

**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
THE FTC'S AMENDED COMPLAINT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
LEGAL STANDARD.....	6
ARGUMENT	6
I. THE FTC AGAIN FAILS TO ALLEGE FACTS PLAUSIBLY ESTABLISHING MONOPOLY POWER	6
A. The FTC Fails To Cure the Fatal Deficiency the Court Identified Because the Agency Alleges No Facts Plausibly Supporting Any PSNS Market Share	6
B. The FTC’s Alleged Facts Undermine Its Claim of Barriers to Entry	13
C. The FTC Still Has No Facts To Support Its “Rare” Direct- Evidence Theory	16
II. THE FTC HAS NOT PLAUSIBLY ALLEGED LEGALLY COGNIZABLE EXCLUSIONARY CONDUCT	20
A. The FTC Fails To Allege a Plausible Section 2 Acquisition Challenge	20
B. The FTC’s Attempt To Revive Dismissed and Defective Platform Allegations Fails as a Matter of Law	33
III. THE FTC’S VOTE PURPORTING TO AUTHORIZE THE AC WAS INVALID; THE COURT SHOULD ACCORDINGLY DISMISS THE AC	38
A. Chair Khan’s Prejudgment of Facebook’s Liability Required Her Recusal.....	40
B. In the Absence of a Valid Commission Vote, the AC Must Be Dismissed.....	44
C. In the Alternative, the Court Should Stay the Case and Remand to the FTC To Resolve the Recusal Issue Now	45
CONCLUSION.....	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES*

	Page
CASES	
* <i>Aera Energy LLC v. Salazar</i> , 642 F.3d 212 (D.C. Cir. 2011).....	39, 45
<i>Alaska Airlines, Inc. v. United Airlines, Inc.</i> , 948 F.2d 536 (9th Cir. 1991)	30
<i>Alberta Gas Chems. Ltd. v. E.I. Du Pont de Nemours & Co.</i> , 826 F.2d 1235 (3d Cir. 1987).....	31
<i>Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Grp. LP</i> , 592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010).....	4
* <i>Am. Cyanamid Co. v. FTC</i> , 363 F.2d 757 (6th Cir. 1966).....	41
<i>AMG Cap. Mgmt., LLC v. FTC</i> , 141 S. Ct. 1341 (2021).....	36
<i>Amos Treat & Co. v. SEC</i> , 306 F.2d 260 (D.C. Cir. 1962).....	45
* <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	6, 12, 22
<i>Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.</i> , 472 U.S. 585 (1985).....	36
<i>Ass'n for Intercollegiate Athletics for Women v. NCAA</i> , 735 F.2d 577 (D.C. Cir. 1984)	30
<i>Assoc. Gen. Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters</i> , 459 U.S. 519 (1983).....	11
<i>BanxCorp v. Bankrate, Inc.</i> , 847 F. App'x 116 (3d Cir. 2021).....	17
* <i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	1, 3, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29
* <i>Berryman-Turner v. Dist. of Columbia</i> , 233 F. Supp. 3d 26 (D.D.C. 2017), <i>aff'd</i> , 720 F. App'x 1 (D.C. Cir. 2018).....	33, 34
<i>Bigio v. Coca-Cola Co.</i> , 2010 WL 3377503 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 23, 2010), <i>aff'd</i> , 675 F.3d 163 (2d Cir. 2012).....	34
<i>Blackbook Cap., Inc. v. Fin. Indus. Reg. Auth., Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 1827268 (D.N.J. May 5, 2021)	34

* Authorities principally relied upon are marked with an asterisk.

