

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

) C-05-0037-JW
)
) DECEMBER 16, 2008
)
) PAGES 1 - 54
)

THE PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD BEFORE
THE HONORABLE UNITED STATES DISTRICT
JUDGE JAMES WARE

A P P E A R A N C E S :

FOR THE PLAINTIFFS: COUGHLIN, STOIA, GELLER, RUDMAN &
ROBBINS
BY: BONNY E. SWEENEY
655 W. BROADWAY
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

BRAUN LAW GROUP, P.C.
BY: MICHAEL D. BRAUN
12304 SANTA MONICA BOULEVARD
SUITE 109
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90025

(APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE.)

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: IRENE RODRIGUEZ, CSR, CRR
CERTIFICATE NUMBER 8074

2 P R O C E E D I N G S

3
4 (WHEREUPON, COURT CONVENEED AND THE
5 FOLLOWING PROCEEDINGS WERE HELD:)

6 THE CLERK: CALLING CASE NUMBER 05-0037,
7 THE APPLE IPOD ITUNES ANTITRUST LITIGATION.

8 ON FOR PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS
9 CERTIFICATION.

10 TWENTY MINUTES EACH SIDE.

11 COUNSEL, PLEASE COME FORWARD AND STATE YOUR
12 APPEARANCES.

13 MS. SWEENEY: GOOD MORNING. BONNY
14 SWEENEY FOR THE DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS.

15 WITH ME IS PAULA ROACH ALSO OF MY OFFICE,
16 FRANK BALINT, AND MICHAEL BRAUN.

17 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: GOOD MORNING, YOUR
18 HONOR. BOB MITTELSTAEDT FOR APPLE AND WITH ME IS
19 CARLYN CLAUSE FOR APPLE.

20 THE COURT: VERY WELL. MS. SWEENEY, YOUR
21 MOTION.

22 MS. SWEENEY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. THE
23 DIRECT PURCHASER PLAINTIFFS ROSEN, TUCKER, AND
24 CHAROENSAK SEEK CLARIFICATION OF A CLASS OF ALL
25 PEOPLE IN THE UNITED STATES WHO PURCHASED IPODS

1 DIRECTLY FROM APPLE BETWEEN APRIL 2003 AND THE
2 PRESENT.

3 IN THIS CASE, AS YOUR HONOR IS AWARE
4 BECAUSE THE COURT HAS RULED ALREADY ON TWO MOTIONS
5 TO DISMISS, PLAINTIFFS SEEK DAMAGES AND INJUNCTIVE
6 RELIEF FOR APPLE'S UNLAWFUL TYING CONDUCT AND ITS
7 UNLAWFUL MONOPOLIZATION.

8 PLAINTIFFS CLAIM THAT APPLE UNLAWFULLY
9 TIED THE IPOD TO THE DIGITAL DOWNLOADS THAT ARE
10 PURCHASED THROUGH THE ITUNES STORE BOTH VIDEO AND
11 MUSIC.

12 PLAINTIFFS ALSO CLAIM THAT APPLE
13 UNLAWFULLY MONOPOLIZED OR ATTEMPTED TO MONOPOLIZE
14 ALL THREE MARKETS; THAT IS, THE DIGITAL PORTABLE
15 PLAYER MARKET, THE DIGITAL VIDEO DOWNLOAD MARKET,
16 AND THE DIGITAL MUSIC DOWNLOAD MARKET.

17 IN OUR PAPERS, YOUR HONOR, PLAINTIFFS
18 SHOWED THAT ALL OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF RULE 23(A)
19 ARE SATISFIED AND IN ADDITION THAT A CLASS IS
20 PROPERLY CERTIFIED UNDER BOTH RULES 23(B)(2) FOR
21 INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND 23(B)(3) FOR DAMAGES.

22 WE ALSO SUBMITTED AN EXPERT REPORT FROM
23 PROFESSOR NOLL OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY. PROFESSOR
24 NOLL IS AN ECONOMIST WHO HAS BEEN VERY ACTIVE IN
25 THE FIELD FOR MORE THAN 40 YEARS. HE'S PUBLISHED

1 MORE THAN 13 BOOKS, MORE THAN 300 ARTICLES, AND HE
2 SUBMITTED AN OPINION IN WHICH HE CONCLUDED THAT
3 USING THE KINDS OF TOOLS THAT THE ECONOMISTS USE,
4 PLAINTIFFS SHOULD BE ABLE TO PROVE USING COMMON
5 PROOF BOTH COMMON IMPACT THAT EACH MEMBER OF THE
6 PROPOSED CLASS SUFFERED ANTITRUST DAMAGES, AND ALSO
7 PROFESSOR NOLL PROPOUNDED THREE ALTERNATIVE DAMAGES
8 METHODOLOGIES THAT CAN BE USED TO SHOW DAMAGES TO
9 THE CLASS.

10 ALL THREE OF THESE METHODOLOGIES HAVE
11 BEEN ADOPTED BY COURTS IN NUMEROUS OTHER ANTITRUST
12 CASES, INCLUDING MOST RECENTLY JUDGE HAMILTON AND
13 JUDGE WILKINS BOTH OF THE NORTHERN DISTRICT
14 CERTIFIED THE DRAM CLASS AND THE SRAM CLASS IN
15 RELIANCE ON EXPERT NOLL'S EXPERT REPORT.

16 NOTABLY APPLE DID NOT SUBMIT ANY EXPERT
17 TESTIMONY TO CHALLENGE PROFESSOR NOLL'S
18 CONCLUSIONS.

19 THERE IS JUST ONE UNCHALLENGED EXPERT
20 REPORT IN THIS CASE, YOUR HONOR, AND IT IS
21 PLAINTIFFS' EXPERT PROFESSOR NOLL.

22 IN OUR OPENING BRIEF AND IN OUR REPLY
23 BRIEF, PLAINTIFFS DEMONSTRATED THAT EACH ELEMENT OF
24 THEIR CLAIMS, THEIR ANTITRUST CLAIMS, CAN BE PROVEN
25 WITH COMMON PROOF.

1 AS TO THE TYING CLAIM, THE ELEMENTS ARE
2 FAIRLY STRAIGHTFORWARD. YOU HAVE TO PROVE THAT
3 THEY'RE SEPARATE PRODUCTS.

4 APPLE HAS CONCEDED THAT THEY'RE SEPARATE
5 PRODUCTS SO THERE'S NO QUESTION THAT THAT PROOF
6 WILL BE COMMON.

7 IN ADDITION, PLAINTIFFS HAVE TO SHOW THAT
8 APPLE HAS SOME MEASURE, NOT NECESSARILY MONOPOLY
9 POWER, BUT SOME MEASURE IN THE TYING MARKET. THAT
10 IS THE TYING PRODUCT MARKET IS THE MARKET FOR
11 DIGITAL DOWNLOADS.

12 AND THAT, AS PROFESSOR NOLL OPINED IN HIS
13 MANY COURTS HAVE HELD, THE QUESTION OF THE
14 APPROPRIATE DEFINITION OF THE MARKET AND WHETHER
15 THE DEFENDANT HAS MARKET POWER, THOSE ISSUES ARE
16 BOTH SUSCEPTIBLE OF ESTABLISHING THROUGH COMMON
17 PROOF, NOT THROUGH INDIVIDUAL PROOF.

18 PLAINTIFFS ALSO HAVE TO SHOW THAT APPLE'S
19 CONDUCT HAD NOT INSUBSTANTIAL EFFECT ON COMMERCE IN
20 THE TIED PRODUCT MARKET.

21 NOW, THIS IS A VERY DE MINIMUS TEST AND
22 WE EXPECT THAT APPLE WILL CONCEDE THAT POINT.

23 THE ONLY APPLE ARGUMENT IN OPPOSITION TO
24 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION IS COERCION. THIS IS THE ONLY
25 ARGUMENT THAT APPLE MAKES TO ARGUE THAT THE CLASS

1 SHOULD NOT BE CERTIFIED.

2 AND THE PROBLEM WITH APPLE'S COERCION
3 ARGUMENT, YOUR HONOR, IS THAT IT IS ONE THAT HAS
4 ALREADY BEEN REJECTED BY THIS COURT TWICE IN
5 DENYING APPLE'S TWO MOTIONS TO DISMISS.

6 IT HAS ALSO BEEN REJECTED BY THE NINTH
7 CIRCUIT.

8 APPLE ARGUES THAT EVEN THOUGH THE TIE,
9 THAT IS THE RESTRICTION ON ITUNES THAT PREVENTS
10 DIGITAL DOWNLOADS, BOTH VIDEO AND MUSIC, FROM
11 PLAYING DIRECTLY ON ANY PORTABLE PLAYER OTHER THAN
12 THE IPOD, EVEN THOUGH THAT RESTRICTION IS PRESENT
13 IN EACH AND EVERY DOWNLOAD, AND EACH AND EVERY
14 IPOD, THAT YOU HAVE TO TAKE INDIVIDUAL TESTIMONY TO
15 DETERMINE WHETHER ANY INDIVIDUAL MEMBER OF THE
16 CLASS WOULD HAVE PURCHASED THE TIED PRODUCT BUT FOR
17 THE TIE.

18 BUT THAT'S NOT WHAT THE LAW REQUIRES.

19 AS YOUR HONOR RECOGNIZED IN DENYING
20 APPLE'S TWO MOTIONS TO DISMISS, BOTH IN THE
21 SLATTERY CASE AND IN THE TUCKER CASE, IN THE NINTH
22 CIRCUIT THE COURT IS NOT REQUIRED TO OR THE
23 PLAINTIFF IS NOT REQUIRED TO DEMONSTRATE ACTUAL
24 COERCION.

25 RATHER, THE PLAINTIFF IS REQUIRED TO

1 DEMONSTRATE MARKET LEVEL COERCION AND THE NINTH
2 CIRCUIT HELD IN THE CASE OF MOORE VERSUS JASON
3 MATTHEWS THAT COERCION MAY BE IMPLIED FROM A
4 SHOWING THAT AN APPRECIABLE NUMBER OF BUYERS HAVE
5 ACCEPTED BURDENSOME TERMS. AN APPRECIABLE NUMBER
6 OF BUYERS.

7 SO PLAINTIFF HAS TO SHOW THAT AN
8 APPRECIABLE NUMBER OF BUYERS OF THE TIED PRODUCT
9 WOULD NOT HAVE PURCHASED THAT PRODUCT BUT FOR THE
10 TIE.

11 PLAINTIFF DOESN'T HAVE TO SHOW THAT EACH
12 AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE CLASS WOULD HAVE MADE AN
13 IDENTICAL DECISION.

14 AS PROFESSOR NOLL OPINED IN HIS REPORT
15 AND TESTIFIED AT HIS DISPOSITION, WHAT MATTERS IS
16 THAT THERE IS A SUFFICIENT NUMBER THAT IT ENABLED
17 APPLE TO INCREASE ITS MARKET POWER AND THEREBY
18 INCREASE THE PRICE OF THE TIED PRODUCT THAT IS THE
19 IPOD.

20 NOW, IN THE MOORE CASE, WHICH I
21 MENTIONED, AND THIS IS 550 F.2D 1207, AND THAT CASE
22 INVOLVED AN ALLEGED TIE BETWEEN THE SALE OF
23 CEMETERY LOTS AND MEMORIAL MARKERS.

24 NOW, THE FACTS OF THAT CASE WERE THAT THE
25 DEFENDANT OWNED EIGHT OF THESE CEMETERIES. ONLY

1 FIVE OF THOSE CEMETERIES ACTUALLY REQUIRED THAT A
2 PERSON WHO WANTED TO PURCHASE A CEMETERY LOT ALSO
3 PURCHASED A MARKER.

4 THE NINTH CIRCUIT HELD THAT THAT WAS
5 SUFFICIENT. AND THE NINTH CIRCUIT SAID THAT
6 RELYING UPON THE LEADING SUPREME COURT TYING CASES,
7 THE COURT SAID THE NINTH CIRCUIT, OUR READING OF
8 THE SUPREME COURT'S OPINIONS SUPPORTS THE VIEW THAT
9 COERCION MAY BE IMPLIED FROM A SHOWING THAT AN
10 APPRECIABLE NUMBER OF BUYERS HAVE ACCEPTED
11 BURDENSOME TERMS SUCH AS THE TYING PRODUCT MARKET.

