

1 David C. Kiernan (State Bar No. 215335)  
2 dkiernan@jonesday.com  
3 Craig E. Stewart (State Bar No. 129530)  
4 cestewart@jonesday.com  
5 Lin W. Kahn (State Bar No. 261387)  
6 lkahn@jonesday.com  
7 JONES DAY  
8 555 California Street, 26th Floor  
9 San Francisco, California 94104  
10 Telephone: +1.415.626.3939  
11 Facsimile: +1.415.875.5700

8 Catherine T. Zeng (State Bar No. 251231)  
9 czeng@jonesday.com  
10 JONES DAY  
11 1755 Embarcadero Road  
12 Palo Alto, California 94303  
13 Telephone: +1.650.739.3939  
14 Facsimile: +1.650.739.3900

12 Attorneys for Defendants  
13 ALPHABET INC. and GOOGLE LLC

14  
15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17

18 DREAM BIG MEDIA, INC., GETIFY  
19 SOLUTIONS, INC., and SPRINTER  
20 SUPPLIER LLC, Individually and on Behalf  
of all Others Similarly Situated,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 ALPHABET INC. and GOOGLE LLC,

24 Defendants.  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Case No. 4:22-cv-02314-JSW**

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO  
DISMISS**

Date: September 30, 2022

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Judge: Hon. Jeffrey S. White

Date Action Filed: April 13, 2022

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b>Page</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	2
I. PLAINTIFFS HAVE FAILED TO STATE A TYING CLAIM. ....	2
II. PLAINTIFFS’ OTHER ANTITRUST CLAIMS LIKEWISE FAIL.....	7
A. Plaintiffs Have Not Stated a Bundling Claim. ....	7
B. Plaintiffs Have Not Stated An Exclusive Dealing Claim.....	7
C. Plaintiffs Have Not Stated a Monopoly Leveraging Claim. ....	8
III. PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT VALIDLY PLED RELEVANT PRODUCT MARKETS OR MARKET POWER. ....	9
A. Plaintiffs’ Relevant Market Allegations are Legally Insufficient. ....	9
B. Plaintiffs Fail to Adequately Allege Market Power.....	11
IV. PLAINTIFFS HAVE FAILED TO STATE A CLAIM UNDER THE CALIFORNIA UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW. ....	14
V. THE COURT NEED NOT ADDRESS AT THIS JUNCTURE GOOGLE’S ACQUISITIONS OR THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.....	14
CONCLUSION .....	15

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

		<b>Page</b>
1		
2		
3	<b>CASES</b>	
4	<i>Abcor Corp. v. AM Int'l, Inc.</i> ,	
5	916 F.2d 924 (4th Cir. 1990).....	9
6	<i>AliveCor, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> ,	
7	No. 21-CV-03958-JSW, 2022 WL 833628 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 21, 2022).....	12
8	<i>Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Grp. LP</i> ,	
9	592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010).....	7
10	<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> ,	
11	556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	2
12	<i>Athos Overseas, Ltd. v. YouTube, Inc.</i> ,	
13	No. 1:21-CV-21698, 2022 WL 910272 (S.D. Fla. Mar. 29, 2022).....	6
14	<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> ,	
15	550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	2
16	<i>Cascade Health Sols. v. PeaceHealth</i> ,	
17	515 F.3d 883 (9th Cir. 2008).....	4, 7
18	<i>Christou v. Beatport, LLC</i> ,	
19	849 F. Supp. 2d 1055 (D. Colo. 2012).....	14
20	<i>Cost Mgmt. Servs., Inc. v. Washington Nat. Gas Co.</i> ,	
21	99 F.3d 937 (9th Cir. 1996).....	8, 12, 13
22	<i>Dang v. San Francisco Forty Niners</i> ,	
23	964 F. Supp. 2d 1097 (N.D. Cal. 2013).....	11
24	<i>Datel Holdings Ltd. v. Microsoft Corp.</i> ,	
25	712 F. Supp. 2d 974 (N.D. Cal. 2010).....	4
26	<i>Delano Farms Co. v. California Table Grape Comm'n</i> ,	
27	623 F. Supp. 2d 1144 (E.D. Cal. 2009).....	11
28	<i>Digidyne Corp. v. Data Gen. Corp.</i> ,	
	734 F.2d 1336 (9th Cir. 1984).....	14

