

ORIGINAL

Paid

FILED

2009 JAN 7 P 3:35

1 SEAN A. LINCOLN (STATE BAR NO. 136387)
 salincoln@orrick.com
 2 I. NEEL CHATTERJEE (STATE BAR NO. 173985)
 nchatterjee@orrick.com
 3 WARRINGTON S. PARKER, III (STATE BAR NO. 148003)
 wparker@orrick.com
 4 MONTE COOPER (STATE BAR NO. 196746)
 mcooper@orrick.com
 5 THERESA A. SUTTON (STATE BAR NO. 211857)
 tsutton@orrick.com
 6 YVONNE P. GREER (State Bar No. 214072)
 ygreer@orrick.com
 7 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
 1000 Marsh Road
 8 Menlo Park, CA 94025
 Telephone: +1-650-614-7400
 9 Facsimile: +1-650-614-7401

RICHARD W. WIEKING
 CLERK
 U.S. DISTRICT COURT
 NO. DIST. OF CA. S.J.

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 THE FACEBOOK, INC. and MARK ZUCKERBERG

11
 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 14 SAN JOSE DIVISION

16 THE FACEBOOK, INC. and MARK
 ZUCKERBERG,
 17
 Plaintiffs,
 18
 v.
 19
 20 CONNECTU, INC. (formerly known as
 CONNECTU, LLC), PACIFIC
 21 NORTHWEST SOFTWARE, INC.,
 WINSTON WILLIAMS, and WAYNE
 22 CHANG,
 Defendants.
 23

Case No. 5:07-CV-01389-JW
 NOTICE OF CROSS-APPEAL BY
 FACEBOOK, INC. AND MARK
 ZUCKERBERG

24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 Notice is hereby given that Facebook, Inc. and Mark Zuckerberg, Plaintiffs in the above
2 named case, hereby appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from the
3 Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Claims Against Defendants Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler
4 Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra ("ConnectU Founders") entered in this action on November 30,
5 2007, Exhibit A. Final Judgment was entered in this action on December 15, 2008, Exhibit B.
6 Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra filed a Notice of Appeal from the
7 Final Judgment and related orders on December 19, 2008, Exhibit C. The issues raised in this
8 Cross-Appeal need not be reached if this Court affirms the Judgment and orders appealed from in
9 Exhibit C.

10
11 Dated: January 8, 2009

ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP

12
13 

14 I. NEEL CHATTERJEE
15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
16 THE FACEBOOK, INC. and MARK
17 ZUCKERBERG
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

E-FILED 11/30/07

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

FACEBOOK, INC., et al
Plaintiffs,
v.
CONNECTU LLC, et al.
Defendants.

Case No. C 07-01389 RS

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
DISMISS CLAIMS AGAINST
DEFENDANTS CAMERON
WINKLEVOSS, TYLER
WINKLEVOSS, AND DIVYA
NARENDRA**

I. INTRODUCTION

Defendants Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra move to dismiss the claims against them on grounds that prior to removal of this action to this court, the Santa Clara Superior Court ruled that none of them was subject to personal jurisdiction in California. Defendants contend that ruling precludes plaintiffs relitigating personal jurisdiction here. Plaintiffs Facebook and Mark Zuckerberg (collectively "Facebook"), in turn contend that they have discovered and pleaded new facts that were not before the Superior Court that make reconsideration of jurisdiction appropriate and that support personal jurisdiction over the moving defendants. Although Facebook has discovered additional factual *detail* and have incorporated numerous

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 allegations bearing on jurisdiction into the amended complaint, it has not shown that the basic facts
2 on which it now relies are any different from those presented to the Superior Court. Accordingly,
3 the Superior Court's decision remains conclusive here, and the motion to dismiss will be granted.
4

5 II. BACKGROUND

6 The general background of this action has been described in prior orders and will not be
7 repeated here. Relevant to this motion is the following: When this action was initiated in Santa
8 Clara Superior Court, the named defendants included Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler Winklevoss, and
9 Divya Narendra. The Winklevosses and Narendra are three founders of defendant ConnectU.¹ They
10 promptly filed a motion to quash service of summons, arguing that they were not subject to personal
11 jurisdiction in California. ConnectU itself did not contest jurisdiction.

