

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

SAMIR ALI CHERIF BENOUIS,
Individually and On Behalf of All Others
Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

MATCH GROUP, INC., AMANDA W.
GINSBERG, and GARY SWIDLER,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:19-cv-02356

Class Action

**PLAINTIFF'S MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION AND APPOINTMENT
OF CLASS REPRESENTATIVE AND CLASS COUNSEL**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT1

PROCEDURAL HISTORY4

STATEMENT OF FACTS5

I. THE CWS DETAILED THE ALLEGED FRAUD.....6

 A. Pervasive Fraudulent And Bad Actor Accounts6

 B. Deficient Anti-Fraud Measures Despite Dangerous Users.....8

II. THE SAC PLEADS ACTIONABLE MISSTATEMENTS9

 A. The Membership Integrity Fraud10

 B. The Reported Results Fraud.....11

III. DEFENDANTS’ SCIENTER.....11

IV. PARTIAL REVELATIONS OF FRAUD DAMAGED CLASS MEMBERS13

ARGUMENT14

I. APPLICABLE LEGAL STANDARDS14

II. THE CLASS SHOULD BE CERTIFIED UNDER FED. R. CIV. P. 23 WITH THE LEAD PLAINTIFF AS CLASS REPRESENTATIVE.....15

 A. Rule 23(a)’s Four Requirements Are All Satisfied.....15

 1. The Proposed Class Is So Numerous That Joinder Is Impracticable15

 2. Numerous Questions Of Law Or Fact Are Common To The Class17

 3. Lead Plaintiff’s Claims Are Typical Of The Class Members’ Claims18

 4. Lead Plaintiff Will Fairly And Adequately Protect The Class Interests....19

 B. Rule 23(b)(3) Class Action Certification Is Appropriate.....21

 1. Common Questions Of Law And Fact Predominate22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Affiliated Ute Citizens of Utah v. U.S.</i> , 406 U.S. 128 (1972).....	3, 22, 30
<i>Alaska Elec. Pension Fund v. Flowserve Corp.</i> , 572 F.3d 221 (5th Cir. 2009)	15
<i>Amchem Prods., Inc. v. Windsor</i> , 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....	14, 15, 20, 21, 22
<i>Amgen Inc. v. Conn. Ret. Plans & Trust Funds</i> , 568 U.S. 455 (2013).....	15, 22, 23, 24
<i>Asarco LLC v. Ams. Mining Corp.</i> , 396 B.R. 278 (S.D. Tex. 2008)	26
<i>Basic, Inc. v. Levinson</i> , 485 U.S. 224 (1988).....	2, 23, 31
<i>Bell v. Ascendant Solutions, Inc.</i> , 422 F.3d 307 (5th Cir. 2005)	25
<i>Berger v. Compaq Computer Corp.</i> , 257 F.3d 475 (5th Cir. 2001)	20
<i>Buettgen v. Harless</i> , No. 3:09-CV-791-K, 2011 WL 1938130 (N.D. Tex. May 19, 2011)	17
<i>Bywaters v. U.S.</i> , 196 F.R.D. 458 (E.D. Tex. 2000).....	14
<i>Cammer v. Bloom</i> , 711 F. Supp. 1264 (D.N.J. 1989)	3, 16, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29
<i>Cheney v. Cyberguard Corp.</i> , 213 F.R.D. 484 (S.D. Fla. 2003).....	29, 30
<i>City of Sterling Heights Gen. Emps. Ret. Sys. v. Prudential Fin., Inc.</i> , No. 12-5275, 2015 WL 5097883 (D.N.J. Aug. 31, 2015)	28, 29
<i>Comcast Corp. v. Behrend</i> , 569 U.S. 27 (2013).....	3, 31, 32

Crutchfield v. Match Group, Inc., No. 19-cv-2356-S,
2021 WL 1167578 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 26, 2021)4

Crutchfield v. Match Group, Inc., No. 19-cv-2356-S,
2021 WL 5480682 (N.D. Tex. Nov. 19, 2021).....5

Dura Pharm., Inc. v. Broudo,
544 U.S. 336 (2005).....14

Erica P. John Fund, Inc. v. Halliburton Co.,
563 U.S. 804 (2011).....15, 22

Finkel v. Docutel/Olivetti Corp.,
817 F.2d 356 (5th Cir. 1987)30

Halliburton Co. v. Erica P. John Fund, Inc.,
573 U.S. 258 (2014).....23

Hayes v. MagnaChip Semiconductor Corp., No. 14-cv-01160-JST,
2016 WL 7406418 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2016).....16

Horton v. Goose Creek Indep. Sch. Dist.,
690 F.2d 470 (5th Cir. 1982)14

In re Banc of Cal. Sec. Litig.,
326 F.R.D. 640 (C.D. Cal. 2018).....16

In re Blech Sec. Litig.,
187 F.R.D. 97 (S.D.N.Y. 1999)32

In re BP p.l.c. Sec. Litig., No. 10-md-2185,
2014 WL 2112823 (S.D. Tex. May 20, 2014),
aff'd sub nom.,
Ludlow v. BP, P.L.C., 800 F.3d 674 (5th Cir. 2015)31

In re Cobalt Int'l Energy, Inc. Sec. Litig., No. H-14-3428,
2017 WL 2608243 (S.D. Tex. June 15, 2017).....18

In re Deepwater Horizon,
739 F.3d 790 (5th Cir. 2014)17, 21

In re Dell Inc., No. A-06-CA-726-SS,
2010 WL 2371834 (W.D. Tex. June 11, 2010),
aff'd, appeal dismissed sub nom.,
Union Asset Mgmt. Holding A.G. v. Dell, Inc., 669 F.3d 632 (5th Cir. 2012)16

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.