

1 SONAL N. MEHTA (SBN 222086)
2 Sonal.Mehta@wilmerhale.com
3 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
4 HALE AND DORR LLP
5 950 Page Mill Road
6 Palo Alto, California 94303
7 Telephone: (650) 858-6000
8 Facsimile: (650) 858-6100

9 DAVID Z. GRINGER (*pro hac vice*)
10 David.Gringer@wilmerhale.com
11 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
12 HALE AND DORR LLP
13 1875 Pennsylvania Ave NW
14 Washington, DC 20006
15 Telephone: (202) 663-6000
16 Facsimile: (202) 663-6363

17 *Attorneys for Defendant*
18 FACEBOOK, INC.

19 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
20 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
21 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

22 MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al., on behalf of
23 themselves and all others similarly situated,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26 FACEBOOK, INC.,

27 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

1 C. Advertisers Have Not Alleged An Antitrust Injury31

2 1. The Alleged Injuries From Advertisers’ Section 2 Claims Are

3 Conclutory31

4 2. Advertisers Lack Antitrust Standing To Pursue Their Section 1

5 Claim.....32

6 V. Users Fail To State A Claim For Unjust Enrichment35

7 CONCLUSION.....35

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 AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
CASES	
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	

<i>Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Grp. LP,</i> 592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010)	23
<i>Am. Ad Mgmt., Inc. v. Gen. Tel. Co. of Cal.,</i> 190 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1999)	27, 33
<i>Am. Prof. Testing Serv., Inc. v. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Legal & Prof. Publ., Inc.,</i> 108 F.3d 1147 (9th Cir. 1997)	21
<i>Amarel v. Connell,</i> 102 F.2d 1494 (9th Cir. 1996)	27, 33
<i>Apple Inc v. Pepper,</i> 139 S. Ct. 1514 (2019).....	29
<i>Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.,</i> 472 U.S. 585 (1985).....	25
<i>Assoc. Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters,</i> 459 U.S. 519 (1983).....	33, 34
<i>Astiana v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.,</i> 783 F.3d 753 (9th Cir. 2015)	35
<i>Atl. Richfield Co. v. USA Petrol. Co.,</i> 495 U.S. 328 (1990).....	29
<i>Bay Area Surgical Mgmt. LLC v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.,</i> 166 F. Supp. 3d 988 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	16
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,</i> 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	22, 24, 26
<i>Bhan v. NME Hosps., Inc.,</i> 669 F. Supp. 998 (E.D. Cal. 1987), <i>aff'd</i> , 929 F.2d 1404 (9th Cir. 1991).....	28
<i>Blue Cross Blue Shield v. Marshfield Clinic,</i> 65 F.3d 1406 (7th Cir. 1995)	32
<i>Brantley v. NBC Universal, Inc.,</i> 675 F.3d 1192 (9th Cir. 2012)	27
<i>Complete Entm't Res. LLC v. Live Nation Entm't, Inc.,</i> 2016 WL 3457177 (C.D. Cal. May 11, 2016)	13

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

3 *Danjaq LLC v. Sony Corp.*,
 4 263 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2001)8

5 *Dodds v. Cigna Sec., Inc.*,
 6 841 F. Supp. 89 (W.D.N.Y. 1992)12

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

9 *DXS, Inc. v. Siemens Med. Sys. Inc.*,
 10 100 F.3d 462 (6th Cir. 1990)7

11 *Eagle v. Star-Kist Foods, Inc.*,
 12 812 F.2d 538 (9th Cir. 1987)29

13 *Eichman v. Fotomat*,
 14 880 F.2d 149 (9th Cir. 1989)12

15 *Evans Analytical Grp., Inc. v. Green Plant Farms, LLC*,
 16 2013 WL 3963822 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2013).....5

17 *Feitelson v. Google Inc.*,
 18 80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (N.D. Cal. 2015)27, 29

19 *Fine v. Barry & Enright Prods.*,
 20 731 F.2d 1394 (9th Cir. 1984)28

21 *Foremost Pro Color, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.*,
 22 703 F.2d 534 (9th Cir. 1983)23

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

25 *Free FreeHand Corp. v. Adobe Sys. Inc.*,
 26 852 F. Supp. 2d 1171 (N.D. Cal. 2012)13

27 *FTC v. Qualcomm Inc.*,
 28 411 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

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.