

FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 17 2023

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

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
Northern District of California,
Oakland

ORDER

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

Before: S.R. THOMAS and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges, and McSHANE,* District Judge.

Concurrence by Judge M. SMITH.

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

Apple's Motion to Stay the Mandate (Dkt No. 247) is GRANTED. Pursuant to Rule 41(d) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, the mandate is stayed for 90 days to permit the filing of a petition for writ of certiorari in the Supreme Court. Apple must notify the Court in writing that the petition has been filed, in which case the stay will continue until the Supreme Court resolves the petition. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 41(d)(2)(B)(ii). Should the Supreme Court grant certiorari, the mandate will be stayed pending disposition of the case. Should the Supreme Court deny certiorari, the mandate will issue immediately. The parties shall advise this Court immediately upon the Supreme Court's decision.

JUL 17 2023

Epic Games v. Apple, Nos. 21-16506 & 16695

M. SMITH, Circuit Judge, concurring in the granting of the motion for a stay of the mandate pending the filing of a petition for certiorari:

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

Given our general practice of granting a motion for a stay if the arguments presented therein are not frivolous, I have voted to grant Apple’s motion. *See United States v. Pete*, 525 F.3d 844, 850 (9th Cir. 2008) (it is “often the case” that our court stays the mandate while a party seeks certiorari). I write separately to express my view that, while the arguments in Apple’s motion may not be technically frivolous, they ignore key aspects of the panel’s reasoning and key factual findings by the district court. When our reasoning and the district court’s findings are considered, Apple’s arguments cannot withstand even the slightest scrutiny. Apple’s standing and scope-of-the-injunction arguments simply masquerade its disagreement with the district court’s findings and objection to state-law liability as contentions of legal error.

I. STANDING

Because Apple’s anti-steering provision negatively affects the revenue Epic earns through the Epic Games Store, Epic had standing to seek injunctive relief against that provision pursuant to California’s Unfair Competition Law (UCL), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 *et seq.*

To establish standing, a plaintiff must have “suffered an injury in fact that is concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent.” *TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez*, 141

S. Ct. 2190, 2203 (2021). “[M]onetary harms” are one of the “[m]ost obvious” types of harm that satisfy the injury-in-fact requirement. *Id.* at 2204.

Epic has “three primary lines of business, each of which figures into various aspects of [this case].” *Epic Games, Inc. v. Apple, Inc. (Epic II)*, 67 F.4th 946, 967 (9th Cir. 2023). First, Epic is a “video game developer—best known for the immensely popular *Fortnite*.” *Id.* Second, Epic is the “the parent company of a gaming-software developer” (Epic International), which still has several apps on Apple’s App Store. *Id.* Third, Epic is “a video game publisher and distributor,” offering “the Epic Games Store as a game-transaction platform” on multiple devices. *Id.* at 968. In this last role, Epic is “a direct competitor” of Apple’s App Store “when it comes to games that feature cross-platform functionality like *Fortnite*.” *Id.*

As the panel opinion explained, the second and third lines of business—not the first—give rise to an injury in fact. *See id.* at 1000. As the parent company of Epic International, Epic is harmed because its subsidiary still has apps on the App Store that are subject to the anti-steering provision. As a games distributor, Epic is harmed because app developers cannot direct, with the promise of lower prices, their users to the Epic Games Store, which takes a significantly lower commission on app purchases than the App Store. As we explained: “[Epic] offers a 12% commission compared to Apple’s 30% commission. If consumers can learn about lower app prices, which are made possible by developers’ lower costs, and have the ability to

substitute to the platform with those lower prices, they will [almost always] do so—increasing the revenue that the Epic Games Store generates.” *Id.*

Such monetary loss is hornbook injury-in-fact, and Apple’s arguments to the contrary misconstrue both our decision and the record. Apple asserts that Epic lacks standing because “Epic’s developer program account has been terminated,” meaning Epic “has no apps on the App Store.” But we did not conclude, as Apple’s argument suggests, that Epic was injured in its role as a video game developer (*i.e.*, as the creator of the since-removed *Fortnite*). We recognized at the very start of our standing analysis that Apple had “terminated Epic’s iOS developer account,” and instead determined that Epic suffered an injury-in-fact in its role as a parent company and competing games distributor. *Id.* at 1000.

Regarding these two bases on which we actually determined standing, Apple offers only the conclusory statement that “no trial evidence or findings by the district court” support them. However, that assertion is simply false. Regarding Epic’s role as the parent of Epic International, the record contains screenshots showing that Epic International still has six apps on the App Store, even though the parent company’s developer account has been terminated.

The record is also filled with support for the common-sense proposition that Epic is harmed as a competing games distributor because consumers would shift some of their spending from the App Store to the Epic Games Store if developers

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.