

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----	X	
SONIA SPATES, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON	:	Index No. 1:21-cv-10155
BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY	:	
SITUATED,	:	
	:	
Plaintiffs,	:	Hon. Andrew L. Carter, Jr
	:	
-against-	:	
	:	
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
-----	X	

**UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.’S MEMORANDUM OF LAW
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION**

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP

Claudia M. Vetesi
Tiffany Cheung
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
Tel: (415) 268-7000
CVetesi@mof.com
TCheung@mof.com

Adam J. Hunt
250 West 55th Street
New York, New York 10019
Tel: (212) 468-8000
AHunt@mof.com

*Attorneys for Defendant
Uber Technologies, Inc.*



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES ii

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS 3

 A. Plaintiff Agreed to Uber’s 2017 Terms of Use When She Registered Her Account.
 3

 B. Uber’s 2017 Terms Include an Arbitration Provision With a Delegation Clause
 and a Provision That Permits Uber to Update its Terms 4

 C. Uber Properly Updated its Terms of Use and Plaintiff Did Not Reject the
 Changes..... 5

 D. Plaintiff Ignored The Arbitration Provisions and Filed Suit..... 6

LEGAL STANDARD..... 7

ARGUMENT..... 8

I. PLAINTIFF MUST INDIVIDUALLY ARBITRATE HER CLAIMS..... 8

 A. Plaintiff Agreed To Be Bound by Uber’s Terms, Which Govern Plaintiff’s
 Claims. 8

 B. The FAA Applies To The Arbitration Provisions Contained in Uber’s Terms..... 9

 C. New York Law Governs Any Dispute Concerning The Enforceability Or Scope
 Of The Arbitration Provision Contained in Uber’s Terms. 10

 D. Under The FAA And New York Law, the Arbitration Provision Contained in
 Uber’s Terms of Use Is Valid And Must Be Enforced..... 11

 1. The Parties’ Agreement requires the arbitrator to decide all issues of
 arbitrability..... 11

 2. Plaintiff’s claims are subject to arbitration because the “gateway” issues
 have been satisfied. 15

 a. Plaintiff entered into valid Arbitration Agreement(s)..... 15

 b. Plaintiff’s claims fall squarely within the scope of Uber’s Terms of
 Use 16

 E. Plaintiff Must Arbitrate Her Claims on an Individual Basis..... 18

II. THIS ACTION SHOULD BE DISMISSED OR STAYED PENDING THE
 COMPLETION OF INDIVIDUAL ARBITRATION..... 18

CONCLUSION..... 19

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aleksanian v. Uber Technologies, Inc.</i> , 524 F. Supp. 3d 251 (S.D.N.Y. 2021) (Carter, J.)	2, 13, 14, 19
<i>Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson</i> , 513 U.S. 265 (1995).....	9
<i>Am. Express Co. v. Italian Colors Rest.</i> , 570 U.S. 228 (2013).....	7, 11
<i>In re Am. Express Fin. Advisors Sec. Litig.</i> , 672 F.3d 113 (2d Cir. 2011).....	15
<i>AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion</i> , 563 U.S. 333 (2011).....	10
<i>Buckeye Check Cashing, Inc. v. Cardegna</i> , 546 U.S. 440 (2006).....	9
<i>Camilo v. Lyft, Inc.</i> , 384 F. Supp. 3d 435 (S.D.N.Y. 2019) (Carter, J.)	10
<i>Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc.</i> , 539 U.S. 52 (2003).....	10
<i>Contec Corp. v. Remote Sol., Co.</i> , 398 F.3d 205 (2d Cir. 2005).....	12
<i>Cordas v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , 228 F. Supp. 3d 985 (N.D. Cal. 2017)	10
<i>Darcheal Reed v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 22-cv-00596 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 28, 2022) (attached as Ex. D to Vetesti Decl.).....	2, 6
<i>Dean Witter Reynolds, Inc v. Byrd</i> , 470 U.S. 213 (1985).....	18
<i>DIRECTV, Inc. v. Imburgia</i> , 577 U.S. 47 (2015).....	18
<i>Epic Sys. Corp. v. Lewis</i> , 138 S. Ct. 1612 (2018).....	18

Feld v. Uber Techs., Inc.,
 No. 19STCV26766 (Cal. Super. Ct., L.A. Cty., Apr. 17, 2020) (attached as
 Ex. A to Vetesti Decl.).....14

