Brian C. Rocca, Bar No. 221576
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com
Sujal J. Shah, Bar No. 215230
sujal.shah@morganlewis.com
Michelle Park Chiu, Bar No. 248421
michelle.chiu@morganlewis.com
Minna Lo Naranjo, Bar No. 259005
minna.naranjo@morganlewis.com
Rishi P. Satia, Bar No. 301958
rishi.satia@morganlewis.com
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105-1596
Telephone: (415) 442-1000
Facsimile: (415) 442-1001

Richard S. Taffet, *pro hac vice*
richard.taffet@morganlewis.com
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
101 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10178-0060
Telephone: (212) 309-6000
Facsimile: (212) 309-6001

Counsel for Defendants

Glenn D. Pomerantz, Bar No. 112503
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
Kuruvilla Olasa, Bar No. 281509
kuruvilla.olasa@mto.com
Nicholas R. Sidney
nick.sidney@mto.com
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor
Los Angeles, California 90071
Telephone: (213) 683-9100

Kyle W. Mach, Bar No. 282090
kyle.mach@mto.com
Justin P. Raphael, Bar No. 292380
justin.raphael@mto.com
Emily C. Curran-Huberty, Bar No. 293065
emily.curran-huberty@mto.com
Dane P. Shikman, Bar No. 313656
dane.shikman@mto.com
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
560 Mission Street, Twenty Seventh Fl.
San Francisco, California 94105
Telephone: (415) 512-4000

Jonathan I. Kravis, *pro hac vice*
jonathan.kravis@mto.com
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
601 Massachusetts Ave. NW, Ste 500E
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 220-1100

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE ANTITRUST LITIGATION

This Document Relates To:

Match Group, LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:22-cv-02746-JD

Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al., Case No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

MDL No. 2891

DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO EPIC'S AND MATCH'S MOTION TO AMEND COMPLAINTS

Judge: Hon. James Donato
Date: November 17, 2022
Time: 10:00 a.m. Pacific Time

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. BACKGROUND 3

A. Relevant Procedural History 3

B. Epic's and Match's Proposed Amendments 4

III. ARGUMENT 5

A. Governing Legal Standards 5

B. Plaintiffs Have Not Met Their Burden to Demonstrate Good Cause 5

1. Epic and Match Fail to Meet Their Burden to Demonstrate Diligence 6

2. Allowing Amendment Would Severely Prejudice Google 8

3. Additional Discovery Would Threaten the Existing Case Schedule 11

C. Amendment Is Not Warranted Because It Would Be Futile 11

1. Plaintiffs Fail to Plead a Horizontal Agreement Not to Compete 12

2. *Per Se* Treatment Is Unavailable Here As a Matter of Antitrust Law 14

IV. CONCLUSION 15

DOCKET ALARM

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

FEDERAL CASES

Amcor Flexibles Inc v. Fresh Express Inc.,
No. C 14-01025 LB, 2015 WL 890360 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 2, 2015) 7

AmerisourceBergen Corp. v. Dialysist W., Inc.,
465 F.3d 946 (9th Cir. 2006) 5

In re ATM Fee Antitrust Litig.,
554 F. Supp. 2d 1003 (N.D. Cal. 2008) 12

Bay Area Surgical Mgmt. LLC v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.,
166 F. Supp. 3d 988 (N.D. Cal. 2015) 10

Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007) 12, 13

Bonin v. Calderon,
59 F.3d 815 (9th Cir. 1995) 11, 12

California ex rel. Harris v. Safeway, Inc.,
651 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2011) 14

In re Citric Acid Litig.,
191 F.3d 1090 (9th Cir. 1999) 9, 12

Dimidowich v. Bell & Howell,
803 F.2d 1473 (9th Cir. 1986) 14

Eberhard v. Cal. Highway Patrol,
No. 14-cv-01910-JD, 2015 WL 4735213 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 10, 2015) 6

