1	Robert A. Mittelstaedt (State Bar No. 60359)	
2	ramittelstaedt@JonesDay.com Craig E. Stewart (State Bar No. 129530)	
3	cestewart@JonesDay.com David C. Kiernan (State Bar No. 129530)	
4	dkiernan@JonesDay.com Amir Q. Amiri (State Bar No. 271224)	
5	aamiri@JonesDay.com JONES DAY	
6	555 California Street, 26th Floor San Francisco, CA 94104	
7	Telephone: +1.415.626.3939 Facsimile: +1.415.875.5700	
8	Attorneys for Defendant	
9	APPLE INC.	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	OAKLAND DIVISION	
13		
14	THE APPLE IPOD ITUNES ANTITRUST Litigation	Case No. 4:05-cv-00037 YGR
15	LINGATION	[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING
		PLAINTIFES' DAURERT MOTION
16		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION
		PLAINTIFFS' DAUBERT MOTION
16		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
16 17		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
16 17 18		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
16 17 18 19		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
16 17 18 19 20		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
16 17 18 19 20 21		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 		PLAINTIFFS' DAUBERT MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M. MURPHY AND ROBERT H. TOPEL
 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 		PLAINTIFFS' <i>DAUBERT</i> MOTION TO EXCLUDE CERTAIN OPINION TESTIMONY OF KEVIN M.

Dockets.Justia.com

Presently before the court is Plaintiffs' *Daubert* Motion to Exclude Certain Opinion Testimony of Kevin M. Murphy and Robert H. Topel. Having reviewed the papers on file and considered the relevant arguments, this Court hereby DENIES the motion.

1

2

3

4 Plaintiffs ask the Court to exclude one portion of Apple's expert reports—the portion 5 dealing with statistical significance. Plaintiffs' motion is based largely on the declaration of their 6 previously undisclosed expert Dr. Jeffrey M. Wooldridge. His declaration, however, directly 7 contradicts the graduate-level textbook he has authored, leading to his admission that if his new 8 opinion on "clustering" were correct, he would need to revise the textbook that he has been using 9 for years. Additionally, Dr. Wooldridge has pointed to no peer-reviewed sources corroborating 10 the opinions and theories advanced in his declaration. Such opinion testimony is invalid under 11 the Supreme Court's precedent and the Federal Rules of Evidence. See Wagner v. County of 12 *Maricopa*, 673 F.3d 977, 982 (9th Cir. 2012) (an expert's analysis should be "supported by the 13 typical Daubert factors – testing, peer review and general acceptance"); Daubert v. Merrell Dow 14 Pharm., Inc., 43 F.3d 1311, 1318 (9th Cir. 1995) (Daubert II) (requiring expert to "point to some 15 objective source" to show conclusions are scientifically valid); Cabrera v. Cordis Corp., 134 F.3d 16 1418, 1423 (9th Cir. 1998) (explaining expert opinion unreliable where expert could not "identify 17 any peer-reviewed research justifying his conclusions").

Indeed, Dr. Wooldridge appears to have inappropriately manufactured his opinions
specifically for purposes of litigation. *See Cabrera*, 134 F.3d at 1423 (expert opinion unreliable
where developed "expressly for the purpose of testifying"); *see also Johnson v. Manitowoc Boom Trucks, Inc.*, 484 F.3d 426, 434-35 (6th Cir. 2007) (opinions "conceived, executed, and invented
solely in the context of th[e] litigation" are per se inadmissible).

Moreover, Plaintiffs never disclosed Dr. Wooldridge testimony during the course of
discovery, despite the fact that the parties have litigated the topics on which he has opined for
over two years. This alone is grounds to exclude Dr. Wooldridge's opinions. *See Reed v. Smith*& *Nephew, Inc.*, 527 F. Supp. 2d 1336, 1348 (W.D. Okla. 2007) (striking declaration of
undisclosed expert submitted in support of *Daubert* motion); *see also Moore v. Napolitano*, 926
F. Supp. 2d 8, 25 n.12 (D.D.C. 2013); *Jeffries v. Centre Life Ins. Co.*, No. 1:02-cv-351, 2004 WL

5506494 at *1 (S.D. Ohio Jan. 28, 2004). 1

1	5500494 at 1 (5.D. Olio Jan. 28, 2004).	
2	Further, the Court finds ample evidence in the record that supports the conclusions of	
3	Apple's experts regarding the correlation of standard errors in the regressions submitted by	
4	Plaintiffs' disclosed expert, Roger G. Noll. In light of Drs. Murphy and Topel's qualifications on	
5	the issue and the volume of evidence supporting their conclusions in the academic literature, the	
6	Court finds their opinions admissible under Daubert and Fed. R. Evid. 702.	
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
8		
9	Dated:, 2014	
10		
11	Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers	
12		
13	SFI-848877v1	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	- 2 - [Proposed] Order 4:05-cv-00037 YGR	