

1 **QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP**  
2 Stephen A. Swedlow (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
3 stephenswedlow@quinnemanuel.com  
4 191 N. Wacker Drive, Suite 2700  
Chicago, IL 60606  
(312) 705-7400

**BATHAE DUNNE LLP**  
Yavar Bathae (Bar No. 282388)  
yavar@bathaedunne.com  
445 Park Avenue, 9th Floor  
New York, NY 10022  
(332) 205-7668

5 **HAGENS BERMAN SOBOL SHAPIRO LLP**  
6 Shana E. Scarlett (Bar No. 217895)  
7 shanas@hbsslaw.com  
8 715 Hearst Avenue, Suite 202  
Berkeley, CA 94710  
(510) 725-3000

**SCOTT + SCOTT ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
LLP**  
Kristen M. Anderson (Bar No. 246108)  
kanderson@scott-scott.com  
230 Park Avenue, 17th Floor  
New York, NY 10169  
(212) 223-6444

9 *Interim Co-Lead Consumer Class Counsel*

*Interim Co-Lead Advertiser Class  
Counsel*

10 [Additional counsel listed on signature page]

11  
12 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
13 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
14 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**  
15

16  
17 MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al.,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20 FACEBOOK, INC.,

21 Defendant.

22 This Document Relates To: All Actions  
23

Consolidated Case No. 5:20-cv-08570-LHK

**CONSUMER CLASS PLAINTIFFS' AND  
ADVERTISER CLASS PLAINTIFFS'  
JOINT OPPOSITION TO FACEBOOK'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS**

The Hon. Lucy H. Koh

Hearing Date: July 15, 2021 at 1:30 p.m.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
1	
2	
3	I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT.....1
4	II. RELEVANT ALLEGATIONS AND BACKGROUND .....3
5	A. <i>Consumers: Anticompetitive Conduct in the Social Media and Social</i>
6	<i>Network Markets</i> .....3
7	1) Systematic and Repeated Deception of Consumers .....3
8	2) Surveillance of Competitive Threats Using Deceptively Obtained
9	Data .....4
10	3) Harm to Competition.....4
11	B. <i>Advertisers: Anticompetitive Conduct in the Social Advertising Market</i> .....5
12	1) API Access Removal, Data Demands, and Whitelist Agreements .....5
13	2) Use of Onavo to Surveil Competitors and Advertising Targets.....6
14	3) Anticompetitive Back-end Integration of Acquired Businesses .....7
15	4) Market Allocation Agreement with Google .....7
16	5) Harm to Competition.....7
17	II. LEGAL STANDARDS .....7
18	III. ARGUMENT .....7
19	A. Plaintiffs’ Section 2 Claims Are Timely .....7
20	1) Plaintiffs Allege Actionable Conduct and Injuries Inside the
21	Limitations Period .....8
22	a) Consumers Detail Continued Conduct and New Injuries .....8
23	b) Advertisers Detail Continued Conduct and New Injuries .....10
24	2) Fraudulent Concealment Tolls Plaintiffs’ Section 2 Claims .....11
25	a) Consumers Adequately Allege Concealment.....11
26	b) Advertisers Adequately Allege Concealment .....13
27	3) Laches Does Not Bar Plaintiffs’ Requests for Equitable Relief .....14
28	B. Facebook Possesses Monopoly Power in Cognizable Product Markets .....15
	1) Consumers’ Social Network and Social Media Markets.....16

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

- a) The Markets Are Well-Defined and Recognized and Address Substitutes .....16
- b) Facebook Has Monopoly Power in Both Markets Alleged by Consumers .....18
- 2) Advertisers’ Social Advertising Market Is Well-Defined and Recognized and Addresses Substitutes .....19
- C. Facebook Obtained and Maintained Monopoly Power by Anticompetitive Means .....21
  - 1) Facebook’s Unrelenting Deception of Consumers Violates Section 2 .....21
  - 2) Facebook’s Anticompetitive Serial Acquisition Conduct .....24
    - a) Consumers’ Claims .....24
    - b) Advertisers’ Claims .....25
  - 3) Plaintiffs Do Not Allege “Product Improvement” Claims .....26
  - 4) Facebook Mischaracterizes Plaintiffs’ Allegations Regarding Developers .....27
    - a) Consumers’ Claims Do Not Implicate a “Duty to Deal” .....27
    - b) Advertisers’ Claims .....27
- D. Plaintiffs Adequately Allege Antitrust Standing and Injury .....28
  - 1) Consumers Suffered Direct, Quantifiable, Antitrust Injury .....28
  - 2) Advertisers Allege Antitrust Standing and Injury .....32
- E. Consumers State a Cognizable, Standalone Unjust Enrichment Claim .....34
- IV. REQUESTS FOR LEAVE TO AMEND .....35
- V. CONCLUSION .....35

