No. 21-16506

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

v.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{APPLE, INC.,} \\ \textit{Defendant-counter-claimant-Appellee.} \end{array}$

On Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of California No. 4:20-cv-05640-YGR Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

BRIEF OF UTAH AND 34 OTHER STATES AS AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF-COUNTER-DEFENDANT-APPELLANT AND REVERSAL

Office of the Attorney General 350 N. State Street, Ste. 230 P.O. Box 142320 Salt Lake City, UT 84114 (801) 538-9600 melissaholyoak@agutah.gov SEAN D. REYES
Attorney General of Utah
MELISSA A. HOLYOAK*
Solicitor General
STANFORD E. PURSER
Deputy Solicitor General
*Counsel of Record

Counsel for Amici States
Additional counsel listed with signature block



TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABL	E OF AUTHORITIES	ii
INTR	ODUCTION AND INTEREST OF AMICI STATES	1
SUMI	MARY OF THE ARGUMENT	2
ARGU	JMENT	5
I.	The district court erred in holding that Section 1 of the Sherman Act does not apply to "unilateral contracts."	5
	A. Under rules of statutory interpretation, a Section 1 "contract" includes unilateral contracts	6
-	B. Excluding unilateral contracts from Section 1 "contract" is inconsistent with Supreme Court precedent.	12
(C. Excluding unilateral contracts or contracts of adhesion from Section 1 is bad public policy because it would impede antitrust enforcement.	14
II.	The district court's rule-of-reason analysis failed to balance the overall competitive effects of Apple's restraints	18
CONC	CLUSION	25
ADDI	TIONAL COUNSEL	27
CERT	CIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE	29
CERT	TIFICATE OF SERVICE	30



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases

Abramski v. United States, 573 U.S. 169 (2014)	11
Aerotec Int'l, Inc. v. Honeywell Int'l, Inc., 836 F.3d 1171 (9th Cir. 2016)	5
Albrecht v. Herald Co., 390 U.S. 145 (1968)	14
Arizona v. Maricopa Cnty. Med. Soc'y, 457 U.S. 332 (1982)	20
Bd. of Trade of Chicago v. United States, 246 U.S. 231 (1918)	18
Bhan v. NME Hosps., Inc., 929 F.2d 1404 (9th Cir. 1991)	24
Bostock v. Clayton Cnty., Georgia, 140 S. Ct. 1731 (2020)	7
Business Elecs. Corp. v. Sharp Elecs. Corp., 485 U.S. 717 (1988)	12
Cal. Dental Ass'n v. F.T.C., 526 U.S. 756 (1999)	21
Cleveland v. United States, 531 U.S. 12 (2000)	11
Cnty. of Tuolumne v. Sonora Cmty. Hosp., 236 F.3d 1148 (9th Cir. 2001)	24
Continental T.V., Inc. v. GTE Sylvania Inc., 433 U.S. 36 (1977)	20
Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp., 467 U.S. 752 (1984)	3, 13, 14



Davis v. Michigan Dep't of Treasury, 489 U.S. 803 (1989)	10
In re NCAA Athletic Grant-in-Aid Cap Antitrust Litig., 375 F. Supp. 3d 1058 (N.D. Cal. 2019)	23
L.A. Mem'l Coliseum Comm'n v. NFL, 726 F.2d 1381 (9th Cir. 1984)	24
Leegin Creative Leather Prods., Inc. v. PSKS, Inc., 551 U.S. 877 (2007)	19, 20, 22
Morissette v. United States, 342 U.S. 246 (1952)	8
Nat'l Soc'y of Pro. Eng'rs v. United States, 435 U.S. 679 (1978)	12, 18
NCAA v. Alston, 141 S. Ct. 2141 (2021)	18, 19, 20, 21
NCAA v. Bd. of Regents, 468 U.S. 85 (1984)	19
Richardson v. Hardwick, 106 U.S. 252 (1882)	9, 10
Standard Oil Co. v. United States, 221 U.S. 1 (1911)	12
State Oil Co. v. Khan, 522 U.S. 3 (1997)	19, 20
United States v. Rodgers, 466 U.S. 475 (1984)	11
Yates v. United States, 574 U.S. 528 (2015)	10
Federal Statutes	
15 U.S.C. & 1	nassim



15 U.S.C. § 15c
Other Authorities
73 Am. Jur. 2d <i>Statutes</i> § 150 (2021)11
Antonin Scalia & Bryan A. Garner, Reading Law: The Interpretation of Legal Texts (2012)
Bilateral and unilateral contracts, 1 Williston on Contracts § 1:17 (4th ed.)
Daniel A. Farber & Brett H. McDonnell, "Is There a Text in this Class?" The Conflict Between Textualism and Antitrust, 14 J. Contemp. Legal Issues 619 (2005)
Felix Frankfurter, Some Reflections on the Reading of Statutes, 47 Colum. L. Rev. 527 (1947)
Gabe Feldman, The Demise of the Rule of Reason, 24 Lewis & Clark L. Rev. 951 (2020)
Maurice Wormser, <i>The True Conception of Unilateral Contracts</i> , 26 Yale L.J. 136 (1916)9
Restatement (First) of Contracts § 1
Restatement (Second) of Contracts § 1 passim
Samuel J. Stoljar, The False Distinction Between Bilateral and Unilateral Contracts, 64 Yale L.J. 515 (1955)15



DOCKET

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.

