SONAL N. MEHTA (SBN 222086)
Sonal.Mehta@wilmerhale.com
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
950 Page Mill Road
Palo Alto, California 94303
Telephone: (650) 858-6000
Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

DAVID Z. GRINGER (*pro hac vice*)
David.Gringer@wilmerhale.com
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Ave NW
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 663-6000
Facsimile: (202) 663-6363

Attorneys for Defendant
FACEBOOK, INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SAN JOSE DIVISION

MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al., on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, Plaintiffs, v. FACEBOOK, INC., Defendant.	Case No. 5:20-cv-08570-LHK **DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS THE CONSOLIDATED CONSUMER CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND CONSOLIDATED ADVERTISER CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF** Hearing Date: July 15, 2021 Time: 1:30 pm Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS 1
STATEMENT OF REQUESTED RELIEF 1
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES 1
INTRODUCTION 1
BACKGROUND 3
A. Pre-2010 Competitive Environment 4
B. Post-2010 Competitive Environment 5
ARGUMENT 6
I. Plaintiffs' Section 2 Claims Are Time-Barred 6
A. The Statute Of Limitations Bars All Plaintiffs' Damages Claims 6
B. Laches Bars All Plaintiffs' Claims For Injunctive Relief 8
C. No Tolling Theory Applies 9
1. Fraudulent Concealment Does Not Apply 9
2. Users Cannot Invoke The Continuing Violation Doctrine 12
II. Plaintiffs Fail To Plausibly Define A Relevant Product Market 13
A. Advertisers Fail To Plausibly Define A Product Market 14
B. Users Fail To Plausibly Define Product Markets 15
1. Users' "Social Network" Market Fails As A Matter Of Law 16
2. Users' "Social Media" Market Fails As A Matter Of Law 17
C. Users Fail To Plausibly Allege Monopoly Power 18
III. Plaintiffs Have Not Adequately Alleged Exclusionary Conduct 19
A. Facebook Did Not Unlawfully Acquire A Monopoly 19
B. None of Plaintiffs' Monopoly Maintenance Theories Are Cognizable 22
1. Plaintiffs' Product Improvement Allegations Are Non-Cognizable 23
2. Facebook's Acquisitions Were Not Exclusionary 23
3. Facebook Did Not Unlawfully "Kill" Third Party App Developers 24
IV. Plaintiffs Lack Antitrust Standing 27
A. Users Have Not Alleged An Antitrust Injury 28
1. Lost "Information And Attention" Is Not A Cognizable Injury 28
2. Users' Alleged Injury From Their Monopoly Acquisition Theory Is Speculative 29
3. Users' Purported Injuries Were Not Caused By Lost Competition 30
B. No Plaintiffs Were Injured By "Copy, Acquire, Kill" 31

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

C. Advertisers Have Not Alleged An Antitrust Injury 31
1. The Alleged Injuries From Advertisers' Section 2 Claims Are Conclusory 31
2. Advertisers Lack Antitrust Standing To Pursue Their Section 1 Claim.....32
V. Users Fail To State A Claim For Unjust Enrichment 35
CONCLUSION.....35

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Grp. LP,
592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010) 23

Am. Ad Mgmt., Inc. v. Gen. Tel. Co. of Cal.,
190 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1999) 27, 33

Am. Prof. Testing Serv., Inc. v. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Legal & Prof. Publ., Inc.,
108 F.3d 1147 (9th Cir. 1997) 21

Amarel v. Connell,
102 F.2d 1494 (9th Cir. 1996) 27, 33

Apple Inc v. Pepper,
139 S. Ct. 1514 (2019).....29

Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.,
472 U.S. 585 (1985).....25

Assoc. Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters,
459 U.S. 519 (1983).....33, 34

Astiana v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.,
783 F.3d 753 (9th Cir. 2015) 35

Atl. Richfield Co. v. USA Petrol. Co.,
495 U.S. 328 (1990).....29

Bay Area Surgical Mgmt. LLC v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.,
166 F. Supp. 3d 988 (N.D. Cal. 2015) 16

Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007).....22, 24, 26

Bhan v. NME Hosps., Inc.,
669 F. Supp. 998 (E.D. Cal. 1987), *aff'd*, 929 F.2d 1404 (9th Cir. 1991).....28

Blue Cross Blue Shield v. Marshfield Clinic,
65 F.3d 1406 (7th Cir. 1995) 32

Brantley v. NBC Universal, Inc.,
675 F.3d 1192 (9th Cir. 2012) 27

Complete Entm't Res. LLC v. Live Nation Entm't, Inc.,
2016 WL 3457177 (C.D. Cal. May 11, 2016) 13

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

Conmar Corp. v. Mitsui & Co. (U.S.A.), Inc.,
858 F.2d 499 (9th Cir. 1988) 9, 11

Danjaq LLC v. Sony Corp.,
263 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2001) 8

Dodds v. Cigna Sec., Inc.,
841 F. Supp. 89 (W.D.N.Y. 1992) 12

Duarte v. Quality Loan Serv. Corp.,
2018 WL 2121800 (C.D. Cal. May 8, 2018) 12

DXS, Inc. v. Siemens Med. Sys. Inc.,
100 F.3d 462 (6th Cir. 1990) 7

Eagle v. Star-Kist Foods, Inc.,
812 F.2d 538 (9th Cir. 1987) 29

Eichman v. Fotomat,
880 F.2d 149 (9th Cir. 1989) 12

Evans Analytical Grp., Inc. v. Green Plant Farms, LLC,
2013 WL 3963822 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2013).....5

Feitelson v. Google Inc.,
80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (N.D. Cal. 2015) 27, 29

Fine v. Barry & Enright Prods.,
731 F.2d 1394 (9th Cir. 1984) 28

Foremost Pro Color, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.,
703 F.2d 534 (9th Cir. 1983) 23

Fraser v. Major League Soccer, L.L.C.,
284 F.3d 47 (1st Cir. 2002).....24

Free FreeHand Corp. v. Adobe Sys. Inc.,
852 F. Supp. 2d 1171 (N.D. Cal. 2012) 13

FTC v. Qualcomm Inc.,
411 F. Supp. 3d 658 (N.D. Cal. 2019) 18

FTC v. Qualcomm Inc.,
969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020) 13, 25, 26, 30

Garrison v. Oracle Corp.,
159 F. Supp. 3d 1044 (N.D. Cal. 2016) 6, 7, 11

Genus Lifesciences Inc. v. Lannett Co.,
378 F. Supp. 3d 823 (N.D. Cal. 2019) 21

DOCKET ALARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

DOCKET ALARM

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.