

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

**IN RE: CENTURLINK SALES
PRACTICES AND SECURITIES
LITIGATION**

This Document Relates to:

Civil Action No. 18-296 (MJD/KMM)

MDL No. 17-2795 (MJD/KMM)

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

Oral Argument Requested

Patrick E. Gibbs, CA Bar No. 183174
COOLEY LLP
3175 Hanover Street
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Telephone: (650) 843-5535
Facsimile: (650) 618-0387
pgibbs@cooley.com

Sarah Lightdale, NY Bar No. 4395661
COOLEY LLP
55 Hudson Yards
New York, NY 10001
Telephone: (212) 479-6374
Facsimile: (212) 479-6275
slightdale@cooley.com

Ryan Blair, CA Bar No. 246724
COOLEY LLP
4401 Eastgate Mall
San Diego, CA 92121
Telephone: (858) 550-6047
Facsimile: (858) 527-2750
rblair@cooley.com

Douglas P. Lobel, VA Bar No. 42329
David A. Vogel, VA Bar No. 48971
Dana A. Moss, VA Bar No. 80095
COOLEY LLP
Reston Town Ctr., 11951 Freedom Dr.
Reston, Virginia 20190-5656
Telephone: (703) 456-8000
dlobel@cooley.com
dvogel@cooley.com
dmoss@cooley.com

William A. McNab, MN Bar No. 320924
Thomas H. Boyd, MN Bar No. 0200517
WINTHROP & WEINSTINE, P.A.
225 South Sixth Street, Suite 3500
Minneapolis, MN 55402
Telephone: (612) 604-6400
wmcnab@winthrop.com
tboyd@winthrop.com

Jerry W. Blackwell, MN Bar No. 186867
BLACKWELL BURKE P.A.
431 South 7th Street, Suite 2500
Minneapolis, MN 55415
Telephone: (612) 343-3200
blackwell@blackwellburke.com

Counsel for Defendants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
RELEVANT BACKGROUND.....	4
I. THE PARTIES AND THE PUTATIVE CLASS	4
II. THE ALLEGED MISREPRESENTATIONS	5
III. THE ALLEGED CORRECTIVE DISCLOSURES.....	6
STANDARD OF REVIEW.....	7
ARGUMENT.....	9
I. PLAINTIFFS CANNOT SATISFY THE RULE 23(B)(3) PREDOMINANCE REQUIREMENT BECAUSE INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS OF RELIANCE OVERWHELM QUESTIONS COMMON TO THE CLASS	9
A. PLAINTIFFS CANNOT PROVE CLASS-WIDE RELIANCE WITH THE <i>BASIC</i> PRESUMPTION	9
1. THE BASIC PRESUMPTION CAN BE REBUTTED BY THE PRODUCTION OF EVIDENCE OF NO “FRONT-END” OR “BACK-END” PRICE CHANGES	9
2. THE EVIDENCE SHOWS NO “FRONT-END” PRICE IMPACT	12
a. Almost Universally, the Alleged Misstatements Did Not Inflate the Price of CenturyLink Stocks.....	12
b. Plaintiffs Cannot Demonstrate Front-End Price Impact by Reference to Four of the 52 At-Issue Dates.....	13
c. In Light of the Undisputed Evidence, Plaintiffs Cannot Credibly Argue All Alleged Misrepresentations “Maintained” the Prices.....	14
3. THE EVIDENCE ALSO SHOWS NO “BACK-END” PRICE IMPACT	16
a. The Allegedly “Corrective” Disclosures Revealed Nothing More than the Fact of Litigation	16

