

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

BARRY'S CUT RATE STORES INC., *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

VISA, INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

MDL No. 1720

Case No. 05-md-01720-MKB-VMS

**THE GRUBHUB PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW
IN OPPOSITION TO EQUITABLE RELIEF PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
II. STATEMENT OF FACTS	2
A. The Grubhub Plaintiffs	2
B. The Rule 23(b)(2) Class Representatives	3
C. The Rule 23(b)(3) Settlement and Release	4
D. Key Distinctions between the Grubhub Plaintiffs and Other Class Members	5
III. ARGUMENT	9
A. The Proposed Rule 23(b)(2) Class, Absent Opt-Out Rights, Is Not Cohesive.....	9
B. The Putative Class Would Not Adequately Represent the Grubhub Plaintiffs.....	11
C. Certification of the Class as Defined Would Violate Due Process Rights	13
D. The Grubhub Plaintiffs Should Be Excluded from the Class Definition or Given Opt-out Rights	16
IV. CONCLUSION.....	18

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Cases	
<i>Allen v. Dairy Farmers of Am., Inc.</i> , 279 F.R.D. 257 (D. Vt. 2011)	12
<i>Amchem Prods. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997)	9, 12, 16, 17
<i>Blackman v. District of Columbia</i> , 633 F.3d 1088 (D.C. Cir. 2011)	11
<i>Brown v. Porter McGuire Kiakona & Chow, Ltd. Liab. P’ship</i> , No. CIVIL 17-00554 LEK-KSC, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8229 (D. Haw. Jan. 17, 2019)	13
<i>Cent. States SE & SW Areas Health & Welfare Fund v. Merck-Medco Managed Care, L.L.C.</i> , 504 F.3d 229 (2d Cir. 2007)	17
<i>Cholakyan v. Mercedes-Benz, USA, LLC</i> , 281 F.R.D. 534 (C.D. Cal. 2012).....	13, 15
<i>Cnty. of Suffolk v. Long Island Lighting Co.</i> , 907 F.2d 1295 (2d Cir. 1990).....	17, 18
<i>Fata v. Pizza Hut of Am., Inc.</i> , No. 6:14-cv-376-Orl-37DAB, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 153545 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 5, 2016)	13
<i>Grubhub Holdings Inc. et al. v. Visa Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 19-cv-07273 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 4, 2019)	5
<i>Grubhub Holdings, Inc. v. Visa Inc.</i> , Case No. 19-cv-06555 (E.D.N.Y.) (MKB) (VMS), First Am. Compl., ECF No. 7906	2, 3
<i>In re Foreign Exch. Benchmark Rates Antitrust Litig.</i> , 407 F. Supp. 3d 422 (S.D.N.Y. 2019)	13
<i>In re LIBOR-Based Fin. Instruments Antitrust Litig.</i> , 299 F. Supp. 3d 430 (S.D.N.Y. 2018)	13
<i>In re Literary Works in Elec. Databases</i> , 654 F.3d 242 (2d Cir. 2011)	17
<i>In re Monumental Life Ins. Co.</i> , 365 F.3d 408 (5th Cir. 2004).....	17
<i>In re Payment Card Interchange Fee & Merch. Discount Antitrust Litig.</i> , 827 F.3d 223 (2d Cir. 2016).....	12, 13, 16
<i>In re Skelaxin (Metaxalone) Antitrust Litig.</i> , 299 F.R.D. 555 (E.D. Tenn. 2014)	15
<i>In re St. Jude Med.</i> , 425 F.3d 1116 (8th Cir. 2005)	9
<i>In re Visa Check/MasterMoney Antitrust Litig.</i> , 280 F.3d 124 (2d Cir. 2001).....	16

Jamie S. v. Milwaukee Pub. Sch., 668 F.3d 481 (7th Cir. 2012) 10

Kartman v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 634 F.3d 883 (7th Cir. 2011)..... 11

Keepseagle v. Johanns, 236 F.R.D. 1 (D.D.C. 2006)..... 18

Lemon v. Int’l Union of Operating Eng’rs, 216 F.3d 577 (7th Cir. 2000) 16

Logan v. Zimmerman Brush Co., 455 U.S. 422 (1982) 13

M.D. ex rel. Stukenberg v. Perry, 675 F.3d 832 (5th Cir. 2012) 11

McReynolds v. Richards-Cantave, 588 F.3d 790 (2d Cir. 2009)..... 17

Ortiz v. Fibreboard Corp., 527 U.S. 815 (1999)..... 17

Phillips Petroleum Co. v. Shutts, 472 U.S. 797 (1985) 13

Rouse v. Caruso, No. 2:06-CV-10961, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19946 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 7, 2013), *report and recommendation adopted by*, No. 06-CV-10961, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 19209 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 13, 2013)..... 15

Scholtisek v. Eldre Corp., 229 F.R.D. 381 (W.D.N.Y. 2005) 17

Slamon v. Carrizo (Marcellus) LLC, No. 3:16-CV-2187, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 87149 (M.D. Pa. May 18, 2020)..... 14

Tech. Training Assocs. v. Buccaneers Ltd., No. 8:16-cv-1622-T-AEP, 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 169334 (M.D. Fla. Sept. 30, 2019)..... 13

Vidal v. Wolf, 16-CV-4756 (NGG) (VMS), 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 213068 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 14, 2020) 17

Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes, 564 U.S. 338 (2011) passim

Other Authorities

David Betson & Jay Tidmarsh, *Optimal Class Size, Opt-Out Rights, and “Indivisible” Remedies*, 79 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 542 (2011)..... 8

Newberg on Class Actions, *Absent Class Members*, § 9:51 18

Rules

Rule 23 1, 17

Rule 23(a)(4)..... 2, 11, 14

Rule 23(b)(1)..... 17

Rule 23(b)(2)..... passim
Rule 23(b)(3)..... passim
Rule 23(d)(2)..... 16
Rule 23(d)(5)..... 16

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.