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

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**

**Cases**

*Abuelhawa v. Santa Clara Univ.*,  
No. 5:20-cv-04045-LHK (N.D. Cal. March 29, 2021) ..... 35

*Allflex USA, Inc. v. Avid Identification Sys., Inc.*,  
2010 WL 11405130 (C.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2010) ..... 18

*Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Grp. LP*,  
592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010) ..... 26

*Am. Ad Mgmt., Inc. v. Gen. Tel. Co. of California*,  
190 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1999) ..... 28

*Am. Pro. Testing Serv., Inc. v. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Legal & Pro. Publications, Inc.*,  
108 F.3d 1147 (9th Cir. 1997) ..... 23

*Apple Inc. v. Pepper*,  
139 S. Ct. 1514 (2019) ..... 30

*Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys. Inc.*,  
2018 WL 11230167 (N.D. Cal. May 21, 2018) ..... 23

*Aspen Skiing Co v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.*,  
472 U.S. 585 (1985) ..... 28

*Backhaut v. Apple Inc.*,  
2015 WL 4776427 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2015) ..... 34

*Beasley v. Conagra Brands, Inc.*,  
374 F. Supp. 3d 869 (N.D. Cal. 2019) ..... 14

*Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*,  
550 U.S. 544 (2007) ..... 7

*Bercut-Vandervoort & Co. v. Maison Tarride Ledroit & Cie*,  
2006 WL 8442285 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2006) ..... 14

*Bhan v. NME Hosps., Inc.*,  
669 F. Supp. 998 (E.D. Cal. 1987) ..... 29

*Brown Shoe Co. v. United States*,  
370 U.S. 294 (1962) ..... 17, 19, 33

*Brown v. Google LLC*,  
2021 WL 949372 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2021) ..... 7, 11, 13, 14

1	<i>Caribbean Broad. Sys., Ltd. v. Cable &amp; Wireless P.L.C.</i> ,	
2	148 F.3d 1080 (D.C. Cir. 1998) .....	21, 23
3	<i>Clayco Petroleum Corp. v. Occidental Petroleum Corp.</i> ,	
4	712 F.2d 404 (9th Cir. 1983).....	7
5	<i>Cnty. Publishers, Inc. v. Donrey Corp.</i> ,	
6	892 F. Supp. 1146 (W.D. Ark. 1995).....	15, 18
7	<i>Cnty. Publishers, Inc. v. DR Partners</i> ,	
8	139 F.3d 1180 (8th Cir. 1998).....	21
9	<i>CollegeNet, Inc. v. Common Application, Inc.</i> ,	
10	355 F. Supp. 3d 926 (D. Or. 2018).....	18
11	<i>Conmar v. Mitsui &amp; Co. (U.S.A.), Inc.</i> ,	
12	858 F.2d 499 (9th Cir. 1988).....	14
13	<i>Cont'l Ore Co. v. Union Carbide &amp; Carbon Corp.</i> ,	
14	370 U.S. 690 (1962) .....	26
15	<i>Danjaq LLC v. Sony Corp.</i> ,	
16	263 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2001).....	15
17	<i>Datel Holdings Ltd. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	
18	712 F. Supp. 2d 974 (N.D. Cal. 2010) .....	17
19	<i>Dial Corp. v. News Corp.</i> ,	
20	165 F. Supp. 3d 25 (S.D.N.Y. 2016).....	9
21	<i>Dodds v. Cigna Securities, Inc.</i> ,	
22	841 F. Supp. 89 (W.D.N.Y. 1992) .....	13
23	<i>Doe 1 v. AOL LLC</i> ,	
24	719 F. Supp. 2d 1102 (N.D. Cal. 2010) .....	22
25	<i>Duarte v. Quality Loan Serv. Corp.</i> ,	
26	2018 WL 2121800 (C.D. Cal. May 8, 2018).....	8
27	<i>E.W. French &amp; Sons, Inc. v. General Portland Inc.</i> ,	
28	885 F.2d 1392 (9th Cir.1989).....	13
	<i>Eagle v. Star-Kist Foods, Inc.</i> ,	
	812 F.2d 538 (9th Cir. 1987).....	30
	<i>ESG Cap. Partners, LP v. Stratos</i> ,	
	828 F.3d 1023 (9th Cir. 2016).....	34, 35
	<i>F.T.C. v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> ,	
	969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020).....	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.