

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

**FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**FACEBOOK, INC.,**

**Defendant.**

**Civil Action No. 20-3590 (JEB)**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

At the time of the last great antitrust battle in our courthouse — between the United States and Microsoft — Mark Zuckerberg was still in high school. Only after his arrival at Harvard did he launch “The Facebook” from his dorm room. Nearly twenty years later, both federal and state regulators contend, in two separate actions before this Court, that Facebook 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 monopoly — 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. Both suits seek equitable relief from this conduct, including forced “divestiture or reconstruction of businesses” as well as orders not to undertake similar conduct in the future. See ECF No. 3 (Redacted Compl.) at 51–52. (The

Court here cites a copy of the FTC’s 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 the State action and the FTC action. This Opinion resolves its Motion as to the FTC’s Complaint, and the Court analyzes the States’ largely parallel claims in its separate Opinion in No. 20-3589. Although the Court does not agree with all of Facebook’s contentions here, it ultimately concurs that the agency’s Complaint is legally insufficient and must therefore be dismissed. The FTC has failed to plead enough facts to plausibly establish a necessary element of all of its Section 2 claims — namely, that Facebook has monopoly power in the market for Personal Social Networking (PSN) Services. The Complaint contains nothing on that score save the naked allegation that the company has had and still has a “dominant share of th[at] market (in excess of 60%).” Redacted Compl., ¶ 64. Such an unsupported assertion might (barely) suffice in a Section 2 case involving a more traditional goods market, in which the Court could reasonably infer that market share was measured by revenue, units sold, or some other typical metric. But this case involves no ordinary or intuitive market. Rather, PSN services are free to use, and the exact metes and bounds of what even constitutes a PSN service — *i.e.*, which features of a company’s mobile app or website are included in that definition and which are excluded — are hardly crystal clear. In this unusual context, the FTC’s inability to offer any indication of the metric(s) or method(s) it used to calculate Facebook’s market share renders its vague “60%-plus” assertion too speculative and conclusory to go forward. Because this defect could conceivably be overcome by re-pleading, however, the Court will dismiss only the Complaint, not the case, and will do so without prejudice to allow Plaintiff to file an amended Complaint. See Ciralsky v. CIA, 355 F.3d 661, 666–67 (D.C. Cir. 2004).

To guide the parties in the event amendment occurs, this Opinion also explains two further conclusions of law. First, even if the FTC had sufficiently pleaded market power, its challenge to Facebook’s policy of refusing interoperability permissions with competing apps fails to state a claim for injunctive relief. As explained herein (and in the Court’s separate Opinion in the States’ case), there is nothing unlawful about having such a policy in general. While it is possible that Facebook’s implementation of that policy as to certain specific competitor apps may have violated Section 2, such finding would not change the outcome here: all such revocations of access occurred in 2013, seven years before this suit was filed, and the FTC lacks statutory authority to seek an injunction “based on [such] long-past conduct.” FTC v. Shire ViroPharma, Inc., 917 F.3d 147, 156 (3d Cir. 2019). Regardless of whether the FTC can amend its Complaint to plausibly allege market power and advance this litigation, then, the conduct it has alleged regarding Facebook’s interoperability policies cannot form the basis for Section 2 liability. Second, the agency is on firmer ground in scrutinizing the acquisitions of Instagram and WhatsApp, as the Court rejects Facebook’s argument that the FTC lacks authority to seek injunctive relief against those purchases. Whether other issues arise in a subsequent phase of litigation is dependent on how the Government wishes to proceed.

## Table of Contents

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| I.   | Background .....                                  | 5  |
| A.   | Social Networking .....                           | 5  |
| B.   | Facebook Blue .....                               | 6  |
| C.   | Alleged Monopoly Maintenance.....                 | 7  |
| 1.   | Instagram .....                                   | 8  |
| 2.   | WhatsApp .....                                    | 10 |
| 3.   | Interoperability Permissions .....                | 11 |
| a.   | Facebook Platform .....                           | 11 |
| b.   | Conditioning Access .....                         | 13 |
| D.   | Procedural History .....                          | 15 |
| II.  | Legal Standard .....                              | 16 |
| III. | Analysis.....                                     | 17 |
| A.   | Monopoly Power.....                               | 18 |
| 1.   | Market Definition .....                           | 19 |
| a.   | Legal Framework .....                             | 19 |
| b.   | Market-Definition Allegations.....                | 21 |
| c.   | Analysis.....                                     | 23 |
| 2.   | Market Share .....                                | 27 |
| B.   | Platform Policies .....                           | 33 |
| 1.   | Refusal to Deal.....                              | 34 |
| a.   | Legal Framework .....                             | 34 |
| b.   | Application.....                                  | 39 |
| i.   | Facebook Policies .....                           | 39 |
| ii.  | Specific Refusals.....                            | 41 |
| 2.   | Conditional Dealing.....                          | 46 |
| C.   | Challenging Acquisitions under Section 13(b)..... | 50 |
| IV.  | Conclusion .....                                  | 53 |

## 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 what came to be known as “social networking” services. See Redacted Compl., ¶ 38. Friendster and Myspace, both launched in 2002, were among the earliest. Id. Although the precise definition of a “Personal Social Networking Service” is disputed (as that is the market in which Facebook has its alleged monopoly), 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., ¶ 40. 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.

Perhaps because humans are naturally social, this new way of interacting became hugely popular. Although Myspace and Friendster had an early lead, by 2009 they had been surpassed by a new competitor. Id., ¶¶ 38, 41. Created at Harvard in 2004, “The Facebook,” as it was initially called, was a social-networking service initially limited to college students. Id., ¶ 41. Within a few years, it had expanded to the general public (and dropped “The” from its name). Id. By at least 2011, it was the dominant player in personal social networking. Id., ¶ 62. Today, the FTC alleges, its flagship product, Facebook Blue, has hundreds of millions of users in the United States. Id., ¶ 3. The following details of Facebook’s conduct are drawn from the FTC’s Complaint, as the Court must consider its allegations true at this stage. The allegations are quite similar, though not identical, to those made by the States in the parallel case and recounted in the Court’s companion Opinion.

# 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.