

No. 23-15992

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MICROSOFT CORP., and
ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC.,
Defendants-Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Northern District of California
No. 3:23-cv-2880
(Hon. Jacqueline Scott Corley, U.S. Distr. J.)

**OPENING BRIEF
OF THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
[REDACTED]**

HOLLY VEDOVA
Director

JOHN NEWMAN
Deputy Director

SHAOUL SUSSMAN
Associate Director for Litigation

JAMES H. WEINGARTEN
PEGGY BAYER FEMENELLA

JAMES ABELL

CEM AKLEMAN

MEREDITH R. LEVERT

JENNIFER FLEURY
Attorneys

BUREAU OF COMPETITION

ANISHA S. DASGUPTA
General Counsel

MARIEL GOETZ
Acting Director of Litigation

IMAD D. ABYAD
Attorney

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20580
(202) 326-3579
iabyad@ftc.gov

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Authorities	iii
Introduction	1
Circuit Rule 28-2 Statement of Jurisdiction	3
Statement of the Issues Presented	3
Statement of the Case	5
A. Statutory Framework	5
B. The Proposed Acquisition	7
C. The Gaming Industry	8
1. Multi-Game Library Subscription Services.....	9
2. Cloud Gaming	10
3. Console Gaming	12
D. Enforcement Proceedings	12
E. The District Court Proceedings and Order on Review	14
Summary of Argument.....	17
Standard of Review	22
Argument	22
I. The District Court Misapplied The Standard For Preliminary Relief That Section 13(b) Of The FTC Act Sets Forth For FTC Cases	23
A. The District Court Erroneously Conflated Section 13(b)'s Preliminary Injunction Standard With the Clayton Act's Ultimate Merits Standard.....	23
B. The FTC Has Marshalled Compelling Evidence That the Merger May Substantially Lessen Competition	28

1. Microsoft’s incentives to foreclose	29
2. Lessening of competition in the multi-game subscription market.....	31
3. Lessening of competition in cloud gaming.....	33
4. Lessening of competition in the console market	34
C. The District Court Erred in Ruling That a Purported Efficiency Negates the Foreclosure in the Market for Multi-Game Subscription Services	36
D. The District Court Impermissibly Relied on Defendants’ Proposed Remedies to Deny Relief.....	45
1. The district court relied on Microsoft’s side deals to find no likelihood of success	46
2. Proposed remedies cannot be considered at the preliminary relief stage of merger analysis.....	48
3. The district court should have deferred to the FTC’s expertise in antitrust remedies rather than evaluating the side deals itself.....	55
II. The District Court Erred in Dismissing the Supreme Court’s <i>Brown Shoe</i> Liability Framework	58
III. The District Court Committed Other Reversible Errors	62
A. Microsoft’s Incentives to Foreclose Cannot Be Negated by Its Executives’ Stated Intent Not to Do So	62
B. Partial Foreclosure Is Likely Even Absent the Incentives for Full Foreclosure	65
IV. The District Court Erred in According No Weight to the Public Equities that Favor Relief.....	68
Conclusion.....	74
Statement of Related Cases	74

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES	PAGE
<i>Ash Grove Cement Co. v. FTC</i> , 577 F.2d 1368 (9th Cir. 1978).....	37, 44
<i>Aspen Skiing Co. v. Aspen Highlands Skiing Corp.</i> , 472 U.S. 585 (1985).....	63
<i>Atl. Refining Co. v. FTC</i> , 381 U.S. 357 (1965).....	56
<i>Brown Shoe Co. v. United States</i> , 370 U.S. 294 (1962).....	passim
<i>Cal. Dental Ass’n v. FTC</i> , 224 F.3d 942 (9th Cir. 2000).....	63
<i>Chicago Bd. of Trade v. United States</i> , 246 U.S. 231 (1918).....	63
<i>Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. N.V. v. FTC</i> , 534 F.3d 410 (5th Cir. 2008).....	56, 64
<i>Crown Zellerbach Corp. v. FTC</i> , 296 F.2d 800 (9th Cir. 1961).....	5, 37
<i>Filtrol Corp. v. Slick Corp.</i> , No. 69-607, 1969 WL 219 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 29, 1969).....	72
<i>Ford Motor Co. v. United States</i> , 405 U.S. 562 (1972).....	44, 59
<i>Fruehauf Corp. v. FTC</i> , 603 F.2d 345 (2nd Cir. 1979).....	59

CASES (CONT'D)	PAGE
<i>FTC v. Affordable Media, LLC</i> , 179 F.3d 1228 (9th Cir. 1999).....	6, 23, 69
<i>FTC v. Cement Institute</i> , 333 U.S. 683 (1948).....	56
<i>FTC v. Consumer Def., LLC</i> , 926 F.3d 1208 (9th Cir. 2019).....	22
<i>FTC v. Elders Grain, Inc.</i> , 868 F.2d 901 (7th Cir. 1989).....	24, 43, 70
<i>FTC v. Enforma Nat. Prods.</i> , 362 F.3d 1204 (9th Cir. 2004).....	22
<i>FTC v. Food Town Stores, Inc.</i> , 539 F.2d 1339 (4th Cir. 1976).....	6, 27, 49, 73
<i>FTC v. Hackensack Meridian Health, Inc.</i> , 30 F.4th 160 (3d Cir. 2022).....	40, 42
<i>FTC v. H.J. Heinz Co.</i> , 246 F.3d 708 (D.C. Cir. 2001).....	passim
<i>FTC v. Ind. Fed'n of Dentists</i> , 476 U.S. 447 (1986).....	5
<i>FTC v. Meta Platforms Inc.</i> , No. 22-4325, 2022 WL 16637996 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 2, 2022).....	7
<i>FTC v. Nat'l Lead Co.</i> , 352 U.S. 419 (1957).....	56, 57
<i>FTC v. Penn St. Hershey Med. Ctr.</i> , 838 F.3d 327 (3rd Cir. 2016).....	passim

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.