

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

**IN RE NIELSEN HOLDINGS PLC  
SECURITIES LITIGATION**

Civil Action No. 1:18-cv-07143-JMF

**DEFENDANTS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'  
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION**

SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT LLP  
425 Lexington Avenue  
New York, New York  
Telephone: (212) 455-2000  
Facsimile: (212) 455-2502

*Attorneys for Defendants*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT ..... 1

BACKGROUND ..... 3

ARGUMENT ..... 5

I. PLAINTIFFS DO NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(b) BECAUSE THEY PROFFER NO VIABLE THEORY OF CLASS-WIDE RELIANCE..... 7

    A. Plaintiffs Have Failed to Carry Their Burden of Demonstrating Market Efficiency and Cannot Rely on the Fraud-on-the-Market Presumption ..... 7

        1. The Coffman Report Fails to Consider Frictions That Could Impede Market Efficiency ..... 9

        2. Plaintiffs’ Event Study is Methodologically Flawed and Does Not Support a Finding of Market Efficiency ..... 11

    B. Plaintiffs May Not Rely on the *Affiliated Ute* Presumption ..... 14

II. PLAINTIFFS DO NOT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(b) BECAUSE THEY PROFFER NO METHOD OF COMPUTING DAMAGES CONSISTENT WITH THE ASSERTED THEORIES OF LIABILITY ..... 15

    A. Plaintiffs Provide No Method of Addressing the Impact of Confounding Information on Measurement of Damages ..... 16

    B. Plaintiffs Provide No Method of Calculating the Inflation Attributable to the Surviving Allegations ..... 19

III. THE PROPOSED CLASS REPRESENTATIVES ARE ATYPICAL AND INADEQUATE..... 21

    A. The Proposed Class Representatives Cannot Satisfy Rule 23(a) Because Each Is Subject to Unique Defenses ..... 22

    B. The Proposed Class Representatives Cannot Satisfy Rule 23(a) Because Each Is Inadequate ..... 24

CONCLUSION..... 25

**Table of Authorities****Cases**

<i>Affiliated Ute Citizens of Utah v. United States</i> , 406 U.S. 128 (1972).....	7, 14
<i>Basic v. Levinson</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988).....	6
<i>Berwecky v. Bear, Stearns &amp; Co.</i> , 197 F.R.D. 65 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) .....	23
<i>Cammer v. Bloom</i> , 711 F. Supp. 1264 (D.N.J. 1989).....	8, 11
<i>Comcast Corp. v. Behrend</i> , 569 U.S. 27 (2013).....	6, 7, 15, 16
<i>Fort Worth Emps. ' Ret. Fund v. J.P. Morgan Chase &amp; Co.</i> , 301 F.R.D. 116 (S.D.N.Y. 2014).....	21
<i>George v. China Auto. Sys., Inc.</i> , No. 11 Civ. 7533 (KBF), 2013 WL 3357170 (S.D.N.Y. July 3, 2013).....	7, 22
<i>Goldman Sachs Grp., Inc. v. Ark. Teacher Ret. Sys.</i> , 141 S.Ct. 1951 (2021).....	7
<i>Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.</i> , 573 U.S. 258 (2014).....	6, 8, 9
<i>In re BP p.l.c. Sec. Litig.</i> , MDL No. 10-MD-2185, 2014 WL 2112823 (S.D. Tex. May 20, 2014) .....	19
<i>In re Flag Telecom Holdings, Ltd. Sec. Litig.</i> , 574 F.3d 29 (2d Cir. 2009) .....	22
<i>In re Hebron Tech. Co., Ltd. Sec. Litig.</i> , Nos. 20 Civ. 4420 (PAE), 20 Civ. 4746 (PAE), 2020 WL 5548856 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 16, 2020).....	22
<i>In re IMAX Sec. Litig.</i> , 272 F.R.D. 138 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) .....	22
<i>In re Initial Pub. Offerings Sec. Litig.</i> , 471 F.3d 24 (2d Cir. 2006) .....	6, 7
<i>In re Monster Worldwide, Inc. Sec. Litig.</i> , 251 F.R.D. 132 (S.D.N.Y. 2008) .....	25

..

<i>In re Petrobras Sec.</i> , 862 F.3d 250 (2d Cir. 2017) .....	8, 11
<i>In re Williams Sec. Litig.</i> , 496 F. Supp. 2d 1195 (N.D. Okla. 2007).....	20
<i>Johnson v. Nextel Commc'ns Inc.</i> , 780 F.3d 128 (2d Cir. 2015) .....	5
<i>Krogman v. Sterritt</i> , 202 F.R.D. 467 (N.D. Tex. 2001).....	8
<i>Kulig v. Midland Funding, LLC</i> , No. 13-CV-4715 (PKC), 2014 WL 6769741 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 20, 2014) .....	24
<i>Maywalt v. Parker &amp; Parsley Petroleum Co.</i> , 67 F.3d 1072 (2d Cir. 1995) .....	24
<i>Menaldi v. Och-Ziff Capital Mgmt. Grp., LLC</i> , 328 F.R.D. 86 (S.D.N.Y. 2018) .....	17
<i>Pearlstein v. BlackBerry Ltd.</i> , No. 13 Civ. 7060 (CM), 2021 WL 253453 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 26, 2021).....	16
<i>Pirnik v. Fiat Chrysler Automobiles, N.V.</i> , 327 F.R.D. 38 (S.D.N.Y. 2018) (Furman, J.) .....	8
<i>Roach v. T.L. Cannon Corp.</i> , 778 F.3d 401 (2d Cir. 2015) .....	7, 19
<i>Rocco v. Nam Tai Elecs., Inc.</i> , 245 F.R.D. 131 (S.D.N.Y. 2007) .....	22, 23
<i>Starr ex rel. Estate of Sampson v. Georgeson S'holder, Inc.</i> , 412 F.3d 103 (2d Cir. 2005) .....	15
<i>Sykes v. Mel S. Harris &amp; Assocs. LLC</i> , 780 F.3d 70 (2d Cir. 2015) .....	16, 17
<i>Teamsters Local 445 Freight Div. Pension Fund v. Bombardier, Inc.</i> , 546 F.3d 196 (2d Cir. 2008) .....	8
<i>Waggoner v. Barclays PLC</i> , 875 F.3d 79 (2d Cir. 2017) .....	passim
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes</i> , 564 U.S. 338 (2011).....	5, 6

...

*Wilson v. Comtech Telecomms. Corp.*,  
648 F.2d 88 (2d Cir. 1981) ..... 14, 15

**Rules**

17 C.F.R. § 242.201 (2021) ..... 11  
Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(3)..... 6, 21  
Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a)(4)..... 6, 21, 24  
Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3)..... 6

**Other Authorities**

Jill E. Fisch, Jonah B. Gelbach, & Jonathan Klick,  
*The Logic and Limits of Event Studies in Securities Fraud Litigation*, 96 Tex. L.  
Rev. 553, 616 (2018) ..... 17

# 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.