

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 **BATHAE DUNNE LLP**
Yavar Bathaee (Bar No. 282388)
2 yavar@bathaedunne.com
445 Park Avenue, 9th Floor
3 New York, NY 10022
4 (332) 322-8835

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

5 *Interim Co-Lead Consumer Class Counsel*

Interim Co-Lead Advertiser Class Counsel

6 [Additional counsel listed on signature page]
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

12 MAXIMILIAN KLEIN, et al.,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 vs.

15 META PLATFORMS, INC.,

16 Defendant.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

**ADVERTISER PLAINTIFFS’
OPPOSITION TO META’S MOTION TO
DISMISS THE FIRST AMENDED
CONSOLIDATED ADVERTISER CLASS
ACTION COMPLAINT**

Hon. James Donato
Hearing Date: May 26, 2022
Time: 10:00 a.m.

FILED UNDER SEAL

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

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

BACKGROUND 1

ARGUMENT 3

I. ADVERTISERS’ AMENDED SECTION 2 CLAIMS ARE AUTHORIZED AND
TIMELY 3

 A. THE FAC’S ALLEGATIONS REGARDING ANTICOMPETITIVE DATA
SHARING AGREEMENTS (SECTIONS V AND VII) ARE TIMELY AND
AUTHORIZED 3

 B. THE FAC’S ONAVO ALLEGATIONS ARE AUTHORIZED AND FACIALLY
TIMELY 8

 C. THE FAC’S PRODUCT INTEGRATION ALLEGATIONS ARE TIMELY AND
AUTHORIZED 9

II. THE FAC ADEQUATELY ALLEGES SECTION 2-VIOLATIVE CONDUCT 11

 A. THE FAC ALLEGES EXCLUSIONARY CONDUCT AS PART OF A
MONOPOLY BROTH, WHICH META CANNOT DISMEMBER 11

 B. THE FACIALLY TIMELY API AND DATA SHARING AGREEMENTS
ALLEGED IN FAC SECTIONS V AND VII ARE ANTICOMPETITIVE AND
FAIL UNDER THE RULE OF REASON 11

 C. THE ONAVO CONDUCT IS ANTICOMPETITIVE AND FAILS THE RULE OF
REASON 14

 D. META’S INTEGRATION OF AI / TARGETING SYSTEMS IS
ANTICOMPETITIVE 14

 E. ADVERTISERS DO NOT SEEK DAMAGES FOR—OR ALLEGE
MONOPOLIZATION BASED ON—CONDUCT OUTSIDE OF THE
LIMITATIONS PERIOD, INCLUDING AS TO THE APRIL 2015 REFUSAL TO
DEAL WITH DEVELOPERS 15

III. META’S SECTION 1 ARGUMENTS FAIL 15

IV. REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO AMEND 15

CONCLUSION 15

FILED UNDER SEAL

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

Cases

Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Grp.,
592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010) 14

E.W. French & Sons, Inc. v. Gen. Portland Inc.,
885 F.2d 1392 (9th Cir. 1989) 5

Free FreeHand Corp. v. Adobe Systems, Inc.,
852 F. Supp. 2d 1171 (N.D. Cal. 2012) 11

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

Image Tech. Servs., Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.,
125 F.3d 1195 (9th Cir. 1997) 11

In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Coffee Antitrust Litig.,
383 F. Supp. 3d 187 (S.D.N.Y. 2019) 12

Reveal Chat Holdco LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc.,
2022 WL 595696 (9th Cir. Feb. 28, 2022) 10

SmileCare Dental Grp. v. Delta Dental Plan of Cal., Inc.,
88 F.3d 780 (9th Cir. 1996) 11

United States ex rel. Jones v. Sutter Health,
2020 WL 6544412 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2020) 15

United States v. Microsoft Corp.,
253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001) 15

Xechem, Inc. v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.,
372 F.3d 899 (7th Cir. 2004) 7

