Facebook, Inc. v. MaxBounty, Inc.

Doc. 39

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT on Friday, July 8, 2011, at 9:00 a.m., in Courtroom 3, 5th Floor, 280 South 1st Street, San Jose, CA 95113, of the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California, San Jose Division, U.S. District Judge Jeremy Fogel presiding, or as soon thereafter as this matter can be heard, Defendant MaxBounty, Inc. ("MaxBounty") will bring its motion for an order dismissing Counts I-III of the Amended Complaint, pursuant to Fed.R.Civ.P. 12(b)(6).

The Court should dismiss Count I, because Facebook cannot prevail on its claim that MaxBounty has violated the "CAN-SPAM" Act. The CAN-SPAM Act prohibits "initiating" or "procuring" the transmission of misleading messages. Plaintiff does not allege that MaxBounty had any contact with anyone that sent any of the (unidentified) "electronic mail messages" at issue in the Amended Complaint. Furthermore, plaintiff did not plead facts that establish that the (unidentified) "electronic mail messages" at issue contain "header information that is materially false or materially misleading" as required by the CAN-SPAM Act. In addition, Plaintiff's primary allegations are mere conclusions, which are not sufficient to state a cause of action.

In Count II, Facebook alleges that MaxBounty has violated the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act ("CFAA"). One can only violate the CFAA by accessing a protected computer "without authorization" or by exceeding "authorized access." MaxBounty and its customers are authorized users. Furthermore, plaintiff has not exceeded authorized access as the Ninth Circuit has defined that term. Therefore, Plaintiff fails to state a claim under the CFAA.

In Count III, Facebook alleges common law fraud. Facebook fails to plead any particular "role in furthering" fraud or "substantial assistance in the wrong" as the law and Federal Rules require. Thus, Plaintiff fails to state a claim for fraud.

26

27

28

1	The grounds for this Motion are set forth more fully in the accompanying Memorandum
2	of Points and Authorities. A Proposed Order is attached.
3	
4	By: <u>/s/ Thomas A. Lewry</u> Thomas A. Lewry (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> )
5	<u>Ilewry@brookskushman.com</u> John S. LeRoy (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i> )
6	jleroy@brookskushman.com BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
7	1000 Town Center, Twenty-Second Floor Southfield, MI 48075
8	Tel. (248) 358-4400; Fax (248) 358-3351
9	Mark B. Mizrahi, State Bar No. 179384  mmizrahi@brookskushman.com  PROOKS (MISHMAN) B.C.
10	BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. 6701 Center Drive, Suite 610
11	Los Angeles, CA 90045 Tel. (310) 348-8200; Fax (310) 846-4799
12	Attorneys for Defendant, MaxBounty, Inc.
13	Date: May 13, 2011
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

NOTICE OF MOTION TO DISMISS AMENDED COMPLAINT Case No.10-cv-04712-JF

28

## **CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on <u>May 13, 2011</u>, I electronically filed the foregoing document with the Clerk of the Court for the Northern District of California using the ECF System which will send notification to the following registered participants of the ECF System as listed on the Court's Notice of Electronic Filing: Joseph Perry Cutler, James R. McCullagh, and Brian Patrick Hennessy.

I also certify that I have mailed by United States Postal Service the paper to the following non-participants in the ECF System: NONE.

By: /s/ Thomas A. Lewry tlewry@brookskushman.com BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

Attorneys for Defendant, MaxBounty, Inc.