12 COERCION OCCURS WHEN THE BUYER MUST
13 ACCEPT THE TIED ITEM AND FOREGO POSSIBLY DESIRABLE
14 SUBSTITUTES.

15 WE ALSO CITED A NUMBER OF OTHER CASES
16 SUPPORTING THE POINT MADE BY THE NINTH CIRCUIT IN
17 MOORE. FOR EXAMPLE, THE BAFUS CASE, WHICH WE CITE
18 IN OUR PAPERS, YOUR HONOR, CERTIFIED A CLASS ON THE
19 BASIS THAT THERE WAS AN APPRECIABLE NUMBER OF
20 BUYERS WHO WERE INFLUENCED BY THE TIE RATHER THAN
21 AN ABSOLUTE REQUIREMENT THAT EACH AND EVERY MEMBER
22 OF THE PROPOSED CLASS WAS BOUND BY THE TIE.

23 APPLE ALSO MAKES THE ARGUMENT THAT THE
24 TYING CLAIM CAN'T BE CERTIFIED BECAUSE OF WHAT IT
25 REFERS TO AS THE PACKAGE THEORY OF DAMAGES.

1 APPLE RELIES ON AN ELEVENTH CIRCUIT CASE
2 WHICH CITES THE NINTH CIRCUIT'S SIEGLE CASE FOR THE
3 PROPOSITION THAT, WELL, IN SOME CASES A TIE
4 ACTUALLY REDUCES -- HAS THE EFFECT IT MAY INCREASE
5 THE PRICE OF THE TIED PRODUCT, BUT IT HAS THE
6 EFFECT OF REDUCING THE PRICE OF THE TYING PRODUCT.

7 IN OTHER WORDS, APPLE SAYS HERE YOU HAVE
8 TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE ITUNES VIDEO AND DIGITAL
9 DOWNLOADS WAS DECREASED AS A RESULT OF THE TIE.

10 WELL, THAT ISN'T REALLY A CORRECT
11 STATEMENT OF THE LAW IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT.

12 THE SIEGLE CASE INVOLVED THE CLASS. THE
13 NINTH CIRCUIT DID NOT OVERTURN THE CLASS DECISION
14 NOR DID THE NINTH CIRCUIT OVERTURN THE LIABILITY
15 JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF THE PLAINTIFFS. RATHER, THE
16 NINTH CIRCUIT SAID THAT YOU HAVE TO TAKE THIS INTO
17 ACCOUNT IN CALCULATING THE AMOUNT OF DAMAGES.

18 SO IT IS MERELY A DAMAGES QUESTION AND AS
19 BLACKIE AND MANY OTHER NINTH CIRCUIT AND MANY OTHER
20 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA CASES HAVE HELD, EVEN IF THERE
21 ARE DAMAGES ISSUES, THAT DOES NOT PRECLUDE
22 CERTIFICATION OF A CLASS.

23 NOW, MOREOVER, THE SIEGLE CASE WAS A
24 LITTLE UNUSUAL BECAUSE THERE THERE WAS NO PRICE FOR
25 THE ALLEGED TYING PRODUCT. THE SO-CALLED TYING

1 PRODUCT WAS THE USE OF THE TRADEMARK NAME CHICKEN
2 DELIGHT WHICH APPARENTLY HAD VALUE IN THE MARKET.

3 HERE, OF COURSE, PLAINTIFFS AND MEMBERS
4 OF THE CLASS PAID MONEY FOR THEIR ITUNES DIGITAL
5 VIDEO AND MUSIC DOWNLOADS.

6 WE ALSO HAVE A CLAIM FOR MONOPOLIZATION
7 BOTH FOR ATTEMPTED MONOPOLIZATION AND MONOPOLY
8 MAINTENANCE OR CREATION.

9 NOW, APPLE DOESN'T REALLY ADDRESS THIS
10 ARGUMENT AT ALL IN THEIR PAPERS. APPLE MERELY SAYS
11 THAT IT'S BASED ON OUR TYING THEORY, AND,
12 THEREFORE, IT FAILS FOR THE SAME REASONS.

13 WELL, IN FACT, PLAINTIFFS HAVE ALLEGED A
14 MONOPOLIZATION CLAIM THAT DON'T RELY SOLELY ON
15 THEIR TYING CLAIMS.

16 THERE ARE SEVERAL DIFFERENT ASPECTS OF
17 APPLE'S CONDUCT THAT PLAINTIFFS CONTEND ARE AND
18 WERE ANTICOMPETITIVE.

19 AND AS WE EXPLAINED IN OUR PAPERS, ALL OF
20 THE ELEMENTS OF THE PLAINTIFFS' MONOPOLIZATION AND
21 ATTEMPTED MONOPOLIZATION CLAIMS WILL BE PROVEN
22 RELYING ON EVIDENCE THAT IS COMMON TO THE CLASS
23 BECAUSE IT IS PRINCIPALLY, IF NOT ENTIRELY,
24 EVIDENCE THAT IS IN THE HANDS OF APPLE.

25 FIRST THE PLAINTIFF HAS TO SHOW THAT

1 APPLE HAS MARKET POWER IN THE PROPERLY DEFINED
2 MARKET. AND AGAIN WE ALLEGE THREE MONOPOLY
3 MARKETS.

4 AND THEN THE PLAINTIFFS HAVE TO SHOW THAT
5 APPLE ACQUIRED OR MAINTAINED THAT MONOPOLY THROUGH
6 WILLFUL OR ANTICOMPETITIVE CONDUCT.

7 AND THE ANTICOMPETITIVE CONDUCT THAT IS
8 OUTLINED IN OUR PAPERS AND IN THE AMENDED COMPLAINT
9 IS, ONE, THE ENCRYPTION THAT WE COMPLAIN ABOUT,
10 NAMELY, THAT APPLE ENCRYPTS THE DIGITAL DOWNLOADS
11 WITH IT'S OWN PROPRIETARY DRM, THEREBY PREVENTING
12 DIRECT PLAYBACK ON ANY PORTABLE PLAYER OTHER THAN
13 THE IPOD.

14 IN ADDITION, APPLE HAS TAKEN STEPS
15 THROUGHOUT THE CLASS PERIOD TO PRECLUDE ENTRY BY
16 WOULD BE COMPETITORS. WHEN A COMPETITOR FIGURED
17 OUT HOW TO PLAY ITUNES MUSIC ON ITS COMPETING
18 PORTABLE PLAYER, APPLE PROMPTLY ISSUED A SOFTWARE
19 FIX THAT PREVENTED THAT.

20 APPLE COULD HAVE LICENSED ITS PROPRIETARY
21 DRM ENCRYPTION TO OTHERS. IT COULD HAVE PURCHASED
22 A LICENSE TO OTHERS FOR ANOTHER ENCRYPTION
23 METHODOLOGY. IT COULD HAVE USED A NONPROPRIETARY
24 ENCRYPTION. THERE ARE ALL SORTS OF WAYS IN WHICH
25 APPLE'S CONDUCT WAS DESIGNED TO -- INTENDED TO AND

1 HAD THE EFFECT OF PRECLUDING ENTRY INTO THE MARKET
2 AND MAINTAINING ITS OWN MONOPOLY IN ALL THREE
3 MARKETS.

4 THE COURT: NOW, HAVE I PREVIOUSLY RULED
5 IN ANY WAY THAT THEIR USE OF THEIR OWN DRM IS
6 WILLFUL CONDUCT THAT WOULD SUPPORT A MONOPOLY
7 CLAIM?

8 MS. SWEENEY: YOUR HONOR IN THE RULINGS
9 ON THE MOTION TO DISMISS RECOGNIZED THE PLAINTIFFS'
10 ALLEGED NUMEROUS WAYS IN WHICH APPLE COULD HAVE
11 AVOIDED THE TIE AND AVOIDED -- AND YOUR HONOR DID
12 NOT SPECIFICALLY RULE THAT USING ITS OWN DRM WAS
13 ANTICOMPETITIVE OR WILLFUL CONDUCT.

14 SO THAT ISSUE REMAINS TO BE RESOLVED ON A
15 MORE COMPLETE RECORD.

16 THE COURT: THAT'S THE PART OF THE
17 MONOPOLY AND ATTEMPTED MONOPOLY CLAIM THAT I'M
18 NEEDING MORE HELP FROM THE PARTIES ON AND
19 UNDERSTANDING, BUT I HAVE COME TO THE TENTATIVE
20 CONCLUSION THAT I CAN PROCEED WITH CLASS
21 CERTIFICATION AND LEAVE THIS FOR LATER. I SUPPOSE
22 YOU AGREE WITH THAT?

23 MS. SWEENEY: YES, YOUR HONOR.

24 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. I MIGHT GET A
25 DIFFERENT VIEW FROM YOUR OPPONENT, BUT IT SEEMS TO

1 ME THAT WHAT I AM BOTHERED BY BY THIS ARGUMENT THAT
2 IT'S WILLFUL CONDUCT IS BECAUSE IT SEEMS TO ME THAT
3 WHAT I UNDERSTAND ABOUT DRM SOFTWARE IS THAT IT'S
4 SOMETHING THAT IS DONE TO PROTECT THE COPYRIGHT
5 OWNER AND THAT ALL DOWNLOAD, SOFTWARE DOWNLOAD
6 DISTRIBUTORS HAVE TO INCORPORATE SOMETHING OF THAT
7 KIND IN THE SOFTWARE.

8 AND SO IT SEEMS TO ME THAT THE QUESTION
9 THAT I HAVE IN MY MIND IS WHETHER WILLFULNESS MUST
10 BE SOMETHING MORE THAN SIMPLY CHOOSING A PARTICULAR
11 DRM OVER ANOTHER.

12 AND WHAT I REMEMBER EARLY ON IN THE CASE
13 IS WHAT YOU'RE TELLING ME THAT SOMEHOW THERE WAS A
14 MODIFICATION OF THE DRM IN A WAY THAT WAS
15 ANTICOMPETITIVE, NOT THE PRESENCE OF A DRM.

16 AND SO I'M TRYING TO MAKE SURE THAT AS I
17 PROCEED I HIGHLIGHT THAT I NEED TO UNDERSTAND THAT
18 ISSUE BETTER. THIS MAY NOT BE THE TIME TO DO IT,
19 BUT IT'S ONE OF THOSE ISSUES THAT I'M STRUGGLING
20 WITH.

21 MS. SWEENEY: I APPRECIATE THAT, YOUR
22 HONOR. AND PLAINTIFFS' VIEW IS THAT ON THIS RECORD
23 WE HAVEN'T YET HAD ANY MERITS DISCOVERY. WE DON'T
24 HAVE A COMPLETE RECORD. AND WE BELIEVE, OF COURSE,
25 THAT THE EVIDENCE WILL BEAR OUT OUR ALLEGATIONS IN

1 OUR COMPLAINT THAT THERE ARE SEVERAL DIFFERENT
2 TYPES OF CONDUCT THAT APPLE ENGAGED IN THAT
3 CONSTITUTE WILLFUL AND ANTI-COMPETITIVE CONDUCT.

4 DID YOUR HONOR WANT ME TO --

5 THE COURT: NO, GO AHEAD.

6 MS. SWEENEY: OKAY.

7 THE COURT: I WAS JUST PAUSING AT THAT
8 POINT BECAUSE THAT IS AN AREA THAT I MARKED FOR
9 MYSELF TO GET A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF AT SOME
10 APPROPRIATE POINT.

11 MS. SWEENEY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR. AS
12 I MENTIONED BEFORE, PLAINTIFFS' EXPERT PROFESSOR
13 NOLL HAS DESCRIBED THREE PROPOSED METHODOLOGIES FOR
14 CALCULATING DAMAGES. ONE IS THE BEFORE AND AFTER;
15 THE SECOND IS THE YARDSTICK METHOD; AND THE THIRD
16 IS ONE THAT LOOKS AT APPLE'S PROFIT MARGINS, IT'S
17 MARKUPS.

18 ALL THREE OF THESE METHODS HAVE BEEN
19 RELIED UPON BY COURTS IN OTHER ANTITRUST CASES,
20 INCLUDING IN THE DRAM CASE WHICH WAS A PRICE FIXING
21 CASE; THE SRAM CASE, ANOTHER PRICE FIXING CASE.