12 Facebook sought and was granted leave to take jurisdictional discovery before the motion to
13 quash was heard. Even prior to the filing of this action, Facebook had been taking discovery from
14 ConnectU in connection with litigation between them pending in the District of Massachusetts. By
15 virtue of the Massachusetts discovery, Facebook was aware before this action was filed that Winston
16 Williams of Pacific Northwest Software ("PNS") had assisted ConnectU in collecting email
17 addresses from the Facebook website and that it had used those addresses with the "social butterfly"
18 software. In the jurisdictional discovery, Facebook learned additional facts regarding PNS's
19 development of an "automated" process for sending emails to addresses found on the Facebook site,
20 as well as facts regarding the individual defendants' prior manual collection of addresses from the
21 site.
22
23
24
25

26 ¹ There has been significant controversy regarding the role Narendra originally was
27 expected to have and regarding how and when anyone became actual "members" of the
28 ConnectU LLC. Those matters are discussed in a contemporaneously-filed order denying
plaintiffs' sanction motion. Regardless of that controversy, the characterization of Narendra
as a "founder" appears fair.

1 In opposing the motion to quash, Facebook cited to and relied on evidence regarding both the
2 manual collection of email addresses and the subsequent automatic processes. For reasons it did not
3 explain, the Superior Court rejected Facebook's arguments and granted the motion to quash.²

4 Facebook subsequently filed an amended complaint in the Superior Court that added certain
5 claims but that omitted the Winklevosses and Narendra as defendants. Based on claims that had
6 been added under federal law, ConnectU then removed the action to this Court and brought a motion
7 to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The Court granted that
8 motion in part, with leave to amend. Facebook then filed a second amended complaint that not only
9 addressed the matters that had been raised by the motion to dismiss, but that also (1) added Mark
10 Zuckerberg as a plaintiff, (2) added certain new individual defendants, and (3) renamed as
11 defendants the Winklevoss brothers and Narendra.

12 Defendants objected to Facebook adding parties without leave of Court. By order issued June
13 14, 2007, the Court in effect granted Facebook *post hoc* leave to add the parties, but without
14 prejudice to any substantive arguments as to why they should not be made parties. The present
15 motion to dismiss followed.

17 III. DISCUSSION

18 Although the parties have characterized the legal precedents differently, there is no real
19 conflict in their respective positions, or in the cases they cite, as to the circumstances under which a
20 prior state court jurisdictional determination will be deemed conclusive in a subsequent federal
21 proceeding. Put simply, if a plaintiff can show *new and different* facts supporting jurisdiction, then
22 the prior determination may be revisited. See *Kendall v. Overseas Dev. Corp.*, 700 F.2d 536, 539
23 (9th Cir. 1983) ("the dispositive question is whether [plaintiff] pleaded any new facts in the federal
24 litigation that would support a different result on the issue of jurisdiction."). If, however, the facts
25 are those that the prior court found insufficient to support jurisdiction, then "even if wrong, an
26

27 ²Howard Winklevoss, the father of Tyler and Cameron Winklevoss, was also named
28 as a defendant and was a party to the motion to quash. Facebook has not attempted to bring
him back into this litigation.

1 earlier decision involving the same issue and the same parties, ‘is as conclusive as a correct’ one.”
2 *Gupta v. Thai Airways Intern. Ltd.*, 487 F.3d. 759, 767 (9th Cir. 2007) (quoting *MIB, Inc. v.*
3 *Superior Court*, 106 Cal.App.3d 228, 235).

4 Here, Facebook insists it has discovered and pleaded significant new evidence bearing on
5 personal jurisdiction over the Winklevoss brothers and Narendra. Certainly the second amended
6 complaint appears to have been drafted with an eye to preempting the argument that personal
7 jurisdiction is lacking; the complaint is replete with assertions that defendants acted with intent and
8 knowledge that their activities would have effects in this forum. Nevertheless, Facebook has not
9 shown that any of the evidence on which it now relies is materially different from that it previously
10 presented to the Superior Court. At most, Facebook has now garnered additional *details*, but the
11 basic conduct it contends is sufficient to give rise to jurisdiction is the *same* conduct it pointed to in
12 the state court motion to quash proceedings.

