

No. 22-15961

---

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

---

DONALD J. TRUMP, ET AL.,  
*Plaintiffs-Appellants,*

v.

TWITTER, INC., ET AL.,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

---

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
No. 3:21-cv-0837-JD  
Hon. James Donato

---

**APPELLEES' RESPONSE TO CERTAIN  
APPELLANTS' MOTION FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE**

---

FELICIA H. ELLSWORTH  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
60 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
Telephone: (617) 526-6000

EMILY BARNET  
RISHITA APSANI  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
7 World Trade Center  
New York, NY 10007  
Telephone: (212) 937-7294

November 25, 2022

PATRICK J. CAROME  
ARI HOLTZBLATT  
SUSAN M. PELLETIER  
ALLISON M. SCHULTZ  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
Telephone: (202) 663-6000  
patrick.carome@wilmerhale.com

*Counsel for Defendants-Appellees  
Twitter, Inc. and Jack Dorsey*

The motion of six of the Appellants—Donald Trump, the American Conservative Union, Rafael Barbosa, Linda Cuadros, Dominick Latella, and Wayne Allyn Root (the “Moving Plaintiffs”)—is an abuse of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Rules of Evidence. In this appeal from the dismissal of all Plaintiffs’ amended complaint, the question before the Court is whether that “*complaint ... contain[ed] sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.*” *Perez v. Mortgage Electronic Registration Sys., Inc.*, 959 F.3d 334, 337 (9th Cir. 2020) (emphasis added) (citation omitted). The Moving Plaintiffs now attempt an end run around that well-established standard by, in effect, seeking to amend their complaint on appeal with hundreds of pages of new factual allegations. This is procedurally improper. These materials could and should have been presented to the district court in the first instance either by inclusion in a second amended complaint—an option all Plaintiffs waived—or through a request for an indicative ruling on a motion for relief from judgment. The motion also violates the Rules of Evidence because it seeks judicial notice of materials not simply “to indicate what was in the public realm at the time” but to establish that their contents—and inferences that supposedly might be drawn therefrom—“were in fact true.” *Von Saher v. Norton Simon Museum of Art at Pasadena*, 592 F.3d 954, 960 (9th Cir. 2010). The motion should be denied for these reasons.

Even if the Moving Plaintiffs' request for judicial notice were proper, the newly submitted documents would not change the soundness of the district court's dismissal of Plaintiffs' claims. Defendants' merits brief will address the substantive reasons why the newly proffered documents have no bearing on the validity of the dismissed claims, and here address only the procedural and evidentiary defects in the motion.

**I. THE MOVING PLAINTIFFS ARE IMPROPERLY ATTEMPTING TO AMEND THEIR COMPLAINT ON APPEAL**

This Court “rarely take[s] judicial notice of facts presented for the first time on appeal.” *Reina-Rodriguez v. United States*, 655 F.3d 1182, 1193 (9th Cir. 2011). Extra-record materials may be considered on appeal only when “necessary to prevent ‘a miscarriage of justice.’” *Foskaris v. Experian Info. Sols., Inc.*, 808 F. App’x 436, 440 (9th Cir. 2020) (unpublished) (quoting *Bolker v. Commissioner of Internal Revenue*, 760 F.2d 1039, 1042 (9th Cir. 1985)). The Moving Plaintiffs have not and could not make that showing. They do not seek notice of just one or two discrete facts but of nearly 200 pages of material cited approximately 50 times throughout their opening brief. This is no ordinary request for judicial notice, but rather an untimely and improper attempt to amend the complaint and augment the record on appeal. Having foregone opportunities to properly put these materials before the district court, the Moving Plaintiffs cannot now belatedly append them to a closed appellate record.

First, the Moving Plaintiffs cannot now seek judicial notice of material that could have been timely included in a second amended complaint. The purpose of a motion to dismiss is to “test[] the legal sufficiency of a claim.” *Conservation Force v. Salazar*, 646 F.3d 1240, 1241-1242 (9th Cir. 2011) (quotation marks and citation omitted). Where a complaint’s factual allegations are found insufficient, plaintiffs ordinarily are given the opportunity to cure any defects through amendment. Here, all Plaintiffs were given just that opportunity; the District Court’s May 6, 2022 order dismissing the first amended complaint gave them until May 27, 2022 to file a second amended complaint. 1-ER-20. All Plaintiffs, however, “advised the Court that they ha[d] elected not to file an amended complaint,” and so the district court entered judgment. 1-ER-2. Given their express decision to forgo amendment, the Moving Plaintiffs may not now “circumvent th[e] process” for proper review of a motion to dismiss “by asking [an appellate court] to amend the complaint, effectively, through the vehicle of judicial notice.” *In re Omnicare, Inc. Secs. Litig.*, 769 F.3d 455, 467 (6th Cir. 2014) (holding that plaintiff’s request for judicial notice was “forfeited” where plaintiff did not challenge district court’s denial of request to amend the complaint). For this reason, the Moving Plaintiffs’ motion should be denied at least as to all proffered documents that were publicly available on or before May 27, 2022, which was the last day they could have filed a second amended

complaint in the district court. This includes, at least, Exhibits 1-10 and 17-28, all of which are public documents dated between April 12, 2019, and May 25, 2022.

Second, with respect to any information that they were able to obtain only after they decided not to amend their complaint, the Moving Plaintiffs could have sought relief through proper channels established in the Federal Rules of Civil and Appellate Procedure. Having chosen not to, their request to now augment the record on appeal is improper. Where newly discovered evidence calls a judgment into question, a party may seek relief through Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). Of course, while an appeal is pending a district court has no jurisdiction to revisit the order being appealed. Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62.1, however, provides an avenue for relief: A litigant may seek an “indicative ruling” from the district court as to whether it would grant a motion, such as a Rule 60(b) motion, over which it no longer has jurisdiction “because of an appeal that has been docketed and is pending.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 62.1. If the district court were to indicate that it would grant such a motion or that the motion raised a substantial issue, the movant could then notify the clerk for the court of appeals under Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 12.1. The court of appeals could then remand for further proceedings in the district court. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 12.1(b).

The Moving Plaintiffs are undoubtedly aware of these procedures. Their co-plaintiff, Naomi Wolf, filed a motion for indicative ruling in the district court

# 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.