Cooperative Association</i> , 716 S.W.2d 320 (Mo.Ct.App.1986).....	20
<i>DIRECTV, Inc. v. Pabnke</i> , 405 F. Supp. 2d 1182 (E.D. Cal. 2005).....	15, 19, 22
<i>In re Facebook, Inc. Internet Tracking Litigation</i> , 956 F.3d 589 (9th Cir. 2020)	8, 13
<i>Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Zerín</i> , 53 Cal. App. 4th 445 (Cal. App. 3d Dist. 1997)	17

1	<i>Feldman v. Allstate Ins. Co.</i> ,	
2	322 F. 3d 660 (9th Cir. 2003).....	14
3	<i>G.S. Rasmussen & Associates, Inc. v. Kalitta Flying Serv., Inc.</i> ,	
4	958 F.2d 896 (9th Cir. 1992).....	15, 16, 18, 21, 22
5	<i>Good Sports of New York, Inc. v. Llorente</i> ,	
6	280 A.D.2d 261 (N.Y. App. Div. 1st Dept. 2001).....	17, 20
7	<i>Hagerman Irr. Co. v. McMurry</i> ,	
8	16 N.M. 172 (1911)	21
9	<i>In re iPhone Application Litigation</i> ,	
10	844 F. Supp. 2d 1040 (N.D. Cal. 2012).....	18
11	<i>Kremen v. Cohen</i> ,	
12	337 F.3d 1024 (9th Cir. 2003).....	15
13	<i>Leoni v. Delany</i> ,	
14	83 Cal. App. 2d 303 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1948).....	27
15	<i>Leuter v. State of California</i> ,	
16	94 Cal. App. 4th 1285 (Cal. App. 3d Dist. 2002).....	23
17	<i>Levi Strauss & Co. v. Aetna Cas. & Sur. Co.</i> ,	
18	184 Cal. App. 3d 1479 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1986)	26
19	<i>Lujan v. Defender of Wildlife</i> ,	
20	504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	12
21	<i>In re Martinez</i> ,	
22	610 B.R. 290 (Bankr. N.D. Cal. 2019).....	24
23	<i>McKell v. Washington Mut., Inc.</i> ,	
24	142 Cal. App. 4th 1457 (Cal. App. 2d Dist. 2006).....	27
25	<i>Monster Energy Co. v. Vital Pharm., Inc.</i> ,	
26	EDCV181882JGBSHKX, 2019 WL 2619666 (C.D. Cal. May 20, 2019)	19, 20
27	<i>Narragansett Elec. Co. v. Carbone</i> ,	
28	898 A.2d 87 (R.I. 2006)	14, 20
	<i>Opperman v. Path, Inc.</i> ,	
	87 F. Supp. 3d 1018 (N.D. Cal. 2014).....	13
	<i>Payne v. Elliot</i> ,	
	54 Cal. 339 (Cal. 1880).....	13, 15
	<i>People v. Davis</i> ,	
	3 Cal. App. 5th 708 (Cal. App. 3d Dist. 2016).....	20

1	<i>People v. Knok,</i>	
2	63 Cal. App. 4th 1236 (Cal. App. 1st Dist. 1998)	18
3	<i>Sandquist v. Lebo Auto., Inc.,</i>	
4	376 P.3d 506 (Cal. 2016).....	27
5	<i>In re Sec. 1031 Exch. Litig.,</i>	
6	716 F. Supp. 2d 415 (D.S.C. 2010)	20
7	<i>Seid Pak Sing v. Barker,</i>	
8	240 P. 765 (Cal. 1925).....	25
9	<i>Shein v. Canon U.S.A., Inc.,</i>	
10	CV 08-07323 CAS EX, 2009 WL 1774287 (C.D. Cal. June 22, 2009)	21
11	<i>Smith v. Intuit Inc.,</i>	
12	5:12-CV-00222 EJD, 2012 WL 3945485 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2012).....	14
13	<i>Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins,</i>	
14	136 S. Ct. 1540 (2016).....	12
15	<i>Strawberry Water Co. v. Paulsen,</i>	
16	220 Ariz. 401 (Ariz. App. 1st Div. 2008)	21
17	<i>Supply Pro Sorbents, LLC v. RingCentral, Inc.,</i>	
18	2017 WL 4685705 (N.D. Cal. July 17, 2017).....	22
19	<i>Terrace Water Co. v. San Antonio Light & Power Co.,</i>	
20	82 P. 562 (Cal. App. 2d Dist. 1905)	14
21	<i>Voris v. Lampert,</i>	
22	446 P.3d 284 (Cal. 2019).....	14, 15, 20
23	<i>Wade v. Sw. Bank,</i>	
24	211 Cal. App. 2d 392 (Cal. App. 2d Dist. 1962)	24
25	<i>Welco Electronics, Inc. v. Mora,</i>	
26	223 Cal.App.4th 202 (Cal. App. 2d Dist. 2014)	15, 19, 21
27	<i>Worldwide Travel, Inc. v. Travelmate US, Inc.,</i>	
28	14-CV-00155-BAS DHB, 2015 WL 1013704 (S.D. Cal. Mar. 9, 2015).....	27
	<i>In re Yahoo Mail Litigation,</i>	
	7 F. Supp. 3d 1016 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	26
	<i>Yunker v. Pandora Media, Inc.,</i>	
	11-CV-03113 JSW, 2013 WL 1282980 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2013).....	13
	<i>Zaslow v. Kroenert,</i>	
	176 P.2d 1 (Cal. 1946).....	21

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.