

1 WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
2  
3 SONAL N. MEHTA (SBN 222086)  
Sonal.Mehta@wilmerhale.com  
2600 El Camino Real, Suite 400  
4 Palo Alto, California 94306  
Telephone: (650) 858-6000  
5

6 DAVID Z. GRINGER (*pro hac vice*)  
David.Gringer@wilmerhale.com  
7 7 World Trade Center  
250 Greenwich Street  
8 New York, New York 10007  
Telephone: (212) 230-8800  
9

10 ARI HOLTZBLATT (*pro hac vice*)  
Ari.Holtzblatt@wilmerhale.com  
11 MOLLY M. JENNINGS (*pro hac vice*)  
Molly.Jennings@wilmerhale.com  
12 1875 Pennsylvania Ave NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
13 Telephone: (202) 663-6000

14 *Attorneys for Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.*

15  
16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
18 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

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

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware  
23 Corporation headquartered in California,

24 Defendant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-08570-JD

**META PLATFORM, INC.'S MOTION TO  
DISMISS FIRST AMENDED  
CONSOLIDATED ADVERTISER CLASS  
ACTION COMPLAINT**

Hearing Date: May 26, 2022

Time: 10:00 am

Judge: Hon. James Donato

**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

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION .....1  
 STATEMENT OF REQUESTED RELIEF .....1  
 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES .....1  
 RELEVANT FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND .....3  
 ARGUMENT .....4  
     I. Plaintiffs’ Claims Are Still Time-Barred .....4  
         A. Plaintiffs’ “Copy, Acquire, Kill” Claims Remain Untimely .....5  
         B. The New “Entry and Capture” Theory Is Untimely and  
             Unauthorized .....8  
     II. Plaintiffs Still Do Not State Valid Section 2 Claims .....9  
         A. None Of The New Conduct Challenged Is Cognizable .....9  
             1. The “Entry And Capture” Theory Fails .....9  
             2. Improving Meta’s Machine Learning Models Is Not  
                 Anticompetitive .....12  
         B. “Copy, Acquire, Kill” Is Not Cognizable .....13  
     III. Plaintiffs’ Section 1 Claim (Count III) Largely Fails .....14  
         A. An “Entry And Capture” Section 1 Claim Is Not Alleged And Is  
             Meritless .....14  
         B. Named Plaintiffs For The Pre-2018 Class Lack Standing For  
             Count III .....15  
 CONCLUSION .....15

**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(s)

**CASES**

*Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Group*,  
592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010) .....12

*American Ad Management, Inc. v. General Telephone Co. of California*,  
190 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1999) .....11

*ASARCO, LLC v. Union Pacific Railroad Co.*,  
765 F.3d 999 (9th Cir. 2014) .....8

*Ashcroft v. Iqbal*,  
556 U.S. 662 (2009).....12

*Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Skiing Highlands Corp.*,  
472 U.S. 585 (1984).....13

*Associated General Contractors of California, Inc. v. California State Council of  
Carpenters*,  
459 U.S. 519 (1983).....5

*Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly*,  
550 U.S. 544 (2007).....11

*Bird v. Department of Human Services*,  
935 F.3d 738 (9th Cir. 2019) .....5

*Brantley v. NBC Universal, Inc.*,  
675 F.3d 1192 (9th Cir. 2012) .....7, 10, 14

*Eastman v. Quest Diagnostics Inc.*,  
108 F. Supp. 3d 827 (N.D. Cal. 2015) .....10

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

*Feitelson v. Google, Inc.*,  
80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (N.D. Cal. 2015) .....11, 14

*FTC v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
2021 WL 2643627 (D.D.C. June 28, 2021).....13

*FTC v. Qualcomm Corp.*,  
969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020) .....9, 11, 13, 15

*Hennegan v. Pacifico Creative Service, Inc.*,  
507 F.3d 1222 (9th Cir. 2016) .....7

1 *Hirsh v. Martindale-Hubbell, Inc.*,  
674 F.2d 1343 (9th Cir. 1982) .....12

2 *Huynh v. Chase Manhattan Bank*,  
3 465 F.3d 992 (9th Cir. 2006) .....4

4 *Jones v. Micron Technology Inc.*,  
5 400 F. Supp. 3d 897 (N.D. Cal. 2019) .....15

6 *Klehr v. A.O. Smith Corp.*,  
7 521 U.S. 179 (1997).....5, 7

8 *Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v. PSKS, Inc.*,  
9 551 U.S. 877 (2007).....12

10 *Liveuniverse, Inc. v. Myspace, Inc.*,  
2007 WL 6865852 (C.D. Cal. June 4, 2007), *aff'd*, 304 F. App'x 554 (9th Cir.  
11 Dec. 22, 2008).....13

12 *Los Angeles Land Co. v. Brunswick Corp.*,  
13 6 F.3d 1422 (9th Cir. 1993) .....10

14 *MetroNet Services Corp. v. Qwest Corp.*,  
15 383 F.3d 1124 (9th Cir. 2004) .....13

16 *Midwestern Machinery Co., Inc. v. Northwest Airlines, Inc.*,  
17 392 F.3d 265 (8th Cir. 2004) .....6

18 *Nacarino v. Chobani, LLC*,  
2022 WL 344966 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2022) .....8

19 *New York v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
20 549 F. Supp. 3d 6 (D.D.C. 2021) .....3

21 *Novell, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
22 731 F.3d 1064 (10th Cir. 2013) .....13

23 *Ohio v. American Express Co.*,  
24 138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018).....10

25 *Oliver v. SD-3C LLC*,  
26 751 F.3d 1081 (9th Cir. 2014) .....4

27 *Reveal Chat Holdco LLC v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
2021 WL 1615349 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2021), *aff'd*, 2022 WL 595696 (9th  
Cir. Feb. 28, 2022) .....3, 6

28 *Reveal Chat Holdco, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
471 F. Supp. 3d 981 (N.D. Cal. 2020) .....3, 6, 12, 13, 14

1 *Samsung Electronics Co. v. Panasonic Corp.*,  
747 F.3d 1199 (9th Cir. 2014) .....5, 7, 9

2 *Somers v. Apple Inc.*,  
3 729 F.3d 953 (9th Cir. 2013) .....9, 14

4 *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*,  
5 141 S. Ct. 2190 (2021).....15

6 *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
7 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001).....12

8 *United States v. Syufy Enterprises*,  
9 903 F.2d 659 (9th Cir. 1990) .....10

10 *Verizon Communications, Inc. v. Law Offices of Curtis V. Trinko, LLP*,  
11 540 U.S. 398 (2004).....13

**STATUTES AND RULES**

12 Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1-38 .....*Passim*

13 Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....1

14 Fed. R. Civ. P. 15(c) .....8, 9

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

15

16 Reply Br. for Plaintiffs-Appellants, *Reveal Chat Holdco LLC v. Meta Platforms*  
17 *Inc.*, No. 21-15863, 2021 WL 6102027 (9th Cir. Dec. 15, 2021), Dkt. 38.....6

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

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.