

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

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-03590-JEB

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF
FACEBOOK, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS FTC'S COMPLAINT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	6
A. Facebook’s Innovative Free Products Deliver Value To Millions Of U.S. Consumers	6
B. Facebook’s 2012 Instagram Acquisition	7
C. Facebook’s 2014 WhatsApp Acquisition	8
D. Facebook’s Former Platform Policies.....	8
LEGAL STANDARD.....	9
ARGUMENT.....	10
I. THE SECTION 2 CLAIM FAILS BECAUSE THE FTC HAS NOT PLEADED FACTS ESTABLISHING A PLAUSIBLE RELEVANT ANTITRUST MARKET	10
A. The FTC’s Alleged Market Definition Is Inadequate For Lack Of Facts Showing Cross-Elasticity Of Demand.....	11
B. The FTC’s Attempt To Define A Market By Reasonable Interchangeability Is Insufficiently Pleaded And Implausible.....	12
II. THE FTC DOES NOT ALLEGE FACTS ESTABLISHING MONOPOLY POWER.....	20
A. The FTC Does Not Allege Direct Proof Of Monopoly Power	20
B. The FTC Does Not Allege Facts Sufficient To Plausibly Establish Indirect Proof Of Monopoly Power	21
III. THE FTC DOES NOT ALLEGE ACTIONABLE EXCLUSIONARY CONDUCT	23
A. The Instagram And WhatsApp Acquisitions Were Not Unlawful Exclusionary Conduct.....	26
1. The FTC Cannot Belatedly Challenge Mergers Cleared After HSR Review As Unlawful Exclusionary Conduct Absent Allegations That Agency Review Was Compromised.....	26

2.	The FTC Fails To Allege Facts Establishing A Plausible Claim That Facebook’s Acquisitions Were Unlawful Exclusionary Conduct.....	30
a)	The FTC alleges no facts establishing a plausible claim that the Instagram acquisition harmed competition and consumers.....	30
b)	The FTC fails to allege that Facebook’s acquisition of non-competitor WhatsApp was exclusionary.....	34
B.	The FTC’s Claim That Facebook’s 2011-2018 Policies Harmed Competition By Preventing Competitors From Making Unrestricted Use Of Its Proprietary Platform Fails As A Matter Of Law	36
IV.	THE FTC LACKS AUTHORITY TO MAINTAIN THIS SUIT.....	39
A.	Congress Authorized The FTC To Sue In Federal Court Only To Halt Imminent Or Ongoing Violations Of Law	40
B.	The FTC Alleges Only Past Conduct Not Cognizable Under Section 13(b).....	42
	CONCLUSION.....	44

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES*

	Page
CASES	
<i>Adidas Am., Inc. v. NCAA</i> , 64 F. Supp. 2d 1097 (D. Kan. 1999)	11, 19
<i>Agnew v. NCAA</i> , 683 F.3d 328 (7th Cir. 2012).....	15
<i>Am. Sales Co. v. AstraZeneca AB</i> , 2011 WL 1465786 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 14, 2011)	16
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	6, 9
<i>Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.</i> , 472 U.S. 585 (1985).....	37
<i>Ball Mem'l Hosp., Inc. v. Mut. Hosp. Ins., Inc.</i> , 784 F.2d 1325 (7th Cir. 1986)	20, 23
<i>Bay Area Surgical Mgmt. LLC v. Aetna Life Ins. Co.</i> , 166 F. Supp. 3d 988 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	16
<i>Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 813 F. Supp. 2d 569 (S.D.N.Y. 2011)	14
* <i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	9, 12, 21, 25, 31, 43
<i>Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 501 F.3d 297 (3d Cir. 2007)	33
<i>Brooke Grp. Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.</i> , 509 U.S. 209 (1993).....	33
<i>Brown Shoe Co. v. United States</i> , 370 U.S. 294 (1962)	28
<i>Chawla v. Shell Oil Co.</i> , 75 F. Supp. 2d 626 (S.D. Tex. 1999)	11
<i>Complete Entm't Res. LLC v. Live Nation Entm't, Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 3457177 (C.D. Cal. May 11, 2016)	43
<i>Compliance Mktg., Inc. v. Drugtest, Inc.</i> , 2010 WL 1416823 (D. Colo. Apr. 7, 2010).....	18
<i>Concord Assocs., L.P. v. Entm't Props. Tr.:</i>	
2014 WL 1396524 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 9, 2014), <i>aff'd</i> , 817 F.3d 46 (2d Cir. 2016).....	10
817 F.3d 46 (2d Cir. 2016).....	18
<i>Concord Boat Corp. v. Brunswick Corp.</i> , 207 F.3d 1039 (8th Cir. 2000).....	43

* Authorities principally relied upon are marked with an asterisk.

<i>Consultants & Designers, Inc. v. Butler Serv. Grp., Inc.</i> , 720 F.2d 1553 (11th Cir. 1983).....	38
<i>CREW v. Pompeo</i> , 2020 WL 5748105 (D.D.C. Sept. 25, 2020)	9
<i>Cupp v. Alberto-Culver USA, Inc.</i> , 310 F. Supp. 2d 963 (W.D. Tenn. 2004)	14, 19
<i>Democracy Forward Found. v. White House Office of Am. Innovation</i> , 356 F. Supp. 3d 61 (D.D.C. 2019).....	39
<i>Dresses for Less, Inc. v. CIT Grp./Commercial Servs., Inc.</i> , 2002 WL 31164482 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 30, 2002).....	31, 32
<i>Eastman v. Quest Diagnostics Inc.</i> , 2016 WL 1640465 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2016), <i>aff'd</i> , 724 F. App'x 556 (9th Cir. 2018).....	28, 31
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Power Ventures, Inc.</i> , 2010 WL 3291750 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2010).....	38
<i>Fraser v. Major League Soccer, L.L.C.</i> , 284 F.3d 47 (1st Cir. 2002)	34
<i>FTC v. AbbVie Inc.</i> , 976 F.3d 327 (3d Cir. 2020).....	40
<i>FTC v. Arch Coal, Inc.</i> , 329 F. Supp. 2d 109 (D.D.C. 2004)	11
<i>FTC v. Credit Bureau Ctr., LLC</i> , 937 F.3d 764 (7th Cir. 2019).....	40
<i>FTC v. Dean Foods Co.</i> , 384 U.S. 597 (1966)	27, 41
<i>FTC v. Elders Grain, Inc.</i> , 868 F.2d 901 (7th Cir. 1989)	30
<i>FTC v. Evans Prods. Co.</i> , 775 F.2d 1084 (9th Cir. 1985)	40
<i>FTC v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020).....	40
<i>FTC v. RAG-Stiftung</i> , 436 F. Supp. 3d 278 (D.D.C. 2020)	11
* <i>FTC v. Shire ViroPharma, Inc.</i> , 917 F.3d 147 (3d Cir. 2019).....	41, 42, 43
<i>FTC v. Steris Corp.</i> , 133 F. Supp. 3d 962 (N.D. Ohio 2015)	35
<i>FTC v. Tronox Ltd.</i> , 332 F. Supp. 3d 187 (D.D.C. 2018).....	41
<i>Geneva Pharm. Tech. Corp. v. Barr Labs. Inc.</i> , 386 F.3d 485 (2d Cir. 2004)	13
<i>Gross v. Wright</i> , 185 F. Supp. 3d 39 (D.D.C. 2016)	10
<i>Herron v. Fannie Mae</i> , 2012 WL 13042852 (D.D.C. Mar. 28, 2012).....	7
* <i>Hicks v. PGA Tour, Inc.</i> , 897 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2018).....	10, 11, 13

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.