

1 Todd M. Schneider (SBN 158253)
2 **SCHNEIDER WALLACE COTTRELL**
3 **KONECKY, LLP**
4 2000 Powell Street, Suite 1400
5 Emeryville, California 94608
6 Tel: 415-421-7100
7 tschneider@schneiderwallace.com

8 Jennie Lee Anderson (SBN 203586)
9 **ANDRUS ANDERSON LLP**
10 155 Montgomery Street, Suite 900
11 San Francisco, California 94104
12 Tel: 415-986-1400
13 jennie@andrusanderson.com

14 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*
15 [additional counsel on signature block]

16 **SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
17 **COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

18 CITY OF LANCASTER, CALIFORNIA,
19 individually and on behalf of all others
20 similarly situated,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 NETFLIX, INC. and HULU, LLC,

24 Defendants.

Case No. 21STCV01881

**PLAINTIFF CITY OF LANCASTER,
CALIFORNIA'S MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT
NETFLIX, INC.'S DEMURRER TO
AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Hearing Date: April 6, 2022
Time: 10:00 a.m.
Department: 9
Judge: Hon. Yvette M. Palazuelos

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1 I. INTRODUCTION..... 1
2
3 II. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND 2
4
5 III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND 3
6 A. DIVCA applies to Netflix’s video service..... 3
7 B. Netflix’s programming is generally considered comparable to programming provided
8 by broadcast television stations. 3
9 C. Netflix provides its programming through facilities in public rights-of-way..... 4
10 A. This action does not violate the California Constitution. 5
11 B. This action does not violate the United States Constitution 5
12 1. This action is not an improper prior restraint..... 5
13 2. This action does not discriminate among speakers..... 7
14 4. This action would not improperly compel speech. 9
15 C. Plaintiffs’ claims are not preempted by federal law. 9
16 D. The Internet Tax Freedom Act does not bar Plaintiff’s claims..... 12
17 1. The franchise fee is not a tax. 12
18 2. The franchise fee does not discriminate against “electronic commerce.” 13
19 E. Reference to the PUC under the primary jurisdiction doctrine is improper. 14
20 V. CONCLUSION 15
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

1

2

3 *729, Inc. v. Kenton Cty. Fiscal Ct.*, 515 F.3d 485 (6th Cir. 2008)..... 6

4 *Arkansas Writers Project v. Ragland*, 481 U.S. 221 (1986)..... 7

5 *Century Fed., Inc. v. City of Palo Alto*, 710 F. Supp. 1559 (N.D. Cal. 1988) 6

6 *Cipollone v. Liggett Grp.*, 505 U.S. 504 (1992) 9

7 *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010)..... 6

8 *City of Dallas v. FCC*, 118 F.3d 393 (5th Cir. 1997) 12

9 *City of Dallas v. FCC*, 165 F.3d 341 (5th Cir. 1999). 10

10 *City of Eugene v. Comcast*, 375 P.3d 446 (Or. 2016)..... 11, 12

11 *Comcast of California II, L.L.C. v. City of San Jose*, 286 F. Supp. 2d 1241 (N.D. Cal. 2003)..... 6

12 *Comcast of California, Inc. v. City of Walnut Creek*, 371 F. Supp. 2d 1147 (N.D. Cal. 2005)..... 6

13 *Community Communications Corp. v. City of Boulder*, 660 F.2d 1370 (10th Cir. 1981) 6

14 *Concentric Network Corp. v. Com.*, 897 A.2d 6 (Pa. Commw. Ct. 2006) 13

15 *Cundiff v. GTE Cal. Inc.*, 101 Cal. App. 4th 1395 (2002) 14

16 *Edelstein v. Cty. & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 29 Cal.4th 164 (2002)..... 9

17 *Elder v. Pac. Bell Tel. Co.*, 205 Cal. App. 4th 841 (2012) 14

18 *Erie Telecommunications, Inc. v. City of Erie*, 659 F. Supp. 580 (W.D. Pa. 1987) 6

19 *Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Super. Ct.*, 2 Cal. 4th 377 (1992)..... 14

20 *Gartner, Inc. v. Dep’t of Revenue*, 455 P.3d 1179 (Wash. 2020)..... 11, 13

21 *Gentile v. State Bar of Nev.*, 501 U.S. 1030 (1991)..... 7

22 *Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project*, 561 U.S. 1 (2010) 8

23 *Kovacs v. Cooper*, 336 U.S. 77 (1949) 6

24 *Lauder, Inc. v. City of Houston, Texas*, 751 F. Supp. 2d 920 (S.D. Tex. 2010)..... 6

