

No. 21-16506

IN THE 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.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California

No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR

Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers, Judge

**BRIEF OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA AS *AMICUS*
CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF NEITHER PARTY**

ROB BONTA
Attorney General of California
KATHLEEN FOOTE
Senior Assistant Attorney General
PAULA BLIZZARD
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
SHIRA HOFFMAN
ROBERT B. MCNARY
BRIAN D. WANG
Deputy Attorneys General
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
Telephone: (415) 510-3871
Fax: (415) 703-5843
Email: Brian.Wang@doj.ca.gov
*Attorneys for Amicus Curiae the State of
California*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Interest of Amicus.....	1
Summary of Argument	2
Argument	5
I. This Court’s Analysis Should Be Informed by a Proper Understanding of the UCL.....	5
A. The California Legislature Enacted the UCL to Address a Broad Range of Wrongful Business Conduct.....	5
B. The California Supreme Court Has Identified Three Tests to Determine Whether Conduct Violates the UCL’s “Unfair” Prong.....	9
C. A UCL Plaintiff Need Not Establish a Concurrent Violation of Antitrust Law.....	12
1. California Supreme Court precedent recognizes that conduct may violate the UCL without violating antitrust law.....	12
2. The “safe harbor” rule applies at most to conduct that is expressly precluded from antitrust liability.....	16
D. Nothing in California Supreme Court Precedent Requires Applying Specific Methods from Antitrust Analysis to UCL Claims and Courts Are Free to Consider a Variety of Factors.....	19
II. An Injunction Prohibiting a California Company from Violating the UCL in Interactions with Out-of-State Customers Is Consistent with the Commerce Clause	23
III. This Court Should Certify to the California Supreme Court Any Novel Questions Regarding the UCL’s Proper Scope and Interpretation	25
Conclusion	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
CASES	
<i>Aleksick v. 7-Eleven, Inc.</i>	
205 Cal. App. 4th 1176 (2012)	11
<i>American Philatelic Soc’y v. Claibourne</i>	
3 Cal. 2d 689 (1935)	6, 7
<i>Barnes-Wallace v. City of San Diego</i>	
607 F.3d 1167 (9th Cir. 2010)	26
<i>Barquis v. Merch. Collection Ass’n</i>	
7 Cal. 3d 94 (1972)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Camacho v. Automobile Club of Southern California</i>	
142 Cal. App. 4th 1394 (2006)	11
<i>Cel-Tech Commc’ns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.</i>	
20 Cal. 4th 163 (1999)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Chavez v. Whirlpool Corp.</i>	
93 Cal. App. 4th 363 (2001)	<i>passim</i>
<i>City of San Jose v. Office of the Comm’r of Baseball</i>	
776 F.3d 686 (9th Cir. 2015)	<i>passim</i>
<i>Clothesrigger, Inc. v. GTE Corp.</i>	
191 Cal. App. 3d 605 (1987)	24
<i>Darush v. Revision LP</i>	
No. CV 12-10296 GAF AGRX, 2013 WL 1749539, at *6 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 10, 2013)	22, 23
<i>Drum v. San Fernando Valley Bar Ass’n</i>	
182 Cal. App. 4th 247 (2010)	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>Fidelity Appraisal Co. v. Federal Appraisal Co.</i> 217 Cal. 307 (1933).....	8
<i>Flood v. Kuhn</i> 407 U.S. 258 (1972).....	18
<i>Healy v. Beer Inst., Inc.</i> 491 U.S. 324 (1989).....	24
<i>Hernandez v. Restoration Hardware, Inc.</i> 4 Cal. 5th 260 (2018).....	23
<i>Hesse v. Grossman</i> 152 Cal. App. 2d 536 (1957).....	5
<i>In re Cipro Cases I & II</i> 61 Cal. 4th 116 (2015).....	23
<i>In re Tobacco II Cases</i> 46 Cal. 4th 298 (2009).....	7, 23
<i>Klein v. Chevron U.S.A., Inc.</i> 202 Cal. App. 4th 1342 (2012).....	16
<i>Krause v. Trinity Mgmt. Servs. Inc.</i> 23 Cal. 4th 116 (2000).....	5, 6
<i>Kremen v. Cohen</i> 325 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 2003).....	26
<i>Kwikset Corp. v. Superior Court</i> 51 Cal. 4th 310 (2011).....	5
<i>LiveUniverse, Inc. v. MySpace, Inc.</i> 304 F. App'x 554 (9th Cir. 2008).....	18, 19

...

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>Lozano v. AT&T Wireless Servs., Inc.</i> 504 F.3d 718 (9th Cir. 2007)	12, 25
<i>Marks v. Loral Corp.</i> 57 Cal. App. 4th 30 (1997)	21
<i>Murray v. BEJ Mins, LLC</i> 924 F.3d 1070 (9th Cir. 2019)	25
<i>Nationwide Biweekly Admin., Inc. v. Superior Court</i> 9 Cal. 5th 279 (2020)	10, 11, 20
<i>Norwest Mortg., Inc. v. Superior Court</i> 72 Cal. App. 4th 214 (1999)	24
<i>Oakland-Alameda County Builders' Exch. v. F. P. Lathrop Constr. Co.</i> 4 Cal. 3d 354 (1971)	21, 22
<i>Ohio v. American Express</i> 138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018)	22, 23
<i>Parents Involved in Cmty. Sch. v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No. 1</i> 294 F.3d 1085 (9th Cir. 2002)	26
<i>People ex rel. Mosk v. Nat'l Research Co.</i> 201 Cal. App. 2d 765 (1962)	5, 6
<i>People v. Nat'l Ass'n of Realtors</i> 120 Cal. App. 3d 459 (1981)	13, 14
<i>Pohl v. Anderson</i> 13 Cal. App. 2d 241 (1936)	8
<i>Progressive W. Ins. Co. v. Superior Court</i> 135 Cal. App. 4th 263 (2005)	9, 10, 11

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.