EPIS, Inc. v. Fid. & Guar. Life Ins. Co.,
156 F. Supp. 2d 1116 (N.D. Cal. 2001) 7

Frame-Wilson v. Amazon.com, Inc.,
No. 2:20-cv-00424-RAJ, 2022 WL 741878, at *7 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 11, 2022) 14

Frost v. LG Elecs., Inc.,
801 F. App'x 496 (9th Cir. 2020) 12

FTC v. Qualcomm Inc.,
969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020) 9, 14, 15

In re Google Digital Advert. Antitrust Litig.,
No. 21-cv-6841, 2022 WL 4226932 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 13, 2022) 13, 15

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

Gough v. Rossmoor Corp.,
585 F.2d 381 (9th Cir. 1978) 15

Guerrero v. Cnty. of Alameda,
No. C 18-02379 WHA, 2018 WL 4680183 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 28, 2018) 12

Jackson v. Bank of Hawaii,
902 F.2d 1385 (9th Cir. 1990) 5

Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.,
975 F.2d 604 (9th Cir. 1992) 5, 6

Krehl v. Baskin-Robbins Ice Cream Co.,
664 F.2d 1348 (9th Cir. 1982) 15

Leegin Creative Leather Prod., Inc. v. PSKS, Inc.,
551 U.S. 877 (2007) 9, 14, 15

Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.,
475 U.S. 574 (1986) 13

Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd. v. Seamaster Logistics, Inc.,
No. 10-cv-5591-SC, 2012 WL 6095089 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 7, 2012) 7

Monsanto Co. v. Spray-Rite Serv. Corp.,
465 U.S. 752 (1984) 13

In re Musical Instruments & Equip. Antitrust Litig.,
798 F.3d 1186 (9th Cir. 2015) 12

Name.Space, Inc. v. Internet Corp. for Assigned Names & Nos.,
795 F.3d 1124 (9th Cir. 2015) 13

NSS Labs, Inc. v. Symantec Corp.,
No. 18-cv-05711-BLF, 2019 WL 3804679 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2019) 12

Ohio v. American Express Co.,
138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018) 15

Oracle Am., Inc. v. Hewlett Packard Enter. Co.,
No. 16-CV-01393-JST, 2017 WL 3149297 (N.D. Cal. July 25, 2017) 8

Par Pharm., Inc. v. Takeda Pharm. Co.,
No. 5:13-cv-01927-LHK-PSG, 2014 WL 3704819 (N.D. Cal. July 23, 2014) 7

Schor v. Abbott Lab'ys,
457 F.3d 608 (7th Cir. 2006) 14

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

Singh v. City of Oakland,
295 F. App'x 118 (9th Cir. 2008) 11

Solomon v. N. Am. Life & Cas. Ins. Co.,
151 F.3d 1132 (9th Cir. 1998) 11

Stonebrae, L.P. v. Toll Bros.,
No. C-08-0221 EMC, 2010 WL 114010 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 7, 2010) 12

Stop & Shop Supermarket Co. v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of R.I.,
373 F.3d 57 (1st Cir. 2004) 12

Texaco Inc. v. Dagher,
547 U.S. 1 (2006) 14

Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.,
No. C04-02123 MJJ, 2007 WL 4104099 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2007) 5, 8, 11

United States v. eBay, Inc.,
968 F. Supp. 2d 1030 (N.D. Cal. 2013) 10

FEDERAL STATUTES

Sherman Act § 1 ..... 1, passim

Sherman Act § 2 ..... 1, passim

FEDERAL RULES

Rule 12(b)(6) 12

Rule 15 11

Rule 15(a) 5, 11

Rule 16 2

Rule 16(b) 5, 11

OTHER AUTHORITIES

Epic Games, *Frequently Asked Questions*, https://www.epicgames.com/site/en-US/epic-games-store-faq (last updated Aug. 18, 2021) 13

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.