

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO. 21-2989-MDL-ALTONAGA/Torres

IN RE:

**JANUARY 2021 SHORT SQUEEZE
TRADING LITIGATION**

This Document Relates to All Claims Included
In the Other Broker Tranche

**DEFENDANT APEX CLEARING CORPORATION'S RULE 12 MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFFS' (FOURTH) CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT AND INCORPORATED
MEMORANDUM OF LAW**

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND..... 4

ARGUMENT 9

I. Plaintiffs’ Common Law Claims Must Be Dismissed..... 9

 A. This Court May Consider Only the Named Plaintiffs’ Claims..... 10

 B. If Necessary, Choice of Law Considerations Compel Application of Texas Law Where Apex Has Its Headquarters..... 11

 C. Plaintiffs’ Negligence Claim (Count I) Fails as a Matter of Law..... 12

 1. It Is Well-Established That a Clearing Broker Such as Apex Owes No Duty of Care to Meme Stock Speculators Such as Plaintiffs.. 14

 2. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege a Standard of Care That Apex’s Conduct Could Have Breached with a Mid-Day, Few Hour Interruption in a Single Day’s Trading of Three Meme Stocks..... 18

 D. Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim for Breach of Fiduciary Duty (Count II) . 23

 1. Apex, a Clearing Broker, Is Not a Fiduciary of Plaintiffs Chavez and Jang and Owes Them No Fiduciary Duty, as the Courts Universally Hold..... 24

 2. Apex Was Not Plaintiffs’ Agent..... 24

 3. Apex’s Status as a Registered Broker-Dealer Does Not Transform Apex’s Back-Office Services into a Fiduciary Relationship 25

 4. Plaintiffs’ Arms-Length Contracts with Apex Specifically Permit Apex to Act in Its Own Interest 27

 5. Apex Did Not Breach Any Fiduciary Duty by Refusing to Accept New Trades 27

 E. Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim for Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing (Count III) 28

 F. Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim for Tortious Interference (Count IV)..... 30

 1. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege “Willful and Intentional” Interference or “Wrongful Conduct” 31

2.	Plaintiffs Fail to Allege that Apex’s Introducing Brokers Contractually Were Forbidden from Declining to Open New Positions.....	31
3.	Apex Was Permitted, as a Matter of Law, to Decline to Clear New Positions.....	32
G.	Apex’s Actions Did Not Proximately Cause Plaintiffs’ Alleged Injury (All Counts).....	33
II.	Plaintiffs Chavez and Jang Lack Article III Standing (All Counts).....	36
A.	Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Injury in Fact Because Their Claims That They Would Have Sold Certain Meme Stocks at a Higher Price Are Speculative and Implausible.....	37
B.	Plaintiffs Fail to Allege They Have a “Legally Protected Interest” in Lost Earnings Due to Plaintiffs’ Thwarted Meme Stock Scheme	39
C.	Named Plaintiffs Lack Standing to Bring Claims on Behalf of a Class of Direct Customers Because Named Plaintiffs Are Not Direct Customers of Apex.....	40
III.	This Action Is Pre-Empted by Federal Securities Laws Because Apex Is Subject to Active and Heavy Federal Regulation and Because the Duty That Plaintiffs Assert Against Apex Would Prove an Obstacle to the Uniform Federal Regulatory Regime in the Interstate Trading of Publicly-Listed Securities.....	41
IV.	The Claims of Plaintiffs Whose Brokers Did Not Use Apex as a Clearing Broker Must Be Dismissed	44
V.	With 25,000 Pages Produced and Multiple Pleading Opportunities, the Fourth Complaint Should Be Dismissed with Prejudice	44
	CONCLUSION.....	45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
CASES	
<i>532 Madison Ave. Gourmet Foods, Inc. v. Finlandia Ctr., Inc.</i> , 96 N.Y.2d 280 (2001)	14, 17
<i>7 W. 57th St. Realty Co., LLC v. Citigroup, Inc.</i> , 771 Fed. App'x 498 (2d Cir. 2019).....	33
<i>Aaron Private Clinic Mgmt. LLC v. Berry</i> , 912 F.3d 1330 (11th Cir. 2019)	36, 37, 38, 39
<i>Abad v. G4S Secure Sols. (USA), Inc.</i> , 293 So. 3d 26 (Fla. Dist. Ct. App. 2020)	12
<i>Ala. Legis. Black Caucus v. Alabama</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1257 (2015).....	39
<i>Alvord & Swift v. Stewart M. Muller Constr. Co.</i> , 46 N.Y.2d 276 (1978)	32
<i>AMBAC Assur. Corp. v. U.S. Bank N.A.</i> , 328 F. Supp. 3d 141 (S.D.N.Y. 2018).....	17
<i>Anton v. Merrill Lynch</i> , 36 S.W.3d 251 (Tex. App. 2001).....	27
<i>Appert v. Morgan Stanley Dean Witter, Inc.</i> , 2009 WL 3764120 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 6, 2009)	42
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	10, 21, 24, 32
<i>Baker v. Welch</i> , 735 S.W.2d 548 (Tex. App. 1987).....	31
<i>Banzhaf v. ADT Sec. Sys. Sw., Inc.</i> , 28 S.W.3d 180 (Tex. App. 2000).....	22
<i>Barrow-Shaver Res. Co. v. Carrizo Oil & Gas, Inc.</i> , 590 S.W.3d 471 (Tex. 2019).....	28
<i>Beckwith v. Hart</i> , 263 F. Supp. 2d 1018 (D. Md. 2003).....	13

Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007).....10

Bly v. Whitehall,
120 N.Y. 506 (1890).....17

Blyth v. White,
49 G.A. App. 738, 832 (1934)13

Bodum USA, Inc. v. J.C. Penney Corp., Inc.,
2019 Tex. App. LEXIS 9353 (Tex. App. Oct. 23, 2019).....28

Bos v. Smith,
556 S.W.3d 293 (Tex. 2018).....23

Brenner v. Centurion Logistics LLC,
2020 Tex. App. LEXIS 9810 (Tex. App. Dec. 14, 2020).....32

Brink v. James,
341 F. Supp. 3d 1314 (S.D. Fla. 2018).....15

Browning-Ferris, Inc. v. Reyna,
865 S.W.2d 925 (Tex. 1993).....29, 30

Bryant v. Dupree,
252 F.3d 1161 (11th Cir. 2001)44

Buckman Co. v. Plaintiffs’ Legal Comm.,
531 U.S. 341 (2001).....43

Busch v. L.F. Rothschild & Co.,
23 A.D.2d 189 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. App. Div. 1965)13, 16, 22, 27, 31

Cantor Fitzgerald Assocs., L.P. v. Tradition N. Am., Inc.,
749 N.Y.S.2d 249 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. App. Div. 2002)32

Capital Options Invest., Inc. v. Goldberg Bros. Commodities, Inc.,
958 F.2d 186 (7th Cir. 1992)20

Capital Options Invs., Inc. v. Goldberg Bros. Commodities,
1990 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 14736 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 5, 1990)13, 31

Carvel Corp. v. Noonan,
3 N.Y.3d 182 (2004).....30

Champlain Enterprises, Inc. v. United States,
945 F. Supp. 468 (N.D.N.Y. 1996).....12

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.