IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS FORT WORTH DIVISION

8

	3	
AMERICAN AIRLINES, INC.,	§	
a Delaware corporation,	§	
Plaintiff, vs.	§	
	§	
	§	Civ
TRAVELPORT LIMITED, a foreign corporation, and TRAVELPORT, LP, a Delaware limited partnership, d/b/a TRAVELPORT;	§	
	§	
	§	
	§	
	§	
and	§	
	§	
ORBITZ WORLDWIDE, LLC, a Delaware	§	
limited liability company, d/b/a ORBITZ,	§	
	§	
Defendants.	§	
	§	

Civil Action No. 4:11-cv-00244-Y

DEFENDANT ORBITZ WORLDWIDE, LLC'S MOTION TO DISMISS PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT

Defendant Orbitz Worldwide, LLC ("Orbitz") respectfully moves to dismiss plaintiff American Airlines, Inc.'s ("American") Second and Third Claims for Relief (the only claims asserted against Orbitz) pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. As pleaded, American's Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted as to Orbitz. In support of this motion, Orbitz files its Brief in Support of its Motion to Dismiss, an Appendix and a Proposed Order.

This motion is made on the grounds that American's Complaint fails to state a claim against Orbitz as a matter of law because: (1) the Subscriber Services Agreement, an alleged unlawful exclusive dealing agreement which forms the basis of American's claims against Orbitz, is not alleged to—and does not—foreclose a "substantial share" of any pleaded market, and American's Sherman Act claims against Orbitz thus fail as a matter of law. *See Tampa Electric Co. v. Nashville Coal Co.*, 365 U.S. 320 (1961); *Jefferson Parish Hosp. Dist. No. 2 v. Hyde*, 466 U.S. 2 (1984); *Apani Southwest, Inc. v. Coca-Cola Enterprises, Inc.*, 300 F.3d 620 (5th Cir. 2002); *Star Tobacco, Inc. v. Darilek*, 298 F. Supp. 2d 436 (E.D. Tex. 2003). (2) Orbitz was a wholly owned subsidiary of defendant Travelport, the other party to the Subscriber Services Agreement, when that agreement was executed, and has remained an affiliate of Travelport at all times since then, and is therefore legally incapable of conspiring with Travelport for purposes of the antitrust laws. *See Copperweld Corp. v. Independence Tube Corp.*, 467 U.S. 752 (1984). And, (3) the remaining allegations in the Complaint fail to adequately plead Orbitz's involvement or participation in any conspiracy to monopolize any pleaded market, as required by the Supreme Court in *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544 (2007).

For these reasons and those stated in its supporting Brief and Appendix, as well as in any Reply Brief and at oral argument, if any, Orbitz respectfully requests that the Court dismiss with prejudice the Complaint's Second and Third Claims for Relief against it for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

DATED: May 25, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

<u>/s/ Daniel M. Wall</u> Daniel M. Wall (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) California State Bar No. 102580 Email: Dan.Wall@lw.com

Christopher S. Yates (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) California State Bar No. 161273 Email: <u>Chris.Yates@lw.com</u>

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000 San Francisco, CA 94111-6538 Telephone: (415) 391-0600 Facsimile: (415) 395-8095

2

and

John J. Little Texas State Bar No. 12424230 Email: jlittle@jpf-law.com Stephen G. Gleboff Texas State Bar No. 08024500 Email: <u>stevegleboff@jpf-law.com</u>

Megan K. Dredla Texas State Bar No. 24050530 Email: <u>mdredla@jpf-law.com</u>

LITTLE PEDERSEN FANKHAUSER LLP 901 Main Street, Suite 4110 Dallas, TX 75202-3714 Telephone: (214) 573-2300 Facsimile: (214) 573-2323

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT ORBITZ WORLDWIDE, LLC

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On May 25, 2011, I electronically submitted the foregoing document with the clerk of the court for the U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division, using the electronic case filing system of the court. The electronic case filing system sent a "Notice of Electronic Filing" to the attorneys of record who have consented in writing to accept this Notice as service of this document by electronic means.

/s/ Daniel M. Wall Daniel M. Wall

SF\855529