

# EXHIBIT Q

THE ARBITRATION TRIBUNALS OF THE  
AMERICAN ARBITRATION ASSOCIATION

In the Matter of the Arbitration between

SPENCER MEYER,  
Claimant,

v.

UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,  
Respondent.

Les Weinstein  
AAA No. 01-18-0002-1956

**CLAIMANT SPENCER MEYER'S POST-HEARING BRIEF**

**HARTER SECREST & EMERY LLP**

Brian Marc Feldman  
Lauren R. Mendolera  
1600 Bausch & Lomb Place  
Rochester, New York 14604

**ANDREW SCHMIDT LAW PLLC**

Andrew Arthur Schmidt  
97 India Street  
Portland, Maine 04101

*Counsel for Claimant Spencer Meyer*

November 15, 2019  
New York, New York

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preliminary Statement.....	1
Point I—THIS CASE IS NOT GOVERNED BY <i>LEEGIN</i> , BUT BY <i>INTERSTATE CIRCUIT</i> ....	3
A. <i>Leegin</i> does not govern this case. ....	3
1. <i>Leegin</i> is limited to vertical theories. ....	3
2. <i>Leegin</i> 's economic rationales are not at issue. ....	5
B. Rather, <i>Interstate Circuit</i> controls this case. ....	7
1. All Uber drivers adopt surge pricing at Uber's invitation. ....	7
2. Uber drivers adopt surge pricing because all other Uber drivers do so. ....	8
C. <i>Leegin</i> and <i>Interstate Circuit</i> are not in conflict. ....	10
1. <i>Leegin</i> restraints create winners and losers. ....	12
2. <i>Interstate Circuit</i> restraints benefit all affected competitors. ....	12
3. Surge pricing is an <i>Interstate Circuit</i> restraint that benefits all Uber drivers. ....	14
Point II—THIS TRIBUNAL SHOULD ENJOIN SURGE PRICING. ....	15
A. Courts regularly enjoin anticompetitive practices <i>in toto</i> . ....	16
B. An injunction against surge pricing is particularly appropriate here. ....	19
C. This tribunal is empowered to award this relief, as Uber elsewhere admits. ....	21
Conclusion .....	24

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

## CASES

<i>Am. Express v. Italian Colors Restaurant</i> , 570 U.S. 228 (2013).....	17
<i>Am. Safety Equip. Corp v. J.P. Maguire &amp; Co.</i> , 391 F.2d 821 (2d Cir. 1968).....	16
<i>Bd. of Regents v. NCAA</i> , 546 F. Supp. 1276 (W.D. Okl. 1982).....	18, 24
<i>Bergjans Farm Dairy Co. v. Sanitary Milk Producers</i> , 241 F. Supp. 476 (E.D. Mo. 1965).....	20
<i>Bigelow v. RKO Radio Pictures</i> , 150 F.2d 877 (7th Cir. 1945) .....	8
<i>Blessing v. Sirius XM Radio</i> , No. 09-cv-10035, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 32791 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 29, 2011).....	20
<i>Bus. Elecs. Corp. v. Sharp Elecs. Corp.</i> , 485 U.S. 717 (1988).....	5
<i>CBS v. Am. Soc’y Composers</i> , 562 F.2d 130 (2d Cir. 1977).....	17
<i>Continental Airlines, Inc. v. United Air Lines, Inc.</i> , 136 F. Supp. 2d 542 (E.D. Va. 2001) .....	3, 17
<i>Continental TV, Inc. v. GTE Sylvania, Inc.</i> , 433 U.S. 36 (1977).....	5
<i>Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Tech. Servs.</i> , 504 U.S. 451 (1992).....	3, 18
<i>ES Dev., Inc. v. RWM Enterp., Inc.</i> , 939 F.2d 547 (8th Cir. 1991) .....	17
<i>Hawaii v. Standard Oil Co.</i> , 405 U.S. 251 (1972).....	17, 20
<i>Image Tech. Servs. v. Eastman Kodak Co.</i> , 125 F.3d 1195 (9th Cir. 1997) .....	18, 19
<i>Image Tech. Servs. v. Eastman Kodak Co.</i> , No. C 87-1686, 1996 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 2386 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 28, 1996).....	18, 19, 20

<i>In re Insurance Brokerage Antitrust Litig.</i> , 618 F.3d 300 (3d Cir. 2010).....	7
<i>Int'l Salt Co. v. United States</i> , 332 U.S. 392 (1947).....	20
<i>Interstate Circuit, Inc. v. United States</i> , 306 U.S. 208 (1939).....	passim
<i>Kristian v. Comcast Corp.</i> , 446 F.3d 25 (1st Cir. 2006).....	22
<i>Lafayette v. La. Power &amp; Light Co.</i> , 435 U.S. 389 (1978).....	20
<i>Laumann v. NHL</i> , 907 F. Supp. 2d 465 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....	9
<i>Leegin Creative Leather Prods. v. PSKS, Inc.</i> , 551 U.S. 877 (2007).....	passim
<i>Meyer v. Kalanick</i> , 174 F. Supp. 3d 817 (S.D.N.Y. 2016).....	passim
<i>Meyer v. Kalanick</i> , 212 F. Supp. 3d 437 (S.D.N.Y. 2016).....	21
<i>Mitsubishi Motors Corp. v. Soler Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc.</i> , 473 U.S. 614 (1985).....	16, 22
<i>Monsanto Co. v. Spray-Rite Serv. Corp.</i> , 465 U.S. 752 (1984).....	9
<i>Nat'l Soc'y of Prof'l Eng'rs v. United States</i> , 435 U.S. 679 (1978).....	17, 20
<i>NCAA v. Bd. of Regents of the Univ. of Okla.</i> , 468 U.S. 85 (1984).....	3, 18
<i>NYNEX Corp. v. Discon, Inc.</i> , 525 U.S. 128 (1998).....	4
<i>Premier Elec. Const. Co. v. NECA, Inc.</i> , 814 F.2d 358 (7th Cir. 1987) .....	10
<i>Schine Chain Theatres v. United States</i> , 334 U.S. 110 (1948).....	18

# 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.