

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
28

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. 22-cv-00965-JHC

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S MOTION TO
DISMISS**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		<u>Page</u>
1		
2	I. INTRODUCTION	1
3	II. FACTS	2
4	III. STANDARD OF REVIEW	3
5	IV. ARGUMENT	3
6	A. Plaintiffs have standing to recover overcharge damages and for	
7	equitable relief.	3
8	1. Plaintiffs’ injuries occurred in the same market where	
9	Amazon has restrained trade.	4
10	2. Plaintiffs are efficient enforcers of antitrust laws.	6
11	B. Amazon’s MMAs are subject to antitrust scrutiny because they are	
12	agreements to raise or stabilize consumer prices by imposing a floor	
13	price that unreasonably restrains online retail competition.	9
14	C. Plaintiffs plausibly allege that Amazon’s MMAs increase consumer	
15	prices and reduce competition in the relevant online markets.	13
16	1. Quick Look is the appropriate standard because the MMA	
17	is anticompetitive and has no procompetitive benefits.	13
18	2. Plaintiffs plausibly allege anticompetitive effects.	15
19	a. Plaintiffs allege supracompetitive prices.	15
20	b. Plaintiffs allege reduced consumer choices.	17
21	3. The relevant market is properly alleged as the Two-Sided	
22	Online Retail Marketplace Market, or alternatively the	
23	Online Retail Sales Market and Product Submarkets	19
24	a. Plaintiffs need not allege a relevant market for	
25	“quick look” claims.	19
26	b. Plaintiffs properly allege a primary relevant market	
27	comprising two-sided online retail marketplaces.	19
28	c. The alleged relevant online markets and submarkets	
	are neither under- nor over-inclusive.	21
	D. Plaintiffs’ state statutes provide broader relief than their federal	
	counterparts and permit claims even if plaintiffs’ federal claims	
	were found deficient.	22
	V. CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

CASES

1		
2		
3		
4	<i>AAA Liquors, Inc. v. Joseph E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.</i> ,	
5	705 F.2d 1203 (10th Cir. 1982)	11, 15
6	<i>AFMS LLC v. UPS Co.</i> ,	
7	105 F. Supp. 3d 1061 (C.D. Cal. 2015)	14
8	<i>Am. Ad Mgmt., Inc. v. Gen. Tel. Co. of Cal.</i> ,	
9	190 F.3d 1051 (9th Cir. 1999)	7
10	<i>In re Am. Express Anti-Steering Rules Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
11	19 F.4th 127 (2d Cir. 2021)	8
12	<i>In re Amazon.com, Inc. eBook Antitrust Litig.</i> ,	
13	2022 WL 4581903 (S.D.N.Y. 2022).....	15, 16
14	<i>Andrx Pharms. v. Biovail Corp. Int'l</i> ,	
15	256 F.3d 799 (D.C. Cir. 2001).....	8
16	<i>Apple Inc. v. Pepper</i> ,	
17	139 S. Ct. 1514 (2019).....	4, 5, 8
18	<i>Arista Networks, Inc. v. Cisco Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
19	2017 WL 6102804 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 10, 2017).....	15
20	<i>Ass'n of Wash. Pub. Hosp. Dists. v. Philip Morris Inc.</i> ,	
21	241 F.3d 696 (9th Cir. 2001)	5, 6
22	<i>Associated Gen. Contractors of Ca., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters</i> ,	
23	459 U.S. 519 (1983).....	5, 6, 7
24	<i>Atl. Richfield Co. v. USA Petroleum Co.</i> ,	
25	495 U.S. 328 (1990).....	11
26	<i>Austin v. Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Ala.</i> ,	
27	903 F.2d 1385 (11th Cir. 1990)	13
28	<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> ,	
29	550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	3
30	<i>Big Bear Lodging Ass'n v. Snow Summit, Inc.</i> ,	
31	182 F.3d 1096 (9th Cir. 1999)	20
32	<i>Bon-Ton Stores, Inc. v. May Dep't Stores Co.</i> ,	
33	881 F. Supp. 860 (W.D.N.Y. 1994).....	22

1 *In re Brand Name Prescription Drugs Antitrust Litig.*,
123 F.3d 599 (7th Cir. 1997)22