13 As noted, the Superior Court did not explain the basis for its decision, leaving it uncertain as
14 to precisely what evidence might or might not have been sufficient to cause it to reach a different
15 result. Because Facebook is relying now on “contacts” that do not differ significantly in kind or in
16 quantity than those it presented during the motion to quash, however, there is no particular reason to
17 believe the “new” details would have changed the result.

18 Although Facebook attempts to argue that a different result is warranted in light of “new”
19 evidence, it is apparent that Facebook actually believes the Superior Court simply got it wrong.³
20 Particularly given that this Court has demonstrated an unwillingness to accept the so-called
21 “fiduciary shield” argument, Facebook appears to believe that it can obtain a different result by
22 arguing the merits better or slightly differently.⁴ Rearguing the same basic facts, however, is not
23

24 ³ In its motion for sanctions, Facebook candidly suggests that the Superior Court
25 accepted defendants’ legally untenable argument that actions they took on behalf of
26 ConnectU did not count as personal contacts with the forum. Although the order regarding
the sanctions motion filed contemporaneously with this decision rejects that conclusion as
unduly speculative, it does show that in Facebook’s view, the Superior Court simply erred.

27 ⁴ At the hearing, defense counsel effectively conceded that if this Court were free to
28 reconsider the issues, then under the reasoning this Court employed in denying the motion to
dismiss brought by Winston Williams and PNS, personal jurisdiction would be proper over


1 permissible. Even if the Superior Court reached an incorrect legal determination, the outcome is
2 conclusive. Facebook “does not now get a do-over.” *Gupta, supra*, 487 F.3d at 767.

3
4 IV. CONCLUSION

5 For the reasons set forth above the motion to dismiss is granted.

6
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 Dated: November 30, 2007



RICHARD SEEBORG
United States Magistrate Judge

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

Cameron Winklevoss. Defendants contend that even in those circumstances personal jurisdiction would not be proper over Tyler Winklevoss or Narendra because there is no evidence they personally participated in any allegedly wrongful conduct at a time when Facebook was located in California.

1 SEAN A. LINCOLN (State Bar No. 136387)
 salincoln@orrick.com
 2 I. NEEL CHATTERJEE (State Bar No. 173985)
 nchatterjee@orrick.com
 3 MONTE COOPER (State Bar No. 196746)
 mcooper@orrick.com
 4 THERESA A. SUTTON (State Bar No. 211857)
 tsutton@orrick.com
 5 YVONNE P. GREER (State Bar No. 214072)
 ygreer@orrick.com
 6 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
 1000 Marsh Road
 7 Menlo Park, CA 94025
 Telephone: 650-614-7400
 8 Facsimile: 650-614-7401



9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 THE FACEBOOK, INC. and MARK ZUCKERBERG

10
 11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 13 SAN JOSE DIVISION

14
 15 THE FACEBOOK, INC. and MARK
 ZUCKERBERG,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 CONNECTU, INC. (formerly known as
 19 CONNECTU, LLC), PACIFIC
 20 NORTHWEST SOFTWARE, INC.,
 WINSTON WILLIAMS, and WAYNE
 21 CHANG,

22 Defendants.

Case No. 5:07-CV-01389-JW


~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER OF
 DISMISSAL

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

On July 2, 2008, the Court entered a Judgment Enforcing Settlement Agreement (Docket Item No. 476) and on November 21, 2008, the Court entered an Amended Judgment Ordering Specific Performance of Settlement Agreement and Declaratory Judgment Release (Docket Item No. 665). Pursuant to the Judgment and Amended Judgment, all claims asserted against Defendants ConnectU, Inc., Pacific Northwest Software, Inc., Winston Williams, and Wayne Change, are dismissed with prejudice.

The parties shall bear their own attorney fees and costs. The Clerk shall close this file.

