

1 Robert A. Mittelstaedt #060359
 Tracy M. Strong #221540
 2 JONES DAY
 555 California Street, 26th Floor
 3 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 626-3939
 4 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700
 ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com
 5 tstrong@jonesday.com

6 Attorneys for Defendant
 APPLE INC.

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 10 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 **THE APPLE IPOD iTUNES ANTI-
 TRUST LITIGATION**

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

CLASS ACTION

14 _____
 15 **This Document Relates to:**

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
 STATEMENT**

16 **ALL ACTIONS.**

17 **STACIE SOMERS, On Behalf of Herself
 and All Others Similarly Situated,**

Case No. C 07-06507 JW

CLASS ACTION

18 **Plaintiff,**

19 **vs.**

20 **APPLE, INC., a California corporation,**

21 **Defendant.**

22 _____
 23 _____
 24 The parties jointly submit this Case Management Conference Statement.

25 **I. Reconsideration of Legal Basis of Tying Claim.**

26 The parties disagree on the appropriate method for reconsideration of the legal basis of the
 27 tying claim and whether plaintiffs should be permitted at this time to move to reconsider denial of
 28 certification of the tying claim.

1 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

2 In its order on Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification ("Class Certification Order"), the
3 Court denied without prejudice certification of Plaintiffs' tying claim. In so doing, the Court
4 expressed a willingness to reconsider its ruling on Apple's motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' tying
5 claim, limited to the following two issues:

6 (1) Whether market-level coercion, as alleged by Plaintiffs, is sufficient to bring their
7 allegations within the ambit of a Section 1 tying claim?

8 (2) Whether, as a matter of law, coercion can be found where there is no requirement that
9 the tying and tied products be purchased together?

10 Class Certification Order, at 7.

11 The Court invited a motion for reconsideration by the parties. *Id.* Plaintiffs suggest the
12 following approach to most expeditiously address the Court's fundamental concerns:

13 Apple and Plaintiffs simultaneously file briefs of equal length. Plaintiffs will file a motion
14 for reconsideration of the Court's Class Certification Order with respect to their tying claim and
15 Apple will file a motion for reconsideration of the Court's denial of Apple's motion to dismiss
16 Plaintiffs' tying claim. The parties will then file simultaneous response briefs of equal length
17 with no further replies. All briefs will be limited to 25 pages in length.

18 Plaintiffs also propose the parties file their opening motions by January 30, 2009, and
19 response briefs by February 13, 2009, with a hearing on March 2, 2009.

20 Plaintiffs believe that motions for reconsideration are the correct manner in which the
21 parties should address the limited issues raised by the Court. The Court did not invite Apple to
22 move for summary judgment under Rule 56, nor would such a motion be appropriate at this time
23 given that, pursuant to Apple's request that discovery be bifurcated, no merits discovery has been
24 conducted.

25 **Apple's Position:**

26 As invited by the Court's December 15 order, Apple intends to file a motion to address the
27 legal sufficiency of the tying claim. Apple submits that a Rule 56 motion is the most efficient
28 way at this stage of the case to resolve the legal sufficiency of the tying claim. The prior motion

1 to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) was addressed to the Tucker complaint before a consolidated
2 complaint was filed. The Tucker complaint admitted that the record labels required Apple to use
3 anti-piracy software, and admitted that Tucker bought an iPod separately from iTunes Store
4 music. The consolidated complaint, however, deleted those admissions. Thus, the appropriate
5 way to present the issue of whether the separate availability and independent uses of iPods and
6 iTunes Store content defeat the tying claim, and whether individual coercion is required, is a Rule
7 56 motion based on the admissions in plaintiffs' depositions. This is consistent with the Court's
8 statement in the December 15 order that "given the unique facts of this case," the Court is
9 persuaded to revisit the tying claim. Those facts are spelled out in the depositions of plaintiffs,
10 not in the consolidated complaint.

11 Plaintiffs' sole objection is that merits discovery has not commenced. But no discovery
12 will be needed to revisit the legal issues referred to in the Court's December 15 order. The
13 pertinent facts, *e.g.*, the separate availability and independent uses of the alleged tied and tying
14 products, and plaintiffs' admission that they voluntarily bought iPods, are contained in plaintiffs'
15 depositions. They provide an appropriate, concrete basis for the Court to reconsider the legal
16 basis for the tying claim.