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
b. The June 19 Disclosure Did Not Cause a Material Drop in the Price of CenturyLink Stock.....	18
B. PLAINTIFFS CANNOT PROVE CLASS-WIDE RELIANCE WITH THE <i>AFFILIATED UTE</i> PRESUMPTION	19
1. DEFENDANTS DID NOT HAVE A DUTY TO DISCLOSE.....	19
2. PLAINTIFFS CANNOT TURN A CASE ABOUT AFFIRMATIVE MISREPRESENTATIONS INTO A CASE ABOUT OMISSIONS	21
II. PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT OFFERED A DAMAGES METHODOLOGY THAT IS COMMON TO THE PUTATIVE CLASS AND CONSISTENT WITH THEIR LIABILITY THEORY	23
A. PREDOMINANCE REQUIRES PROOF THAT CLASS-WIDE DAMAGES CAN BE MEASURED IN A WAY THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH PLAINTIFFS’ LIABILITY CASE.....	23
B. PLAINTIFFS’ EXPERT FAILS TO IDENTIFY A DAMAGES MODEL WITH THE SPECIFICITY REQUIRED BY <i>COMCAST</i>	25
C. PLAINTIFFS’ EXPERT FAILS TO SHOW HOW HIS “OUT-OF-POCKET METHOD” COULD BE APPLIED IN A WAY THAT IS CONSISTENT WITH PLAINTIFFS’ LIABILITY CASE.....	29
D. <i>HALLIBURTON I</i> DOES NOT CHANGE PLAINTIFFS’ BURDEN UNDER <i>COMCAST</i>	32
III. OREGON DOES NOT MEET THE TYPICALITY OR ADEQUACY REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(A)(3) AND (A)(4).....	33
A. THROUGHOUT THE CLASS PERIOD, OREGON HAD UNIQUE ACCESS TO INFORMATION AND AN OPPORTUNITY TO UNCOVER THE ALLEGED FRAUD	34

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
B. OREGON CONTINUED PURCHASING CENTURYLINK SECURITIES EVEN AFTER LEARNING OF THE ALLEGED FRAUD.....	36
C. OREGON DID NOT IN FACT RELY ON ANY OF THE ALLEGED MISSTATEMENTS OR OMISSIONS	38
IV. EVEN IF A CLASS CAN BE CERTIFIED, THE COURT SHOULD SHORTEN THE CLASS PERIOD.....	40
A. THE JUNE 16, 2017, <i>BLOOMBERG</i> ARTICLE FULLY DISCLOSED ALLEGATIONS OF CENTURYLINK'S FRAUD TO THE MARKET	41
B. THE JUNE 19 ARTICLE AND JULY 12 ANNOUNCEMENT PROVIDED NO ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO THE MARKET.....	42
CONCLUSION	44

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page(s)
<i>Affiliated Ute Citizens of Utah v. United States</i> , 406 U.S. 128 (1972).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Pharmacia Corp.</i> , No. 03-cv-1519, 2007 WL 276150 (D.N.J. Jan. 25, 2007).....	42
<i>In re Am. Italian Pasta Co. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 05-cv-0725, 2007 WL 927745 (W.D. Mo. Mar. 26, 2007)	42, 43
<i>In re Apollo Grp., Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 04-cv-2147, 2008 WL 3072731 (D. Ariz. Aug. 4, 2008)	44
<i>Ark. Teachers Ret. Sys. v. Goldman Sachs Grp., Inc.</i> , 879 F.3d 474 (2d Cir. 2018).....	16
<i>Basic Inc. v. Levinson</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Beaver Cty. Emps’ Ret. Fund v. Tile Shop Holdings, Inc.</i> , No. 14-cv-786, 2016 WL 4098741 (D. Minn. 2016).....	20, 21
<i>Berwecky v. Bear, Stearns & Co.</i> , 197 F.R.D. 65 (S.D.N.Y. 2000)	38
<i>In re BP p.l.c. Sec. Litig.</i> , No. 10-MD-2185, 2013 WL 6388408 (S.D. Tex. Dec. 6, 2013).....	25, 29
<i>Catogas v. Cyberonics</i> , 292 F. Appx. 311 (5th Cir. 2008).....	43
<i>Comcast Corp. v. Behrend</i> , 569 U.S. 27 (2013).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>In re Credit Suisse First Bos. Corp. (Lantronix Inc.) Analyst Sec. Litig.</i> , 250 F.R.D. 137 (S.D.N.Y. 2008)	13, 15, 16, 17
<i>Davidson v. Wilson</i> , 973 F.2d 1391 (8th Cir. 1992)	34

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.