Dated: December 15, 2008



JAMES WARE
United States District Judge

1 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (State Bar No. 144177)
sholtzman@bsflp.com
2 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900
3 Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (510) 874-1000
4 Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

5 DAVID A. BARRETT (*pro hac vice*)
dbarrett@bsflp.com
6 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
575 Lexington Ave., 7th Floor
7 New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-2300
8 Facsimile: (212) 446-2350

9 D. MICHAEL UNDERHILL (*pro hac vice*)
munderhill@bsflp.com
10 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
5301 Wisconsin Avenue NW
11 Washington, D.C. 20015
Telephone: (202) 237-2727
12 Facsimile: (202) 237-6131

13 Attorneys for Cameron Winklevoss,
Tyler Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra.
14

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
17 SAN JOSE DIVISION

18 THE FACEBOOK, INC. and MARK
19 ZUCKERBERG,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 CONNECTU, INC. (formerly known as
23 CONNECTU, LLC), PACIFIC NORTHWEST
24 SOFTWARE, INC., WINSTON WILLIAMS,
and WAYNE CHANG,

25 Defendants.
26
27
28

Case No. 5:07-CV-01389-JW

NOTICE OF APPEAL

1 Notice is hereby given that CAMERON WINKLEVOSS, TYLER WINKLEVOSS and
2 DIVYA NARENDRA¹ appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from the
3 following orders and judgment and all related orders:

- 4 (a) the December 15, 2008, Order of Dismissal (Docket No. 667), a copy of which is
5 attached as Exhibit A;
- 6 (b) the November 21, 2008 Amended Judgment Ordering Specific Performance of
7 Settlement Agreement and Declaratory Judgment of Release (Docket No. 665), a copy of
8 which is attached as Exhibit B; and
- 9 (c) the November 3, 2008, Order Directing the Special Master to Deliver the Property Being
10 Held in Trust to the Parties in Accordance with the Terms of their Settlement Agreement
11 (Docket No. 653), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit C.

12 This notice is in addition to, and related to, their prior notice of appeal filed on August 11,
13 2008 (Docket No. 611), which is incorporated by reference. In order to preserve all rights to appeal,
14 notice is again provided that CAMERON WINKLEVOSS, TYLER WINKLEVOSS, and DIVYA
15 NARENDRA appeal from the following orders and judgment and all related orders:

- 16 (d) the August 8, 2008, Order Denying the ConnectU Founders' Motion to Intervene;
17 Denying ConnectU's Motion to Stay Execution of Judgment, entered by the district court
18 on August 8, 2008 (Docket No. 610), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit D;

20 ¹ To the extent Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler Winklevoss and Divya Narendra and their
21 counsel have any existing rights or obligations with respect to ConnectU, Inc. (all of the stock of
22 ConnectU having been transferred to The Facebook, Inc. on December 15, 2008, as part of the
23 settlement transaction which is at issue on appeal), Notice would hereby be given on ConnectU's
24 behalf. Otherwise, no new notice is provided with respect to ConnectU. *See* ConnectU's Notice of
25 Appeal (Docket No. 582), attached as Exhibit H, and hereby incorporated by reference. *See also*
26 ConnectU and Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra's Emergency Motion
27 to Stay and Alternative Petition for Mandamus, filed with the United States Court of Appeals for the
28 Ninth Circuit on November 24, 2008 (Docket No. 43 in Appeal No. 08-16745), also incorporated by
reference, providing notice on that date that ConnectU was seeking relief from, among other things,
the November 3 Order attached as Exhibit C and November 21 Amended Judgment attached as
Exhibit B.

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

- (e) the July 2, 2008, final Judgment Enforcing Settlement Agreement (Docket No. 476), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit E;
- (f) the June 25, 2008, Order Granting Plaintiffs' Confidential Motion to Enforce the Settlement Agreement (Docket No. 461), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit F; and
- (g) the June 10, 2008, Order Granting in Part and Denying in Part Motions Posted As Docket Items Nos. 366, 374 and 393 (Docket No. 428), a copy of which is attached as Exhibit G.

1 December 19, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Evan A. Parke /KPR

Evan A. Parke
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP

*Attorneys for Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler
Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra.*

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

1 STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (State Bar No. 144177)
sholtzman@bsflp.com
2 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900
3 Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone: (510) 874-1000
4 Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

5 DAVID A. BARRETT (*pro hac vice*)
dbarrett@bsflp.com
6 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
575 Lexington Ave., 7th Floor
7 New York, NY 10022
Telephone: (212) 446-2300
8 Facsimile: (212) 446-2350

9 D. MICHAEL UNDERHILL (*pro hac vice*)
munderhill@bsflp.com
10 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
5301 Wisconsin Avenue NW
11 Washington, D.C. 20015
Telephone: (202) 237-2727
12 Facsimile: (202) 237-6131

13 Attorneys for Cameron Winklevoss,
Tyler Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra.
14
15

16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18 SAN JOSE DIVISION

19 THE FACEBOOK, INC. and MARK
ZUCKERBERG,
20
21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 CONNECTU, INC. (formerly known as
CONNECTU, LLC), PACIFIC NORTHWEST
24 SOFTWARE, INC., WINSTON WILLIAMS,
25 and WAYNE CHANG,
26 Defendants.

