

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION**

CHRISTOPHER MOEHRL, MICHAEL)
COLE, STEVE DARNELL, VALERIE)
NAGER, JACK RAMEY, SAWBILL)
STRATEGIC, INC., DANIEL UMPA, and)
JANE RUH, on behalf of themselves and all)
others similarly situated,)

Plaintiffs,)

v.)

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF)
REALTORS, REALOGY HOLDINGS)
CORP., HOMESERVICES OF AMERICA,)
INC., BHH AFFILIATES, LLC, HSF)
AFFILIATES, LLC, THE LONG &)
FOSTER COMPANIES, INC., RE/MAX)
LLC, and KELLER WILLIAMS REALTY,)
INC.,)

Defendants.)

Civil Action No.: 1:19-cv-01610

Judge Andrea R. Wood

Magistrate Judge M. David Weisman

**DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM
IN OPPOSITION TO
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
CLASS CERTIFICATION AND
APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL**

**DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
CLASS CERTIFICATION AND APPOINTMENT OF CLASS COUNSEL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS	5
I. Residential Real Estate in the United States	5
II. The National Association of REALTORS® and the Challenged Rules.	7
A. MLS Policy Statement 7.23	8
B. Standards of Practice (“SOPs”) 16-16 and 3-2	8
C. “One Sided Commission Transparency” and Steering.	10
D. The “Free” Rule	11
III. Plaintiffs’ Experts’ Theories of Harm.....	11
IV. The Natural Experiments of Northwest MLS, West Penn MLS, and REBNY	15
V. Home Services of America	16
VI. Keller Williams	18
VII. Realty	19
VIII. RE/MAX, LLC	21
ARGUMENT	23
I. Plaintiffs Have Failed To Meet Their Burden to Prove That Common Issues Predominate Over Purely Individual Issues.	23
A. Plaintiffs Have Proposed No Valid Method of Proving Class-Wide Impact Using Common Proof.	25
1. Plaintiffs Have No Class-Wide Evidence to Show They Are “Forced” to Offer Cooperative Compensation By the Challenged Rules.....	26

a)	Plaintiffs’ “Steering” Theory Cannot Serve As Class-wide Proof Of Impact.	28
b)	The Evidence Contradicts Plaintiffs’ Claims of Class-wide Impact.	30
2.	Plaintiffs Have No Class-Wide Evidence that Buyers Would No Longer Use Buyer Brokers or that Sellers Would No Longer Be Incentivized to Pay For Them.....	32
a)	Buyers Would Still Use Buyer Brokers.	32
b)	Because Sellers Would Be Incentivized To Offer Cooperative Compensation Even Without the Rule, Individual Issues Predominate.	37
3.	Plaintiffs Have Not Met Their Burden in Providing Class-Wide Evidence That Uninjured Sellers Don’t Exist, But Instead, Only Offer the Unreliable Say-So Of Their Experts.	39
a)	The Elhauge and Economides Reports Cannot Be Considered Because They Are Inadmissible under <i>Daubert</i>	39
b)	Even If Considered, The Elhauge and Economides Reports Do Not Support Class Certification.	41
4.	Plaintiffs Have No Common, Class-wide Proof that Class Members Would be Better Off in the But-For World.	52
5.	Plaintiffs’ Mode of Class-wide Impact Fails to Account for Real-world Variation in Commission.	57
B.	Plaintiffs’ Claimed Common Class-wide Evidence of Conspiracy Ignores Predominant Individualized Issues Raised in Defense.	58
C.	The Fatal Flaws in Plaintiffs’ Class-Wide Damages Model Preclude Class Certification.....	61
1.	Plaintiffs’ Liability and Damages Theories Fail Under <i>Comcast</i>	62

..

2.	Plaintiffs’ Damages Model Fails To Consider the Impact of Eliminating the Offer of Cooperative Compensation	62
3.	Plaintiffs’ Damages Model Fails to Account for Individualized Factors That Explain Class Members’ Commission Rates	63
D.	Plaintiffs Cannot Show that a Class Action is a Superior Method of Adjudication.	64
E.	Plaintiffs Incorrectly Argue that <i>Per Se</i> Analysis is Appropriate Here.	65
II.	Plaintiffs Have Failed To Satisfy The Rule 23(a) Factors.	66
A.	Plaintiffs Have Failed to Satisfy Commonality.	66
B.	Plaintiffs Have Failed to Satisfy Typicality.	66
III.	The Court Should Not Certify The Proposed Rule 23(b)(2) Injunctive Relief Class.	68
IV.	Plaintiffs’ Proposed Class Definition is Overbroad, Because It Fails to Exclude Sellers Who Have Agreed to Arbitrate This and Related Disputes.	70
V.	The Western District of Missouri’s Decision in <i>Burnett v. NAR</i> is Not Persuasive.	73
	CONCLUSION.....	74

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Advanced Aerofoil Techs., Inc. v. Todaro</i> , No. 11-cv-7866, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 137230 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 30, 2011)	72
<i>AD/SAT, Div. of Skylight, Inc. v. Associated Press</i> , 181 F.3d 216 (2d Cir. 1999)	58
<i>Affymax, Inc. v. Johnson & Johnson</i> , 420 F. Supp. 2d 876 (N.D. Ill. 2006).....	72
<i>Am. Honda Motor Co. v. Allen</i> , 600 F.3d 813 (7th Cir. 2010)	39, 73, 74
<i>Avilez v. Pinkerton Gov. Servs., Inc.</i> , 596 F. App'x 579 (9th Cir. 2015)	71
<i>Barber v. United Airlines, Inc.</i> , 17 F. App'x 433 (7th Cir. 2001).....	52
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. AT&T Corp.</i> , 339 F.3d 294 (5th Cir. 2003)	25
<i>Berni v. Barilla S.p.A.</i> , 964 F.3d 141 (2d Cir. 2020)	69
<i>Blades v. Monsanto</i> , 400 F.3d 562 (8th Cir. 2005)	30, 36, 37, 39
<i>Blanton v. Domino's Pizza Franchising LLC</i> , 962 F.3d 842 (6th Cir. 2020)	71
<i>Butler v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.</i> , 727 F.3d 796 (7th Cir. 2013)	63
<i>Cates v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 2017 WL 1862640 (N.D. Ill. May 9, 2017).....	48, 52
<i>Chen v. Yellen</i> , 2021 WL 4192078 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 15, 2021).....	52
<i>Chicago Teachers Union, Local No. 1 v. Board of Educ.</i> , 797 F.3d 426 (7th Cir. 2015)	70
<i>Clark v. Bumbo Int'l Trust</i> , No. 15-C-2725, 2017 WL 370825 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 28, 2017)	68
<i>Colby v. J.C. Penney Co.</i> , 811 F.2d 1119 (7th Cir. 1987)	73

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.