22 THEY ALSO HAVE BEEN ADOPTED BY COURTS
23 THAT HAVE CERTIFIED CLASSES WHERE PLAINTIFFS ALLEGE
24 TYING CLAIMS.

25 FOR EXAMPLE, THE SECOND CIRCUIT IN THE

1 VISA CHECK MASTER MONEY LITIGATION CERTIFIED A
2 CLASS OF MERCHANTS -- EXCUSE ME -- WHO CHALLENGED
3 VISA AND MASTER CARD'S TYING OF THE MERCHANT'S
4 ACCEPTANCE OF SIGNATURE DEBIT TO THEIR ACCEPTANCE
5 OF CREDIT CARDS.

6 IN THAT CASE THE PLAINTIFFS' EXPERT
7 PROFFERED A METHODOLOGY THAT USED THE YARDSTICK
8 METHOD. THE EXPERT COMPARED THE COST OF ACCEPTANCE
9 OF SIGNATURE DEBIT, WHICH IS WHERE YOU HAVE TO SIGN
10 TO USE THE CREDIT CARD AND PIN DEBIT AND THE COURT
11 HELD THAT WAS AN APPROPRIATE METHOD FOR DETERMINING
12 THE OVERCHARGE CAUSED BY THE TIE.

13 THE BAFUS CASE, WHICH WE CITE IN OUR
14 PAPERS, ALSO RELIES UPON A YARDSTICK METHOD AND
15 THAT ALSO IS A TYING CASE.

16 APPLE SAYS THAT THE APPROPRIATE
17 METHODOLOGY FOR DETERMINING DAMAGES IN A TYING CASE
18 IS A METHODOLOGY CITED IN THE LESSIG CASE. THAT'S
19 A NINTH CIRCUIT CASE.

20 BUT AS WE POINT OUT IN OUR PAPERS, THE
21 LESSIG CASE HAS NO ANALYSIS AS TO WHAT KIND OF
22 DAMAGES METHODOLOGY IS APPROPRIATE IN A TYING CASE.

23 IT MERELY, EXCUSE ME, AFTER TRIAL --
24 THE COURT: YOU CAN PAUSE AND GET SOME
25 WATER.

1 MS. SWEENEY: OH, THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
2 IN THE LESSIG CASE THE COURT HELD THAT
3 THE INTRODUCTION BY THE PLAINTIFF OF CERTAIN
4 EVIDENCE REGARDING THE COST OF SUBSTITUTE PRODUCTS
5 WHICH WAS THE ONLY EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD AS TO
6 DAMAGES WAS SUFFICIENT TO SUPPORT THE JURY'S
7 VERDICT.

8 SO WE DON'T THINK THAT THE LESSIG CASE
9 HAS ANY APPLICABILITY. AND I SEE THE LIGHT IS ON,
10 YOUR HONOR, AND I WANT TO RESERVE SOME TIME FOR
11 REBUTTAL SO I'LL CLOSE MY REMARKS NOW. THANK YOU
12 VERY MUCH.

13 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. COUNSEL.

14 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: GOOD MORNING, YOUR
15 HONOR. IT WOULD BE UNPRECEDENTED AND CONTRARY TO
16 PRECEDENT TO CERTIFY THE CLASSES OR THE CLASS
17 REQUESTED BY THE PLAINTIFFS HERE.

18 IF ANY ONE HAD THE TYING OR
19 MONOPOLIZATION CLAIM THAT THEY ALLEGE, THE ONLY WAY
20 TO PROVE IT WOULD BE BY INDIVIDUAL PROOF. AND
21 THAT'S TRUE BOTH FOR THE ALL IMPORTANT COERCION
22 ELEMENTS AND IT'S ALSO TRUE FOR FACT OF INJURY OR
23 IMPACT.

24 IN A TYING CASE THE PLAINTIFF COMES INTO
25 COURT AND PROVES THAT IN ORDER TO BUY A HIGHLY

1 DESIRABLE PRODUCT HE WAS ALSO FORCED TO BUY A
2 PRODUCT THAT HE DIDN'T WANT, THE TIED AND THE TYING
3 PRODUCT.

4 SO IN TYING CASES, THE PRODUCT THAT HE'S
5 FORCED TO BUY IS ONE THAT HE DOESN'T WANT BY
6 DEFINITION. HE'S COERCED, HE'S FORCED INTO BUYING
7 THE PRODUCT THAT HE DOESN'T WANT IN ORDER TO BUY
8 THE PRODUCT THAT HE DOES WANT.

9 HERE WHAT IS WRONG WITH THIS CASE RIGHT
10 FROM THE OUTSET IS THAT THEY'RE SAYING THAT THE
11 PRODUCT THAT ALL OF THEIR CLASS MEMBERS, ALL
12 CONSUMERS HAVE BEEN FORCED TO BUY IS AN IPOD, ONE
13 OF THE MOST POPULAR PRODUCTS IN THE COUNTRY.

14 SO THEIR BURDEN IS TO SHOW THAT SOMEBODY,
15 THAT EVERYBODY THAT WHOEVER IS IN THEIR CLASS WAS
16 FORCED TO BUY AN IPOD RATHER THAN BUYING AN IPOD
17 FOR ALL OF THE REASONS THAT PEOPLE BUY IPODS,
18 COMPLETELY UNRELATED TO THE AVAILABILITY OF MUSIC
19 FROM APPLE'S MUSIC STORE.

20 I'LL GET INTO THIS IN MORE DETAIL BUT
21 WHEN THEY TALK ABOUT THE MOORE CASE, THE NINTH
22 CIRCUIT CASE THAT SAYS THAT YOU CAN INFER COERCION
23 IF AN APPRECIABLE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AGREE TO AN
24 ONEROUS TERM, A BURDENSOME TERM. THAT HAS NO
25 APPLICATION HERE, THAT EVIDENTIARY INFERENCE OR

1 IMPLICATION HAS NO BEARING HERE, NO APPLICATION
2 BECAUSE BUYING AN IPOD IS NOT A BURDENSOME TERM,
3 IT'S NOT ONEROUS, IT'S NOT SOMETHING THAT PEOPLE
4 WOULD DO ONLY IF THEY'RE FORCED TO DO IT.

5 SO THIS IDEA THAT THEY CAN JUST SORT OF
6 WAVE THEIR HANDS AND SAY EVERYBODY IS COERCED TO
7 BUY AN IPOD WITHOUT ANY PROOF, WITHOUT GOING PERSON
8 BY PERSON AND WITHOUT ASKING WHY DID YOU BUY YOUR
9 IPOD? WAS IT BECAUSE YOU WERE FORCED BECAUSE YOU
10 HAD BOUGHT MUSIC FROM APPLE STORE, OR WAS IT FOR
11 ANY OTHER NUMBER OF REASONS?

12 SO, FIRST OF ALL, WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE
13 WHOLE CASE AND WHAT HAS, YOU KNOW, STRONG BEARING
14 ON WHETHER THEY CAN CERTIFY A CLASS IS THAT THE
15 PRODUCT THAT THEY HAVE SELECTED FOR THE TIED
16 PRODUCT IS A VERY POPULAR PRODUCT.

17 SECONDLY, IT'S SEPARATELY AVAILABLE AND
18 CAN BE USED SEPARATELY. AND THAT'S TRUE BOTH OF
19 THE MUSIC AND OF THE IPOD. EVERYBODY KNOWS AND WE
20 NOW HAVE IT IN THE RECORD IN THE DEPOSITIONS OF THE
21 PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR EXPERT, YOU CAN WALK INTO AN
22 APPLE STORE AND BUY AN IPOD. NOBODY EVER ASKED YOU
23 ABOUT THE MUSIC.

24 NOBODY -- AND YOU CAN BUY MUSIC ON THE
25 MUSIC STORE AND NOBODY EVER SAYS WE'RE ONLY GOING

1 TO SELL YOU MUSIC IF YOU AGREE TO BUY AN IPOD.

2 THE OTHER WAY WE KNOW SOMETHING IS WRONG
3 WITH THIS CASE IS EACH OF THE PLAINTIFFS, ALL FIVE
4 OF THEM, TESTIFIED THAT THEY BOUGHT IPODS
5 VOLUNTARILY WITHOUT COERCION.

6 IN MOST CASES THEY HADN'T EVEN BOUGHT
7 MUSIC FROM THE MUSIC STORE YET.

8 SO WE KNOW THEY WEREN'T COERCED. THEY
9 HAVE ADMITTED THEY WEREN'T COERCED. THERE'S NEVER
10 BEEN A TYING CASE BY A CONSUMER WHERE THE CONSUMER
11 COMES IN AND SAYS THAT I WASN'T COERCED BUT YET I
12 WANT TO REPRESENT A CLASS AND SAY THAT THE CLASS
13 WAS COERCED.

14 IN ADDITION, THEY HAVE NOT IDENTIFIED A
15 SINGLE PERSON WHO THEY SAY WAS COERCED ON THE
16 THEORY THAT THEY HAVE THEORIZED HERE AND THEY
17 HAVEN'T COME UP WITH ANY METHOD OF IDENTIFYING
18 ANYBODY WHO THEY SAY WAS COERCED.

19 THE COURT: LET'S DIVIDE THE
20 CONSIDERATION INTO WHETHER OR NOT THERE IS PROOF OF
21 INDIVIDUAL COERCION WITH WHETHER OR NOT THERE NEEDS
22 BE PROOF OF INDIVIDUAL COERCION AND -- BECAUSE
23 YOU'RE RAISING BOTH.

24 AND I BELIEVE THAT MY PRIOR LOOK AT THIS
25 LEAD ME TO BELIEVE THAT INDIVIDUAL COERCION IS

1 UNNECESSARY IF I CAN IDENTIFY COERCION AT A MARKET
2 LEVEL.

3 NOW, YOU MAY TAKE ISSUE WITH THAT, BUT IT
4 SEEMS TO ME THAT THAT IS WHAT YOU, THAT IS WHAT YOU
5 ARE FACED WITH IN TERMS OF THE COURT'S PRIOR RULING
6 AND ESSENTIALLY WHAT YOU'RE INVITING ME TO DO IS TO
7 GO BACK TO THAT, REEXAMINE IT, AND TURN IT AROUND
8 AND THEN GO TO INDIVIDUAL COERCION AS OPPOSED TO MY
9 NEEDING TO FIND INDIVIDUAL COERCION.

10 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: LET ME ADDRESS THAT
11 HEAD ON. THE COURT -- AND THIS IS ON THE MOTION TO
12 DISMISS. SO YEARS AGO BEFORE WE HAD DEPOSITIONS,
13 BEFORE WE WERE COMING TO THE CLASS CERT STAGE WHERE
14 THE QUESTION IS HOW ARE THE PLAINTIFFS GOING TO
15 PROVE THEIR CASE AND CAN THEY PROVE IT ON A CLASS
16 BASIS?

17 YOUR HONOR RELIED ON THE MURPHY CASE FOR
18 THIS CONCEPT OF MARKET LEVEL COERCION. WITH ALL
19 RESPECT, MURPHY DOES NOT SUPPORT THAT PROVISION,
20 THAT PROPOSAL.

21 MURPHY SAYS IT STARTS OFF RELYING ON
22 JEFFERSON PARISH, THE SUPREME COURT CASE, THAT SAYS
23 AN ESSENTIAL CHARACTERISTIC OF TYING IS FORCING THE
24 BUYER, AND I'M PARAPHRASING, FORCING THE BUYER INTO
25 THE PURCHASE OF A TIED PRODUCT THAT HE DIDN'T WANT.

1 AND THEN THE COURT SAYS, WE AGREE WITH
2 THE DISTRICT COURT THAT SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR
3 DEFENDANTS WAS APPROPRIATE. AS THAT COURT STATED,
4 THE UNCONTRADICTED EVIDENCE SHOWS THAT NO PLAINTIFF
5 WAS FORCED TO ACCEPT A TIED PRODUCT.

6 SO IN THE MURPHY CASE THE COURT AFFIRMED
7 SUMMARY JUDGMENT FOR THE DEFENDANT. THE DEFENDANT
8 WON ON THE GROUND THAT THE PLAINTIFF HAD NOT SHOWN
9 THAT HE WAS FORCED TO ACCEPT THE TIED PRODUCT.

