

COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER  
 RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP  
 BONNY E. SWEENEY (176174)  
 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900  
 San Diego, CA 92101  
 Telephone: 619/231-1058  
 619/231-7423 (fax)  
 bonnys@csgrr.com

THE KATRIEL LAW FIRM  
 ROY A. KATRIEL (*pro hac vice*)  
 1101 30th Street, N.W., Suite 500  
 Washington, DC 20007  
 Telephone: 202/625-4342  
 202/330-5593 (fax)  
 rak@katriellaw.com

Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

[Additional counsel appear on signature page.]

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

THE APPLE IPOD ITUNES ANTI-TRUST  
 LITIGATION

) Lead Case No. C-05-00037-JW(RS)

) CLASS ACTION

This Document Relates To:

ALL ACTIONS.

) PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO  
 ) DEFENDANTS' MOTION UNDER CIVIL  
 ) L.R. 7-3.(D) TO FILE RESPONSE TO  
 ) PLAINTIFFS' REPLY MEMORANDUM IN  
 ) SUPPORT OF CLASS CERTIFICATION

JUDGE: Hon. James Ware  
 DATE: December 15, 2008  
 TIME: 9:00 a.m.  
 CTRM: 8-4th Floor

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 In an attempt to have the last word less than two weeks before the scheduled hearing on  
3 Plaintiffs' motion for class certification, Apple asks the Court permission to file additional briefing  
4 by disingenuously framing certain of Plaintiffs' arguments as "new" and claiming Plaintiffs have  
5 "misstated" Apple's position with respect to the Section 2 claims. Apple contends that its additional  
6 briefing "will assist the Court in evaluating the parties' arguments and will permit a more efficient  
7 presentation of the issues [at] the hearing." Apple's Mot. for Leave at 1. Quite to the contrary,  
8 Apple's "response" presents redundant merits arguments which are of no use to the Court on a  
9 motion for class certification and are entirely improper.

10 The filing of additional memoranda may be permitted in certain circumstances "where a valid  
11 reason for such additional briefing exists." *Hill v. England*, No. CVF05869RECTAG 2005 WL  
12 3031136, at \*1 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 8, 2005); *see also* Civil L.R. 7-3.(d) ("[O]nce a reply is filed, no  
13 additional memoranda, papers or letters may be filed without prior Court approval."). But where, as  
14 here, the moving party merely reiterates arguments made in their opening brief, additional briefing  
15 by the opposing party is not permitted. *See id.*; *see also Edwards v. Toys "R" Us*, 527 F. Supp. 2d  
16 1197, 1205 n.31 (C.D. Cal. 2007). The arguments made by Plaintiffs in their reply brief are certainly  
17 not "new" but instead appropriately respond to arguments raised by Apple in its opposing brief and  
18 reinforce the arguments Plaintiffs made in their opening brief.

19 Accordingly, this Court should deny Apple's motion to file additional briefing.

20 **II. PLAINTIFFS DO NOT PRESENT ANY "NEW" ARGUMENTS IN THEIR**  
21 **REPLY BRIEF THAT WOULD NECESSITATE ADDITIONAL**  
22 **BRIEFING BY APPLE**

23 In its "response" memorandum, Apple once again improperly attempts to place the merits  
24 issue of "burning and ripping" before the Court at the class certification stage. In its opposing brief,  
25 Apple repeatedly contends that "burning and ripping" presents a viable alternative to consumers who  
26 wish to purchase a competing player. *See* Apple's Opp. at 1, 2, 6, 8-11, 17. In response, Plaintiffs  
27 assert that issues concerning burning and ripping, including its legality and whether it is a viable  
28 alternative, are merits issues common to the class that do not defeat class certification. Pltf's Reply

1 at 7. Indeed, Apple’s “response,” arguing the merits of burning and ripping, demonstrates that this is  
2 in fact a merits issue common to the class. Additional briefing on this issue is thus entirely improper  
3 and unnecessary.

4 Apple also contends that Plaintiffs allege a “new argument, [citing] *N. Pac. Ry. Co. v. U.S.*,  
5 356 U.S. 1, 5-6 (1958), for the proposition that a tie can consist of a requirement that the customer  
6 not purchase the tied product from any other supplier.” Apple’s Response at 2. This is incorrect and  
7 a complete waste of the Court’s time. In their reply, Plaintiffs cited *Northern Pacific Railway* to  
8 support their argument that Apple’s unremitting policy – permitting only iPod owners to directly  
9 play iTunes audio and video downloads – precludes customers from purchasing portable digital  
10 media players other than an iPod. Pltf’s Reply at 5-6. Plaintiffs made this argument in their opening  
11 brief. Citing *Northern Pacific Railway*, Plaintiffs stated, “[t]here is no question here that under  
12 Apple’s ‘unremitting policy’ of applying FairPlay to the online recordings, buyers may not exercise  
13 free choice in choosing a portable digital media player . . . .” Pltf’s Open. at 16. Thus, Apple’s  
14 attempt to reframe Plaintiffs’ arguments in an effort to provide further briefing to the Court is not  
15 well-taken and should not be countenanced by the Court.

16 But, Apple takes it one step further. Failing to provide *any* justification, including even an  
17 effort to reframe Plaintiffs’ arguments as “new,” Apple simply makes its own additional arguments  
18 regarding coercion by rearguing the facts and holding of a particular case. Apple’s Response at 2-3.  
19 In fact, Apple already raised these arguments in its opposing brief. *See* Apple’s Opp. at 16.  
20 Accordingly, consideration of Apple’s further argument regarding coercion should be denied  
21 entirely.

