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-TSH The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

BRIEF OF THE AMERICAN ANTITRUST INSTITUTE AS AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF, COUNTER-DEFENDANT-APPELLANT

Counsel of Record
RANDY M. STUTZ
AMERICAN ANTITRUST INSTITUTE
1025 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 276-4050
lalexander@antitrustinstitute.org

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

January 27, 2022



Case: 21-16506, 01/27/2022, ID: 12353961, DktEntry: 57, Page 2 of 39

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Pursuant to Appellate Rule 26.1(a), the American Antitrust Institute states that it is a nonprofit, non-stock corporation. It has no parent corporations, and no publicly traded corporations have an ownership interest in it.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENTi
TABLE OF AUTHORITIESiii
INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE1
INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 2
ARGUMENT5
I. COURTS MUST DEFINE MARKETS CONSISTENT
WITH FIRST PRINCIPLES OF ANTITRUST LAW 5
A. The District Court's Opinion Cannot be Squared with First Principles of Antitrust Law Reflected in <i>Kodak</i>
B. The District Court Did Not Properly Assess Apple's Conduct as It Relates to the Source of Apple's Market Power 10
C. A Common Error Underlies the District Court's Failure to Recognize Distinct Markets in at Least Two Instances
D. AmEx Applies Only to the Narrow Economic Circumstances that Underly Its Departure from Well-established Market Definition Principles
•
II. UPHOLDING THE DECISION BELOW WOULD PROVIDE
A ROADMAP FOR PLATFORMS TO EVADE FEDERAL ANTITRUST LAWS WITH ENORMOUS IMPLICATIONS
FOR CONSUMERS, DEVELOPERS, AND MARKETS29
CONCLUCION 21



TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

American Needle, Inc. v. National Football League, 560 U.S. 183 (2010)	3
Apple, Inc. v. Pepper, 139 S.Ct. 1514 (2019)	29
Digidyne Corp. v. Data Gen. Corp., 734 F.2d 1336 (9th Cir. 1984)	19
Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Tech. Servs., 540 U.S. 451 (1992)	passim
Eastman Kodak Co. v. Image Tech. Servs., 903 F.2d 612 (9th Cir. 1990)	19
Image Tech. Servs. v. Eastman Kodak Co., 125 F.3d 1195 (9th Cir. 1997)	11
Jefferson Parish Hosp. Dist. No. 2 v. Hyde, 466 U.S. 2 (1984)	2, 17, 19
Leegin Creative Leather Prods., Inc. v. PSKS, Inc., 551 U.S. 877 (2007)	23
Nat'l Soc'y of Prof'l Eng'rs v. United States, 435 U.S. 679 (1978)	2
Newcal Industries, Inc. v. IKON Office Solutions, 513 F.3d 1038 (9th Cir. 2008)	8
Ohio v. American Express, 138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018)	passim
Rick-Mik Enters., Inc. v. Equilon Enters. LLC, 532 F.3d 963 (9th Cir. 2008)	17, 18



<i>Times-Picayune Publishing Co. v. United States</i> , 345 U.S. 594 (1953)
United States v. Microsoft Corp., 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (en banc)
United States v. Sabre Corp., 452 F. Supp. 3d 97 (D. Del. 2020)
OTHER AUTHORITIES
Brief for Petitioner Apple, <i>Apple, Inc. v. Pepper</i> , No. 17-204, 139 S. Ct. 1514 (filed Aug. 10, 2018)
Daniel J. Solove, <i>The Myth of the Privacy Paradox</i> , 89 GEO. WASH. L. REV. 1 (Jan. 2021)
Dennis W. Carlton, <i>The Anticompetitive Effects of Vertical Most-Favored-Nation Restraints and the Error of Amex</i> , 2019 Columbia Bus. L. Rev. 93 (2019)
Donald Turner, Antitrust Policy and the Cellophane Case, 70 Harv. L. Rev. 281 (1956)
Fed. Trade Comm'n & U.S. Dep't of Just., Antitrust Div., Horizontal Merger Guidelines (2010)
Federal Trade Comm'n & U.S. Dep't of Justice, Commentary on the Horizontal Merger Guidelines (2006)
Herbert Hovenkamp, <i>Platforms and the Rule of Reason: The American Express Case</i> , 2019 COLUMBIA BUS. L. REV. 35 (2019)
Jack Kirkwood, Antitrust and Two-Sided Platforms: The Failure of American Express, 41 CARDOZO L. REV. 1805 (2020)
Jeffrey Harrison, Ohio v. American Express: Misunderstanding Two-Sided Platforms; the Charge Card "Market;" and the Need for Procompetitive Justifications, 70 MERCER I. REV. 437 (2019)



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.