10 THE COURT DIDN'T SAY, WELL, THAT DOESN'T
11 MATTER AS LONG AS HE CAN PROVE MARKET LEVEL
12 COERCION. IN THAT CASE THE COURT SAYS, YOU'RE OUT
13 OF COURT, PLAINTIFF, BECAUSE YOU HAVEN'T PROVED
14 COERCION.

15 THE PLAINTIFFS, YOUR HONOR, DO NOT TRY
16 AND SUPPORT THE PRIOR DECISION BASED ON THE MURPHY
17 CASE. THEY RECOGNIZE AT LEAST IMPLICITLY THAT
18 MURPHY DOESN'T SUPPORT A CONCEPT OF MARKET LEVEL
19 COERCION.

20 WHAT THEY DO IS THAT THEY GO TO THE MOORE
21 CASE. THERE IS A PRIOR DECISION IN THE MOORE CASE
22 AT 473 F.2D 328 THAT TALKS ABOUT THE EVIDENCE OF
23 COERCION IN THAT RECORD.

24 IN MOORE ITSELF, MOORE STARTS OFF BY
25 SAYING THAT COERCION IS REQUIRED. IT SAYS TYINGS

1 INVOLVE A SELLER'S REFUSAL TO SELL ONE PRODUCT
2 UNLESS THE BUYER ALSO PURCHASES ANOTHER PRODUCT.

3 AND THEN IT SAYS, REVIEWS THE EVIDENCE OF
4 COERCION ON THAT RECORD, AND THEN IT SAYS,
5 "COERCION MAY BE IMPLIED FROM A SHOWING THAT AN
6 APPRECIABLE NUMBER OF BUYERS HAVE ACCEPTED
7 BURDENSOME TERMS."

8 AND THIS IS WHAT I WAS REFERRING TO
9 BEFORE. IN ORDER TO GET THE BENEFIT OF AN
10 INFERENCE THAT THERE'S COERCION, THEY HAVE TO SHOW
11 THAT AN APPRECIABLE NUMBER OF BUYERS ACCEPTED
12 BURDENSOME TERMS.

13 BUT BUYING AN IPOD IS NOT A BURDENSOME
14 TERM. ONE CANNOT INFER FROM THE MERE FACT THAT
15 SOMEBODY BUYS AN IPOD THAT THEY WERE COERCED INTO
16 DOING THAT AND THAT WAS TRUE WHETHER IT'S AN
17 INDIVIDUAL OR WHETHER YOU LOOK AT ALL INDIVIDUALS.

18 THE COURT: WELL, YOU STATE THAT BUYING
19 AN IPOD IS NOT A BURDENSOME TERM BUT AM I TO SIMPLY
20 ACCEPT THAT AT THIS POINT?

21 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: YOUR HONOR, IF I COULD
22 HAND UP A HANDOUT THAT WILL ADDRESS THAT ISSUE.

23 THIS FIRST CHART SUMMARIZES THE EVIDENCE
24 IN THE RECORD AND SOME OF IT IS CONFIDENTIAL SO I'M
25 NOT GOING TO SAY IT OUT LOUD. BUT WHAT WE KNOW

1 FROM THE DATA IS THAT A MAJORITY OF IPOD USERS
2 EITHER RECEIVE THEIR IPOD AS A GIFT, SO THEY
3 WEREN'T COERCED, OR THE PERSON BUYING IT WASN'T
4 COERCED OR THEY NEVER BOUGHT MUSIC FROM APPLE'S
5 MUSIC STORE SO THEY COULDN'T HAVE BEEN COERCED BY
6 THAT.

7 AND AT PAGE 6 OF OUR BRIEF WE SET FORTH
8 THE DATA ON THAT, BUT IT'S A SIZEABLE PERCENTAGE OF
9 IPOD PURCHASERS JUST NEVER GO TO THE MUSIC STORE.
10 SO THEY COULDN'T HAVE BEEN COERCED UNDER THE
11 PLAINTIFFS' THEORY, OR THEY BOUGHT THE IPOD BEFORE
12 BUYING ANY MUSIC FROM THE MUSIC STORE, SO THEY
13 COULDN'T HAVE BEEN COERCED, OR THEY HAVE VERY SMALL
14 ELEMENTS OF ITUNES MUSIC ON THEIR IPOD.

15 SO UNDER THEIR LOCK-IN THEORY IT DOESN'T
16 WORK BECAUSE THE MAJORITY OF THE MUSIC ON AN IPOD
17 COMES FROM SOURCES OTHER THAN THE MUSIC STORE,
18 NOTABLY A PERSON'S CD COLLECTION.

19 SO WHAT WE KNOW IS THAT A LOT OF PEOPLE
20 BOUGHT IPODS EVEN BEFORE THE MUSIC STORE WAS
21 LAUNCHED. YOU KNOW, IT DIDN'T COME ON THE SCENE
22 UNTIL 18 MONTHS AFTER IPODS HAD BEEN INTRODUCED AND
23 WERE SELLING.

24 WE KNOW THAT FIVE OUT OF THE FIVE
25 PLAINTIFFS ADMIT THEY WEREN'T COERCED. THEY BOUGHT

1 IPODS IN THESE CIRCUMSTANCES.

2 AND AS I SAY, THERE'S NEVER BEEN A
3 CONSUMER CLASS ACTION WHERE IT WAS ADMITTED BY THE
4 NAMED PLAINTIFFS THAT THERE WASN'T ANY COERCION.

5 SO THEY DON'T GET THE BENEFIT OF AN
6 INFERENCE THAT JUST BECAUSE YOU BUY AN IPOD YOU
7 WERE COERCED TO DO IT, BECAUSE AS I SAY, A MAJORITY
8 OF IPOD USERS COULDN'T POSSIBLY HAVE BEEN COERCED.
9 AND THE PLAINTIFFS RECOGNIZE THAT.

10 AND SO WHAT THEY DO, AND THIS IS ON THE
11 SECOND PAGE, THEIR EXPERT COMES UP WITH A LIST OF
12 CHARACTERISTICS OF THE PERSON THAT THEY SAY IS
13 COERCED.

14 AND HERE'S WHAT ACCORDING TO THEIR EXPERT
15 THEY HAVE TO FIND. FIRST OF ALL, THE PERSON HAS TO
16 BUY ENOUGH MUSIC FROM ITUNES THAT IT MATTERS;

17 THEN THEY HAVE TO WANT TO PLAY IT ON A
18 PORTABLE PLAYER, A PORTABLE DIGITAL PLAYER;

19 AND THEN THEY WANT TO -- THEY HAVE TO
20 PREFER AN IPOD COMPETITOR, RATHER THAN AN IPOD;

21 AND THEN THEY HAVE TO SHOW THAT THEY
22 DON'T KNOW HOW TO BURN AND RIP THE MUSIC BECAUSE IT
23 IS ADMITTED ON THIS RECORD THAT BY BURNING AND THEN
24 RIPPING THE MUSIC, YOU CAN PLAY ITUNES MUSIC ON A
25 COMPETING PLAYER.

1 IN AN ADDENDUM TO OUR OPPOSITION BRIEF,
2 YOUR HONOR, WE SET FORTH SOME SCREEN SHOTS THAT
3 SHOW HOW THAT PROCESS OF BURNING AND RIPPING WORKS.

4 AND THE PLAINTIFFS HAVE ADMITTED THAT A
5 CONSUMER CAN MAKE COPIES OF THE RECORDINGS YOU GET
6 FROM ITUNES MUSIC STORE AND READ THEM BACK INTO A
7 PERSONAL COMPUTER AS DRM FREE FILES. THAT'S QUOTED
8 AT FOOTNOTE 8 OF OUR BRIEF.

9 AND THEN NOLL, THEIR EXPERT, SAYS THAT
10 THE MECHANISM TO PLAY ITUNES FILES ON COMPETING
11 PLAYERS IS TO DO AN ACTUAL OR A VIRTUAL BURN OF THE
12 CD AND THEN REPLAY IT.

13 AND THE PLAINTIFFS HAVE ADMITTED THAT
14 IT'S EASY TO DO THAT. AND AT PAGE 9 OF OUR BRIEF,
15 WE SET FORTH THE DEPOSITION TESTIMONY WHERE THEY
16 ADMIT IT TAKES UNDER A MINUTE TO DO THAT. THEY
17 KNOW HOW TO DO IT. THEY DO IT FREQUENTLY. AND THE
18 FIRST PLAINTIFF, MR. SLATTERY, ADMITTED THAT BY
19 BURNING AND RIPPING, HE CAN PLAY COMPETING -- HE
20 CAN PLAY ITUNES MUSIC ON COMPETING DEVICES.

21 AND I ASKED HIM, AND BURNING AND RIPPING
22 IS A PROCESS THAT YOU HAVE DONE NUMEROUS TIMES?
23 OH, YES, MANY.

24 AND SO ALL THEY HAVE TO DO IS PUT A BLANK
25 CD IN THEIR COMPUTER, HIT THE BURN DISK ICON IN

1 ITUNES AND IT BURNS THE MUSIC, COPIES THE MUSIC TO
2 A CD, AND THEN THEY JUST DRAG IT BACK TO THEIR
3 MUSIC LIBRARY AND THEY CAN PUT IT ON ANY COMPETING
4 PLAYER THAT THEY WANT TO.

5 AND AS I SAY, APPENDIX 2 TO OUR
6 OPPOSITION SETS FORTH THAT PROCESS.

7 SO WHAT THE PLAINTIFFS SAY IS THAT THEY
8 ACKNOWLEDGE THAT IF YOU BURN AND RIP AND KNOW HOW
9 TO DO IT, THEN YOU'RE NOT UNDER THEIR THEORY
10 COERCED. YOU'RE NOT LOCKED IN. YOU CAN PLAY
11 ITUNES MUSIC ON A COMPETING PLAYER.

12 SO THE OTHER ELEMENT FOR THEIR COERCED
13 CONSUMERS IS THAT THIS PREFERENCE FOR A COMPETING
14 PLAYER HAS TO BE NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO JUSTIFY THIS
15 SMALL AMOUNT OF TIME AND EFFORT IT TAKES TO DO THE
16 BURNING AND RIPPING BECAUSE IF YOU REALLY WANT A
17 COMPETING PLAYER, THEN YOU'RE GOING TO TAKE, YOU
18 KNOW, THE MINUTE OR LESS IT TAKES TO DO THIS EASY
19 STEP OF BURNING AND RIPPING.

20 AND ONLY IF THEY MEET ALL OF THOSE
21 REQUIREMENTS COULD THEY SAY THAT THEY'RE FORCED TO
22 BUY AN IPOD.

23 WELL, WHAT IS THE SIGNIFICANCE OF ALL OF
24 THAT?

25 FIRST OF ALL, THE PLAINTIFFS THEMSELVES

1 DON'T MEET THOSE CRITERIA. THEY HAVEN'T FOUND
2 ANYBODY WHO DOES. THEY HAVEN'T PROPOSED ANY CLASS
3 WIDE METHOD OF IDENTIFYING ANYBODY WHO FITS INTO
4 THAT CATEGORY.

5 THEY CERTAINLY HAVEN'T NARROWED THE CLASS
6 TO THESE TYPES OF PEOPLE AND THE REASON THEY
7 HAVEN'T DONE ANY OF THAT IS THAT THEY RECOGNIZE THE
8 ONLY WAY TO DETERMINE IF ANYBODY FITS INTO THIS SET
9 OF CRITERIA IS TO GO INDIVIDUAL BY INDIVIDUAL.

10 SO THEY COME BACK AND SAY, WELL, MOORE
11 SAYS THAT WE CAN JUST INFER THAT PEOPLE ARE
12 COERCED. WELL, NOT UNDER THEIR THEORY. YOU CAN'T
13 INFER, JUST BECAUSE SOMEBODY HAS AN IPOD, THAT THEY
14 MEET THESE CRITERIA. THE ONLY WAY TO DO THIS IS TO
15 GO INDIVIDUAL BY INDIVIDUAL. AND THAT'S WHY, YOUR
16 HONOR, WHEN YOU LOOK AT THE TYING CASES, IN
17 ANTITRUST CASES, YOU KNOW, PRICE FIXING CASES,
18 COURTS OFTEN CERTIFY CLASSES BUT THAT'S NOT TRUE IN
19 TYING CASES.

