

The Honorable John C. Coughenour

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE

WOLFIRE GAMES, LLC, William Herbert  
and Daniel Escobar, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

VALVE CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:21-cv-00563-JCC

SEAN COLVIN, EVERETT STEPHENS,  
RYAN LALLY, SUSANN DAVIS, and  
HOPE MARCHIONDA, individually and on  
behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

VALVE CORPORATION,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:21-cv-00650-JCC

**DEFENDANT VALVE CORPORATION'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFFS'  
CONSOLIDATED AMENDED CLASS  
ACTION COMPLAINT**

**NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:  
September 17, 2021**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

		<b>Page</b>
1		
2		
3	I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
4	II. STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	3
5	III. ARGUMENT .....	6
6	A. LEGAL STANDARD.....	6
7	B. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO ALLEGE THAT VALVE’S CONDUCT IN ITS FREE STEAM KEYS PROGRAM VIOLATES THE ANTITRUST LAWS .....	6
8	C. PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIM THAT VALVE APPLIES THE ALLEGED PMFN TO SALES NOT INVOLVING STEAM KEYS FAILS TO ALLEGE INJURY TO COMPETITION .....	9
9		
10	D. PLAINTIFFS FAIL TO ALLEGE ANTITRUST INJURY .....	12
11	1. PLAINTIFFS MUST PLAUSIBLY ALLEGE ANTITRUST INJURY .....	12
12	2. PLAINTIFFS PREDICATE THEIR ALLEGED INJURY ON VALVE’S PRICE BEING SUPRACOMPETITIVE .....	12
13	3. PLAINTIFFS’ MARKET ALLEGATIONS RENDER SUPRACOMPETITIVE PRICING IMPLAUSIBLE.....	13
14	4. OTHER ALLEGATIONS DO NOT CURE THE IMPLAUSIBLE SUPRACOMPETITIVE PRICE.....	16
15	5. PLAINTIFFS’ ALLEGED NON-PRICE ANTITRUST INJURIES ARE ALSO IMPLAUSIBLE.....	18
16		
17	E. PLAINTIFFS’ SHERMAN ACT SECTION 1 CLAIM AND SECTION 2 CLAIMS BASED ON SEPARATE PRODUCT MARKETS FOR GAMES AND GAMING PLATFORMS FAIL FOR LACK OF A FACIALLY SUSTAINABLE MARKET DEFINITION.....	19
18	1. PLAINTIFFS’ SEPARATE-PRODUCTS ALLEGATIONS ARE IMPLAUSIBLE UNDER THE MODERN INTEGRATION TEST THE D.C. AND NINTH CIRCUITS APPLY .....	20
19	2. PLAINTIFFS’ SEPARATE-PRODUCTS ALLEGATIONS ARE IMPLAUSIBLE UNDER THE OLDER JEFFERSON PARISH CONSUMER DEMAND TEST .....	22
20		
21	F. PLAINTIFFS’ STATE CPA CLAIM FALLS WITH THEIR FEDERAL ANTITRUST CLAIMS .....	24
22		
23		
24		
25	IV. CONCLUSION.....	24
26		

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

**Page(s)**

**Cases**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

*Abbott Labs. v. Adelpia Supply USA*,  
2017 WL 5992355 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 10, 2017).....16

*Aerotec Int’l, Inc. v. Honeywell Int’l, Inc.*,  
836 F.3d 1171 (9th Cir. 2016) .....7

*Ashcroft v. Iqbal*,  
556 U.S. 662 (2009).....6

*Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*,  
550 U.S. 544 (2007).....6

*Bio-Rad Labs., Inc. v. 10X Genomics, Inc.*,  
483 F. Supp. 3d 38 (D. Mass. 2020) .....13

*Blue Cross & Blue Shield United of Wisconsin v. Marshfield Clinic*,  
65 F.3d 1406 (7th Cir. 1995) .....16

*Brooke Grp. Ltd. v. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.*,  
509 U.S. 209 (1993).....14

*Brunswick Corp. v. Pueblo Bowl-O-Mat, Inc.*,  
429 U.S. 477 (1977).....11

*Dominguez v. UAL Corp.*,  
666 F.3d 1359 (D.C. Cir. 2012).....18

*Epic Games, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*,  
493 F. Supp. 3d 817 (N.D. Cal. 2020) .....20, 21, 22, 23

*Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Facebook, Inc.*,  
2021 WL 2643627 (D.D.C. June 28, 2021).....3, 14

*Fed. Trade Comm’n v. Qualcomm Inc.*,  
969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020) .....7, 8, 19

