

Nos. 21-16506 & 21-16695

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

EPIC GAMES, INC.,
Plaintiff, Counter-defendant – Appellant, Cross-Appellee,

v.

APPLE INC.,
Defendant, Counterclaimant – Appellee, Cross-Appellant.

Appeal from the U.S. District Court
for the Northern District of California
The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers (No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR-TSH)

**REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL AND
RESPONSE BRIEF ON CROSS-APPEAL OF
APPELLANT, CROSS-APPELLEE EPIC GAMES, INC.**

Christine A. Varney
Katherine B. Forrest
Gary A. Bornstein
Antony L. Ryan
Yonatan Even
Omid H. Nasab
CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP
825 Eighth Avenue
New York, NY 10019-7475
(212) 474-1000

Paul J. Riehle
FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH
LLP
Four Embarcadero Center
San Francisco, CA 94111-4180
(415) 591-7500

Thomas C. Goldstein
GOLDSTEIN & RUSSELL, P.C.
7475 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 850
Bethesda, MD 20814-6902
(202) 362-0636

Counsel for Appellant, Cross-Appellee Epic Games, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
STATUTORY PROVISIONS.....	xvii
INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	5
ARGUMENT ON EPIC’S APPEAL	8
I. THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN REJECTING EPIC’S SECTION 1 CLAIMS.	8
A. Epic Proved Its Section 1 Claims Under the District Court’s Market.	8
B. Epic Has Challenged a Contract in Restraint of Trade.	10
1. Apple’s Contractual Restraints Are Not Unilateral Conduct.	12
2. IP Agreements Are Not Carved Out of Section 1.	14
3. The Challenged Contractual Restraints Are Not “Technical Requirements” of iOS.	18
C. Apple’s Restrictions Do Not Survive Rule of Reason Scrutiny.....	22
1. The District Court Found Substantial Anticompetitive Effects.	22
2. The District Court Used the Wrong Legal Framework To Evaluate Apple’s Procompetitive Justifications.	31
3. The District Court’s Findings Establish Less Restrictive Alternatives.	38
4. The District Court’s Failure To Balance Was Error.	47

II.	THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN REJECTING EPIC’S SECTION 2 CLAIMS.	57
A.	The District Court Erred in Rejecting Epic’s Foremarket.	57
B.	The District Court Erred in Rejecting Epic’s Aftermarkets.	61
1.	The District Court and Apple Use the Wrong Framework for Aftermarket Lock-In.	62
2.	Direct Evidence of Apple’s Monopoly Power Confirms Epic’s Aftermarkets.	65
C.	Epic Correctly Analyzed the Markets Under <i>Amex</i>	71
D.	Epic’s Aftermarkets Should Not Be Limited to Game Transactions.	75
E.	Apple’s Restrictions Do Not Survive Rule of Reason Scrutiny.	77
III.	THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN REJECTING EPIC’S TYING CLAIM.	79
IV.	THE CONTRACTUAL RESTRICTIONS AT ISSUE ARE UNLAWFUL, VOID AS AGAINST PUBLIC POLICY, AND UNCONSCIONABLE.	83
	ARGUMENT ON APPLE’S CROSS-APPEAL.	85
I.	APPLE’S POST-JUDGMENT CONDUCT DOES NOT MOOT EPIC’S CLAIM.	87
II.	EPIC’S UCL CLAIM IS NOT FORECLOSED AS A MATTER OF LAW.	91
A.	“Unfair” Conduct Need Not Be “Unlawful.”	92

B.	The District Court Correctly Applied Both the Competitor Tethering and Consumer Balancing Tests To Find Apple Violated the UCL.	96
1.	Epic Satisfied <i>Cel-Tech's</i> Competitor Test.....	98
2.	Epic Satisfied the Consumer Balancing Test.	100
C.	Comprehensive Market Definition Analysis Is Not Required for UCL Unfairness Claims.	101
D.	<i>Amex</i> Has No Bearing on UCL Claims or Apple's Anti-Steering Restraints.	104
III.	THE UCL INJUNCTION WAS WITHIN THE DISTRICT COURT'S AUTHORITY.....	106
A.	The District Court Properly Exercised Its Authority Under California Law.	106
B.	The District Court Properly Exercised Its Authority Under Federal Law.	109
IV.	THE DISTRICT COURT CORRECTLY INTERPRETED APPLE'S INDEMNIFICATION CLAUSE.	113
	CONCLUSION.....	116

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Alki Partners, LP v. DB Fund Servs., LLC</i> , 4 Cal. App. 5th 574 (2016)	113, 114, 115
<i>Allen-Myland, Inc. v. IBM Corp.</i> , 33 F.3d 194 (3d Cir. 1994)	10
<i>Allied Orthopedic Appliances Inc. v. Tyco Health Care Grp.</i> , 592 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2010).....	54
<i>Am. States Ins. Co. v. Dastar Corp.</i> , 318 F.3d 881 (9th Cir. 2003).....	89
<i>Am. Needle, Inc. v. NFL</i> , 560 U.S. 183 (2010)	13
<i>Ariz. Dream Act Coal. v. Brewer</i> , 855 F.3d 957 (9th Cir. 2017).....	112
<i>Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.</i> , 472 U.S. 585 (1985)	17
<i>Avaya Inc., RP v. Telecom Labs, Inc.</i> , 838 F.3d 354 (3d Cir. 2016)	62, 63
<i>Barquis v. Merchs. Collection Ass’n</i> , 7 Cal. 3d 94 (1972)	93
<i>Beaver v. Tarsadia Hotels</i> , 816 F.3d 1170 (9th Cir. 2016).....	93
<i>Berkey Photo, Inc. v. Eastman Kodak Co.</i> , 603 F.2d 263 (2d Cir. 1979)	36
<i>Bresgal v. Brock</i> , 843 F.2d 1163 (9th Cir. 1987).....	108, 110, 111

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.