20 THE PARTIES CITED ABOUT 20 TYING CASES
21 WHERE A CLASS WAS REQUESTED IN THE VARIOUS BRIEFS.

22 IN 11 OF THOSE, THE COURTS DENIED
23 CLASSES. AND IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT IN THE DISTRICT
24 COURTS, THE PERCENTAGE IS ABOUT THE SAME. AND THE
25 KRELL CASE IN THE NINTH CIRCUIT IS A GOOD EXAMPLE.

1 IN THAT CASE THE COURT CERTIFIED SOME CLAIMS AND
2 REFUSED TO CERTIFY OTHER CLAIMS.

3 AND THE DIFFERENTIATING FACTOR IN THESE
4 TWO LINES OF CASES AND IN KRELL ITSELF IS THAT IF
5 THERE IS A UNIFORM CONTRACTUAL REQUIREMENT THAT
6 SAYS THAT I'M NOT GOING TO SELL YOU PRODUCT A
7 UNLESS YOU BUY PRODUCT B, AND I'M NOT GOING TO SELL
8 THE PRODUCT SEPARATELY, THEN THE COURTS FIND THAT
9 THERE'S A UNIFORM CLASS WIDE METHOD OF PROOF.

10 THE COURT: NOW, I AGREE WITH A LOT OF
11 WHAT YOU'RE TELLING ME, BUT THERE IS SOME PARTS OF
12 WHAT I UNDERSTAND ABOUT THIS CIRCUMSTANCE THAT
13 YOU'RE NOT ADDRESSING AND IT HELPS YOUR ARGUMENT IF
14 YOU WOULD PAY ATTENTION TO THAT.

15 AND THAT IS THAT ANTITRUST LAW EVOLVED AS
16 THE SOCIETY HAS EVOLVED AND INDUSTRIES AND
17 TECHNOLOGIES AFFECTED BY IT BRING DIFFERENT
18 PROBLEMS TO BEAR. HERE WE LIVE IN A WORLD TODAY
19 THAT IS VERY DIFFERENT THAN WHAT EXISTED THEN THE
20 DECISIONS THAT ARE BEING CITED TO ME AND ACROSS
21 VARIOUS MARKETS THE PARAMETERS THAT THE COURTS
22 SHOULD USE TO JUDGE COERCION CAN CHANGE.

23 WE EXIST IN A WORLD TODAY WHERE I NOTICE
24 THAT ONE BULLET POINT YOU HAVE NOT PUT ON YOUR
25 SLIDE IS THAT THERE ARE AN APPRECIABLE NUMBER OF

1 CONSUMERS WHO UNDERSTAND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN
2 THE DIGITAL MUSIC MARKET AND DIGITAL MUSIC PLAYERS
3 AND CHOOSE TO PURCHASE PRODUCTS BASED UPON THAT
4 LEVEL OF UNDERSTANDING.

5 AND DO I UNDERSTAND YOU TO DENY THAT
6 THERE ARE A GROUP OF PURCHASERS WHO APPRECIATE THAT
7 APPLE HAS A LARGE MARKET IN DIGITAL MUSIC IN ITS
8 ITUNES STORE AND WHO WOULD WISH TO PURCHASE THAT
9 MUSIC UNENCUMBERED BY A REQUIREMENT THAT THEY
10 DOWNLOAD IT TO A DISK BEFORE THEY COULD THEN
11 DOWNLOAD IT TO A PLAYER AND WHO WOULD WISH TO
12 SIMPLY DOWNLOAD IT DIRECTLY TO A PLAYER BUT FIND
13 THAT THEY CAN'T DO THAT?

14 WE ARE A SOCIETY OF CONVENIENCE. IF
15 GIVEN THE CHOICE BETWEEN A GAS STATION WHERE YOU
16 COULD BUY YOUR GAS WITHOUT HAVING TO GO INSIDE BY
17 SIMPLY SLIDING A CARD WITH A HIGHER PRICE THAN ONE
18 THAT HAS A CHEAPER PRICE IF YOU GO INSIDE TO
19 SOMEONE AND TALK TO THEM AND DEAL WITH THEM,
20 CONSUMERS ARE ONES WHO MIGHT TAKE THE FASTER COURSE
21 OUT OF HABIT.

22 AND SO THE MERCHANTS OF THE WORLD KNOWING
23 THAT PROCLIVITY CAN TAKE ADVANTAGE OF IT AND ONE OF
24 THE WAYS AS I UNDERSTAND APPLE HAS TAKEN ADVANTAGE
25 OF THAT IS TO SAY THAT IF WE MAKE A PLAYER WHICH

1 CAN ONLY DIRECTLY DOWNLOAD FROM THE INTERNET MUSIC
2 CALLED THE IPOD AND NO OTHER PLAYER CAN DO THAT,
3 AND WE SET UP OUR MUSIC IN A WAY THAT IT CAN ONLY
4 DOWNLOAD DIRECTLY TO AN IPOD, CONSUMERS WILL
5 PURCHASE THAT PRODUCT BECAUSE OF THEIR PROCLIVITY
6 FOR THAT FAST AND CONVENIENT WAY OF DOING IT.

7 DO YOU DISAGREE WITH ANYTHING THAT I HAVE
8 JUST SAID?

9 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: YES AND NO. THE
10 QUESTION IS THAT IT'S NOT APPLE TAKING ADVANTAGE OF
11 SOMETHING THAT IT'S CREATING ITSELF. THIS DOESN'T
12 GO DIRECTLY TO YOUR --

13 THE COURT: I DIDN'T SAY APPLE CREATED
14 IT. TOOK ADVANTAGE OF IT AS A PROCLIVITY IN HUMAN
15 NATURE.

16 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: LET ME ADDRESS THAT
17 AND IT'S CLEAR AND EVERYBODY AGREES THAT THE REASON
18 THAT MUSIC STORES USE DRM, ANTI-PIRATE SOFTWARE IS
19 BECAUSE THE RECORD LABELS REQUIRE IT.

20 THE COURT: AND I ACKNOWLEDGE THAT WHEN I
21 WAS SPEAKING WITH YOUR OPPONENT.

22 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: AND IT'S ALSO TRUE AND
23 THIS IS A NEW FACT THAT PLAINTIFFS' EXPERT HAS
24 ACKNOWLEDGED THAT THERE'S NOTHING WRONG WITH APPLE
25 USING ITS OWN PROPRIETARY SOFTWARE. HE SAID IT

1 WOULD BE STUPID TO PROHIBIT THAT, STUPID IS HIS
2 WORD, BECAUSE IT WAS THWART INNOVATION. SO HE'S ON
3 BOARD WITH APPLE USING ITS OWN SOFTWARE RATHER THAN
4 MICROSOFT'S, FOR EXAMPLE.

5 THE COURT: AND I HOPE I HAVE NOT SAID
6 ANYTHING CONTRARY TO THAT. I THINK APPLE HAS
7 DISTINGUISHED ITSELF AS A COMPANY BY THAT VERY
8 FREEDOM.

9 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: SO TO GET TO YOUR
10 HONOR'S QUESTION, LET'S ASSUME THAT THERE ARE
11 PEOPLE OUT THERE WHO BOUGHT IPODS BECAUSE THEY WORK
12 WELL WITH THE ITUNES MUSIC STORE AND WORK BETTER
13 AND DON'T TAKE THAT EXTRA MINUTE THAN A COMPETING
14 PLAYER.

15 THE COURT: YOU CALLED IT A MINUTE. I'LL
16 LET YOU GO FOR NOW, BUT I'M AFRAID I DON'T AGREE
17 WITH YOU THAT IT'S A MINUTE.

18 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: WELL, IT'S A MINUTE OF
19 THE USER'S TIME. YOU KNOW, THE COMPUTER TAKES
20 LONGER. I CAN SHOW YOUR HONOR HOW TO DO IT IN A
21 MINUTE.

22 THE COURT: WELL, YOU SEE -- BUT THAT'S
23 NOT THE ISSUE BUT GO AHEAD.

24 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: THE ISSUE, I THINK,
25 YOUR HONOR, IS WHETHER THIS IS SOMETHING THAT CAN

1 BE PROVED ON A CLASS WIDE BASIS OR WHETHER IT
2 REQUIRES INDIVIDUAL PROOF.

3 THE COURT: THAT I THINK IS THE ISSUE.
4 AND SO THE QUESTION THAT YOU'RE ASKING ME TO
5 RECONSIDER IS WHETHER OR NOT THE MARKET LEVEL
6 COERCION IS PERMISSIBLE IN THIS CASE, AND I'M
7 WILLING TO THINK ABOUT THAT MORE BECAUSE I DO THINK
8 THAT THAT IS AN IMPORTANT ISSUE TO ANSWER.

9 BUT IF I ANSWER THAT IT IS PERMISSIBLE,
10 DO YOU HAVE AN ARGUMENT THAT THERE IS NO MARKET
11 LEVEL COERCION?

12 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: THE ARGUMENT AT THAT
13 POINT IS HOW ARE THEY GOING TO PROVE MARKET LEVEL
14 COERCION? THEY NEED TO COME UP WITH A METHOD TO
15 PROVE THIS ON A CLASS WIDE BASIS AND THEY HAVEN'T
16 SUGGESTED ANY.

17 IT'S, YOU KNOW, WHETHER IT'S
18 INDIVIDUAL --

19 THE COURT: I THINK BY DEFINITION, MARKET
20 LEVEL COERCION IS CLASS WIDE.

21 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: WELL, BUT HOW DO THEY
22 PROVE COERCION?

23 IF I'M RIGHT THAT THE ELEMENTS OF THEIR
24 COERCED CONSUMER ARE AS SET FORTH HERE ON CHART
25 NUMBER 2, AND LET'S ADD TO IT WHAT I THINK IS

1 IMPLICIT AND WHAT WAS SUGGESTED BY YOUR HONOR THAT
2 YOU HAVE TO KNOW THAT IF YOU BURN AND RIP, THEN YOU
3 CAN PLAY THE MUSIC ON A COMPETING PLAYER, LET'S ADD
4 THAT. THAT'S ANOTHER INDIVIDUAL ISSUE.

5 AND IN ORDER TO PROVE THAT I WAS COERCED
6 OR IN ORDER TO PROVE THAT, YOU KNOW, THE MARKET WAS
7 COERCED. AND AGAIN, THE MARKET IS JUST A BUNCH OF
8 INDIVIDUALS.

9 AND THERE'S -- YOU KNOW, IF YOU CAN'T
10 PROVE THAT I WAS COERCED WITHOUT ASKING ME AND
11 EXPLORING MY CIRCUMSTANCES, YOU CAN'T GET AWAY FROM
12 THAT. THE PLAINTIFFS CAN'T GET AROUND THAT BY JUST
13 SAYING, WELL, WE'RE NOT GOING TO LOOK AT
14 INDIVIDUALS. WE'RE GOING TO LOOK AT EVERYBODY AS A
15 GROUP BECAUSE WHEN YOU LOOK AT EVERYBODY AS A
16 GROUP, YOU STILL HAVE TO FIND OUT, YOU KNOW, WHY
17 DID YOU BUY YOUR IPOD? WERE YOU HAPPY TO BUY YOUR
18 IPOD?

19 I MEAN, SOME PEOPLE BUY AN IPOD BECAUSE
20 IT WORKS WELL WITH THE MUSIC STORE AND THEY'RE
21 DELIGHTED AND THEY WOULD NEVER BUY A COMPETING
22 PLAYER EVEN IF IT WAS AS EASY TO USE WITH THE MUSIC
23 STORE AS THE IPOD BECAUSE THE IPOD IS A REALLY
24 GREAT DEVICE.

