1	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP	
2	Daniel M. Wall (Bar No. 102580) Christopher S. Yates (Bar No. 161273)	
3	Sadik Huseny (Bar No. 224659) 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000	
4	San Francisco, California 94111-6538 Telephone: (415) 391-0600	
5	Facsimile: (415) 395-8095 Email: <u>Dan.Wall@lw.com</u>	
6	Email:Chris.Yates@lw.comEmail:Sadik.Huseny@lw.com	
7	Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.	
8	AFFLE INC.	
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	OAKLAND DIVISION	
12		
13	IN RE APPLE IPHONE ANTITRUST	CASE NO. C 11-06714-YGR
14	LITIGATION	RELATED CASE NO. C 07-05152-JW
15		[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT APPLE'S MOTION TO
16		DISMISS PLAINTIFFS' AMENDED CONSOLIDATED COMPLAINT
17		Date: December 18, 2012
18		Time:2:00 P.M.Place:Courtroom TBD
19		
20		The Honorable Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT APPLE'S MOTION TO DISMISS CASE NUMBER: C 11-06714-JW

1	Before the Court is Apple's Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Amended Consolidated Class	
2	Action Complaint ("Complaint").	
3	The Court's July 11, 2012 Order required the joinder of ATTM for the assertion of any	
4	voice and data service aftermarket claim. As ATTM has not been joined, the Court hereby	
5	DISMISSES the voice and data aftermarket claim (Count III) and grants Apple's request for an	
6	order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(f), striking all allegations concerning, and	
7	requests for injunction based on, the voice and data aftermarket claim (Count III).	
8	With respect to Counts I and II, concerning iPhone Applications, the Complaint fails to	
9	allege that Plaintiffs have Article III or antitrust standing to pursue these claims. In addition,	
10	Counts I and II fail to state a claim and must therefore be dismissed pursuant to Federal Rule of	
11	Civil Procedure 12(b)(6). Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES Counts I and II.	
12	The Court thus GRANTS Defendant Apple Inc.'s Motion to Dismiss in its entirety. As	
13	the Court finds that the defects in the Complaint cannot be cured, further amendment would be	
14	futile. Accordingly, the Complaint is dismissed with prejudice.	
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
16	Dated:	
17		
18	By THE HONORABLE YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS	
19	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE SF\1198356	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	ORDER GRANTING DEFENDAN	

RDER GRANTING DEFENDANT APPLE'S MOTION TO DISMISS CASE NUMBER: C 11-06714-JW