3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

21

22

23

24

25 II

26

27

28

No. C 11-6166 CW

ORDER GRANTING IN

IN PART MOTION TO

PART AND DENYING

DISMISS THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT

(Docket No. 54)

## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOE HAND PROMOTIONS, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

BILL DAVIS,

Defendant.

BILL DAVIS,

Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.

DISH NETWORK, LLC,

Third-Party Defendant.

Third-Party Plaintiff Bill Davis brings this action against Third-Party Defendant DISH Network LLC for negligent misrepresentation, breach of contract, negligence, and violations of California's Unfair Competition Law (UCL). DISH Network moves 20 to dismiss the third-party complaint for failure to state a claim. After considering the parties' papers and oral argument, the Court GRANTS the motion in part and DENIES it in part.

## BACKGROUND

In February 2012, Plaintiff Joe Hand Promotions, Inc. filed a first amended complaint (FAC) against Davis for violations of 47 U.S.C. §§ 553, 605, and the UCL. Docket No. 8. The FAC alleges that Davis unlawfully showed a televised fight at the cigar lounge

3

10

11

12

14

15

16

19

20 II

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

he operates, West Coast Cigars, in violation of Joe Hand's exclusive rights to promote the fight. Id. ¶¶ 13-41.

Davis subsequently filed a third-party complaint against DISH Network, the satellite television provider for West Coast Cigars. Docket No. 48, Third-Party Compl. ¶ 8. His complaint asserts that DISH Network failed to provide his business with lawful television Id. ¶ 10. Specifically, he claims DISH Network provided West Coast Cigars with a residential service account -rather than a commercial account -- even though, "when the DISH Network L.L.C. personnel came to perform the installation it was obvious that this was a business establishment." Id.  $\P$  8. Davis alleges that, by relying on DISH Network's implicit promise to 13 provide lawful services, he has "been forced to defend himself and incur significant damages and liabilities to [Joe Hand]."

## LEGAL STANDARD

A complaint must contain a "short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief." Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). On a motion under Rule 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim, dismissal is appropriate only when the complaint does not give the defendant fair notice of a legally cognizable claim and the grounds on which it rests. Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007). In considering whether the complaint is sufficient to state a claim, the court will take all material allegations as true and construe them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. NL Indus., Inc. v. Kaplan, 792 F.2d 896, 898 (9th Cir. 1986). However, this principle is inapplicable to legal conclusions; "threadbare recitals of the elements of a cause of action, supported by mere conclusory statements," are not

3

4

5

11

13

14

18

19

20 II

21

23

24

25

26

27

28

taken as true. Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (citing Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555).

When granting a motion to dismiss, the court is generally required to grant the plaintiff leave to amend, even if no request to amend the pleading was made, unless amendment would be futile. Cook, Perkiss & Liehe, Inc. v. N. Cal. Collection Serv. Inc., 911 F.2d 242, 246-47 (9th Cir. 1990). In determining whether amendment would be futile, the court examines whether the complaint could be amended to cure the defect requiring dismissal 10 | without contradicting any of the allegations of [the] original complaint." Reddy v. Litton Indus., Inc., 912 F.2d 291, 296 (9th 12 | Cir. 1990).

## DISCUSSION

Davis has alleged that DISH Network provided his commercial 15|| business with a residential service subscription in breach of its 16 service agreement and its promise to provide lawful commercial services. Although DISH Network argued at the hearing that Davis signed an agreement to purchase residential services, it conceded that it is unable to provide a copy of that agreement. Accordingly, the Court must accept Davis' plausible factual allegations as true. Those allegations support his claims for 22 negligent misrepresentation, breach of contract, and negligence.

They do not, however, support his claim under the UCL, Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 17200 et seq., which must be plead with particularity under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 9(b).

<sup>1</sup> This failure distinguishes the present case from Joe Hand Promotions, Inc. v. Campbell, 2011 WL 3439217, \*5-\*7 (E.D. Cal.), where the third-party defendant provided a copy of the operative service agreement and the agreement "expressly contemplate[d] residential service, not commercial service."

Kearns v. Ford Motor Co., 567 F.3d 1120, 1127-28 (9th Cir. 1998).

Thus, Davis' UCL claim is dismissed. He may amend his third-party complaint within fourteen days of this order if he can truthfully plead specific details regarding when, how, and by whom DISH

Network's alleged misrepresentations were communicated to him, as well as the nature of the false representations.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, DISH Network's motion to dismiss (Docket No. 54) is GRANTED in part and DENIED in part.

Davis' UCL claim is dismissed with leave to amend; his claims for negligent misrepresentation, breach of contract, and negligence may proceed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 4/4/2013

United States District Judge