UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

MICHELI & SHEL, LLC, *individually and on behalf* of others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

DOCKET

GRUBHUB INC., GRUBHUB INC. d/b/a SEAMLESS, SEAMLESS NORTH AMERICA, LLC, UBER TECHNOLOGIES INC., UBER EATS, POSTMATES LLC, and DOORDASH INC.,

Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-04995-JMF

DEFENDANT POSTMATES, LLC'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS

Andrew A. Ruffino Teena-Ann V. Sankoorikal COVINGTON & BURLING LLP The New York Times Building 620 Eighth Avenue New York, New York 10018-1405 Tel. (212) 841-1000 aruffino@cov.com tsankoorikal@cov.com

Counsel for Defendant Postmates, LLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT			
I.	BACK	GROUND	1
II.	LEGAL STANDARD		4
III.	I. ARGUMENT		4
	A.	There is No Private Right of Action Under Local Law Nos. 52 and 88	4
	B.	The Complaint Does Not Plausibly Allege Any Unlawful Conduct	8
	C.	Dismissal Should Be With Prejudice Because Amendment Would Be Futile	9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

DOCKET

Gayle v. Pfizer Inc., 452 F. Supp. 3d 78, 90 (S.D.N.Y. 2020), aff'd, 847 F. App'x 79 (2d Cir. 2021)10
Johnson v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A., 488 F. Supp. 3d 144, 158 (S.D.N.Y. 2020)
<i>Lively v. WAFRA Inv. Advisory Grp., Inc.,</i> 6 F.4th 293 (2d Cir. 2021)
<i>Madonna v. United States,</i> 878 F.2d 62 (2d Cir. 1989)4
Mark G. v. Sabol, 93 N.Y.2d 710 (1991)
Mitsui O.S.K. Lines, Ltd. v. Archer-Daniels-Midland Co., No. 17-CV-5588 (JMF), 2018 WL 3946446 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 16, 2018)4, 9
New York Wheel Owner LLC v. Mammoet Holding B.V., 481 F. Supp. 3d 216, 238 (S.D.N.Y. 2020)5
<i>Pincus v. Am. Traffic Sols., Inc.,</i> No. 18-CV-80864, 2019 WL 9355827 (S.D. Fla. Jan. 14, 2019), <i>aff'd</i> , 25 F.4th 1339 (11th Cir. 2022)
<i>Schlessinger v. Valspar Corp.</i> , 817 F. Supp. 2d 100 (E.D.N.Y. 2011), <i>aff'd</i> , 723 F.3d 396 (2d Cir. 2013)6, 7
Sheehy v. Big Flats Cmty. Day, Inc., 73 N.Y.2d 629 (1989)
<i>Uhr ex rel. Uhr v. E. Greenbush Cent. Sch. Dist.</i> , 94 N.Y.2d 32 (1999)
Yucyco, Ltd. v. Republic of Slovenia, 984 F. Supp. 209 (S.D.N.Y. 1997)9
Statutes
N.Y., Code § 20-563
N.Y., Code § 20-845

A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

N.Y., Code § 20-846	2, 3, 8
N.Y., Code § 20-848	

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

On behalf of a proposed class of New York City restaurants, plaintiff Micheli & Shel, LLC purports to assert claims against Postmates and other third-party food delivery services on the theory that they allegedly charged restaurants fees in excess of caps imposed by New York Local Law Nos. 52 and 88 during the COVID-19 pandemic.¹ Plaintiff's Complaint fails as a matter of law because neither Local Law No. 52 nor Local Law No. 88 included a private cause of action, and both have since been repealed. The plain text of those laws did not contemplate private enforcement, and the legislative history confirms none was intended. In any event, the Complaint is also bereft of well-pleaded factual allegations that could support any recovery.

Because plaintiff's claims are deficient facially as a matter of law, and because any attempt at amendment would be futile, the Court should dismiss the Complaint with prejudice and enter judgment on the pleadings in favor of Postmates.

I. BACKGROUND

On May 26, 2020, the New York City Council passed Local Law No. 52 as part of its response to the COVID-19 pandemic. *See* ECF No. 1 ("Compl.") ¶ $32.^2$ The law took effect on June 2, 2020, "seven days after it [became] law," and implemented a cap on "fees charged by third-party food delivery services during, and for 90 days after, a declared emergency that prohibits on-premises dining." *See* Compl., ¶ $33.^3$ This emergency fee cap law made it "unlawful for a third-party food delivery service to charge a food service establishment a

¹ This action is currently stayed pending arbitration as to all defendants other than Postmates. *See* ECF No. 79.

² See Local Law No. 52, N.Y. CITY COUNCIL (2020), https://legistar.council.nyc.gov/ LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4344564&GUID=BAB73224-E999-411A-8C42-1BDF14C0DACE.

³ See Local Law No. 52, N.Y. CITY COUNCIL (2020), https://legistar.council.nyc.gov/ LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=4344564&GUID=BAB73224-E999-411A-8C42-1BDF14C0DACE.

DOCKET A L A R M



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.