

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

APPLE INC.,

Movant

v.

BASECAMP, LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 21-cv-3860

Underlying Litigation:

*Cameron v. Apple Inc.*,  
No. 4:19-cv-3074

*In re Apple iPhone Antitrust Litigation*,  
No. 4:11-cv-6714

U.S. District Court for the Northern  
District Of California

**MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF APPLE INC.'S  
MOTIONS TO TRANSFER THE MOTION TO COMPEL  
AND EXPEDITE PROCEEDINGS**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT ..... 1

ARGUMENT..... 4

    I.    APPLE’S MOTION TO TRANSFER SHOULD BE GRANTED..... 4

        A.    Legal Standard for Motion to Transfer ..... 4

        B.    Transfer to the Northern District of California Is Warranted  
            Given the Procedural Posture, History, and Complexity of  
            the Underlying Litigation in the Northern District of  
            California ..... 5

    II.   APPLE’S MOTION TO EXPEDITE SHOULD ALSO BE  
          GRANTED ..... 9

CONCLUSION..... 10

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

*In re Braden*,  
344 F. Supp. 3d 83 (D.D.C. 2018)..... *passim*

*Cont’l Auto. Sys., U.S., Inc. v. Omron Auto. Elecs., Inc.*,  
No. 14 C 3731, 2014 WL 2808984 (N.D. Ill. June 20, 2014) ..... *passim*

*In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litig.*,  
306 F. Supp. 3d 372 (D.D.C. 2017).....8

*Wultz v. Bank of China, Ltd.*,  
304 F.R.D. 38 (D.D.C. 2014).....4, 6, 7

*Wyoming v. U.S. Dep’t of Agric.*,  
208 F.R.D. 449 (D.D.C. 2002).....8

**Statutes**

U.S. Code § 1657 .....8

**Other Authorities**

Fed. R. Civ. P. 45(f).....4, 6, 7

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23 .....3

Apple Inc. (“Apple”) submits this Motion to Transfer the Motion to Compel and Motion to Expedite these proceedings (the “Transfer Motion”). Apple incorporates by reference its separate Motion to Compel certain documents from Basecamp LLC (“Basecamp”) (the “Compel Motion”), including the Declaration of Michael R. Huttenlocher, dated July 19, 2021, appended thereto.

### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT<sup>1</sup>

On December 8, 2020, Apple served Basecamp with a Rule 45 subpoena (the “Subpoena”) seeking documents highly relevant to two ongoing antitrust class action cases brought against Apple in the Northern District of California before U.S. District Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers and U.S. Magistrate Judge Thomas S. Hixson. These two class actions, one brought by a putative class of app developers and the other by a putative class of app consumers, essentially assert the same claims against Apple as asserted in a related, third antitrust action, filed in August 2020 by Epic Games, Inc. (“Epic”), the developer of the popular *Fortnite* video game, and which recently concluded in a three-week bench trial on May 24, 2021.<sup>2</sup> Judge Gonzalez Rogers and Magistrate Judge Hixson are intimately familiar with the facts of these complex antitrust cases, and Magistrate Judge Hixson has issued at least eighteen orders deciding at least 25 discovery disputes that arose in the coordinated discovery proceedings required of these three actions, including disputes involving third party subpoenas.

On December 22, 2020, Basecamp interposed a set of objections and, later, produced a limited number of documents in response to the Subpoena. Basecamp, however, objected to and

---

<sup>1</sup> Apple respectfully refers this Court to the Declaration of Michael R. Huttenlocher, dated July 19, 2021, appended hereto, for a more fulsome recitation of the factual background.

<sup>2</sup> A fourth antitrust action filed by app marketplace SaurikIT, LLC in December 2020 has been related to these cases and is also pending before Judge Gonzales Rogers and Magistrate Judge Hixson. *SaurikIT, LLC v. Apple, Inc.*, 20-cv-8733-YGR.

did not produce any documents responsive to requests 10, 11, and 25 (the “Relevant Requests”). The Relevant Requests seek documents, information, and communications relating to Basecamp’s relationship to and involvement with the Coalition for App Fairness (the “Coalition”), and communications between Basecamp (including Basecamp’s *counsel*) and any app developer regarding the subject matter of the antitrust litigation brought against Apple and/or matters relating to app marketplaces and Apple’s guidelines and policies. In its written objections to the Relevant Requests, Basecamp objected on the basis of relevance but agreed that it would meet and confer with Apple to agree upon a reasonable scope of production. Notably, Basecamp did not interpose any specific privilege objections to any of the Relevant Requests.

Apple and Basecamp met and conferred several times concerning the Relevant Requests but could not come to agreement on a scope of production. Basecamp claimed that the requested documents were irrelevant and too burdensome; Basecamp failed to articulate the alleged undue burden or the costs associated of a search and production of relevant documents. After Apple served a similar subpoena upon the Coalition, its PR firm and its executive director, as well as Coalition members, including Yoga Buddhi Co., (“Yoga Buddhi”) and Match Inc. (“Match”), Basecamp (who is represented by the same counsel as the Coalition, Yoga Buddhi, and Match) asserted an additional frivolous objection, namely that the documents and communications sought by the Relevant Requests were protected from disclosure by the First Amendment. On July 1, 2021, Apple and Basecamp met and conferred about this newly asserted First Amendment objection. Basecamp continued to stand on its blanket First Amendment objection to the Relevant Requests, and refused to have the dispute heard by Magistrate Judge Hixson despite his having heard and provided expedited decisions on more than a dozen discovery disputes in these antitrust cases (including third party subpoenas).”

# 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.