

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

METROPLEX COMMUNICATIONS, INC., on behalf of itself and all others similarly situated,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	Case No. 3:22-cv-1455
)	
v.)	Hon. David W. Dugan
)	
META PLATFORMS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**DEFENDANT META PLATFORM, INC.'S MEMORANDUM
IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
A. The Parties	2
1. Plaintiff Metroplex Communications, Inc.	2
2. Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc.	3
B. The Challenged Statements.....	3
1. Meta’s MAU Estimates In Its SEC Filings.....	4
2. Estimated Audience Sizes For Meta Advertising Campaigns	5
C. Lawsuits	6
1. <i>DZ Reserve v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i>	6
2. <i>Metroplex Communications, Inc. v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i>	7
III. LEGAL STANDARDS	7
IV. ARGUMENT.....	8
A. Plaintiff Lacks Article III Standing.....	8
B. Plaintiff Has Not Stated A Lanham Act Claim.....	10
1. Plaintiff Lacks Standing Under The Lanham Act.....	10
2. Plaintiff Has Not Alleged A “Commercial Advertising Or Promotion”	11
3. Plaintiff Has Not Plausibly Alleged A False Or Misleading Statement.....	14
a. The SEC Estimates Are Not False Or Misleading.....	15
b. The Statements Regarding Individual Ad Campaigns Are Not False Or Misleading.....	17
4. Plaintiff Has Not Sufficiently Alleged Materiality	18
C. Plaintiff Has Not Stated An IUDTPA Claim.....	19

D. Plaintiff Has Not Pled A Basis For Injunctive Relief.....19

E. Plaintiff’s Claims Are Time-Barred.....20

V. CONCLUSION.....20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****CASES**

<i>AAVN, Inc. v. WestPoint Home, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 1168102 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 13, 2019).....	11
<i>Allbirds, Inc. v. Giesswein Walkwaren AG</i> , 2020 WL 6826487 (N.D. Cal. June 4, 2020).....	9, 10
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	8
<i>Avery v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 835 N.E.2d 801 (Ill. 2005).....	19
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	8
<i>Bell v. Publix Super Markets, Inc.</i> , 982 F.3d 468 (7th Cir. 2020)	15
<i>Bridges v. Blackstone Grp., Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 2643968 (S.D. Ill. July 8, 2022)	17
<i>C=Holdings B.V. v. Asiarim Corp.</i> , 992 F. Supp. 2d 223 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	12
<i>CardioNet, Inc. v. LifeWatch Corp.</i> , 2008 WL 567031 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 27, 2008)	8
<i>Catilina Nominees Proprietary Ltd. v. Stericycle, Inc.</i> , 2021 WL 1165087 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 26, 2021).....	12
<i>Chi. Consulting Actuaries, LLC v. Scrol</i> , 2005 WL 819555 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 6, 2005).....	14
<i>City of Los Angeles v. Lyons</i> , 461 U.S. 95 (1983).....	10
<i>Conditioned Ocular Enhancement, Inc. v. Bonaventura</i> , 458 F. Supp. 2d 704 (N.D. Ill. 2006)	8
<i>Control Sols., LLC v. Oshkosh Corp.</i> , 2011 WL 1131329 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 28, 2011).....	8, 16, 17

<i>In re Copper Antitrust Litig.</i> , 436 F.3d 782 (7th Cir. 2006)	20
<i>Crabtree v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.</i> , 948 F.3d 872 (7th Cir. 2020)	9, 18
<i>Daniels v. Southfort</i> , 6 F.3d 482 (7th Cir. 1993)	20
<i>DZ Reserve, et al. v. Meta Platforms, Inc.</i> , No. 18-cv-04978-JD (N.D. Cal.)	6, 7
<i>eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.</i> , 547 U.S. 388 (2006).....	19
<i>First Health Grp. Corp. v. BCE Emergis Corp.</i> , 269 F.3d 800 (7th Cir. 2001)	11, 13
<i>Gensler v. Strabala</i> , 764 F.3d 735 (7th Cir. 2014)	8
<i>Genus Lifesciences, Inc. v. Lannett Co., Inc.</i> , 378 F. Supp. 3d 823 (N.D. Cal. 2019)	12
<i>Guar. Tr. Co. of N.Y. v. York</i> , 326 U.S. 99 (1945).....	19
<i>Hot Wax, Inc. v. Turtle Wax, Inc.</i> , 191 F.3d 813 (7th Cir. 1999)	10, 15, 18, 19
<i>Hytera Comms. Corp. Ltd, v. Motorola, Sols., Inc.</i> , 2022 WL 3645908 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 24, 2022)	14
<i>ISI Int'l Inc. v. Borden Ladner Gervais LLP</i> , 316 F.3d 731 (7th Cir. 2003)	13
<i>Johnson Controls, Inc. v. Exide Corp.</i> , 152 F. Supp. 2d 1075 (N.D. Ill. 2001)	14, 20
<i>LAJIM, LLC v. Gen. Elec. Co.</i> , 917 F.3d 933 (7th Cir. 2019)	19
<i>Lexmark Int'l, Inc. v. Static Control, Components, Inc.</i> , 572 U.S. 118 (2014).....	10, 11
<i>LG Elecs. U.S.A. v. Whirlpool Corp.</i> , 809 F. Supp. 2d 857 (N.D. Ill. 2011).....	19

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.