

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

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,

Plaintiff,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC.

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-03589 (JEB)

**PLAINTIFF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

Table of Contents

Table of Authorities iii

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 3

 A. Instagram Acquisition..... 3

 B. WhatsApp Acquisition..... 4

 C. Facebook Platform..... 5

LEGAL STANDARD..... 6

ARGUMENT 6

I. THE FTC’S COMPLAINT STATES A CLAIM OF MONOPOLIZATION..... 6

 A. The Complaint’s Allegations Establish that Facebook Possesses Monopoly Power in PSN Services in the United States..... 7

 1. The Complaint’s Allegations Establish that PSN Services in the United States Constitute a Relevant Market 8

 2. Facebook’s Criticisms of the Complaint’s Relevant Market Allegations Fail..... 10

 a) Facebook’s Assertion that It Provides PSN Services “Free and In Unlimited Quantities” Provides No Basis for Dismissal 11

 b) The FTC’s Complaint Is Not Required to Plead a Method of Quantifying Cross-Elasticity of Demand..... 12

 c) Facebook’s Claim that PSN Services Are Reasonably Interchangeable with Other Services Disputes the Complaint’s Factual Allegations 13

 d) Facebook’s Remaining Arguments Fail to Undermine the Relevant Market 15

 3. The Complaint’s Allegations Establish Facebook Possesses a Dominant Share of the Relevant Market that Is Protected by Entry Barriers..... 17

 B. The Complaint Details How Facebook Has Maintained Its Monopoly Position Through an Anticompetitive Course of Conduct..... 20

 1. The Complaint Alleges that Facebook Maintained Its Monopoly Through the Acquisitions of Instagram and WhatsApp..... 21

 a) Facebook’s Acquisitions of Instagram and WhatsApp Constitute Anticompetitive Conduct..... 21

 b) The Complaint Provides Detailed Allegations that Facebook’s Acquisitions of Instagram and WhatsApp Caused Anticompetitive Effects..... 23

 c) Prior HSR Review Does Not Bar this Action or Create a Heightened Pleading Standard 27

d) Section 2 Provides an Independent Basis for Challenging the Acquisitions of a Monopolist	29
2. The Complaint Alleges that Facebook Maintained Its Monopoly Through Its Platform Policies.....	31
a) Facebook’s Platform Policies Constitute Unlawful Conditional Dealing	31
b) Facebook’s Platform Conduct Is Also Actionable Under <i>Trinko</i> and <i>Aspen</i>	34
c) Facebook Inaccurately Claims that Courts Have Ruled on Its Platform Conduct	37
II. THE COMPLAINT ESTABLISHES THE FTC’S AUTHORITY TO FILE THIS SUIT ...	38
A. Section 13(b) Empowers the FTC to Sue in Federal Court When the Commission “Has Reason to Believe” a Defendant Is Violating the Law.....	39
B. The Complaint Alleges an Ongoing Monopolization Offense	41
CONCLUSION.....	45

..

Table of Authorities

CASES

2301 M Cinema LLC v. Silver Cinemas Acquisition Co., 342 F. Supp. 3d 126
 (D.D.C. 2018).....17, 18

Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....6

Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp., 472 U.S. 585 (1985).....34, 35, 36, 37

Ball Mem’l Hosp., Inc. v. Mut. Hosp. Ins., Inc., 784 F. 2d 1325 (7th Cir. 1986).....19, 34

Behrend v. Comcast Corp., 2012 WL 1231794 (E.D. Pa. Apr. 12, 2012).....30

Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....6, 13

Bd. of Trade v. CFTC, 605 F.2d 1016 (7th Cir. 1979)40

Boise Cascade Corp. v. FTC, 498 F. Supp. 772, 779 (D. Del. 1980).....40

BRFHH Shreveport, LLC v. Willis Knighton Med. Ctr., 176 F. Supp. 3d 606
 (W.D. La. 2016)26, 30

Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc., 501 F.3d 297 (3d Cir. 2007)25

Brooke Grp. Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., 509 U.S. 209 (1993).....26

Brown Shoe Co. v. United States, 370 U.S. 294 (1962)8, 9, 12

Brown v. Gov’t of D.C., 390 F. Supp. 3d 114 (D.D.C. 2019).....13

California v. Am. Stores Co., 495 U.S. 271 (1990)43

City of Anaheim v. S. Cal. Edison Co., 955 F.2d 1373 (9th Cir. 1992)20

Cnty. Publishers, Inc. v. Donrey Corp., 892 F. Supp. 1146 (W.D. Ark. 1995).....12

CollegeNet, Inc. v. Common Application, Inc., 355 F. Supp. 3d 926 (D. Or. 2018)10

Concord Boat Corp. v. Brunswick Corp., 207 F.3d 1039 (8th Cir. 2000)44

...

Consultants & Designers, Inc. v. Butler Serv. Grp., Inc., 720 F.2d 1553
 (11th Cir. 1983).....37

Cont'l Ore Co. v. Union Carbide & Carbon Corp., 370 U.S. 690 (1962).....21

Covad Commc'ns Co. v. Bell Atl. Corp., 398 F.3d 666 (D.C. Cir. 2005).....31, 32, 33

Dresses for Less, Inc. v. CIT Grp./Commercial Services, Inc., 2002 WL 31164482
 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 30, 2002).....25

Eastman v. Quest Diagnostics Inc., 2016 WL 1640465 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 26, 2016),
 724 Fed. App'x 556 (9th Cir. 2018)26, 28

Facebook, Inc. v. Power Ventures, Inc., 2010 WL 3291750
 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2010).....38

FTC v. AbbVie Inc., 976 F.3d 327 (3d. Cir. 2020).....17

FTC v. Accusearch, Inc., 570 F.3d 1187 (10th Cir. 2009).....45

FTC v. Actavis, Inc., 570 U.S. 136 (2013).....24, 33

FTC v. Arch Coal, Inc., 329 F. Supp. 2d 109 (D.D.C. 2004)14

FTC v. CCC Holdings, Inc., 605 F. Supp. 2d 26 (D.D.C. 2009)10

FTC v. Hornbeam Special Situations, LLC, 391 F. Supp. 3d 1218 (N.D. Ga. 2019).....39

FTC v. Nat'l Urological Grp., Inc., 2006 WL 8431977 (N.D. Ga. Jan. 9, 2006)40

FTC v. OSF Healthcare Sys., 852 F. Supp. 2d 1069 (N.D. Ill. 2012)18

FTC v. Qualcomm Inc., 969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020).....41

FTC v. RAG Stiftung, 436 F. Supp. 3d 278 (D.D.C. 2020).....14

FTC v. Shire ViroPharma, Inc., 917 F.3d 147 (3d Cir. 2019).....40, 41

FTC v. Staples, Inc., 190 F. Supp. 3d 100 (D.D.C. 2016)16

FTC v. Surescripts, LLC, 424 F. Supp. 3d 92 (D.D.C. 2020).....25, 41

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.