

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

STATE OF NEW YORK, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC.,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 20-3589 (JEB)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

As the pillars of our national economy have shifted from the concrete to the virtual, so too have the targets of government antitrust actions. Where railroads and oil companies were alleged to be early violators, over the past decades, providers of telecommunications (AT&T) and computer operating systems (Microsoft) have been the defendants. In the internet age, not surprisingly, Facebook finds itself in the spotlight, as both federal and state regulators contend, in two separate actions before this Court, that it is now the one violating the antitrust laws. The company, they allege, has long had a monopoly in the market for what they call “Personal Social Networking Services.” And it has allegedly maintained that monopoly, in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act, through two different kinds of actions: first, by acquiring firms that it believed were well positioned to erode its dominance — most notably, Instagram and WhatsApp; and second, by adopting policies preventing interoperability between Facebook and certain other apps that it saw as threats, thereby impeding their growth into viable competitors. The State Plaintiffs in this action further contend that Facebook’s purchases of Instagram and WhatsApp violated Section 7 of the Clayton Act, which prohibits acquisitions “the effect of [which] may be

substantially to lessen competition, or to tend to create a monopoly.” 15 U.S.C. § 18. Both suits seek equitable remedies for these alleged antitrust violations, including forced “divestiture or reconstruction of illegally acquired businesses and/or divestiture of Facebook assets or business lines.” ECF No. 4 (Redacted Compl.) at 75. (The Court cites a version of the States’ Complaint that has minor redactions to protect confidential business information, and it mentions certain redacted facts only with the parties’ permission.)

Facebook now separately moves to dismiss both actions. This Opinion resolves its Motion as to the States’ Complaint, and the Court analyzes the Federal Trade Commission’s largely parallel claims in its separate Opinion in No. 20-3590. Although the Court does not agree with all of Defendant’s contentions here, it ultimately concurs with Facebook’s bottom-line conclusion: none of the States’ claims may go forward. That is so for two main reasons.

First, the States’ Section 2 and Section 7 attacks on Facebook’s acquisitions are barred by the doctrine of laches, which precludes relief for those who sleep on their rights. Although Defendant purchased Instagram in 2012 and WhatsApp in 2014, Plaintiffs’ suit — which seeks, in the main, to have Facebook divest one or both companies — was not filed until December 2020. The Court is aware of no case, and Plaintiffs provide none, where such a long delay in seeking such a consequential remedy has been countenanced in a case brought by a plaintiff other than the federal government, against which laches does not apply and to which the federal antitrust laws grant unique authority as sovereign law enforcer. If laches is to mean anything, it must apply on these facts, even in a suit brought by states.

Second, the States’ Section 2 challenge to Facebook’s policy of preventing interoperability with competing apps fails to state a claim under current antitrust law, as there is nothing unlawful about having such a policy. While it is possible that Facebook’s

implementation of that policy as to certain specific competitor apps may have violated Section 2, the Court does not reach that question because all such revocations of access occurred over five years before the filing of the Complaint. Such long-past violations cannot furnish a basis for the injunctive relief that Plaintiffs seek here.

The Court, consequently, will grant Facebook's Motion and dismiss the case.

Table of Contents

- I. Background 5
 - A. Social Networking 5
 - B. Facebook Blue 6
 - C. Alleged Monopoly Maintenance..... 7
 - 1. Acquisitions 8
 - 2. Interoperability Permissions 11
 - a. Facebook Platform 11
 - b. Conditioning Access 13
 - D. Procedural History 15
- II. Legal Standard 17
- III. Analysis..... 17
 - A. Standing 18
 - B. Platform Policies..... 21
 - 1. Refusal to Deal..... 23
 - a. Legal Framework 23
 - b. Application..... 28
 - i. Facebook Policies 28
 - ii. Specific Refusals..... 31
 - 2. Conditional Dealing..... 35
 - C. Acquisitions 40
 - 1. Legal Framework 40
 - 2. Application..... 43
 - 3. Counterarguments..... 47
 - a. Applicability of Laches..... 47
 - b. Ongoing Violation 51
 - c. Prospective Relief 57
 - d. Course of Conduct 58
 - e. Procedural Posture 65
- IV. Conclusion 67

I. Background

A. Social Networking

At the dawn of our century, in the much earlier days of the internet, a number of websites began to offer services that, in hindsight, were precursors to the sort that Facebook provides. Those websites provided users a platform for creating a unique webpage, personalized with photos and messages, that could then be used to interact with the pages of other “friends.” See Redacted Compl., ¶ 58. Interactions were initially limited to email, using services such as America Online (AOL). *Id.*, ¶¶ 58–59. Eventually, new online services emerged that allowed users to organize their profiles into a specific network and communicate with that network, such as Classmates.com and SixDegrees.com. *Id.*, ¶ 59. Friendster and Myspace, both launched in 2002, built further on this trend, offering the first of what came to be known as “social networking” services. *Id.*, ¶ 60. Although the precise definition of a “Personal Social Networking Service” (the main market in which Facebook allegedly operates) is disputed, it can be summarized here as one that enables users to virtually connect with others in their network and to digitally share their views and experiences by posting about them in a shared, virtual social space. *Id.*, ¶¶ 1, 28, 70. For example, users might view and interact with a letter-to-the-editor-style post on politics by a neighbor, pictures from a friend’s recent party, or a birth announcement for a newborn cousin. *Id.*, ¶¶ 1, 70.

Perhaps because humans are naturally social, this new way of interacting became hugely popular. In 2006, Myspace, at one point the leading social network, “overtook Google as the most-visited website in the world.” *Id.*, ¶ 60. By 2008, however, it had been surpassed by a new competitor: Facebook. *Id.*, ¶ 66. Launched in 2004 by then-undergraduate Mark Zuckerberg from his Harvard dorm room, “The Facebook,” as it was initially called, was a social-networking

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.