

ORAL ARGUMENT NOT SCHEDULED

No. 21-7078

**United States Court of Appeals
for the District of Columbia Circuit**

STATE OF NEW YORK, *et al.*,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC.,
Defendant-Appellee,

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Columbia, No. 1:20-cv-03589
The Honorable James E. Boasberg

**BRIEF OF THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS
CURIAE SUPPORTING PLAINTIFFS-APPELLANTS**

Jonathan S. Kanter

Assistant Attorney General

Doha G. Mekki

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

David B. Lawrence

Policy Director

Daniel E. Haar

Nickolai G. Levin

Adam D. Chandler

Cecilia Y. Cheng

Attorneys

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ANTITRUST DIVISION

950 Pennsylvania Ave., NW #3320

Washington, DC 20530

202-514-2886

Nickolai.Levin@usdoj.gov

Counsel for United States of America

January 28, 2022

CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS, AND RELATED CASES

Pursuant to D.C. Circuit Rule 28(a)(1), the undersigned counsel certifies as follows:

A. Parties and Amici

The plaintiffs-appellants are the State of New York, District of Columbia, State of California, State of Colorado, State of Florida, State of Iowa, State of Nebraska, State of North Carolina, State of Ohio, State of Tennessee, State of Alaska, State of Arizona, State of Arkansas, State of Connecticut, State of Delaware, Territory of Guam, State of Hawaii, State of Idaho, State of Illinois, State of Indiana, State of Kansas, Commonwealth of Kentucky, State of Louisiana, State of Maine, State of Maryland, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, State of Michigan, State of Minnesota, State of Mississippi, State of Missouri, State of Montana, State of Nebraska, State of Nevada, State of New Hampshire, State of New Jersey, State of New Mexico, State of North Dakota, State of Oklahoma, State of Oregon, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, State of Rhode Island, State of Texas, State of Utah, State of Vermont, Commonwealth of Virginia, State of Washington, State of West Virginia, State of Wisconsin, and State of Wyoming.

The defendant-appellee is Facebook, Inc. In October 2021, Facebook, Inc. changed its name to Meta Platforms, Inc.; however, the caption in this case has not been changed.

The parties and caption in this Court are the same as in the district court.

In this Court, the United States appears as amicus curiae supporting plaintiffs-appellants. The Committee to Support the Antitrust Laws, Economists (Daron Acemoglu, Cristina Caffarra, Gregory S. Crawford, Tomaso Duso, Florian Ederer, Massimo Motta, Martin Peitz, Thomas Philippon, Nancy L. Rose, Robert Seamans, Hal Singer, Marshall Steinbaum, Joseph E. Stiglitz, Ted Tatos, Tommaso Valletti, Luigi Zingales), and Former State Antitrust Enforcement Officials and Antitrust Law Professors (Lloyd Constantine, Harry First, Aaron Edlin, Andrew Chin, Andrew I. Gavil, Andrew Rossner, Anne Schneider, Barak Richman, Barak Y. Orbach, Charles G. Brown, Christopher L. Sagers, Dan Drachler, Darren Bush, Don Allen Resnikoff, Edward Cavanagh, Eleanor Fox, Ellen Cooper, George Sampson, James Tierney, Jeffrey L. Harrison, John B. Kirkwood, Joshua P. Davis, Kevin J. O'Connor, Marina Lao, Maurice Eitel Stucke, Norman W. Hawker, Pamela Jones Harbour, Paul F. Novak, Peter Carstensen, Rebecca Haw Allensworth, Robert Abrams, Robert H. Lande, Samuel N. Weinstein, Steven M. Rutstein, Susan Beth Farmer, Tam Ormiston, Thomas Greaney, Thomas J. Horton, and Warren Grimes) all appear as amicus curiae, also supporting plaintiffs-appellants.

B. Rulings Under Review

References to the rulings at issue appear in the Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants.

C. Related Cases

A list of related cases appears in the Brief for Plaintiffs-Appellants.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS, AND RELATED CASES	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	iv
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
GLOSSARY OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
INTEREST OF THE UNITED STATES	1
STATUTORY PROVISIONS	1
ISSUES PRESENTED.....	2
STATEMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT	4
I. THE DISTRICT COURT MISAPPLIED SECTION 2 OF THE SHERMAN ACT	6
A. The District Court Erred By Disaggregating Plaintiffs’ Monopolization Claim.....	8
B. The District Court Did Not Properly Analyze Plaintiffs’ Platform Allegations.....	13
1. Many Platform Allegations Do Not Challenge Unilateral Refusals To Deal.....	14
2. No Universal Checklist Governs All Unilateral Refusal- To-Deal Claims.....	19
3. This Case Presents Materially Different Market Realities From <i>Trinko</i>	24
II. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRONEOUSLY RULED OUT THE POSSIBILITY OF INJUNCTIVE RELIEF	27
CONCLUSION.....	31
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	33

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.