

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X
DOORDASH, INC., GRUBHUB INC., and
PORTIER, LLC,

Plaintiffs,

21-cv-7564 (GHW)

- against -

CITY OF NEW YORK,

Defendant(s).

-----X
**DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO
DISMISS THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT**

HON. SYLVIA HINDS-RADIX
Corporation Counsel of the
City of New York
Attorney for Defendant
100 Church Street
New York, New York 10007
Tel: (212) 356-1662

Michelle Goldberg-Cahn
Darren Trotter
Kevin Collins,
of Counsel.

Jessica Katzen,
on the brief

March 7, 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	ii
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
ARGUMENT.....	2
STANDARD OF REVIEW	2
A. THE FAC FAILS TO PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE A CONTRACTS CLAUSE VIOLATION	3
i. The Ordinance Does Not Substantially Impair Plaintiffs’ Contracts	4
ii. The City Had a Significant and Legitimate Public Interest in Enacting the Ordinance.....	6
iii. The Ordinance is a Reasonable and Appropriate Means to Achieve the City’s Significant and Legitimate Public Interest.....	8
B. PLAINTIFFS’ REGULATORY TAKINGS CLAIM FAILS	12
i. Plaintiffs’ Contracts Do Not Give Rise to a Claim Under the Takings Clause.....	12
ii. The FAC Fails to Establish a Regulatory Taking	13
C. THE ENACTMENT OF THE ORDINANCE DOES NOT EXCEED THE CITY’S POLICE POWER	16
D. THE FAC FAILS TO PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE A PROCEDURAL DUE PROCESS CLAIM	18
E. THE FAC FAILS TO PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE A EQUAL PROTECTION VIOLATION.....	19
F. THE FAC FAILS TO PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE A DORMANT COMMERCE CLAUSE VIOLATION	22
CONCLUSION.....	26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<u>1256 Hertel Avenue Assocs., LLC v. Calloway</u> , 761 F.3d 252 (2d Cir. 2014)	15
<u>Allied Structural Steel Co. v. Spannaus</u> , 438 U.S. 234 (1978)	6
<u>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</u> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	2
<u>Ass'n of Surrogates & Supreme Court Reporters v. New York</u> , 940 F.2d 766 (2d Cir. 1991)	8
<u>Bell Atlantic v. Twombly</u> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007)	2
<u>Big Apple Food Vendors' Ass'n v. City of New York</u> , 168 Misc. 2d 483 (Sup. Ct. N.Y. Cty. 1995), <u>aff'd</u>	17
<u>Buffalo Teachers Fed'n v. Tobe</u> , 464 F.3d 362 (2d Cir. 2006)	<i>passim</i>
<u>Casciani v. Nesbitt</u> , 659 F. Supp. 2d 427 (W.D.N.Y. 2009)	17
<u>CCA Assocs. v. United States</u> , 667 F.3d 1239 (Fed. Cir. 2011)	14
<u>Chambers v. Time Warner</u> , 282 F.3d 147 (2d Cir. 2002)	3
<u>Concrete Pipe & Prods. of Cal. v. Constr. Laborers Pensions Trust for S. Cal.</u> , 508 U.S. 602 (1993)	14
<u>Connolly v. Pension Benefit Guaranty Corp.</u> , 475 U.S. 211 (1986)	12, 13
<u>Cortec Indus. v. Sum Holding L.P.</u> , 949 F.2d 42 (2d Cir. 1991)	3
<u>CTS Corp. v. Dynamics Corp. of America</u> , 481 U.S. 69 (1987)	25
<u>D'Amico v. Crosson</u> , 93 N.Y.2d 29 (1999)	20

..

Dandridge v. Williams,
390 U.S. 471 (1970) 22

DJL Rest. Corp. v. City of New York,
96 N.Y.2d 91 (2001)..... 16, 17

Energy Reserves Grp., Inc. v. Kansas Power & Light Co.,
459 U.S. 400 (1982) *passim*

F.C.C. v. Beach Commc’ns, Inc.,
508 U.S. 307 (1993) 20

Fitzgerald v. Racing Ass’n of Cent. Iowa,
539 U.S. 103 (2003) 21

Freedom Holdings, Inc. v. Spitzer,
357 F.3d 205 (2d Cir. 2004) 22

GMC v. Tracy,
519 U.S. 278 (1997) 22, 23

Grand River Enters. Six Nations, Ltd. v. Pryor,
425 F.3d 158 (2d Cir. 2005) 25

Healy v. Beer Inst.,
491 U.S. 324 (1989) 23

Heidel v. Hochul,
2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 203572 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 21, 2021)..... 12

Heller v. Doe,
509 U.S. 312 (1993) 20

Hernandez v. United States,
939 F.3d 191 (2d Cir. 2019) 18

Joglo Realties, Inc. v. Seggos,
229 F. Supp. 3d 146 (E.D.N.Y. 2017) 3

Jones v. Schneiderman,
974 F. Supp. 2d 322 (S.D.N.Y. 2013) 23

Lefrancois v. Rhode Island,
669 F. Supp 1204 (D.R.I. 1987) 4, 5

Martin v. Town of Simsbury,
505 F. Supp. 3d 116 (2d Cir. 2020) 15

Matusovsky v. Merrill Lynch,
186 F. Supp. 2d 397 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) 3

...

Melendez v. City of New York,
2021 U.S. App. LEXIS 32327 (2d Cir. 2021) 5, 10, 11, 12

MHC Fin. L.P. v. City of San Rafael,
714 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2013) 14

Norfolk Southern Corp. v. Oberly,
822 F.2d 388 (3d Cir. 1987) 25

Or. Waste Sys. v. Dep’t of Env’tl. Quality,
511 U.S. 93 (1994) 24

Penn Central Transp. Co. v. New York City,
438 U.S. 104 (1978) 13, 16

Pennell v. City of San Jose,
485 U.S. 1 (1988) 18

People v. DeJesus,
54 N.Y.2d 465 (1981)..... 16

People v. Lewis,
295 N.Y. 42 (1945)..... 17

Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.
397 U.S. 137 (1970) 25

Ruckelshaus v. Monsanto Co.,
467 U.S. 986 (1984) 15

Sanitation and Recycling Indus., Inc. v. City of New York,
107 F.3d 985 (2d Cir. 1997) 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 15

Sazerac Co. v. Falk,
861 F. Supp. 253 (S.D.N.Y. 1994) 3

Sensational Smiles, LLC v. Mullen,
793 F.3d 281 (2d Cir. 2015) 20

Shumway v. UPS,
118 F.3d 60 (1997) 20

Sullivan v. Nassau Cty. Interim Fin. Auth.,
959 F.3d 54 (2d Cir. 2020) *passim*

Taylor v. United States,
959 F.3d 1081 (Fed. Cir. 2020) 15

TCF Nat. Bank v. Bernanke,
643 F.3d 1158 (8th Cir. 2001) 19

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.