<i>Blue Cross & Blue Shield United of Wis. v. Marshfield Clinic</i> , 65 F.3d 1406 (7th Cir. 1995).....	20
<i>Bookhouse of Stuyvesant Plaza, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 985 F. Supp. 2d 612 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	10
<i>BRFHH Shreveport, LLC v. Willis Knighton Med. Ctr.</i> , 176 F. Supp. 3d 606 (W.D. La. 2016).....	25
<i>Brown Shoe Co. v. United States</i> , 370 U.S. 294 (1962)	21
* <i>Cinderella Career Coll. & Finishing Schs., Inc. v. FTC</i> , 425 F.2d 583 (D.C. Cir. 1970).....	40, 44
<i>Connecticut v. U.S. Dep't of the Interior</i> , 344 F. Supp. 3d 279 (D.D.C. 2018)	39
<i>Cosgrove v. Oregon Chai, Inc.</i> , 520 F. Supp. 3d 562 (S.D.N.Y. 2021)	40
<i>CREW v. Pompeo</i> , 2020 WL 5748105 (D.D.C. Sept. 25, 2020)	6
<i>Cummings v. City of New York</i> , 2021 WL 1163654 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 26, 2021), <i>appeal pending</i> , No. 21-1380 (2d Cir.).....	34
* <i>DeHoog v. Anheuser-Busch InBev SA/NV</i> , 899 F.3d 758 (9th Cir. 2018).....	23, 27
<i>Dresses for Less, Inc. v. CIT Grp./Com. Servs., Inc.</i> , 2002 WL 31164482 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 30, 2002).....	22, 29
<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).....	21, 26
<i>Epic Games, Inc. v. Apple Inc.</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2021 WL 4128925 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 10, 2021), <i>appeal pending</i> , No. 21-16506 (9th Cir.).....	17
<i>Epicenter Recognition, Inc. v. Jostens, Inc.</i> , 81 F. App'x 910 (9th Cir. 2003).....	14
<i>Facebook, Inc. v. Power Ventures, Inc.</i> , 2010 WL 3291750 (N.D. Cal. July 20, 2010).....	38
<i>Farah v. Esquire Mag.</i> , 736 F.3d 528 (D.C. Cir. 2013)	39
<i>Feitelson v. Google Inc.</i> , 80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (N.D. Cal. 2015).....	28
<i>Fraser v. Major League Soccer, L.L.C.</i> , 284 F.3d 47 (1st Cir. 2002)	27
<i>Friedman v. Dollar Thrifty Auto. Grp., Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 4036319 (D. Colo. July 1, 2015).....	34
<i>FTC v. Guignon</i> , 390 F.2d 323 (8th Cir. 1968)	44

<i>FTC v. H.J. Heinz Co.</i> , 246 F.3d 708 (D.C. Cir. 2001)	23
* <i>FTC v. Libbey, Inc.</i> :	
211 F. Supp. 2d 34 (D.D.C. 2002)	44
No. 1:02-cv-00060-RBW, ECF No. 76 (D.D.C. Apr. 3, 2002)	39
* <i>FTC v. Shire ViroPharma, Inc.</i> , 917 F.3d 147 (3d Cir. 2019)	32, 36, 37
<i>FTC v. Steris Corp.</i> , 133 F. Supp. 3d 962 (N.D. Ohio 2015)	24, 25
<i>Hooks v. Kitsap Tenant Support Servs., Inc.</i> , 816 F.3d 550 (9th Cir. 2016)	44
<i>ICC v. S. Ry. Co.</i> , 543 F.2d 534 (5th Cir. 1976)	44
<i>Indep. Ink, Inc. v. Trident, Inc.</i> , 210 F. Supp. 2d 1155 (C.D. Cal. 2002), <i>aff'd in part, rev'd in part, and remanded sub nom. Indep. Ink, Inc. v. Ill. Tool Works, Inc.</i> , 396 F.3d 1342 (Fed. Cir. 2005), <i>vacated and remanded</i> , 547 U.S. 28 (2006)	11-12
<i>Jones v. Shea</i> , 532 A.2d 571 (Vt. 1987)	43
* <i>Kaufman v. Time Warner</i> , 836 F.3d 137 (2d Cir. 2016)	9
<i>LaShawn A. v. Barry</i> , 87 F.3d 1389 (D.C. Cir. 1996)	33
<i>Lowry v. Soc. Sec. Admin.</i> , 2000 WL 730412 (D. Or. June 7, 2000)	39
<i>Marchese v. Cablevision Sys. Corp.</i> , 2011 WL 3022529 (D.N.J. July 21, 2011)	9
<i>Maris Distrib. Co. v. Anheuser-Busch, Inc.</i> , 302 F.3d 1207 (11th Cir. 2002)	8
<i>Med Vets, Inc. v. VIP Petcare Holdings, Inc.</i> , 811 F. App'x 422 (9th Cir. 2020)	8
* <i>New York v. Facebook</i> , --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2021 WL 2643724 (D.D.C. June 28, 2021), <i>appeal pending</i> , No. 21-7078 (D.C. Cir.)	35, 36
<i>Rambus Inc. v. FTC</i> , 522 F.3d 456 (D.C. Cir. 2008)	16
<i>Rebel Oil Co. v. Atl. Richfield Co.</i> , 51 F.3d 1421 (9th Cir. 1995)	16-17
<i>Reveal Chat Holdco, LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 471 F. Supp. 3d 981 (N.D. Cal. 2020)	38
* <i>Rick-Mik Enters., Inc. v. Equilon Enters., LLC</i> , 532 F.3d 963 (9th Cir. 2008)	8, 10
<i>Rothery Storage & Van Co. v. Atlas Van Lines, Inc.</i> , 792 F.2d 210 (D.C. Cir. 1986)	11
<i>Sambreel Holdings LLC v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 906 F. Supp. 2d 1070 (S.D. Cal. 2012)	38

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.