25 *Leathers v. Medlock*, 499 U.S. 439 (1991) 7

26 *Lehman v. City of Shaker Heights*, 418 U.S. 298 (1974)..... 6

27

28

1	<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr</i> , 518 U.S. 470 (1996)	9
2	<i>Members of the City Council of Los Angeles v. Taxpayers for Vincent</i> , 466 U.S. 789 (1984).....	6
3	<i>Metromedia, Inc. v. City of San Diego</i> , 453 U.S. 490 (1981).....	6
4	<i>Montgomery Cnty., Md. v. FCC</i> , 863 F.3d 485 (6th Cir. 2017).....	10
5	<i>Murdock v. Pennsylvania</i> , 319 U.S. 105 (1943).....	6
6	<i>NAACP v. Button</i> , 371 U.S. 415 (1963).....	7
7	<i>Nat'l Endowment for the Arts v. Finley</i> , 524 U.S. 569 (1998)	7, 8
8	<i>Nat'l Inst. of Family & Life Advocates v. Becerra</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2361 (2018).....	7
9	<i>Nat'l Private Truck Council, Inc. v. Oklahoma Tax Comm'n</i> , 515 U.S. 582 (1995)	11
10	<i>Omega Satellite Products v. City of Indianapolis</i> , 694 F.2d 119 (7th Cir. 1982).....	6
11	<i>Pacific Bell Telephone Co. v. City of Walnut Creek</i> , 428 F. Supp. 2d 1037 (N.D. Cal. 2006)	6
12	<i>Pacific West Cable Co. v. City of Sacramento, Cal.</i> , 798 F.2d 353 (9th Cir. 1986).....	6
13	<i>Performance Marketing Ass'n v. Hamer</i> , 998 N.E. 2d 54 (Ill. 2013).....	13
14	<i>Perry Educ. Ass'n v. Perry Local Educators' Ass'n</i> , 460 U.S. 37 (1983).....	7
15	<i>Preferred Commc'ns, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 754 F.2d 1396 (9th Cir. 1985).....	6
16	<i>Qwest Comm'ns Corp. v. City of Berkeley</i> , 146 F. Supp. 2d 1081 (N.D. Cal. 2001).....	12
17	<i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert</i> , 576 U.S. 155 (2015)	7
18	<i>RTM Media, L.L.C. v. City of Houston</i> , 584 F.3d 220 (5th Cir. 2009).....	6
19	<i>Sacramento Metro. Cable Television Commc'n v. Comcast Cable Commc'ns Mgmt., LLC</i> , 507 F. Supp. 3d 1226 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2020)	5
20	<i>Sorrell v. IMS Health, Inc.</i> , 564 U.S. 552 (2011)	7
21	<i>Steele v. City of Bemidji</i> , 257 F.3d 902 (8th Cir. 2001).....	6
22	<i>Taxpayers for Vincent</i> , 466 U.S. 789 (1984)	6
23	<i>Telesat Cablevision, Inc. v. City of Riviera Beach</i> , 773 F. Supp. 383 (S.D. Fla. 1991).....	6
24	<i>Time Warner Entertainment Co., L.P. v. FCC</i> , 93 F.3d 957 (D.C. Cir. 1996).....	6
25	<i>Turner Broad. Sys., Inc. v. FCC</i> , 512 U.S. 622 (1994).....	7
26		
27		
28		

1	<i>United States v. Armstrong</i> , 517 U.S. 456 (1996)	9
2	<i>Village of Hoffman Estates v. Flipside, Hoffman Estates, Inc.</i> , 455 U.S. 489 (1982).....	8
3	<i>Wayte v. United States</i> , 470 U.S. 598 (1985).....	8
4	<i>Wyeth v. Levine</i> , 555 U.S. 555 (2009)	9
5	Statutes	
6	Internet Tax Freedom Act, 47 U.S.C. § 151(note).....	11, 12, 13
7	47 U.S.C. § 556(a)	9
8	Cal. Pub. Util. Code	
9	§ 441.....	5
10	§ 5810(b).....	2, 5
11	§ 5830 (s)	13
12	§ 5830(r).....	1, 2, 3
13	§ 5830(s)	1, 2, 3
14	§ 5840(h).....	14
15	§ 5840(b).....	14
16	§ 5840(c)	3
17	§ 5840(c), (k)	1
18	§ 5840(k).....	3
19	§ 5840(q)(1)	5, 12
20	§ 5860.....	14
21	§ 5860(a)	1
22	§ 5860(i).....	14
23	§ 5870.....	9
24	§ 5890(g).....	14
25	§ 5900(k).....	14
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.