

The Honorable John H. Chun

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
27

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CHRISTOPHER BROWN, SCOTT
GRAEBER, LAURA LOES, LETICIA SHAW,
and DAVID ATWOOD, on behalf of
themselves and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

AMAZON.COM, INC., a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

No. 2:22-cv-00965-JHC

AMAZON.COM, INC.'S
MOTION TO DISMISS

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
December 16, 2022

Oral Argument Requested

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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
27

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 3

 A. Amazon’s Store and Its Dealings with Suppliers 3

 B. Plaintiffs’ Theory of Harm..... 4

 C. The Retail Landscape..... 5

 D. Plaintiffs 6

LEGAL STANDARDS 6

ARGUMENT 7

I. PLAINTIFFS LACK ANTITRUST STANDING..... 7

 A. The Alleged Anticompetitive Conduct Occurred in a Market Involving Wholesale Suppliers Selling to Retailers, and Plaintiffs Do Not Participate in Such a Market. 7

 B. Plaintiffs Are Not Efficient Enforcers of the Antitrust Laws. 8

II. COURTS ARE RELUCTANT TO INTERFERE WITH NEGOTIATIONS BETWEEN A RETAILER AND ITS SUPPLIERS..... 11

 A. Margin Protection Agreements Reflect Lawful and Procompetitive Price Negotiations. 11

 B. Amazon Can Lawfully Bargain for Lower Costs Because It Is Free to Choose the Terms on Which It Deals with Its Suppliers. 13

III. PLAINTIFFS’ SHERMAN ACT CLAIMS FAIL FOR ADDITIONAL, INDEPENDENT REASONS..... 15

 A. Plaintiffs Fail to State a Section 1 Claim under the Quick-Look Framework. 15

 B. Plaintiffs’ Sections 1 and 2 Claims Fail Because the Complaint Does Not Plausibly Allege Anticompetitive Effects..... 17

 C. Plaintiffs Fail to State Section 1 and 2 Claims Because They Do Not Allege Cognizable Relevant Markets. 20

IV. PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS UNDER CALIFORNIA AND MARYLAND LAW FAIL FOR THE SAME REASONS PLAINTIFFS’ FEDERAL CLAIMS FAIL. 23

CONCLUSION..... 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

1

2

3

4 *49er Chevrolet, Inc. v. Gen. Motors Corp.*,

5 803 F.2d 1463 (9th Cir. 1986)14

6 *AAA Liquors, Inc. v. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*,

7 705 F.2d 1203 (10th Cir. 1982)12, 16

8 *AFMS LLC v. United Parcel Serv. Co.*,

9 105 F. Supp. 3d 1061 (C.D. Cal. 2015)16

10 *Am. Ad Mgmt, Inc. v. Gen. Tel. Co. of California*,

11 90 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1999)8

12 *Am. Ad Mgmt., Inc. v. GTE Corp.*,

13 92 F.3d 781 (9th Cir. 1996)7

14 *In re Amazon.com, Inc. eBook Antitrust Litigation*,

15 2022 WL 4581903 (S.D.N.Y. 2022).....17, 19

16 *In re Am. Express Anti-Steering Rules Antitrust Litig.*,

17 19 F.4th 127 (2d Cir. 2021)9, 10

18 *Ohio v. Am. Express*,

19 138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018).....20, 23

20 *Analogix Semiconductor Inc. v. Silicon Image, Inc.*,

21 2008 WL 8096149 (N.D. Cal. 2008)20

22 *Andrx Pharms. v. Biovail Corp. Int’l*,

23 256 F.3d 799 (D.C. Cir. 2001)10

24 *United States v. Apple*,

25 791 F.3d 290 (2d Cir. 2015).....16, 17

26 *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*,

27 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....6

Ass’n of Wash. Pub. Hosp. Dists. v. Philip Morris Inc.,

241 F.3d 696 (9th Cir. 2001)8

Associated General Contractors of California, Inc. v. California State Council of
Carpenters,

459 U.S. 519 (1983).....1, 8

1 *Atl. Richfield Co. v. USA Petrol. Co.*,
495 U.S. 328 (1990).....11

2

3 *Austin v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Ala.*,
903 F.2d 1385 (11th Cir. 1990)13

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

5

6 *Big Bear Lodging Ass’n v. Snow Summit, Inc.*,
182 F.3d 1096 (9th Cir. 1999)21

7

8 *Blue Shield of Virginia v. McCready*,
457 U.S. 465 (1982).....10

9 *Brantley v. NBC Universal, Inc.*,
675 F.3d 1192 (9th Cir. 2012)20

10

11 *Brillhart v. Mut. Med. Ins., Inc.*,
768 F.2d 196 (7th Cir. 1985)13

12

13 *Bubar v. Ampco Foods, Inc.*,
752 F.2d 445 (9th Cir. 1985)7

14 *Butera v. Sun Oil Co.*,
496 F.2d 434 (1st Cir. 1974).....13

15

16 *Cable Line, Inc. v. Comcast Cable Communications of Pennsylvania, Inc.*,
2017 WL 4685359 (M.D. Pa. 2017)21, 22, 23

17

18 *Campfield v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*,
532 F.3d 1111 (10th Cir. 2008)20, 22

19 *City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders*,
20 F.4th 441 (9th Cir. 2021)7, 8, 10

20

21 *In re Coordinated Pretrial Proceedings in Petroleum Products Antitrust Litig.*,
691 F.2d 1335 (9th Cir. 1982)11

22

23 *Coronavirus Rep. v. Apple, Inc.*,
2021 WL 5936910 (N.D. Cal. 2021)23

24 *Dickson v. Microsoft Corp.*,
309 F.3d 193 (4th Cir. 2002)18

25

26 *In re EpiPen Direct Purchaser Litigation*,
2022 WL 1017770 (D. Minn. 2022)19

27

1 *Feitelson v. Google Inc.*,
80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (S.D. Cal. 2015).....8, 20

2 *Frame-Wilson v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,
3 2022 WL 741878 (W.D. Wash. 2022).....17

4 *Golden Gate Pharm. Servs., Inc. v. Pfizer, Inc.*,
5 433 F. App’x 598 (9th Cir. 2011)22

6 *United States v. Grinnell Corp.*,
384 U.S. 563 (1966).....7

7 *Cal. ex rel. Harris v. Safeway, Inc.*,
8 651 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2011)2, 16

9 *Hicks v. PGA Tour, Inc.*,
10 897 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2018)20

11 *Illinois Brick Co. v. Illinois*,
431 U.S. 720 (1977).....10

12 *Kartell v. Blue Shield of Mass., Inc.*,
13 749 F.2d 922 (1st Cir. 1984).....13

14 *Kloth v. Microsoft Corp.*,
15 444 F.3d 312 (4th Cir. 2006)11

16 *Kolling v. Dow Jones & Co.*,
137 Cal. App. 3d 709 (Ct. App. 1982).....23

17 *Kunert v. Mission Fin. Servs. Corp.*,
18 110 Cal. App. 4th 242 (2003)24

19 *Leegin Creative Leather Prods. v. PSKS, Inc.*,
20 551 U.S. 877 (2007).....14

21 *Lewis Service Center, Inc. v. Mack Truck*,
714 F.2d 842 (8th Cir. 1983)11, 12

22 *Lifewatch Servs. Inc. v. Highmark Inc.*,
23 902 F.3d 323 (3d Cir. 2018).....20

24 *Lorenzo v. Qualcomm Inc.*,
603 F. Supp. 2d 1291 (S.D. Cal. 2009).....8

25 *Lucas v. Bechtel Corp.*,
26 800 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986)10

27

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.