2 *Brantley v. NBC Universal, Inc.*,
3 675 F.3d 1192 (9th Cir. 2012)17

4 *Brillhart v. Mut. Med. Ins., Inc.*,
5 768 F.2d 196 (7th Cir. 1985)12

6 *Bus. Elecs. Corp. v. Sharp Elecs. Corp.*,
485 U.S. 717 (1988).....9, 10, 11

7 *Butera v. Sun Oil Co.*,
8 496 F.2d 434 (1st Cir. 1974).....12

9 *Cable Line, Inc. v. Comcast Cable Commc’ns, of Pa., Inc.*,
2017 WL 4685359 (M.D. Pa. Oct. 18, 2017)21

10 *In re Cal. Gasoline Spot Mkt. Antitrust Litig.*,
11 2022 WL 3215002 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 9, 2022)23

12 *California v. ARC Am. Corp.*,
13 490 U.S. 93 (1989).....23

14 *Campfield v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*,
532 F.3d 1111 (10th Cir. 2008)20, 21

15 *Carter v. Variflex, Inc.*,
16 101 F. Supp. 2d 1261 (C.D. Cal. 2000)19

17 *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litig.*,
2016 WL 5871243 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2016).....13

18 *City of Oakland v. Oakland Raiders*,
19 20 F.4th 441 (9th Cir. 2021)6

20 *Dickson v. Microsoft Corp.*,
21 309 F.3d 193 (4th Cir. 2002)16

22 *Eastman Kodak Co. v. Henry Bath LLC*,
936 F.3d 86 (2d Cir. 2019).....6

23 *In re EpiPen Direct Purchaser Litig.*,
24 2022 WL 1017770 (D. Minn. Apr. 5, 2022).....15, 16

25 *Feitelson v. Google Inc.*,
80 F. Supp. 3d 1019 (N.D. Cal. 2015)5, 18

26 *Fortner Enters. v. U.S. Steel Corp.*,
27 394 U.S. 495 (1969).....16

28

1 *Frame-Wilson v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,
2022 WL 741878 (W.D. Wa. March 11, 2022) *passim*

2 *FTC v. Qualcomm Inc.*,
3 969 F.3d 974 (9th Cir. 2020) 5

4 *FTC v. Staples, Inc.*,
5 970 F. Supp. 1066 (D.D.C. 1997)..... 22

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

7 *Cal. ex rel Harris v. Safeway, Inc.*,
8 651 F.3d 1118 (9th Cir. 2011) 14

9 *Illinois Brick Co. v. Illinois*,
431 U.S. 720 (1977)..... 4

10 *Kartell v. Blue Shield of Mass., Inc.*,
11 749 F.2d 922 (1st Cir. 1984)..... 13

12 *Kong v. Trader Joe's Co.*,
13 2022 WL 1125667 (9th Cir. Apr. 15, 2022) 3

14 *Kunert v. Mission Fin. Servs. Corp.*,
110 Cal. App. 4th 242 (2003) 23

15 *Leeder v. Nat'l Ass'n of Realtors*,
16 2022 WL 1307100 (N.D. Ill. May 2, 2022) 7

17 *Leegin Creative Leather Prods., Inc. v. PSKS, Inc.*,
18 551 U.S. 877 (2007)..... 4, 6, 9

19 *Lewis Serv. Ctr., Inc. v. Mack Trucks, Inc.*,
714 F.2d 842 (8th Cir. 1983) 11

20 *LifeWatch Servs. Inc. v. Highmark Inc.*,
21 902 F.3d 323 (3rd Cir. 2018) 20

22 *Lorenzo v. Qualcomm Inc.*,
603 F. Supp. 2d 1291 (S.D. Cal. 2009)..... 5

23 *Lucas v. Bechtel Corp.*,
24 800 F.2d 839 (9th Cir. 1986) 8

25 *Monahan's Marine, Inc. v. Boston Whaler, Inc.*,
866 F.2d 525 (1st Cir. 1989)..... 12

26 *Moreno v. UtiliQuest, LLC*,
27 29 F.4th 567 (9th Cir. 2022) 3

28

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.