25 SAME REASON ON CHART NUMBER 1. PEOPLE

1 BUY AN IPOD WITHOUT REGARD TO THE MUSIC STORE.

2 SO YOU NEED TO ASK INDIVIDUAL BY
3 INDIVIDUAL AND THAT'S WHY, YOU KNOW, I'M NOT SAYING
4 TYING LAWS SHOULDN'T KEEP UP WITH THE TIMES BUT AN
5 ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF TYING LAW AND CLASS
6 CERTIFICATION IS CAN YOU PROVE IT ON A CLASS WIDE
7 BASIS AND THEY DON'T HAVE A METHOD FOR DOING THAT,
8 ESPECIALLY IF YOU NEED INDIVIDUAL COERCION, BUT
9 EVEN IF YOU CALL IT MARKET COERCION, IT'S STILL A
10 GROUP OF INDIVIDUALS.

11 YOUR HONOR, LET ME JUST HIT TWO OTHER
12 POINTS QUICKLY. IT'S NOT RIGHT THAT COERCION IS
13 OUR ONLY ARGUMENT AS AN INDIVIDUAL ISSUE. AS
14 COUNSEL RECOGNIZES THIS NET OVERCHARGE IS ALSO A
15 REASON THAT THEY DON'T RECOGNIZE THAT THEY
16 ADDRESSED IT. BUT WE SAY THE NEED TO PROVE PROOF
17 OF INJURY OR THE FACT OF DAMAGE IN THE NINTH
18 CIRCUIT THAT NEEDS TO BE PROVED IN A TYING CASE ON
19 A PACKAGE BASIS. AND CHART NUMBER 7 SUMMARIZES THE
20 LAW ON THAT.

21 AND THE BASIC IDEA, AS SET FORTH BY THE
22 FREELAND CASE, THE AT & T CASE IN THE SOUTHERN
23 DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, IF A TIE CAUSES A BUYER TO
24 PAY MORE THAN THE MARKET PRICE FOR THE TIED
25 PRODUCT, THE BUYER IS MOST LIKELY PAYING LESS THAN

1 THE PRICE THAT THE SELLER COULD OTHERWISE CHARGE
2 FOR THE TYING PRICE.

3 IN OTHER WORDS, THE PRICE ON THE FIRST
4 PRODUCT IS LOWER AND THAT'S BASIC ECONOMIC THEORY
5 FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE FREELAND CASE.

6 FREELAND DENIES CLASS CERTIFICATION
7 BECAUSE THE PLAINTIFF WAS UNABLE TO IDENTIFY A
8 METHOD TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THAT HAD NOT HAPPENED.

9 AND THE REASON THAT'S IMPORTANT IS A
10 CONSUMER IS NOT DAMAGES, IS NOT INJURED IF, IN
11 FACT, THERE'S BEEN A LOWERING OF THE PRICE ON THE
12 MUSIC WHICH IS OFFSET IN ANY INCREASE IN THE PRICE
13 OF THE IPOD. THAT'S THE LAW OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT
14 IN THE SIEGLE CASE AND THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT CASE WE
15 CITE THERE IN THE BOTTOM BULLET SHOWS THAT. AND IT
16 INTERPRETS AND APPLIES THE NINTH CIRCUIT SIEGLE
17 RULE.

18 THE COURT: WELL, I WANT TO LEARN A LOT
19 MORE ABOUT THAT. IN OTHER WORDS, IF THE TIED -- IF
20 A TIE CAUSES A BUYER TO PAY MORE THAN THE MARKET
21 PRICE FOR THE TIED PRODUCT, THE BUYER IS MOST
22 LIKELY PAYING LESS THAN THE PRICE THE SELLER COULD
23 PROFITABLY CHARGE.

24 SO THAT IS -- IS THAT MORE OR LESS THAN
25 MARKET FOR THE TYING PRODUCT?

1 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: LESS, LESS.

2 THE COURT: LESS THAN MARKET?

3 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: YES. AND THE IDEA IS
4 THAT ON DAY ONE YOU'RE SELLING THE FIRST PRODUCT.

5 THE COURT: BUT HOW DOES THAT FOLLOW
6 THERE'S NO DAMAGE? WHAT IF YOU REDUCE IT BY A
7 NICKEL AND SOMETHING ELSE IS SOLD AT A PREMIUM, HOW
8 DOES THAT MEAN THAT THERE IS NO DAMAGE?

9 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: YEAH, IT DEPENDS ON
10 THE SIZE OF THE OVERCHARGE AND THE SIZE OF THE --
11 THE SIZE OF THE OVERCHARGE AND THE SIZE OF THE
12 UNDERCHARGE IF YOU WILL.

13 THE COURT: RIGHT.

14 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: AND THE RELATIVE
15 NUMBER OF UNITS THAT YOU BUY OF EACH.

16 THE COURT: YES.

17 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: AND SO IN THE VISA
18 CASE THE PLAINTIFFS' EXPERT CAME IN AND SAID THAT
19 THERE'S NO UNDERCHARGE ON THE FIRST PRODUCT. AND
20 SO THE COURT SAID, OKAY, WE DON'T HAVE A PROBLEM
21 WITH A NET OVERCHARGE.

22 AND HERE WHEN I ASKED PROFESSOR NOLL,
23 WHAT ABOUT THE PRICE OF MUSIC, WAS THAT LOWERED?
24 AND HE SAID HE HASN'T STUDIED IT, HE DOESN'T
25 PROPOSE TO STUDY IT AND HE'S NOT GOING TO OFFER AN

1 OPINION ON THAT.

2 SO THE BURDEN ON THE PLAINTIFFS IN THE
3 NINTH CIRCUIT AND THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT IS TO SHOW
4 THAT THERE WAS A NET OVERCHARGE TAKING INTO
5 ACCOUNT, IN OUR CASE, THE AMOUNT OF MUSIC THAT AN
6 INDIVIDUAL CONSUMER BOUGHT, THE AMOUNT OF THE
7 UNDERCHARGE ON THAT, AND COMPARED WITH THE NUMBER
8 OF IPODS THAT THE PERSON BOUGHT AND THE OVERCHARGE
9 ON THAT.

10 THE COURT: WHY SHOULD I DEAL WITH THIS
11 AT THE CLASS CERTIFICATION?

12 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: WELL, FOR THE VERY
13 REASON, YOUR HONOR, THAT THE PLAINTIFFS DON'T DEAL
14 WITH IT.

15 THE REASON THEY DON'T DEAL WITH IT IS
16 THAT THE ONLY WAY TO ESTABLISH THIS FACT OF INJURY
17 IN A REGIME WHERE THE NET OVERCHARGE MUST BE SHOWN
18 ON A PACKAGE BASIS IS TO GO CONSUMER BY CONSUMER.

19 IT RAISES INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS, WHICH IS
20 WHAT THE FREELAND CASE HELD AND THAT'S WHY FREELAND
21 DENIED CERT. THE PLAINTIFFS RECOGNIZE THAT BECAUSE
22 THE RELATIVE AMOUNT OF PURCHASES MATTERS IN THIS
23 NET OVERCHARGE APPROACH, YOU HAVE TO GO INDIVIDUAL
24 BY INDIVIDUAL TO SEE WHETHER THEY BOUGHT ENOUGH
25 MUSIC TO MAKE UP FOR THE OVERCHARGE ON THE IPOD.

1 THAT'S AN INDIVIDUAL QUESTION.

2 THERE'S NO CLASS WIDE WAY TO DO IT OR AT
3 LEAST THEY HAVEN'T PROPOSED ANY. AND THAT'S WHY AS
4 I SAY PROFESSOR NOLL JUST SAYS I'M NOT GOING TO
5 WORRY ABOUT THAT.

6 THE SECOND ARGUMENT ON FACT OF DAMAGES
7 LEADS TO THE SAME CONCLUSION. THE PLAINTIFFS AGREE
8 THAT AT LEAST ONE WAY OF PROVING TYING DAMAGES IS
9 TO LOOK AT THE DIFFERENCE OF PRICE BETWEEN THE IPOD
10 YOU WERE FORCED TO BUY AND THE COMPETING PLAYER YOU
11 WANTED TO BUY.

12 THAT'S WHAT THE LESSIG CASE DOES, AND
13 THAT'S WHAT THE GRAY CASE ALSO CITED DOES AND
14 THAT'S A RELATIVELY STRAIGHTFORWARD METHOD OF
15 PROVING DAMAGES.

16 THEY DON'T DO THAT. AND THE REASON THEY
17 DON'T DO THAT IS THAT, TOO, RAISES INDIVIDUAL
18 QUESTIONS.

19 AS SET FORTH IN OUR PREVIOUS ORDER TO
20 PROVE THAT, YOU HAVE TO GO INDIVIDUAL BY INDIVIDUAL
21 SAYING WHAT PLAYER DID YOU WANT TO USE AND DID YOU
22 WANT TO BUY AN IPOD AND WHAT WAS THE DIFFERENCE IN
23 PRICE AND THAT RAISES AN INDIVIDUAL QUESTION AND SO
24 THEY DON'T DO THAT.

25 THAT'S ANOTHER REASON WHY THE CLASS --

1 WHY THIS MOTION SHOULD NOT BE GRANTED. IT SHOULD
2 BE DENIED BECAUSE THEY HAVE IN ESSENCE FORFEITED,
3 GIVEN UP, NOT PURSUED THAT RELATIVE STRAIGHTFORWARD
4 METHOD OF PROVING DAMAGES FOR AN INDIVIDUAL.

5 AND IF THERE'S ANYBODY OUT THERE IN THE
6 WORLD, AND AGAIN, THEY HAVEN'T IDENTIFIED ANYBODY
7 THAT MEETS ALL OF THESE CRITERIA. THAT PERSON
8 WOULD WANT TO COME IN AND HAVE A RELATIVELY SIMPLE
9 CASE AND SAY, HERE'S MY MEASURE OF DAMAGES. IT'S
10 THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE REAL, THE SANSA, THE
11 WHATEVER I WANTED TO BUY AND THE IPOD. AND THEY
12 DON'T DO THAT.

13 AND FINALLY, LET ME ADDRESS THEIR SECTION
14 2 CLAIM. IN THE FREELAND CASE FOOTNOTE 16 THE
15 COURT SAYS THAT WHERE YOU HAVE TYING PRACTICES AND
16 THEY'RE MOST REGULARLY CHALLENGED AS TYING CLAIMS
17 WHEN THE CONDUCT AT ISSUE IS REALLY ALLEGED TO BE A
18 TYING CLAIM, IT'S FROM THE TYING CASE LAW THAT
19 GUIDANCE MUST BE SOUGHT IN AN ATTEMPT TO EVALUATE
20 THE INJURY CLAIMED BY THE PLAINTIFFS.

21 AND THEN THEY SAY THE PRINCIPLES GLEANED
22 FROM THOSE CASES ARE EQUALLY APPLICABLE TO THE
23 NON-TYING CLAIMS WHEN THE BASIC ALLEGATION GOES TO
24 TYING.

25 AND THAT'S WHAT IS GOING ON HERE. THEY

1 CAN'T -- TO THE EXTENT THAT THEY HAVE PROBLEMS WITH
2 INDIVIDUAL PROOF FOR THEIR TYING CLAIM, THEY CAN'T
3 GET RID OF THAT SIMPLY BY SAYING, OKAY, WE'RE NOT
4 GOING TO CALL IT TYING OR COERCIVE. WE'RE GOING TO
5 CALL IT EXCLUSIONARY.

6 BECAUSE WHEN THEY'RE -- IN ORDER TO HAVE
7 A SECTION 2 CLAIM FOR EXCLUSIONARY CONDUCT ON THE
8 FACTS THAT THEY'RE GOING ON HERE OR ON THE THEORY,
9 THEY HAVE TO SHOW THAT CONSUMERS WERE COERCED INTO
10 DOING SOMETHING THAT THEY OTHERWISE WOULDN'T DO AND
11 THEREBY EXCLUDED COMPETITION OR EXCLUDED
12 COMPETITORS.

13 SO HOWEVER THEY PHRASE THEIR CLAIM, IT
14 ALL GETS BACK TO WHETHER THERE WAS ANY COERCIVE
15 EFFECT ON CONSUMERS AND WHETHER THEY WANT TO CALL
16 IT COERCIVE TYING OR EXCLUSIONARY.

17 THE CASE THAT REALLY LAYS OUT I THINK THE
18 IMPORTANCE OF THIS COERCIVE EFFECT IS THE COLBURN
19 CASE. IT WAS JUDGE CONTI'S CASE. IT CAME AFTER
20 MOORE.