1	<i>Dominick v. Collectors Universe, Inc.</i> ,	
2	No. 2:12-CV-04782-ODW, 2012 WL 4513548 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 1, 2012).....	13
3	<i>Eatoni Ergonomics, Inc. v. Research in Motion Corp.</i> ,	
4	486 F. App'x 186 (2d Cir. 2012) .....	9
5	<i>Fed. Trade Comm'n v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,	
6	560 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2021) .....	3
7	<i>Gumwood HP Shopping Partners, L.P. v. Simon Prop. Grp., Inc.</i> ,	
8	No. 3:11-CV-268 JD, 2013 WL 3214983 (N.D. Ind. Mar. 13, 2013) .....	14
9	<i>Hannah's Boutique, Inc. v. Surdej</i> ,	
10	No. 13 C 2564, 2013 WL 4553313 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 28, 2013).....	14
11	<i>Illinois Tool Works Inc. v. Indep. Ink, Inc.</i> ,	
12	547 U.S. 28 (2006).....	14
13	<i>Kellam Energy, Inc. v. Duncan</i> ,	
14	668 F. Supp. 861 (D. Del. 1987).....	6
15	<i>Klein v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,	
16	No. 20-CV-08570-LHK, 2022 WL 141561 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 14, 2022).....	10, 12
17	<i>Mortg. Elec. Registration Sys., Inc. v. Koepfel</i> ,	
18	2020 WL 1233925 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 13, 2020).....	11
19	<i>Nat'l Football League's Sunday Ticket Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
20	933 F.3d 1136 (9th Cir. 2019).....	9
21	<i>Ohio v. Am. Express Co.</i> ,	
22	138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018).....	13
23	<i>Pac. Bell Tel. Co. v. linkLine Commc'ns, Inc.</i> ,	
24	555 U.S. 438 (2009).....	9
25	<i>Paladin Assocs., Inc. v. Montana Power Co.</i> ,	
26	328 F.3d 1145 (9th Cir. 2003).....	5, 6
27	<i>Ploss v. Kraft Foods Grp., Inc.</i> ,	
28	197 F. Supp. 3d 1037 (N.D. Ill. 2016) .....	14
	<i>RealPage, Inc. v. Yardi Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
	852 F. Supp. 2d 1215 (C.D. Cal. 2012) .....	4, 11, 13

1 *Rumble, Inc. v. Google LLC*,  
 2 No. 21-CV-00229-HSG, 2022 WL 3018062 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2022) ..... 9

3 *Sambreel Holdings LLC v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
 4 906 F. Supp. 2d 1070 (S.D. Cal. 2012)..... 3, 4

5 *Smith v. eBay Corp.*,  
 6 No. C 10-03825 JSW, 2012 WL 27718 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 5, 2012)..... 4

7 *Sumotext Corp. v. Zoove, Inc.*,  
 8 No. 16-CV-01370-BLF, 2020 WL 6544410 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2020)..... 11

9 *Suture Exp., Inc. v. Cardinal Health 200, LLC*,  
 10 963 F. Supp. 2d 1212 (D. Kan. 2013) ..... 4

11 *Teradata Corp. v. SAP SE*,  
 12 No. 18-CV-03670-WHO, 2018 WL 6528009 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 12, 2018)..... 12

13 *Thompson v. Metro. Multi-List, Inc.*,  
 14 934 F.2d 1566 (11th Cir. 1991)..... 12

15 *United Energy Trading, LLC v. Pac. Gas & Elec. Co.*,  
 16 200 F. Supp. 3d 1012 (N.D. Cal. 2016) ..... 12

17 *Universal Hosp. Servs., Inc. v. Hill-Rom Holdings, Inc.*,  
 18 No. CIV.A. SA-15-CA-32, 2015 WL 6994438 (W.D. Tex. Oct. 15, 2015)..... 4

19 *Webkinz Antitrust Litig.*,  
 20 695 F. Supp. 2d 987 (N.D. Cal. 2010) ..... 11

21 *Webkinz Antitrust Litig.*,  
 22 No. C 08-1987 RS, 2010 WL 4168845 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2010)..... 12

23 *Zenith Radio Corp. v. Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd.*,  
 24 513 F. Supp. 1100 (E.D. Pa. 1981) ..... 9

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.