17 Apple proposes filing the motion by January 19, 2009, with a hearing noticed for February
18 23, 2009.

19 Apple opposes plaintiffs' proposal for simultaneous briefing on a motion by plaintiffs to
20 reconsider denial of a tying class. The Court did not invite any such motion. It would be
21 inefficient, unnecessary and repetitive of previous briefing. If on reconsideration the tying claim
22 is dismissed, there would be no need to consider class certification of that claim, and thus no need
23 for the further briefing plaintiffs now propose. If on the other hand the tying claim survives, the
24 Court can then apply the previous briefing on the class certification motion or invite further
25 briefing on specific issues if the Court believes that anything further is needed. This approach is
26 consistent with the Court's December 15 order:

27 "Since resolution of this [tying] issue will affect whether
28 individualized proof is required and thus whether the
commonality requirement can be satisfied with respect to the

1 tying claim, the Court denies certification without prejudice
2 with respect [to the tying claims] pending further proceedings.”

3 **II. Other Issues Raised by Apple.**

4 Apple raises the following additional issues related to the class certification decision. The
5 parties' respective positions are set forth below.

6 **Apple's Position:**

7 **A. Counts V and VI – non-antitrust claims under California law.**

8 Apple seeks clarification that the Court did **not** certify any class with respect to the non-
9 antitrust claims in Counts V and VI of the consolidated complaint. Count V is under the
10 California Unfair Competition Law, Bus. & Prof. Code section 17200. It alleges, *inter alia*, that
11 Apple has "deceived" those consumers "who reasonably believed" that iTunes Store music and
12 video were "compatible" with any "standard" portable music player. Cons. Cmplt. ¶ 123. Count
13 VI is under the California Consumer Legal Remedies Act, Cal. Civil Code section 1750. It
14 alleges, *inter alia*, that Apple "unconscionably exploits" unequal bargaining position.

15 Plaintiffs did not seek certification of the non-antitrust claims in either of those Counts,
16 presumably to simplify their motion and to avoid the individual questions inherent in litigating
17 what individual consumers believed or did not believe about compatibility and whether
18 individual consumers relied on any such belief in buying an iPod. Plaintiffs' motion for class
19 certification was expressly limited to their federal antitrust law claims and their California
20 Cartwright Act claim, *i.e.*, Counts I, II, III and IV. *See e.g.*, Motion For Class Certification,
21 Doc. 165, p. 1 ("Plaintiffs respectfully seek certification of their claims that . . . Apple violated
22 antitrust laws . . .). The only reference in their briefing to anything other than the federal
23 antitrust laws claims is a six-line paragraph under the heading "Plaintiffs' State Law Claims" on
24 the last page of their brief. That paragraph refers exclusively to plaintiffs' Cartwright Act claims.
25 *Id.*, p. 24.

26 The Court's December 15 order stated: "**To the extent** certification is sought with respect
27 to Counts Four, Five, Six and Seven, since these Counts incorporate Counts Two and Three [the
28 actual and attempted monopolization claims] by reference, the Court GRANTS certification with

1 respect to Counts Four, Five, Six and Seven.” Doc. 196, p. 13 (emphasis added).

2 Because plaintiffs did not seek certification of any claims in Counts Five and Six and
3 because in any event the non-disclosure claim was not based on the claims in Counts Two and
4 Three, we read the Order to mean that no such claim is certified for class treatment. In their
5 response below, plaintiffs concede that the non-disclosure and unconscionability claims are not
6 antitrust claims and further that they did not move to certify the non-antitrust claims in those two
7 counts.

8 **B. Injunctive relief class:**

9 In their motion for class certification, plaintiffs expressly limited their request to a class of
10 iPod purchasers since April 28, 2003. Doc. 165, p. 3 ("Plaintiffs respectfully seek certification of
11 the following class: 'All persons or entities in the United States . . . who since April 28, 2003
12 purchased an iPod directly from Apple.>"). They did not include purchasers of iTunes Store
13 music or video. Thus, defendants' opposition did not address the issues that would be raised by
14 including iTunes Store purchasers in a class. In its certification order, the Court reverted to the
15 allegations of the complaint that included iTunes music/video purchasers in the injunctive relief
16 class definition (Doc. 107, ¶ 31), notwithstanding the narrower scope of class requested in
17 plaintiffs' motion. The appropriate resolution, Apple respectfully submits, is to revise the
18 December 15 order to limit the class definition to that proposed by plaintiffs in their motion, *i.e.*
19 iPod purchasers.

