

**FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

EPIC GAMES, INC.,  
*Plaintiff-counter-  
defendant-Appellant,*

v.

APPLE, INC.,  
*Defendant-counter-  
claimant- Appellee.*

No. 21-16506

D.C. No.  
4:20-cv-05640-  
YGR

OPINION

EPIC GAMES, INC.,  
*Plaintiff-counter-  
defendant-Appellee,*

v.

APPLE, INC.,  
*Defendant-counter-  
claimant-Appellant.*

No. 21-16695

D.C. No.  
4:20-cv-05640-  
YGR

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted November 14, 2022  
San Francisco, California

Filed April 24, 2023

Before: SIDNEY R. THOMAS and MILAN D. SMITH,  
JR., Circuit Judges, and MICHAEL J. MCSHANE,\*  
District Judge.

Opinion by Judge Milan D. Smith, Jr.;  
Partial Concurrence and Partial Dissent by Judge S.R.  
Thomas

---

**SUMMARY\*\***

---

**Antitrust**

The panel affirmed in part and reversed in part the district court's judgment, after a bench trial, against Epic Games, Inc., on its Sherman Act claims for restraint of trade, tying, and monopoly maintenance against Apple, Inc.; in favor of Epic on its claim under California's Unfair Competition Law; against Epic on Apple's claim for breach of contract; and against Apple on its claim for attorney fees. The panel affirmed except for the district court's ruling respecting attorney fees, where it reversed and remanded for further proceedings.

---

\* The Honorable Michael J. McShane, United States District Judge for the District of Oregon, sitting by designation.

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

The panel explained that, when Apple opened the iPhone to third-party app developers, it created a “walled garden,” rather than an open ecosystem in which developers and users could transact freely without mediation from Apple. Epic alleged that Apple acted unlawfully by restricting app distribution on iOS devices to Apple’s App Store, requiring in-app purchases on iOS devices to use Apple’s in-app payment processor, and limiting the ability of app developers to communicate the availability of alternative payment options to iOS device users. These restrictions were imposed under the Developer Program Licensing Agreement (“DPLA”), which developers were required to sign in order to distribute apps to iOS users. The district court rejected Epic’s Sherman Act §§ 1 and 2 claims challenging the first and second restrictions, principally on the factual grounds that Epic failed to propose viable less restrictive alternatives to Apple’s restrictions. The district court concluded that the third restriction was unfair pursuant to the California UCL and enjoined Apple from enforcing it against any developer. The district court held that Epic breached its contract with Apple but was not obligated to pay Apple’s attorney fees.

On Epic’s appeal, the panel affirmed the district court’s denial of antitrust liability and its corresponding rejection of Epic’s illegality defense to Apple’s breach of contract counter-claim. The panel held that the district court erred as a matter of law in defining the relevant antitrust market and in holding that a non-negotiated contract of adhesion, such as the DPLA, falls outside the scope of Sherman Act § 1, but those errors were harmless. The panel held that, independent of the district court’s errors, Epic failed to establish, as a factual matter, its proposed market definition and the existence of any substantially less restrictive

alternative means for Apple to accomplish the procompetitive justifications supporting iOS's walled-garden ecosystem.

On Apple's cross-appeal, the panel affirmed as to the district court's UCL ruling in favor of Epic, holding that the district court did not clearly err in finding that Epic was injured, err as a matter of law when applying California's flexible liability standards, or abuse its discretion when fashioning equitable relief. Reversing in part, the panel held that the district court erred when it ruled that Apple was not entitled to attorney fees pursuant to the DPLA's indemnification provision.

Concurring in part and dissenting in part, Judge S.R. Thomas wrote that he fully agreed with the majority that the district court properly granted Epic injunctive relief on its California UCL claims. Judge S.R. Thomas also fully agreed that the district court properly rejected Epic's illegality defenses to the DPLA but that, contrary to the district court's decision, the DPLA did require Epic to pay attorney fees for its breach. On the federal claims, Judge S.R. Thomas also agreed that the district court erred in defining the relevant market and erred when it held that a non-negotiated contract of adhesion falls outside the scope of Sherman Act § 1. Unlike the majority, however, Judge S.R. Thomas would not conclude that these errors were harmless because they related to threshold analytical steps and affected Epic's substantial rights. He would remand for the district court to re-analyze the case using the proper threshold determination of the relevant market.

## COUNSEL

Thomas C. Goldstein (argued), Goldstein & Russell P.C., Bethesda, Maryland; Christine A. Varney, Katherine B. Forrest, Gary A. Bornstein, Peter T. Barbur, Antony L. Ryan, Yonatan Even, Omid H. Nasab, M. Brent Byars, and Wes Earnhardt, Cravath Swaine & Moore LLP, New York, New York; Paul J. Riehle, Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath, San Francisco, California; for Plaintiff-counter-defendant-Appellant.

Mark A. Perry (argued), Weil Gotshal & Manges LLP, Washington, D.C.; Cynthia Richman, Joshua M. Wesneski, Anna Casey, and Zachary B. Copeland, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher LLP, Washington, D.C.; Theodore J. Boutrous Jr., Daniel G. Swanson, Richard J. Doren, Samuel Eckman, Jason C. Lo, and Jagannathan Srinivasan, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher LLP, Los Angeles, California; Rachel S. Brass and Julian W. Kleinbrodt, Gibson Dunn & Crutcher LLP, San Francisco, California; Karen L. Dunn, Paul Weiss Rifkind Wharton & Garrison LLP, Washington, D.C.; for Defendant-counter-claimant-Appellee.

Nickolai G. Levin (argued), Daniel E. Haar, Patrick M. Kuhlmann, and Matthew C. Mandelberg, Attorneys; David B. Lawrence, Policy Director; Doha G. Mekki, Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General; Antitrust Division, United States Department of Justice; Washington, D.C.; for Amicus Curiae United States of America.

Joshua Patashnik (argued), Deputy Solicitor General; Shira Hoffman, Robert B. McNary, and Brian D. Wang, Deputy Attorneys General; Paula Blizzard, Supervising Deputy Attorney General; Kathleen Foote, Senior Assistant Attorney General; Rob Bonta, Attorney General of

# 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.