21 IN THAT CASE JUDGE CONTI DENIED A CLASS
22 SAYING THAT THE COERCIVE EFFECT, IF ANY, OF THE
23 ALLEGED TYING AGREEMENT COULD NOT BE MEASURED ON A
24 CLASS WIDE BASIS. IT HAD TO GO INDIVIDUAL BY
25 INDIVIDUAL AND THIS IS AFTER MOORE AND HE SAID ON

1 THE FACTS OF THAT CASE, YOU NEED TO GO INDIVIDUAL
2 BY INDIVIDUAL AND SO WE'RE NOT GOING TO CERTIFY A
3 CLASS.

4 THAT CASE IN MY VIEW WOULD NOT HAVE COME
5 OUT ANY DIFFERENTLY IF THE PLAINTIFF WOULD HAVE
6 SAID, OKAY, LET'S NOT CALL IT COERCION. LET'S JUST
7 CALL IT EXCLUSIONARY.

8 IT WOULD REQUIRE THE SAME KIND OF
9 ANALYSIS OF WHETHER ANY CONSUMER HAD BEEN COERCED
10 INTO BUYING AN IPOD THAT THEY DIDN'T WANT TO BUY.

11 FINALLY, YOUR HONOR, THE PLAINTIFFS ON
12 THIS BURNING AND RIPPING ISSUE IN THEIR REPLY BRIEF
13 RAISE THE QUESTION ABOUT WHETHER IT'S LAWFUL TO
14 BURN AND RIP.

15 AND THEY SAID, YOU KNOW, IF IT'S NOT
16 LAWFUL, THEN ALL OF THIS GOES AWAY AND THIS IS ONE
17 INDIVIDUAL ISSUE THAT WOULD BE WITHDRAWN.

18 AT PAGE 6 OF THIS HANDOUT I SUMMARIZE THE
19 LAW ON THAT AND, YOU KNOW, OUR VIEW IS THAT IT'S
20 LEGAL TO BURN AND RIP AND THAT THAT'S NOT A REASON
21 THE -- THAT'S NOT A WAY FOR THE PLAINTIFFS TO AVOID
22 THE IMPACT OF THE AVAILABILITY OF BURNING AND
23 RIPPING.

24 AND JUST TO EMPHASIZE ONE POINT, YOUR
25 HONOR, AS WE SET FORTH IN THE BRIEF, THE PLAINTIFFS

1 AND THEIR EXPERTS ADMIT THAT BURNING AND RIPPING IS
2 A VIABLE OPTION.

3 ONE CAN QUARREL ABOUT HOW LONG IT TAKES
4 TO DO THAT, HOW EASY IT IS TO DO THAT, BUT THAT
5 ONLY HIGHLIGHTS THAT IT'S AN INDIVIDUAL ISSUE.

6 THE PLAINTIFFS HAVEN'T COME UP WITH ANY
7 CLASS WIDE METHOD OF SAYING NOBODY OUT THERE KNOWS
8 HOW TO BURN AND RIP. YOU KNOW, NOBODY EVER DOES
9 IT. IT'S NOT AN OPTION.

10 AND THEY COULDN'T DO THAT GIVEN THE
11 ADMISSIONS OF THEIR OWN CLIENTS.

12 AND SO LET ME END WITH THIS THOUGHT AND
13 IT'S REALLY THE WAY I BEGAN THAT THIS REALLY IS AT
14 BOTTOM I THINK A CONTRIVED ANTITRUST CLAIM BECAUSE
15 IT'S BASED ON APPLE USING ANTI-PIRACY SOFTWARE
16 BECAUSE THE RECORD LABELS REQUIRE IT.

17 AND IT'S EQUALLY CONTRIVED OR EVEN MORE
18 CONTRIVED TO TRY TO TURN THIS INTO A CLASS ACTION
19 AND A CLASS ACTION NOT JUST FOR CONSUMERS BUT ALSO
20 FOR RESELLERS. I'LL RELY ON WHAT WE SAY IN THE
21 PAPERS ABOUT WHY THE CLASS SHOULDN'T BE CERTIFIED
22 FOR THE RESELLERS LIKE WALMART AND TARGET AND BEST
23 BUY. THEY'RE OBVIOUSLY A DIFFERENT CATEGORY OF
24 PURCHASER.

25 THESE PLAINTIFFS, YOUR HONOR MAY RECALL,

1 WHEN THEY FIRST MOVED FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION, IT
2 WAS MRS. -- WHO WAS IT? I FORGET WHO THE PLAINTIFF
3 WAS AT THAT TIME. MAYBE SLATTERY. ANYHOW, THEY
4 MOVED FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION. IT WAS TAKEN OFF
5 CALENDAR WHEN THE NEW COMPLAINT WAS FILED AND THEN
6 THE COMPLAINT WAS CONSOLIDATED.

7 BUT THE FIRST TIME AROUND WHEN THEY MOVED
8 FOR CLASS, THEY DIDN'T MENTION, THEY DIDN'T INCLUDE
9 THE RESELLERS AND I THINK THAT'S BECAUSE THEY'RE
10 OBVIOUSLY IN A DIFFERENT CATEGORY. THEY HAVE NOT
11 ASKED FOR ANY DISCOVERY ON THE RESELLERS. AGAIN,
12 THEY'RE IN A DIFFERENT CATEGORY. THEY'RE BUYING
13 HUGE VOLUMES AND THEIR PURCHASING DECISIONS ARE
14 DIFFERENT.

15 AND THESE PLAINTIFFS, YOU KNOW, ARE NOT
16 TYPICAL OF RESELLERS THAT BUY MILLIONS AND MILLIONS
17 OF IPODS.

18 OUR PAPER ALSO ADDRESSES THE REQUEST FOR
19 AN INJUNCTIVE RELIEF CLASS THAT CLEARLY IS
20 INAPPROPRIATE BECAUSE THE THRUST OF THIS CASE IS
21 FOR DAMAGES AND SO LET ME END AS I STARTED.

22 WHAT IS UNUSUAL ABOUT THIS CASE AND WHAT
23 WOULD MAKE IT UNPRECEDENTED TO CERTIFY A CLASS IS
24 THE IPOD IS A VERY POPULAR PRODUCT. ONE CANNOT
25 INFER THAT THE ONLY REASON ANYBODY WOULD BUY IT IS

1 BECAUSE THEY WERE COERCED TO DO SO. SO THIS
2 EVIDENTIARY INFERENCE FROM MOORE SIMPLY DOESN'T
3 WORK.

4 THERE'S NEVER BEEN A CLASS ACTION
5 CERTIFIED WHERE THE ALLEGED TYING AND TIED PRODUCTS
6 WERE SEPARATELY AVAILABLE, NOT ONLY SEPARATELY
7 AVAILABLE BUT COULD BE USED SEPARATELY AND HERE
8 EVERYBODY AGREES THAT ITUNES MUSIC CAN BE PLAYED ON
9 A COMPUTER. IT CAN BE PLAYED ON AN IPOD, AND IT
10 CAN BE PLAYED WITH AN EXTRA STEP ON ANY COMPETING
11 PLAYER.

12 THERE'S NEVER BEEN A CLASS CERTIFIED IN
13 THAT CIRCUMSTANCE BECAUSE IT OBVIOUSLY, I SAY
14 OBVIOUSLY, TO ME IT RAISES INDIVIDUAL ISSUES ABOUT
15 WHY SOMEBODY BOUGHT THEIR IPOD AND WHETHER THEY CAN
16 MEET THE CRITERIA THAT THE PLAINTIFFS HAVE SET
17 FORTH.

18 THERE'S NEVER BEEN A CLASS ACTION IN A
19 CONSUMER CASE WHERE ALL OF THE PLAINTIFFS ADMIT
20 THAT THEY BOUGHT THE ALLEGED UNWANTED PRODUCT
21 VOLUNTARILY. THEY ADMIT THAT THEY WEREN'T COERCED.

22 AND, YOUR HONOR, WHEN THE COURT GOES BACK
23 TO LOOK AT THE MOORE CASE, ANOTHER DIFFERENCE TO
24 KEEP IN MIND IN MOORE IS MOORE WAS A CASE BROUGHT
25 BY A COMPETITOR. AND SO THERE THE COURT WAS ASKING

1 THE QUESTION, HOW MUCH COERCION OF CONSUMERS DOES A
2 COMPETITOR NEED TO SHOW IN ORDER TO PROVE A CLAIM
3 FOR LOST PROFITS BECAUSE THEY WERE EXCLUDED FROM
4 THE MARKET? THAT'S A MUCH DIFFERENT CIRCUMSTANCE
5 BECAUSE THERE THE ISSUE IS HOW MUCH OF THE MARKET
6 HAS TO BE FORECLOSED TO A COMPETITOR BY THIS TYING
7 IN ORDER FOR THE COMPETITOR TO HAVE A CLAIM FOR
8 LOST PROFITS.

9 AND SO IT'S ONE THING IN A CASE LIKE THAT
10 TO SAY, YOU KNOW, OF COURSE A QUESTIONER DOESN'T
11 HAVE TO SHOW THAT HE WAS COERCED AT ALL. HE'S NOT
12 BUYING THE PRODUCT. AND SO WHATEVER THE COURT SAYS
13 IN THAT CONTRACT DOESN'T APPLY AT LEAST DIRECTLY IN
14 THE CASE WHERE A CONSUMER COMES IN AND THE CONSUMER
15 IS SAYING I WANT TO RECOVER DAMAGES BUT I WASN'T
16 COERCED.

17 AT PAGE 14 OF OUR BRIEF WE QUOTE FROM
18 PROFESSOR AREDA, YOU KNOW, THE LEADING EXPERT ON
19 ANTITRUST LAW AND FROM HIS TREATISE AND WHAT HE
20 SAYS I THINK IS RELEVANT TO ALL OF THIS. HE SAYS
21 THAT IF YOU WOULD HAVE PURCHASED THE TIED PRODUCT
22 ANYWAY, SO YOU WOULD HAVE BOUGHT AN IPOD REGARDLESS
23 OF THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE MUSIC STORE, YOU LACK
24 STANDING TO OBTAIN DAMAGES BECAUSE YOU HAVEN'T BEEN
25 DAMAGED BY TYING. YOU HAVEN'T BEEN COERCED TO DO

1 ANYTHING. YOU JUST BOUGHT THE PRODUCT, YOU WOULD
2 HAVE BOUGHT IT ANYWAY.

3 AND THEN HE SAYS, THE RESULT IS THAT
4 TYING ARRANGEMENT PURCHASER CONSUMER CLASS ACTIONS,
5 SEEKING DAMAGES CANNOT BE CERTIFIED IF THE CLASS
6 MIGHT INCLUDE SOME PURCHASERS WHO WOULD HAVE
7 PURCHASED THE TIED PRODUCT IN ANY EVENT BECAUSE
8 THAT PERSON HASN'T BEEN DAMAGED, HASN'T SUFFERED
9 ANTITRUST INJURY. HE WOULD HAVE BOUGHT IT ANYWAY.

10 HERE, AS I HAVE SAID, THE PLAINTIFFS HAVE
11 NOT TRIED TO NARROW THEIR CLASS TO THE PEOPLE WHO
12 MEET THESE CHARACTERISTICS.

13 THE COURT: I APPRECIATE YOUR ARGUMENT,
14 AND I DO NEED TO HAVE YOU BRING IT TO A CLOSE
15 MAINLY BECAUSE THERE ARE A COUPLE OF ISSUES THAT I
16 NEED TO DEAL WITH BEFORE I CAN MOVE INTO THESE MORE
17 ESOTERIC THEORIES THAT YOU HAVE HIGHLIGHTED FOR ME
18 WELL ENOUGH. AND SO THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

19 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: OKAY. THANK YOU, YOUR
20 HONOR.

