

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

ELIZABETH DE COSTER et al., on behalf of  
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware  
corporation,

Defendant.

Case No. C21-693RSM

ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND  
DENYING IN PART MOTION TO  
DISMISS

**I. INTRODUCTION**

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Amazon.com, Inc. (“Amazon”)’s Motion to Dismiss, Dkt. #35. Plaintiffs have filed an opposition brief, Dkt. #39. The parties have filed numerous notices of supplemental authority. Dkts. #44, #45, #47, #51, #52, and #55.

The Court can rule on this Motion without oral argument. For the reasons stated below, the Court GRANTS IN PART AND DENIES IN PART Amazon’s Motion.

**II. BACKGROUND**

For purposes of this 12(b)(6) Motion, the Court will accept all facts in the Consolidated Amended Complaint (“CAC” or “Amended Complaint”), Dkt. #20, as true. Unless stated otherwise, the following facts are drawn from that pleading.

Defendant Amazon operates the largest online retail marketplace in the United States. Amazon sells its own goods, but also designed its marketplace to be a platform where third-party merchants can register and list their goods for Amazon to sell.

1 Third-party merchants post their products on the platform, which Amazon presents to  
2 users together with its own goods according to a certain algorithm that takes the form of a  
3 ranking list.

4 At the time the pleading was drafted, Amazon's marketplace accounted for over 50% of  
5 all online retail sales revenue in the United States. By comparison, Amazon's two closest  
6 competitors, eBay and Walmart, accounted for only 6.1% and 4.6%, respectively, of that  
7 revenue.  
8

9 Many third-party merchants listing their goods on Amazon's marketplace also sell their  
10 goods on other platforms—including on their own websites and on competing online  
11 marketplaces.  
12

13 Amazon competes both (a) as a retailer against the third-party merchants that list their  
14 goods on Amazon's marketplace, and (b) as a marketplace, against other online retail  
15 marketplaces, such as eBay and Walmart, where third-party merchants can list their goods.  
16

17 Amazon is critical to the financial success of its third-party merchants. Almost half of  
18 the third-party merchants who list their goods on Amazon's marketplace generate between 81%  
19 and 100% of their revenues on it.

20 The Amended Complaint asserts that Amazon charges higher fees for third-party  
21 merchants than competitor marketplaces and that these inflated fees are passed on to customers  
22 like Plaintiffs through higher prices.  
23

24 In a competitive market, third-party merchants would be able to sell their products for  
25 less in competitor marketplaces. Amazon bars this type of competition by imposing on third-  
26 party merchants Platform "Most Favored Nation ("MFN") policies, or did so during the  
27  
28

1 relevant time period. Amazon’s MFN policies forbid third-party merchants from listing their  
2 goods anywhere else on the internet at prices lower than their Amazon list prices.

3 An investigation by the House of Representatives Judiciary Committee’s Subcommittee  
4 on Antitrust, Commercial, and Administrative Law (the “House subcommittee on antitrust”)  
5 found that “Amazon has a history of using MFN clauses to ensure that none of its suppliers or  
6 third-party sellers can collaborate with an existing or potential competitor to make lower-priced  
7 or innovative product offerings available to consumers.”

9 Amazon imposes its MFN policies on third-party merchants through the Amazon  
10 Business Solutions Agreement (BSA). Every third-party merchant that registers to list goods  
11 on Amazon’s marketplace must “agree[] to the terms of the [BSA] and the policies  
12 incorporated in that agreement.”

14 Until March 2019, Amazon enforced its MFN policies through BSA’s “Price Parity  
15 Clause,” which expressly prohibited third-party merchants from listing goods on other online  
16 retail platforms—whether marketplaces or single-merchant websites—at prices lower than their  
17 Amazon list prices. In late 2013, because of German and United Kingdom antitrust  
18 proceedings, Amazon voluntarily abandoned its price parity clause on an EU-wide basis.  
19 Amazon continued to enforce that clause in the United States for six more years.

21 Even after withdrawing this clause, Amazon continues to enforce MFN-type policies  
22 through its so-called “Fair Pricing” Policy. This policy in the BSA states that, if a third-party  
23 merchant engages in pricing practices with regard to “a marketplace offer that harms customer  
24 trust,” Amazon may impose sanctions. According to the policy, a “pricing practice that harms  
25 customer trust” occurs if a merchant lists goods on a competing online retail platform at prices  
26 that are significantly below its Amazon list prices. Sanctions include making the merchant’s  
27  
28

1 product ineligible for a feature (the “Buy Box” button) that would make the product the most  
2 visible and easiest to purchase among similar goods; removing the third-party merchant’s  
3 goods from Amazon’s marketplace; suspending shipping options for the merchant’s goods; and  
4 terminating or suspending the merchant’s ability to have any goods sold on Amazon’s  
5 marketplace.

6  
7 The intent and effects of the “Fair Pricing” Policy are the same as those of the former  
8 Price Parity Clause. These effects can be anticompetitive by, e.g., preventing merchants from  
9 listing their goods at lower prices on other platforms that charge lower (or no) fees, and  
10 preventing other online retail marketplaces from competing with Amazon by hosting those  
11 third-party merchants’ products at lower prices. Taking these pled facts as true, Amazon’s  
12 MFN policies cause Amazon customers to pay more for goods purchased on its marketplace  
13 than they would pay in a competitive market.

14  
15 Amazon enforces these policies by, e.g., systematically monitoring the prices listed by  
16 third-party merchants on other online retail platforms.

17  
18 Named Plaintiffs are residents of Maryland, Washington, D.C., Illinois, Texas,  
19 Tennessee, and Connecticut who purchased numerous goods from Amazon’s marketplace,  
20 including those listed by third-party merchants. They bring this action on behalf of themselves,  
21 and as a class action on behalf of all persons who, on or after May 26, 2017, purchased one or  
22 more goods on Amazon’s marketplace.

23  
24 The Amended Complaint includes causes of action for per se and not per se violation of  
25 the Sherman Act under 15 U.S.C. § 1 (First and Second Causes of Action), violation of the  
26 Sherman Act under 15 U.S.C. § 2 for monopolization (Third Cause of Action), and violation of  
27 the Sherman Act under 15 U.S.C. § 2 for attempted monopolization (Fourth Cause of Action).  
28

### III. DISCUSSION

#### A. Legal Standard under Rule 12(b)(6)

In making a 12(b)(6) assessment, the court accepts all facts alleged in the complaint as true, and makes all inferences in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Baker v. Riverside County Office of Educ.*, 584 F.3d 821, 824 (9th Cir. 2009) (internal citations omitted). However, the court is not required to accept as true a “legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation.” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007)). The complaint “must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.” *Id.* at 678. This requirement is met when the plaintiff “pleads factual content that allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.* The complaint need not include detailed allegations, but it must have “more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 555. Absent facial plausibility, a plaintiff’s claims must be dismissed. *Id.* at 570.

#### B. Analysis

Amazon’s first argument for dismissal is that its MFN policies are legal as a matter of law. Dkt. #35 at 16. Amazon recharacterizes the policies found in the Amended Complaint as a “Retail Competitive Price Provision” and an “Anti-Gouging Policy.” *Id.* Amazon argues that its policies “provide for competitive prices to consumers, rather than for itself” and that “[n]o court has ever condemned competitive price policies like these.” *Id.*

The fact that no Court has ever found a policy like these to violate the Sherman Act does not, in itself, render these claims implausible. Amazon goes on to argue that certain cases

# 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.