### 22 **III. NO ADDITIONAL EXPLANATION OF APPLE’S OPPOSITION TO** 23 **PLAINTIFFS’ SECTION 2 CLAIMS IS NEEDED**

24 Nor do Plaintiffs “misstate” Apple’s position with respect to certification of Plaintiffs’  
25 Section 2 claims. Plaintiffs merely contend that Apple’s summary arguments do not amount to a  
26 valid opposition to class certification of these claims. Indeed, Plaintiffs stated, “[b]ecause all the  
27 elements of Plaintiffs’ monopolization claims are subject to common proof, and *because Apple has*  
28 *not offered any substantive argument in opposition to the motion to certify these freestanding*

1 **counts**, Plaintiffs' motion for class certification should also be granted with respect to their Section 2  
2 monopoly claims." Pltf's Reply at 12 (emphasis added). Plaintiffs are free to make arguments in  
3 their reply based on their interpretation of Apple's briefing without opening the door to sur-replies.  
4 And, certainly the Court is fully capable of reading the parties briefs and understanding the  
5 arguments without officious "assistance" from Apple.

6 **IV. CONCLUSION**

7 For the foregoing reasons, the Court should deny Defendants' Motion Under Civil L.R. 7-  
8 3.(d) to File Response to Plaintiffs' Reply Memorandum in Support of Class Certification.

9 DATED: December 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

10 COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER  
11 RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP  
12 BONNY E. SWEENEY

13 s/ BONNY E. SWEENEY  
14 BONNY E. SWEENEY

15 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900  
16 San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: 619/231-1058  
619/231-7423 (fax)

17 THE KATRIEL LAW FIRM  
18 ROY A. KATRIEL  
1101 30th Street, N.W., Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20007  
19 Telephone: 202/625-4342  
20 202/330-5593 (fax)

21 Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

22 BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN  
& BALINT, P.C.  
23 ANDREW S. FRIEDMAN  
FRANCIS J. BALINT, JR.  
24 ELAINE A. RYAN  
TODD D. CARPENTER  
25 2901 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1000  
Phoenix, AZ 85012  
26 Telephone: 602/274-1100  
602/274-1199 (fax)

27 BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.  
28 MICHAEL D. BRAUN  
12304 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 109

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

Los Angeles, CA 90025  
Telephone: 310/442-7755  
310/442-7756 (fax)

MURRAY, FRANK & SAILER LLP  
BRIAN P. MURRAY  
JACQUELINE SAILER  
275 Madison Avenue, Suite 801  
New York, NY 10016  
Telephone: 212/682-1818  
212/682-1892 (fax)

GLANCY BINKOW & GOLDBERG LLP  
MICHAEL GOLDBERG  
1801 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 311  
Los Angeles, CA 90067  
Telephone: 310/201-9150  
310/201-9160 (fax)

Additional Counsel for Plaintiffs

S:\CasesSD\Apple Tying\BRF00056073.doc

1 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

2 I hereby certify that on December 4, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk  
3 of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail  
4 addresses denoted on the attached Electronic Mail Notice List, and I hereby certify that I have  
5 mailed the foregoing document or paper via the United States Postal Service to the non-CM/ECF  
6 participants indicated on the attached Manual Notice List.

7 I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the  
8 foregoing is true and correct. Executed on December 4, 2008.

9 s/ BONNY E. SWEENEY  
10 BONNY E. SWEENEY

11 COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER  
12 RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP  
13 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900  
14 San Diego, CA 92101-3301  
15 Telephone: 619/231-1058  
16 619/231-7423 (fax)

17 E-mail:BonnyS@csgr.com  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

## Mailing Information for a Case 5:05-cv-00037-JW

### Electronic Mail Notice List

The following are those who are currently on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case.

- **Francis Joseph Balint , Jr**  
fbalint@bffb.com
- **Michael David Braun**  
service@braunlawgroup.com
- **Andrew S. Friedman**  
rcreech@bffb.com,afriedman@bffb.com
- **Alreen Haeggquist**  
alreenh@zhlaw.com
- **Roy A. Katriel**  
rak@katriellaw.com,rk618@aol.com
- **Thomas J. Kennedy**  
tkennedy@murrayfrank.com
- **Caroline Nason Mitchell**  
cnmitchell@jonesday.com,mlandsborough@jonesday.com,ewallace@jonesday.com
- **Robert Allan Mittelstaedt**  
ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com,ybennett@jonesday.com
- **Brian P Murray**  
bmurray@murrayfrank.com
- **Jacqueline Sailer**  
jsailer@murrayfrank.com
- **Adam Richard Sand , Esq**  
invalidaddress@invalidaddress.com
- **Craig Ellsworth Stewart**  
cestewart@jonesday.com,mlandsborough@jonesday.com
- **John J. Stoia , Jr**  
jstoia@csgrr.com
- **Tracy Strong**  
tstrong@jonesday.com,dharmon@jonesday.com

- **Bonny E. Sweeney**  
bonnys@csgrr.com,E\_file\_sd@csgrr.com,christinas@csgrr.com
- **Helen I. Zeldes**  
helenz@zhlaw.com

## Manual Notice List

The following is the list of attorneys who are **not** on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case (who therefore require manual noticing). You may wish to use your mouse to select and copy this list into your word processing program in order to create notices or labels for these recipients.

### **Todd David Carpenter**

Bonnett, Fairbourn, Friedman, & Balint  
2901 N. Central Avenue  
Suite 1000  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

### **Elaine A. Ryan**

Bonnett Fairbourn Friedman & Balint, P.C  
2901 N. Central Avenue  
Suite 1000  
Phoenix, AZ 85012