Rules

FED. R. CIV. P. 15(b) 5

FILED UNDER SEAL**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

1
2 On February 28, 2022, Advertisers filed a First Amended Complaint (“FAC,” Dkt. 237)
3 against Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc. (“Meta”) with leave of the Court. (See Dkt. 214.) The new
4 allegations in the FAC allege overt acts exclusively within the Clayton Act’s four-year limitations
5 period, including facially timely overt acts—all post-dating December 18, 2016—pertaining to (1)
6 anticompetitive Extended API (“whitelist”) data agreements with targeted developers; (2)
7 anticompetitive market division and data sharing agreements with eBay, Netflix, and Foursquare;
8 (3) anticompetitive leveraging of deceptively obtained Onavo data to maintain Meta’s Social
9 Advertising dominance; and (4) an anticompetitive integration of Meta’s disparate AI and machine-
10 learning systems and sources. The FAC also alleges, in detail, that each of the foregoing overt acts
11 was indeed anticompetitive—*i.e.*, proscribed by Sherman Act § 2 as violating the rule of reason—
12 and injured the Advertiser Plaintiffs, including by contributing to inflated advertising prices in the
13 Social Advertising Market. Given the Court’s previous ruling that (i) the Social Advertising Market
14 has been adequately pleaded and (ii) Advertisers adequately pleaded Section 1 and 2 claims based
15 on Meta’s anticompetitive agreement with Google, the FAC plausibly asserts viable Section 2
16 claims against Meta based on five categories of exclusionary conduct—all timely on their face.

17 In view of the above, there are really no serious timeliness or plausibility questions left in
18 this case. What remains are factual questions—and the parties have indeed proceeded into factual
19 discovery, with expert discovery shortly on the way. Nonetheless, rather than answering, Meta has
20 moved to dismiss portions of the FAC. (Dkt. 262, “Mot.”) Meta’s motion misstates the Court’s
21 previous ruling as to the scope of leave to amend; makes meritless and incoherent timeliness
22 arguments; and ignores and dismembers the FAC’s allegations of anticompetitive conduct by Meta
23 in favor of blindered strawmen. The five categories of exclusionary conduct recited in the FAC are
24 all timely; they are all adequately pleaded (and indeed, one category has already been upheld by this
25 Court); and they all pertain to an adequately pleaded market. Meta’s motion should be denied.

BACKGROUND

26
27 Advertisers commenced this action on December 18, 2020. (See *Affiliious, Inc. v. Facebook,*
28 *Inc.*, No. 5:20-cv-09217, Dkt. No. 1). After consolidation with the Consumer cases, which were

FILED UNDER SEAL

1 filed beginning December 3, 2020 (Dkt. No. 68), and the appointment of the undersigned as lead
2 and executive committee counsel for the Advertiser classes (Dkt. No. 73), Advertisers filed a
3 Consolidated Amended Complaint on April 22, 2021 (Dkt. No. 86, the “CAC”).

4 Meta moved to dismiss the CAC. On January 14, 2022, after briefing and oral argument,
5 then-District Judge Koh sustained Advertisers’ Social Advertising Market (Dkt. 214 at 33-38) and
6 Advertisers’ Section 1 and 2 claims based on allegations that Meta and Google entered into an
7 unlawful market division agreement in September 2018 (*id.* at 100-06). The Court gave Advertisers
8 leave to amend as to the remaining Section 2 allegations in the CAC, which the Court referred to
9 (collectively with Consumers’ similar allegations) as “Copy, Acquire, Kill” claims.¹ (*Id.* at 70-100.)

10 On February 28, 2022, Advertisers timely filed their FAC. In addition to facts supporting
11 the Advertisers’ previously sustained Section 1 and 2 claims, the FAC alleges four more categories
12 of exclusionary acts in further support of Advertisers’ Section 2 claims: (1) post-December 18, 2016
13 anticompetitive API / whitelisting agreements providing certain developers access to portions of
14 Meta’s scuttled developer Platform (FAC ¶¶ 302-315); (2) 2017 and 2018 anticompetitive data
15 sharing agreements with eBay, Netflix, and Foursquare, which were extracted after [REDACTED]

16 [REDACTED]
17 [REDACTED] (FAC ¶¶ 316-536); (3) post-December 18, 2016 anticompetitive use of
18 deceptively obtained data acquired through Onavo spyware to surveil and target rivals and their
19 users, including by using this deceptively obtained data to train Meta’s AI and machine learning
20 targeting systems (FAC ¶¶ 537-569); and (4) the anticompetitive integration—began in late 2019
21 and lacking legitimate, non-pretextual technical justification—of Meta’s disparate AI and machine-
22 learning systems from across its business (FAC ¶¶ 657-764). For the sake of brevity, detailed
23 allegations concerning the above categories of conduct are discussed (as relevant) in the context of
24 the arguments set forth below.

25 On March 21, 2022, Meta moved to dismiss any claims in the FAC to the extent they are
26 based on new factual allegations.

28

1. Meta’s “Copy, Acquire, Kill” claims in the CAC.

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.