Fteja v. Facebook, Inc.,
 841 F. Supp. 2d 829 (S.D.N.Y. 2012).....16

Guan v. Uber Techs., Inc.,
 236 F. Supp. 3d 711 (E.D.N.Y. 2017)3, 8, 11, 14

Gunn v. Uber Techs., Inc.,
 No. 16-CV-1668, 2017 WL 386816 (S.D. Ind. Jan. 27, 2017).....14

Guyden v. Aetna, Inc.,
 544 F.3d 376 (2d Cir. 2008).....19

Hartford Accident & Indem. Co. v. Swiss Reinsurance Am. Corp.,
 246 F.3d 219 (2d Cir. 2001).....12

Hines v. Overstock.com, Inc.,
 380 Fed. Appx. 22 (2d Cir. 2010).....15

Horton v. Dow Jones & Co., Inc.,
 804 F. App'x 81 (2d Cir. 2020)14

Kindred Nursing Ctrs. Ltd. P'ship v. Clark,
 137 S. Ct. 1421 (2017).....7

Klein v. ATP Flight Sch., LLP,
 No. 14-CV-1522 JFB GRB, 2014 WL 3013294 (E.D.N.Y. July 3, 2014)10

Lee v. Uber Techs., Inc.,
 208 F. Supp. 3d 886 (N.D. Ill. 2016)14

Man Fong Wong v. 1st Disc. Brokerage, Inc.,
 No. 10 CV 1487 ENV, 2011 WL 1298857 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 6, 2011).....12

Matthews v. Uber Techs., Inc.,
 No. CGC-20-584582 (Cal. Super. Ct., S.F. Cty., Nov. 18, 2020) (attached as
 Ex. C to Vetesi Decl.)2, 6, 14

McGill v. Citibank, N.A.,
 2 Cal. 5th 945 (2017)14

Merrick v. UnitedHealth Grp. Inc.,
 127 F. Supp. 3d 138 (S.D.N.Y. 2015).....19

<i>Micheli & Shel, LLC v. Grubhub Inc.</i> , No. 21-CV-4995 (JMF), 2022 WL 622828 (S.D.N.Y. Mar. 1, 2022).....	11, 18
<i>Monarch Consulting, Inc. v. Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, PA</i> , 26 N.Y.3d 659 (N.Y. 2016)	13
<i>Mortensen v. Bresnan Commc'ns, LLC</i> , 722 F.3d 1151	7
<i>Moses H. Cone Mem'l Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp.</i> , 460 U.S. 1 (1983).....	18, 19
<i>Nicosia v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , No. 14 CV 4513 (SLT)(LB), 2017 WL 10111078 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 18, 2017).....	8
<i>O'Callaghan v. Uber Corp. of Cal.</i> , No. 17 Civ. 2094 (ER), 2018 WL 3302179 (S.D.N.Y. July 3, 2018).....	15
<i>PaineWebber Inc. v. Bybyk</i> , 81 F.3d 1193 (2d Cir. 1996).....	12, 13
<i>Peng v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , 237 F. Supp. 3d 36 (E.D.N.Y. 2017)	14
<i>Rent-A-Center, West, Inc. v. Jackson</i> , 561 U.S. 63 (2010).....	12
<i>Sena v. Uber Techs. Inc.</i> , No. CV-15-02418-PHX-DLR, 2016 WL 1376445 (D. Ariz. Apr. 7, 2016).....	14
<i>Southland Corp. v. Keating</i> , 465 U.S. 1 (1984).....	7
<i>Spinelli v. Nat'l Football League</i> , 96 F. Supp. 3d 81 (S.D.N.Y. 2015).....	17
<i>Starke v. Gilt Groupe, Inc.</i> , No. 13 Civ. 5497(LLS), 2014 WL 1652225 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 24, 2014).....	15, 16
<i>Suarez v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , No. 8:16-CV-166, 2016 WL 2348706 (M.D. Fla. May 4, 2016).....	14
<i>Sutherland v. Ernst & Young LLP</i> , 726 F.3d 290 (2d Cir. 2013).....	14, 18
<i>Totalplan Corp. of Am. v. Colborne</i> , 14 F.3d 824 (2d Cir. 1994).....	11

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.