

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

MARIAM DAVITASHVILI, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GRUBHUB INC., *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:20-cv-03000 (LAK)

**ECF Case**

**Electronically filed**

**JOINT MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS' JOINT MOTION TO  
DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT** ..... 1

**COMPLAINT ALLEGATIONS** ..... 3

    A. Defendants’ Meal-Ordering Platforms, Their Value to Both Consumers and Restaurants, and the Vigorous Competition They Face..... 3

    B. The Alleged Markets and Market Shares..... 5

    C. The Challenged Contractual Provisions and Plaintiffs’ Causes of Action ..... 6

**LEGAL STANDARD** ..... 8

**ARGUMENT**..... 8

**I. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE COGNIZABLE ANTICOMPETITIVE EFFECTS IN THE “DIRECT” MARKETS (COUNT I AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS)** ..... 10

    A. Purported Harm in the “Direct” Markets Cannot Sustain a Claim Against Defendants Absent Harm in the Purported Platform Market..... 10

    B. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Actual Anticompetitive Effects in the “Direct” Markets ..... 12

    C. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Anticompetitive Effects Indirectly in the “Direct” Markets ..... 14

**II. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE ANTICOMPETITIVE EFFECTS IN THE PURPORTED PLATFORM MARKET (COUNT II AGAINST GRUBHUB AND UBER EATS)**..... 16

    A. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Actual Anticompetitive Effects in the Purported Platform Market ..... 16

        1. *Plaintiffs Do Not Plausibly Allege That Consumers Pay Supracompetitive Prices* ..... 17

        2. *Plaintiffs Do Not Plausibly Allege That Restaurant Commissions on Grubhub or Uber Eats Are Above a Competitive Level* ..... 18

    B. Plaintiffs Fail to Indirectly Allege Anticompetitive Effects in the Purported Platform Market ..... 19

        1. *Plaintiffs Do Not Allege Facts Suggesting That Grubhub or Uber Eats Possesses Sufficient Market Share in Any Purported Geographic Market*..... 19

..

2.	<i>Plaintiffs Do Not Allege Facts Suggesting That Grubhub or Uber Eats Can Control Prices or Exclude Competition</i> .....	21
<b>III.</b>	<b>PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO ALLEGE A PLAUSIBLE RELEVANT PRODUCT OR GEOGRAPHIC MARKET (COUNTS I AND II)</b> .....	<b>23</b>
A.	Plaintiffs Fail to Allege a Plausible Product Market .....	24
B.	Plaintiffs Fail to Allege a Plausible National Platform Market .....	26
<b>IV.</b>	<b>PLAINTIFFS' STATE LAW CLAIMS SHOULD BE DISMISSED (COUNTS III AND IV)</b> .....	<b>27</b>
	<b>CONCLUSION</b> .....	<b>29</b>

...

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<i>In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litigation</i> , No. 13-md-2481 (KBF), 2014 WL 4743425 (E.D. Pa. Sept. 15, 2014) .....	28
<i>Apotex Corp. v. Hospira Healthcare India Private Ltd.</i> , No. 18-cv-4903(JMF), 2020 WL 58247 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 6, 2020) .....	20
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662, 129 S. Ct. 1937 (2009).....	8
<i>Bayer Schering Pharma AG v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> , 813 F. Supp. 2d 569 (S.D.N.Y. 2011).....	9
<i>Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544, 127 S. Ct. 1955 (2007).....	8, 14
<i>Bookhouse of Stuyvesant Plaza, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 985 F. Supp. 2d 612 (S.D.N.Y. 2013).....	19, 24
<i>Capital Imaging Associates, P.C. v. Mohawk Valley Medical Associates</i> , 996 F.2d 537 (2d Cir. 1993).....	15
<i>Chapman v. N.Y. State Division for Youth</i> , 546 F.3d 230 (2d Cir. 2008).....	24
<i>Chufen Chen v. Dunkin' Brands, Inc.</i> , No. 17-CV-3808 (CBA) (RER), 2018 WL 9346682 (E.D.N.Y. Sept. 17, 2018).....	28
<i>Cinema Village Cinemart, Inc. v. Regal Entertainment Group</i> , No. 15-cv-05488 (RJS), 2016 WL 5719790 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 29, 2016) .....	29
<i>Concord Associates, L.P. v. Entertainment Properties Trust</i> , 817 F.3d 46 (2d Cir. 2016).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Contant v. Bank of America Corp.</i> , No. 17 Civ. 3139 (LGS), 2018 WL 1353290 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 15, 2018) .....	29
<i>Data Servers, Inc. v. International Business Machines Corp.</i> , 262 F. Supp. 2d 50 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).....	20
<i>Dozier v. Deutsche Bank Tr. Co. Americas</i> , No. 09 Civ. 9865 (LMM), 2011 WL 4058100 (S.D.N.Y. Sept. 1, 2011).....	23
<i>E &amp; L Consulting, Ltd. v. Doman Industries Ltd.</i> , 472 F.3d 23 (2d Cir. 2006).....	9
<i>Eastern Food Services, Inc. v. Pontifical Catholic University Services Ass'n</i> , 357 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2004).....	10

<i>FTC v. Qualcomm Inc.</i> , 969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	11, 15
<i>Heerwagen v. Clear Channel Communications</i> , 435 F.3d 219 (2d Cir. 2006).....	27
<i>IQ Dental Supply, Inc. v. Henry Schein, Inc.</i> , 924 F.3d 57 (2d Cir. 2019).....	28
<i>It's My Party, Inc. v. Live Nation, Inc.</i> , 811 F.3d 676 (4th Cir. 2016) .....	27
<i>K.M.B. Warehouse Distrs., Inc. v. Walker Manufacturing Co.</i> , 61 F.3d 123 (2d Cir. 1995).....	9, 14
<i>Michael E. Jones M.D., P.C. v. UnitedHealth Group, Inc.</i> , No. 19-CV-7972 (VEC), 2020 WL 4895675 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 19, 2020) .....	14
<i>Ohio v. American Express Co.</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Olde Monmouth Stock Transfer Co. v. Depository Trust &amp; Clearing Corp.</i> , 485 F. Supp. 2d 387 (S.D.N.Y. 2007).....	15
<i>PepsiCo, Inc. v. Coca-Cola Co.</i> , 315 F.3d 101 (2d Cir. 2002).....	24
<i>Spinelli v. National Football League</i> , 903 F.3d 185 (2d Cir. 2018).....	10, 11, 12
<i>Stubhub, Inc. v. Golden State Warriors, LLC</i> , No. C 15-1436 MMC, 2015 WL 6755594 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2015).....	24, 25
<i>In re SunEdison, Inc. Securities Litigation</i> , 300 F. Supp. 3d 444 (S.D.N.Y. 2018).....	13
<i>In re Tamoxifen Citrate Antitrust Litigation</i> , 277 F. Supp. 2d 121 (E.D.N.Y. 2003) .....	28
<i>Teamsters Local 445 Freight Division Pension Fund v. Bombardier Inc.</i> , 546 F.3d 196 (2d Cir.2008).....	27
<i>Tops Markets, Inc. v. Quality Markets, Inc.</i> , 142 F.3d 90 (2d Cir. 1998).....	20, 21, 22
<i>United States v. American Express Co.</i> , 838 F.3d 179 (2d Cir. 2016).....	26

# 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.