20 **C. Resellers:**

21 In their certification motion, plaintiffs did not specifically contend that resellers like Wal-
22 Mart, Best Buy and Target should be included in their class definition, as opposed to individual
23 end-user consumers like themselves. In opposition, in an abundance of caution, Apple separately
24 addressed (pp. 22-24) the issue of whether resellers should be included in the purported class, and
25 identified several reasons why they should not be. In reply, plaintiffs separately addressed the
26 issue of resellers as well, concluding that if Apple is correct that resellers were in a different
27 position than end-user consumers, "the remedy would be to narrow the direct purchaser class" by,
28 *inter alia*, excluding the "relatively few resellers" rather than declining to certify any class.

1 Doc. 188, p. 15.

2 The Court's December 15 order did not specifically refer to the resellers or to the separate
3 arguments raised by the parties with respect to the resellers. Thus, Apple requests clarification as
4 to whether they are included in the certified class. For reasons set forth previously, Apple's
5 position is that they should not be included.

6 **Plaintiffs' Position:**

7 **A. Count V and VI.**

8 Plaintiffs expressly moved for certification of their antitrust claims, which are in fact
9 incorporated into their California statutory claims in Count V and Count VI. *See* Complaint,
10 ¶¶121, 131. Specifically, with respect to Count V, Plaintiffs alleged “Apple’s actions are
11 unlawful and unfair because it has violated, *inter alia*, the Sherman Antitrust Act. . . .” *Id.* at
12 ¶121. And, with respect to Count VI, Plaintiffs alleged “Apple is a monopolist . . . [and] [t]he
13 unnecessary technological restrictions it places on its products offer no benefit to consumers
14 while preventing them from using . . . a competitor’s Digital Music Player or online store.” *Id.* at
15 ¶131. The Court accordingly properly certified Plaintiffs’ statutory claims under Counts V and
16 VI for class-wide resolution because they are premised on the alleged antitrust violations.

17 **B. Resellers.**

18 Plaintiffs' proposed class definition encompassed all direct purchasers of iPods, including
19 those direct purchasers who happened to be iPod resellers. As Apple concedes, the parties fully
20 briefed Apple's contention that resellers be denied the opportunity to decide for themselves
21 whether to remain in the proposed class. The Court properly rejected any such summary
22 exclusion from the class, and no further briefing on the issue is required.

23 **III. Issues That Plaintiffs Raise.**

24 Plaintiffs raise the following issues related to the class certification decision.

25 **Plaintiffs' position:**

26 **A. Class Notice**

27 Plaintiffs intend shortly to file a motion for approval of form and manner of dissemination
28 of class notice so that, upon resolution of the pending class certification issues class notice can

1 promptly be disseminated. In preparation, Plaintiffs have requested that Apple provide Plaintiffs
2 with information regarding customer lists, including email addresses available for class members.

3 **B. Issues Related to Discovery**

4 As discussed above, the Court previously bifurcated discovery pending certification of
5 Plaintiffs' claims. In light of the Court's Class Certification Order certifying, among other
6 claims, Plaintiffs' independent monopoly and attempted monopoly claims, Plaintiffs shall now
7 renew their merits discovery.

8 **Apple's position:**

9 Apple agrees with plaintiffs that notice is premature at this point. Apple is considering
10 plaintiffs' recent request regarding customer lists, and will consider any discovery requests once
11 they are served.

12
13 Dated: January 6, 2009

JONES DAY

14 By: /s/ Robert A. Mittelstaedt
15 Robert A. Mittelstaedt

16 Counsel for Defendant
APPLE INC.

17 Dated: January 6, 2009

COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER
18 RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP
19 BONNY E. SWEENEY

20 By: /s/ Bonny E. Sweeney
21 Bonny E. Sweeney

22 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
23 San Diego, CA 92101
24 Telephone: 619/231-1058
25 619/231-7423 (fax)

26 THE KATRIEL LAW FIRM
27 ROY A. KATRIEL
28 1101 30th Street, N.W., Suite 500
Washington, DC 20007
Telephone: 202/625-4342
202/330-5593 (fax)

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

Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

BONNETT, FAIRBOURN, FRIEDMAN
& BALINT, P.C.

ANDREW S. FRIEDMAN

FRANCIS J. BALINT, JR.

ELAINE A. RYAN

TODD D. CARPENTER

2901 N. Central Avenue, Suite 1000

Phoenix, AZ 85012

Telephone: 602/274-1100

602/274-1199 (fax)

BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.

MICHAEL D. BRAUN

12304 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 109

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)