

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

----- X
U.S. SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE :
COMMISSION, :
 :
Plaintiff, :
 :
vs. : Civil Action No. 19-cv-5244 (AKH)
 :
KIK INTERACTIVE INC., :
 :
Defendant. :
----- X

**KIK INTERACTIVE, INC.'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| PRELIMINARY STATEMENT | 1 |
| RELEVANT FACTUAL BACKGROUND..... | 3 |
| A. Early Development of Kik Messenger and the Vision for Kin..... | 3 |
| B. Kik’s Announcement of Kin and Product Launch Strategy. | 4 |
| 1. Kik Conducted a Private Placement of Future Rights to Kin..... | 5 |
| 2. Kik Sold Kin to the Public to Jumpstart the Kin Economy..... | 7 |
| 3. Kik Marketed and Sold Kin as a Medium of Exchange For Use in a Diverse and Decentralized Economy of Digital Services. | 8 |
| C. At the Time of Launch, Kin Tokens Were Functional and Could be Used as a Medium of Exchange..... | 10 |
| D. Kin Tokens Continue to Serve as the Medium of Exchange for a Flourishing Digital Economy..... | 12 |
| E. The SEC’s Complaint Conflates the Pre-sale and the TDE..... | 13 |
| ARGUMENT..... | 13 |
| I. THE SALES OF KIN TOKENS DURING THE TDE DO NOT CONSTITUTE INVESTMENT CONTRACTS..... | 14 |
| A. The Howey Test Requires An Objective Analysis of What Kik “Offered and Promised.” | 15 |
| B. There Is No Common Enterprise Between Kin Purchasers and/or Kik..... | 17 |
| 1. There Is No Common Enterprise Because Kik Did Not Owe TDE Purchasers Ongoing Contractual Obligations..... | 18 |
| 2. No Common Enterprise Exists Because Purchasers Assumed Full Control of Their Kin. | 21 |
| 3. There Is No “Horizontal Commonality” Between TDE Purchasers. | 23 |
| 4. There Is No Strict Vertical Commonality Between Kik and TDE Purchasers. | 25 |
| C. Kik Did Not Lead Purchasers Primarily To Expect Profits Based On The Essential Managerial and Entrepreneurial Efforts Of Others..... | 27 |
| 1. Kik Led Purchasers to Expect Use and Consumption of Kin..... | 29 |
| 2. Any Expectation of Profits Could Not Have Been Based on the Essential Entrepreneurial or Managerial Efforts of Kik. | 31 |

Table of Contents
(continued)

| | Page |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| D. Characterizing Sales of Kin as Investment Contracts Would Be Confusing and Potentially Inconsistent With the Actions of Other Agencies..... | 35 |
| II. THE PRE-SALE WAS CONDUCTED PURSUANT TO A VALID EXEMPTION UNDER RULE 506(C) OF REGULATION D. | 37 |
| A. Kik’s Pre-Sale Complied with Regulation D, and is Therefore Exempt from the Securities Act’s Registration Requirements. | 38 |
| B. The Pre-Sale and the TDE Were Separate and Distinct Offerings. | 41 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 42 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

| | Page(s) |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| <u>Cases</u> | |
| <i>Albanese v. Fla. Nat'l Bank of Orlando</i> , 823 F.2d 408 (11th Cir. 1987)..... | 16, 32 |
| <i>Aldrich v. McCulloch Props., Inc.</i> , 627 F.2d 1036 (10th Cir. 1980)..... | 16 |
| <i>Alunni v. Dev. Res. Grp., LLC</i> , 2009 WL 2579319 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 18, 2009)..... | 21, 22 |
| <i>Alunni v. Dev. Res. Grp., LLC</i> , 445 F. App'x 288 (11th Cir. 2011)..... | 17, 19, 28, 29 |
| <i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> , 477 U.S. 242 (1986) | 13 |
| <i>Bamert v. Pulte Home Corp.</i> , 445 F. App'x 256 (11th Cir. 2011)..... | 16, 32 |
| <i>Bender v. Cont'l Towers Ltd. P'ship</i> , 32 F. Supp. 497 (S.D.N.Y. 1986) | 31 |
| <i>Berman v. Bache, Halsey, Stuart, Shields, Inc.</i> , 467 F. Supp. 311 (S.D. Ohio 1979)..... | 36 |
| <i>CFTC v. McDonnell</i> , 287 F. Supp. 3d 213 (E.D.N.Y. 2018)..... | 35, 37 |
| <i>CFTC v. My Big Coin Pay, Inc.</i> , 334 F. Supp. 3d 492 (D. Mass. 2018)..... | 37 |
| <i>Copeland v. Hill</i> , 680 F. Supp. 466 (D. Mass. 1988)..... | 22, 27 |
| <i>Dallas Aerospace, Inc. v. CIS Air Corp.</i> , 2002 WL 31453789 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 31, 2002)..... | 20 |
| <i>Davis v. Rio Rancho Estates, Inc.</i> , 401 F. Supp. 1045 (S.D.N.Y. 1975) | 16, 18, 20, 33 |
| <i>De Luz Ranchos Inv., Ltd. v. Coldwell Banker & Co.</i> , 608 F.2d 1297 (9th Cir. 1979)..... | 16, 18, 20 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

| | Page(s) |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|
| <i>Dependable Sales & Serv., Inc. v. TrueCar, Inc.</i> , 377 F. Supp. 3d 337 (S.D.N.Y. 2019) | 13 |
| <i>Goldberg v. 401 North Wabash Venture LLC</i> , 755 F.3d 456 (7th Cir. 2014) | 23, 25 |
| <i>Goodwin Props., LLC v. Acadia Grp., Inc.</i> , 2001 WL 800064 (D. Me. July 17, 2001) | 41 |
| <i>Goodwin v. Elkins & Co.</i> , F.2d 99 (3d Cir. 1984) | 15 |
| <i>Gugick v. Melville Capital LLC</i> , 2014 WL 349526 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 31, 2014) | 26 |
| <i>Happy Inv. Grp. v. Lakeworld Props., Inc.</i> , 396 F. Supp. 175 (N.D. Cal. 1975) | 19 |
| <i>Hart v. Pulte Homes of Michigan Corp.</i> , 735 F.2d 1001 (6th Cir. 1984) | 18, 28 |
| <i>In re J.P. Jeanneret Assocs., Inc.</i> , 769 F. Supp. 2d 340 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) | 25 |
| <i>Int’l Bhd. of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen & Helpers of Am. v. Daniel</i> , 439 U.S. 551 (1979) | 14, 36 |
| <i>Inter-Mark USA, Inc. v. Intuit, Inc.</i> , 2008 WL 552482 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 27, 2008) | 20 |
| <i>Jordan (Bermuda) Inv. Co., Ltd. v. Hunter Green Invs. Ltd.</i> , 205 F. Supp. 2d 243 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) | 25 |
| <i>Keith v. Black Diamond Advisors, Inc.</i> , 48 F. Supp. 2d 326 (S.D.N.Y. 1999) | 27 |
| <i>Lavery v. Kearns</i> , 792 F. Supp. 847 (D. Me. 1992) | 22, 23 |
| <i>Lehman Bros. Commercial Corp. v. Minmetals Int’l Non-Ferrous Metals Trading Co.</i> , 179 F. Supp. 2d 159 (S.D.N.Y. 2001) | 34 |
| <i>Long v. Shultz Cattle Co.</i> , 881 F.2d 129 (5th Cir. 1989) | 32 |

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.