Case No. 5:07-CV-01389-JW

**REPRESENTATION STATEMENT
PURSUANT TO
NINTH CIRCUIT RULE 3-2**

1 Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra file this Representation
2 Statement in accordance with Ninth Circuit Rule 3-2. The parties to the suit and their respective
3 counsel, including their contact information, are as follows:

4 **Parties:**

5 Pacific Northwest Software, Inc.
6 (defendant)
7 Wayne Chang (defendant)
8 Winston Williams (defendant)

9 **Counsel:**

10 Scott R. Mosko (SBN106070)
11 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON,
12 FARABOW, GARRETT
13 & DUNNER, L.L.P.
14 Stanford Research Park
15 3300 Hillview Avenue
16 Palo Alto, California 94304
17 Telephone: (650) 849-6600
18 Facsimile: (650) 849-6666

9 **Parties:**

10 Cameron Winklevoss
11 Tyler Winklevoss
12 Divya Narendra¹

13 **Counsel:**

14 Steven C. Holtzman (SBN 144177)
15 BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
16 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900
17 Oakland, CA 94612
18 Telephone: (510) 874-1000
19 Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

20 D. Michael Underhill (*pro hac vice*)
21 Jonathan M. Shaw (*pro hac vice*)
22 Evan A. Parke (*pro hac vice*)
23 BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
24 5301 Wisconsin Avenue NW
25 Washington, D.C. 20015
26 Telephone: (202) 237-2727
27 Facsimile: (202) 237-6131

28 David A. Barrett (*pro hac vice*)
BOIES SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP

19 _____
20 ¹ To the extent Cameron Winklevoss, Tyler Winklevoss and Divya Narendra and their
21 counsel have any existing rights or obligations with respect to ConnectU, Inc. (all of the stock of
22 ConnectU having been transferred to The Facebook, Inc. on December 15, 2008, as part of the
23 settlement transaction which is at issue on appeal), ConnectU would be represented by counsel set
24 forth above. We have been informed that ConnectU may substitute as its counsel:

25 James Towery
26 HOGE FENTON JONES & APPEL, INC.
27 60 South Market Street, Suite 1400
28 San Jose, California 95113-2396
Telephone: (408) 287-9501
Facsimile: (408) 287-2583

1 575 Lexington Avenue, 7th Floor
2 New York, NY 10022
3 Telephone: (212) 446-2300
4 Facsimile: (212) 446-2350

5 Scott R. Mosko (SBN106070)
6 FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
7 GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.
8 Stanford Research Park
9 3300 Hillview Avenue
10 Palo Alto, California 94304
11 Telephone: (650) 849-6600
12 Facsimile: (650) 849-6666 Mark A. Byrne
13 (SBN116657)

14 Mark Byrne
15 BYRNE & NIXON LLP
16 800 West Sixth Street, Suite 430
17 Los Angeles, California 90017
18 Telephone: (213) 620-8003
19 Fascimile: (213) 620-8013

20 Sean F. O'Shea (*pro hac vice*)
21 O'SHEA PARTNERS LLP
22 90 Park Avenue, 20th Floor
23 New York, NY 10016
24 Telephone: (212) 682-4426
25 Facsimile: (212) 682-4437

26 **Parties:**

27 The Facebook, Inc. (plaintiff)
28 Mark Zuckerberg (plaintiff)

Counsel:

I. Neel Chatterjee (SBN 173985)
Monte Cooper (SBN 196746)
Theresa A. Sutton (SBN 211857)
Yvonne P. Greer (SBN 214072)
ORRICK, HERRINGTON
& SUTCLIFFE LLP
1000 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025
Telephone: 650-614-7400
Facsimile: 650-614-7401

1 December 19, 2008

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

Respectfully submitted,

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP

Evan A Parke / EAP

Evan A. Parke

Attorneys for Cameron Winklevoss,
Tyler Winklevoss, and Divya Narendra.