

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

MARIAM DAVITASHVILI, ADAM BEN-
SIMON, MIA SAPIENZA, PHILIP ELI-
ADES, JONATHAN SWABY, JOHN BOISI,
NATHAN OBEY, and MALIK DREWEY,
individually and on behalf of all others simi-
larly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GRUBHUB INC., UBER TECHNOLOGIES,
INC., and POSTMATES INC.,

Defendants.

Civ. No. 1:20-cv-03000-LAK

**PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM OF LAW
IN OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

INTRODUCTION 1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND..... 3

I. THE RELEVANT MARKETS..... 3

II. DEFENDANTS’ ANTICOMPETITIVE CONDUCT 4

 A. Defendants Impose Supracompetitive Pricing in the Relevant Markets. 4

 B. Defendants Maintain and Cause Supracompetitive Pricing in the Relevant Markets Through Vertical Agreements That Fix Uniform and Minimum Prices. 6

 C. Grubhub and Uber Further Fix Prices and Preclude Competition in the Relevant Markets Through Their Particular Vertical Agreements. 7

ARGUMENT 8

I. PLAINTIFFS PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE THE RELEVANT MARKETS..... 8

 A. Defendants’ Argument for the Scope of the Product Markets Necessarily Fails Under the Controlling Precedent..... 8

 B. Plaintiffs Plausibly Allege the Relevant Product Markets..... 9

 1. Restaurant Platforms Offer Services That Restaurants Do Not Offer. 10

 2. Low Cross-Elasticity Exists Between the Markets at Issue..... 11

 3. Plaintiffs Account for the *Cellophane* Fallacy in Making Their Allegations, Which Defendants Fail to Do in Their Motion. 13

 C. Plaintiffs Plausibly Allege the Relevant Geographic Markets. 14

II. PLAINTIFFS PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE AND MAY SEEK REDRESS FOR THEIR INJURY IN THE DIRECT MARKETS..... 16

 A. The Direct Classes Have Suffered Injury Inextricably Intertwined with the Injury That Defendants Sought to Inflict in the Restaurant Platform Market. 16

 B. Plaintiffs Allege Anticompetitive Effects in the Direct Markets Because the NPCCs Cause Supracompetitive Pricing in Those Markets. 19

III. PLAINTIFFS PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE ANTICOMPETITIVE EFFECTS IN THE RESTAURANT PLATFORM MARKET 24

A.	Plaintiffs Plausibly Allege Anticompetitive Effects Directly.....	24
1.	Plaintiffs Plausibly Allege Increased Consumer Prices.....	25
2.	Plaintiffs Plausibly Allege Increased Restaurant Prices.....	27
B.	Plaintiffs Plausibly Allege Anticompetitive Effects Indirectly.	29
1.	Plaintiffs Allege that Grubhub and Uber Have the Ability to Adversely Affect Competition in the Restaurant Platform Market.....	29
2.	Plaintiffs Allege Grubhub’s and Uber’s Market Shares.	30
3.	Plaintiffs Allege Other Evidence of Grubhub’s and Uber’s Market Power.	32
IV.	PLAINTIFFS ADEQUATELY ALLEGE THEIR CLAIMS UNDER STATE LAW	33
	CONCLUSION.....	35

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Cases**

<i>Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Bank of Am. Corp.</i> , 306 F. Supp. 3d 610 (S.D.N.Y. 2018)	10
<i>Allen v. Dairy Farmers of Am., Inc.</i> , 748 F. Supp. 2d 323 (D. Vt. 2010)	29
<i>Allen v. Dairy Mktg. Servs., LLC</i> , 2013 WL 6909953 (D. Vt. Dec. 31, 2013)	12
<i>Apotex Corp. v. Hospira Healthcare India Private Ltd.</i> , 2020 WL 58247 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 6, 2020)	31
<i>Babyage.com, Inc. v. Toys R Us, Inc.</i> , 558 F. Supp. 2d 575 (E.D. Pa. 2008)	21, 25
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	8
<i>Blue Shield of Virginia v. McCready</i> , 457 U.S. 465 (1982).....	3, 16, 18
<i>Bookhouse of Stuyvesant Plaza, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 985 F. Supp. 2d 612 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)	10, 31
<i>Capital Imaging Assocs., P.C. v. Mohawk Valley Med. Assocs., Inc.</i> , 996 F.2d 537 (2d Cir. 1993).....	19
<i>Caruso Mgmt. Co. v. Int’l Council of Shopping Ctrs.</i> , 403 F. Supp. 3d 191 (S.D.N.Y. 2019)	19
<i>Commercial Data Servers, Inc. v. IBM</i> , 262 F. Supp. 2d 50 (S.D.N.Y. 2003)	31
<i>Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp.</i> , 467 U.S. 752 (1984).....	31
<i>Darush v. Revision LP</i> , 2013 WL 1749539 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 10, 2013)	33
<i>Dennis v. JPMorgan Chase & Co.</i> , 343 F. Supp. 3d 122 (S.D.N.Y. 2018)	19
<i>Discovery Fin. Servs., Inc. v. Visa U.S.A., Inc.</i> , 2005 WL 8178488 (S.D.N.Y. Nov. 10, 2005).....	10

<i>DSM Desotech Inc. v. 3D Sys. Corp.</i> , 2009 WL 174989 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 26, 2009).....	30
<i>Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Tech. Servs., Inc.</i> , 504 U.S. 451 (1992).....	8, 12, 31
<i>F&M Schaefer Corp. v. C. Schmidt & Sons, Inc.</i> , 597 F.2d 814 (2d Cir. 1979).....	25
<i>FTC v. AbbVie Inc.</i> , 976 F.3d 327 (3d Cir. 2020).....	19
<i>FTC v. Indiana Fed’n of Dentists</i> , 476 U.S. 447 (1986).....	29
<i>Geneva Pharm. Tech. Corp. v. Barr Labs. Inc.</i> , 386 F.3d 485 (2d Cir. 2004).....	13
<i>Gordon v. Amadeus IT Grp., S.A.</i> , 194 F. Supp. 3d 236 (S.D.N.Y. 2016)	22
<i>Hanover 3201 Realty, LLC v. Vill. Supermarkets, Inc.</i> , 806 F.3d 162 (3d Cir. 2015).....	18
<i>Heerwagen v. Clear Channel Commc’ns</i> , 435 F.3d 219 (2d Cir. 2006).....	14, 15
<i>In re Aggrenox Antitrust Litig.</i> , 199 F. Supp. 3d 662 (D. Conn. 2016).....	13, 32
<i>In re Aluminum Warehousing Antitrust Litig.</i> , 833 F.3d 151 (2d Cir. 2016).....	16, 18
<i>In re Commodity Exch., Inc.</i> , 213 F. Supp. 3d 631 (S.D.N.Y. 2016)	27
<i>In re Crude Oil Commodity Futures Litig.</i> , 913 F. Supp. 2d 41 (S.D.N.Y. 2012)	11
<i>In re Disposable Contact Lens Antitrust Litig.</i> , 215 F. Supp. 3d 1272 (M.D. Fla. 2016).....	24
<i>In re Keurig Green Mountain Single-Serve Coffee Antitrust Litig.</i> , 383 F. Supp. 3d 187 (S.D.N.Y. 2019)	12
<i>In re London Silver Fixing Ltd., Antitrust Litig.</i> , 213 F. Supp. 3d 530 (S.D.N.Y. 2016)	9

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.