21 THE COURT: COUNSEL, YOU RESERVED SOME OF
22 YOUR TIME FOR REBUTTAL.

23 I APOLOGIZE TO THOSE WHO ARE HERE FOR OUR
24 10:00 O'CLOCK HEARING, BUT I NEED TO GIVE COUNSEL
25 TIME FOR REBUTTAL AND WE'LL BE DONE IN ABOUT TEN

1 MINUTES.

2 MS. SWEENEY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR, I
3 WILL BE BRIEF. MR. MITTELSTAEDT'S ARGUMENT
4 FOCUSED PRIMARILY ON THE MERITS ISSUES IN THIS
5 CASE AND I JUST WANTED TO REMIND THE COURT THAT NOT
6 ONLY IS THAT APPROPRIATE IN CLASS CERTIFICATION BUT
7 IN THIS CASE DISCOVERY HAS BEEN BIFURCATED. WE
8 HAVE HAD NO MERITS DISCOVERY.

9 SO THE QUESTION WHETHER BURNING AND
10 RIPPING IS A VIABLE OPTION, OF COURSE WE DON'T
11 AGREE THAT IT IS A VIABLE OPTION. THAT'S A MERITS
12 ISSUE THAT WILL BE ADDRESSED AFTER FULL DISCOVERY.

13 THE QUESTION ABOUT WHETHER THERE CAN BE
14 INTERPLAYABILITY WITHOUT VIOLATING DRM, THAT IS
15 ANOTHER MERITS QUESTION AND WE HIGHLIGHTED IN OUR
16 OPENING BRIEF THE STATEMENT OF SOME OF THE LABELS
17 THAT THEY WOULD LIKE TO SEE INTEROPERABILITY.

18 SO OBVIOUSLY THE LABELS HAVE A DIFFERENT
19 POINT OF VIEW THAN APPLE. THAT IS APPLE'S VIEW IS,
20 WELL, WE HAVE TO DO IT THIS WAY BECAUSE OTHERWISE
21 WE WOULD BE VIOLATING COPYRIGHT LAWS.

22 SO THAT'S ANOTHER MERITS ISSUE THAT IS
23 RESERVED UNTIL AFTER PLAINTIFFS HAVE HAD AN
24 OPPORTUNITY TO CONDUCT DISCOVERY.

25 I WOULD ALSO LIKE TO CORRECT SOME OF THE

1 MISSTATEMENTS THAT MR. MITTELSTAEDT MADE. HE MADE
2 CLAIMS ABOUT FIVE PLAINTIFFS IN THIS ACTION. THERE
3 ARE THREE PLAINTIFFS, THREE NAMED PLAINTIFFS.

4 PLAINTIFF SLATTERY DISMISSED HIS CLAIM.
5 PLAINTIFF SOMERS IS A PLAINTIFF IN THE INDIRECT
6 PURCHASER ACTION, NOT THIS ACTION.

7 MR. MITTELSTAEDT SAID REPEATEDLY THAT
8 EACH OF THOSE PLAINTIFFS ADMITTED THAT HE OR SHE
9 WAS NOT COERCED INTO BUYING AN IPOD. IN FACT, THE
10 DEPOSITION TESTIMONY READS A LITTLE DIFFERENTLY
11 THAN THAT.

12 PLAINTIFF TUCKER, WHO PURCHASED TWO
13 IPODS, SHE PURCHASED AN IPOD AFTER HER FIRST ONE
14 BROKE, WAS ASKED BY MR. MITTELSTAEDT, WHY DID YOU
15 BUY THAT? AND SHE SAID BECAUSE MY FIRST ONE BROKE.

16 HE THEN ASKED, AND HOW DID YOU CHOOSE AN
17 IPOD RATHER THAN SAY AN IRIVER? AND SHE ANSWERED,
18 BECAUSE ALL OF MY MUSIC WAS ALREADY IN ITUNES AND
19 THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN THE ONLY WAY TO KEEP MY MUSIC.

20 AND I MENTION THIS JUST TO SHOW THAT
21 THERE ARE DISCREPANCIES IN THE RECORD AND THERE ARE
22 SIMILAR TESTIMONY BY THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS BUT
23 NONETHELESS, AS YOUR HONOR HAS RECOGNIZED, THE
24 QUESTION IS NOT WHETHER WE CAN SHOW ON A CLASS
25 MEMBER BY CLASS MEMBER BASIS WHETHER THERE WAS

1 COERCION BUT WHETHER THERE WAS COERCION AT THE
2 MARKET LEVEL.

3 AND THE MURPHY CASE IS STILL GOOD LAW.
4 IT'S TRUE THAT IN THAT CASE THE PLAINTIFF DID NOT
5 PREVAIL BUT THE COURT STATED THE APPROPRIATE
6 STANDARD, WHICH WAS ALSO STATED IN THE MOORE CASE
7 WHICH WE TALKED ABOUT EARLIER.

8 PROFESSOR NOLL'S COMMENTS ALSO HAVE BEEN
9 A LITTLE BIT DISTORTED IN ARGUMENT. PROFESSOR NOLL
10 HAS IN HIS 60 PAGE REPORT, WHICH APPLE DOESN'T
11 ADDRESS AT ANY TIME IN ITS BRIEF OR IN ARGUMENT, IN
12 HIS REPORT HE DEVOTED A NUMBER OF PAGES TO
13 EXPLAINING HOW AN ECONOMIST WOULD GO ABOUT
14 DETERMINING WHETHER THERE WAS AN EFFECT ON THE
15 MARKET, THAT IS, WHETHER THERE WAS MARKET LEVEL
16 COERCION AND I BELIEVE THAT THE RELEVANT PAGES ARE
17 39 THROUGH 49. THAT'S IN EXHIBIT 1 TO MY
18 DECLARATION.

19 PROFESSOR NOLL EXPLAINED IN HIS
20 DEPOSITION THAT YOU DON'T HAVE TO SHOW THAT EACH
21 CLASS MEMBER WAS COERCED. AND THOSE BULLET POINTS
22 THAT MR. MITTELSTAEDT SENT UP TO THE COURT, THAT
23 WAS AN EXAMPLE THAT PROFESSOR NOLL GAVE OF HOW SOME
24 PEOPLE, SOME MEMBERS OF THE CLASS WERE COERCED.

25 AND THE QUESTION IS WHETHER ANY OF THOSE

1 CLASS MEMBERS WERE COERCED THAT IT HAD AN EFFECT ON
2 MARKET POWER POSSESSED BY APPLE? IF IT APPRECIABLY
3 ENHANCED APPLE'S MARKET POWER, THEN APPLE WAS ABLE
4 TO INCREASE THE PRICE OF IPODS AND THEREBY INCREASE
5 THE PRICE CHARGED TO EACH AND EVERY MEMBER OF THE
6 CLASS.

7 AND THIS IS WHERE WE GO BACK TO WHAT WE
8 SAID IN OUR EARLIER OPENING PAPERS AND THAT IS THAT
9 APPLE HAS AN UNREMITTING POLICY. IT HAS THE
10 TECHNOLOGICAL RESTRICTION.

11 IN EVERY ITUNES DOWNLOAD AND IN EVERY
12 IPOD THEREFORE IF ENOUGH CLASS MEMBERS WERE COERCED
13 TO EFFECT IT AT THE MARKET LEVEL, THEN EVERY CLASS
14 MEMBER PAID AN OVERCHARGE.

15 APPLE CITES A BUNCH OF TYING CASES AND
16 LOOKING, YOU JUST HAVE TO READ THE FACTS OF THOSE
17 CASES WHERE THE COURTS DENY THE CERTIFICATION TO
18 SEE THAT THEY'RE NOT APPLICABLE HERE.

19 AND THE COLBURN CASE, WHICH
20 MR. MITTELSTAEDT MENTIONED A FEW TIMES, THE
21 PLAINTIFF INTRODUCED EVIDENCE OF ONE CONTRACT, HIS
22 CONTRACT AND NO OTHER EVIDENCE THAT THERE WERE
23 SIMILARLY SITUATED PLAINTIFFS IN THE CLASS.

24 THERE WAS NO EVIDENCE THAT THERE WERE
25 OTHER SIMILAR CONTRACTS.

1 SO THOSE CASES ARE INAPPOSITE FOR A
2 NUMBER OF REASONS.

3 AND I WANT TO TAKE ISSUE WITH
4 MR. MITTELSTAEDT'S STATEMENT THAT THE PLAINTIFFS
5 AGREED THAT THE LESS SIGNIFICANT DAMAGES
6 METHODOLOGY IS APPROPRIATE IN THE TYING CASE.

7 IN FACT, AS PROFESSOR NOLL TESTIFIED AT
8 HIS DEPOSITION, IT'S JUST -- IT'S NOT THE CORRECT
9 WAY TO GO ABOUT PROVING DAMAGES BECAUSE YOU HAVE TO
10 LOOK AT THE "BUT FOR WORLD." YOU HAVE TO CONCEDE
11 FROM AN ECONOMIST POINT OF VIEW WHAT THE MARKET
12 WOULD LOOK LIKE IN THE ABSENCE OF THE
13 ANTICOMPETITIVE MARKET.

14 AND SO IF WE WERE JUST, OF COURSE, TO SIT
15 DOWN TODAY AND LOOK AT A COMPETING PRODUCT, THAT'S
16 NOT THE REAL BUT FOR WORLD BECAUSE, IN FACT, THE
17 PRICE OF THAT COMPETING PRODUCT IS AFFECTED BY THE
18 TIE, BY THE MONOPOLISTIC CONDUCT BY APPLE.

19 SO IT'S NOT A REALISTIC PICTURE AND
20 PROFESSOR NOLL TESTIFIED WHY THAT WAS NOT AN
21 APPROPRIATE METHODOLOGY.

22 WITH RESPECT TO RESELLERS, WE EXPLAINED
23 IN OUR BRIEF, WE CITED NUMEROUS CASES FOR THE
24 PROPOSITION THAT IT'S PERFECTLY APPROPRIATE TO
25 INCLUDE RESELLERS IN THE PLAINTIFF CLASS.

1 PROFESSOR NOLL EXPLAINED THROUGHOUT HIS
2 60 PAGE REPORT HOW HE WOULD PROPOSE DEALING WITH
3 RESELLERS. HE STATED BOTH AT HIS DEPOSITION AND IN
4 HIS REPORT THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE TO BE TREATED A
5 LITTLE DIFFERENT BUT HIS METHODOLOGY TAKES THAT
6 INTO ACCOUNT.

7 I'M GOING TO --

8 MS. SWEENEY: CUT ME OFF.

9 THE COURT: -- ASK YOU TO BRING YOUR
10 ARGUMENT TO A CLOSE.

11 MS. SWEENEY: ALL RIGHT. I APPRECIATE
12 YOUR INDULGENCE, YOUR HONOR. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

13 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WELL, I MAKE THE
14 SAME STATEMENT TO THE PLAINTIFF THAT I MADE TO THE
15 DEFENSE AND THAT IS I HAVE BENEFITTED FROM BOTH THE
16 BRIEFING AND THE ARGUMENT HERE ON THIS ISSUE.

17 THE TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENTS THAT HAVE
18 BROUGHT US THE KIND OF DEVICES AND THE OPPORTUNITY
19 TO USE THOSE DEVICES IN A DIFFERENT WORLD AND IN
20 THE PAST PRESENTS DIFFERENT PROBLEMS TO THE COURT
21 IN THE CONTEXT OF A CASE OF THIS KIND. AND SO ON
22 THIS MOTION IT COULD BE THAT I'LL INVITE YOU BACK
23 TO ADDRESS SOME OF THESE MATTERS.

24 AGAIN, BECAUSE I REGARD THIS AS A PROCESS
25 AS OPPOSED TO AN EVENT, I DO WANT TO GO BACK AND

1 LOOK AT, AS I INDICATED, AGAIN, THE MARKET LEVEL
2 COERCION ISSUE BECAUSE IT IS ONE OF THE KEYS TO WHY
3 I WOULD BE ABLE TO CERTIFY THE CLASS IN THE WAY
4 THAT IT IS BEING PROPOSED TO THE COURT.

5 BUT I HOPE THAT THAT WON'T DELAY ME TOO
6 LONG IN GIVING YOU A DECISION ON THIS.

7 AND IF I NEED MORE FROM YOU, I WON'T
8 HESITATE TO ASK.

9 THANK YOU BOTH VERY MUCH.

10 MS. SWEENEY: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

11 MR. MITTELSTAEDT: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

12 (WHEREUPON, THE PROCEEDINGS IN THIS MATTER
13 WERE CONCLUDED.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25