FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

KAREN STROMBERG; SAMUEL ROECKER; THOMAS LAMMEL; MARY GALLOWAY; DANIELLE LAGRAVE; THOMAS MCMAHON; BOARDSPORTS SCHOOL LLC; PATRICK BENAD; LINDSEY CARR; RENEE ACOSTA; PATRICIA BURNESS; CAROL HARRIS; ROBERT LINKS; NICHELLE LYONS; NUALA VIGNOLES; RACHEL L. MILLER; JOHN WILLIAM KIEFER III; MATTHEW MITCHELL; SUSAN GONZALEZ-PENDER; TERESE RUSSELL; SARAH KEY; DALIA ZATLIN; BETH CRANDALL; CLARISSA SIMON; KENDALL MARTIN; RODRIGO SAPLA; REBECCA DAVIS; THOMAS MCMANUS; KIMBERLY SCAVONE; MELISSA JU; CHRIS THOMPSON; MARTHA COUNTESS; KAREN HOOD; JAIME MARTIN; ADRIAN ESTEBAN; JEFFREY DAVIS; ERICSSON BROADBENT; PAUL SCOTT ERVIN; CARALYN TADA; NAGORE MILES; BETHANY RISING; JIYING SPENCER; DAYAN CRUTCHER; CATHERINE SCHMIDLIN; ALLISON TRIPP; LINDSAY SMITH; KATIE SMITH; KIRSTEN LUENZ; LAUREL VENER; STEPHEN JUDGE; SETH SALENGER;

DOCKE

No. 19-15159

D.C. No. 5:17-md-02773-LHK

OPINION

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

SCOTT HANSEN; JOSEPH KOVACEVICH; MICHELLE REYNOLDS; GEORGE MARUT; JANET ACKERMAN; ALAN SCHLAIKJER; LORI LANDES; JOYCE GRANTZ; GABRIELLE KURDT; JOHN SOLAK; TODD ESPINOSA; ANDREW WESTLEY; LAURA HALLAHAN; MARY C. MCDEVITT; PADRAIC J. BRENNAN; JASON SCHWARTZ; SUZANNE BLOCK; KEVIN CALERO; CARLO ENDOZO CARINGAL; IAN CARSON; ANDRE CRUZ; LUCAS RANGEL FERREIRA; MASOOD JAVAHERIAN; DAVID KOPLOVITZ; BRIAN LETULLE; DEIRDRE MCELHANEY; CARMEN MINON; ERICA MINON; GABRIEL MINON; BETSY SANTIAGO; JAVIER SANTIAGO; PETER YEE; ALICIA HADNETT; DANIEL CARROLL; DEBRA GRASL; AMANDA NEWSOME; DAVID KREUZER; ARMANDO HERRERA; EDEN WAGNER; NEIL WAGNER; ALLAN ROTMAN; SHARI COLE; PHILLIP JAMES ZACHARIAS; MARY BETH CUMMINS; GUY SNOWDY; CYNTHIA BAMBINI; GRANT HAUSCHILD; DAVID FLOYD; KIM COUGHLIN; BRANDON FULLER; LISA PATNODE; NINA BARTOSHEVICH; LEONIDAS MIRAS; JAMES CLARK, Plaintiffs-Appellees,

and

DOCKE

2

JORDIE BORNSTEIN; CORDT BYRNE; ELLIOT CARTER; JEFF CIOTTI; DWIGHT DICKERSON; MATTHEW CHRISTIANSON; LOGAN GRIESEMER; RYAN HART; WILLIAM HORTON; STEVE KRUG; GAIL MARGOLIS; KATE MORTENSEN; ALYSSA NEE; CHRISTOPHER WHALEN; STEPHAN FARID WOZNIAK; CHRISTOPHER ZAYAS-BAZAN; DAVID CARNEY; JULIE EWALD; TOM PARKIN; BRIAN DEPPERSCHMIDT; BRANDON STEELE; KYLE WEBER; CRAIG HOUSENICK; RYAN MARGULIS; RICHARD RIZZO; GUY DIETRICH; JEFFREY M. KURZON; SUSAN NAGY; NICOLAS YOUSIF; SCOTT FREDERICK; CHARLES POON; ANDREA HOGAN; TINA HEIM; MONICA MORROW; MARK CARDILLO; ALLISON SHIPP; MICHELLE MACKAY; COLLEEN SPARKE; JANET SILVERNESS; MELANIE BARCLAY; TIFFANY RINGO; HALLIE LINGO; CRYSTAL HOHENTHANER; DANIEL K. BRENDTRO; DANIEL DELIER; PAUL NELSON; CATHERINE KADERAVEK; KAREN CARLET; DAVID WARING; LEON THEODORE LIPKA III, Plaintiffs,

v.

DOCKE.

3

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED, Defendant-Appellant.

> Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of California Lucy H. Koh, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted December 2, 2019 Submission Withdrawn March 3, 2020 Resubmitted September 21, 2021 San Francisco, California

Filed September 29, 2021

Before: Eugene E. Siler^{*}, Jay S. Bybee, and Ryan D. Nelson, Circuit Judges.

Opinion by Judge R. Nelson

^{*} The Honorable Eugene E. Siler Jr., Senior United States Circuit Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, sitting by designation.

Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at docketalarm.com.

SUMMARY**

Antitrust / Class Certification

The panel vacated the district court's order certifying a nationwide indirect purchaser class in an antitrust multidistrict litigation seeking injunctive and monetary relief under §§ 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act and California law against Qualcomm Incorporated, and remanded for reconsideration of the plaintiffs' claims given FTC v. *Qualcomm Inc.*, 969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020) (holding that Qualcomm's modem chip licensing practices did not violate the Sherman Act, and there was nothing to be enjoined because its exclusive dealing agreements with Apple did not substantially foreclose competition and were terminated years ago).

The plaintiffs, consumers who bought cellphones, alleged that Qualcomm maintained a monopoly in modem chips, harming consumers because the amount attributable to an allegedly excessive royalty was passed through the distribution chain to consumers in the form of higher prices or reduced quality in cellphones. The district court certified a damages class under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) and an injunctive relief class under Rule 23(b)(2).

Vacating the Rule 23(b)(3) class certification order, the panel held that the class was erroneously certified under a faulty choice of law analysis because differences in relevant state laws swamped predominance. The panel held that

5

^{**} This summary constitutes no part of the opinion of the court. It has been prepared by court staff for the convenience of the reader.

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.