*Feitelson v. Google Inc.*,  
80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (N.D. Cal. 2015) .....18

*Free FreeHand Corp. v. Adobe Sys. Inc.*,  
852 F. Supp. 2d 1171 (N.D. Cal. 2012) .....7

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES***(continued)***Page(s)**

1	<i>GMA Cover Corp. v. Saab Barracuda LLC,</i>	
2	2012 WL 642739 (E.D. Mich. Feb. 8, 2012).....	16
3	<i>Harrison Aire, Inc. v. Aerostar Int'l, Inc.,</i>	
4	423 F.3d 374 (3d Cir. 2005).....	16
5	<i>Hicks v. PGA Tour, Inc.,</i>	
6	897 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2018) .....	6, 19
7	<i>In re IBM Peripheral EDP Devices Antitrust Litig.,</i>	
8	481 F. Supp. 965 (N.D. Cal. 1979) .....	16
9	<i>Insulate SB, Inc. v. Advanced Finishing Sys., Inc.,</i>	
10	797 F.3d 538 (8th Cir. 2015) .....	6
11	<i>Intel Corp. v. Fortress Inv. Grp. LLC,</i>	
12	2021 WL 51727 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2021).....	13
13	<i>In re Intuniv Antitrust Litig.,</i>	
14	496 F. Supp. 3d 639 (D. Mass. 2020).....	17
15	<i>Jefferson Parish Hospital District No. 2 v. Hyde,</i>	
16	466 U.S. 2 (1984).....	22
17	<i>Kartell v. Blue Shield of Mass.,</i>	
18	749 F.2d 922 (1st Cir. 1984).....	11
19	<i>Leegin Creative Leather Prods. v. PSKS, Inc.,</i>	
20	551 U.S. 877 (2007).....	11
21	<i>Lubic v. Fid. Nat. Fin., Inc.,</i>	
22	2009 WL 2160777 (W.D. Wash. July 20, 2009) .....	24
23	<i>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co., Ltd. v. Zenith Radio Corp.,</i>	
24	475 U.S. 574 (1986).....	10
25	<i>Metronet Servs. Corp. v. Qwest Corp.,</i>	
26	2001 WL 765167 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 16, 2001).....	17
	<i>In re Musical Instruments and Equipment Antitrust Litig.,</i>	
	798 F.3d 1186 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	10
	<i>In re NCAA I-A Walk-On Football Players Litig.,</i>	
	2006 WL 1207915 (W.D. Wash. May 3, 2006).....	12

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

*(continued)*

**Page(s)**

1 *Newcal Indus., Inc. v. Ikon Off. Sol.*,  
 2 513 F.3d 1038 (9th Cir. 2008) .....20

3 *Northstar Fin. Advisors Inc. v. Schwab Invs.*,  
 4 779 F.3d 1036 (9th Cir. 2015) .....7

5 *Ocean State Physicians Health Plan, Inc. v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of R.I.*,  
 6 883 F.2d 1101 (1st Cir. 1989).....2, 11

7 *Olympia Equip. Leasing Co. v. W. Union Tel. Co.*,  
 8 797 F.2d 370 (7th Cir. 1986) .....8, 9

9 *PBTM LLC v. Football Nw., LLC*,  
 10 2021 WL 37648 (W.D. Wash. Jan. 5, 2021).....24

11 *Pool Water Products v. Olin Corp.*,  
 12 258 F.3d 1024 (9th Cir. 2001) .....12

13 *Power Analytics Corp. v. Operation Tech., Inc.*,  
 14 820 F. App'x 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2020) .....18

15 *Principe v. McDonald's Corp.*,  
 16 631 F.2d 303 (4th Cir. 1980) .....21

17 *Rebel Oil Co., Inc. v. Atl. Richfield Co.*,  
 18 51 F.3d 1421 (9th Cir. 1995) .....12

19 *Rick-Mik Enterprises, Inc. v. Equilon Enterprises LLC*,  
 20 532 F.3d 963 (9th Cir. 2008) .....21, 22

21 *Somers v. Apple, Inc.*,  
 22 729 F.3d 953 (9th Cir. 2013) .....12, 15, 16, 19

23 *Subsolutions Inc. v. Doctor's Assocs., Inc.*,  
 24 2001 WL 1860382 (D. Conn. Apr. 6, 2001).....23

25 *Top Rank, Inc. v. Haymon*,  
 26 2015 WL 9948936 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 16, 2015).....13

*United States v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
 147 F.3d 935 (D.C. Cir. 1998).....20, 21, 22

*United States v. Microsoft Corp.*,  
 253 F.3d 34 (D.C. Cir. 2001).....23

# 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.