

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GLASS EGG DIGITAL MEDIA,
Plaintiff,
v.
GAMELOFT, INC., et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [17-cv-04165-MMC](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART DEFENDANT
GAMELOFT, INC.'S MOTION TO
DISMISS**

Re: Dkt. No. 40

Before the Court is defendant Gameloft, Inc.'s ("Gameloft USA") motion, filed November 8, 2017, to dismiss plaintiff Glass Egg Digital Media's ("Glass Egg") amended Complaint ("FAC"), filed October 2, 2017. Glass Egg has filed opposition, to which Gameloft USA has replied. Having read and considered the papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion, the Court deems the matter appropriate for determination on the parties' respective written submissions, hereby VACATES the hearing scheduled for February 9, 2018, and rules as follows.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

The following factual allegations are taken from the FAC.

Glass Egg, a British Virgin Island corporation with its principal place of business in Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam, is a "3D art production studio servicing the electronic game industry." (See FAC ¶¶ 6, 16.) Gameloft USA, a Delaware corporation with its "principal business office" located in San Francisco, California, is a wholly owned subsidiary of Gameloft SE ("Gameloft France"), a French corporation with its "principal business office" in Paris, France. (See id. ¶¶ 7-8, 11.) Defendants Gameloft France and its subsidiaries,

United States District Court
Northern District of California

with its “principal business office” in Barcelona, Spain, are in the business of “develop[ing]” and “publish[ing]” mobile games.¹ (See id. ¶ 27, 28, 31.)

Gameloft² “outsourced” to two companies, Alive Interactive Limited (“AIL”) and Hung Thinh 3D (“HT3D”), the production of 3D digital car models for Gameloft’s “Asphalt” game series. (See id. ¶¶ 76, 93.) AIL and HT3D, through a Glass Egg employee, “recruit[ed] Glass Egg personnel to work on [3D] digital car models for the Asphalt” game series (see id. ¶ 99), after which, those Glass Egg personnel, without Glass Egg’s knowledge or approval, “creat[ed] and produc[ed]” the 3D digital car models using Glass Egg’s “equipment,” including computers, server network, licensed software, “know-how[,] and trade secrets.” (See id. ¶¶ 101, 105.) “AIL and/or HT3D delivered” the 3D digital car models to Gameloft, which “published, reproduced and distributed” the 3D digital car models in its Asphalt game series. (See id. ¶¶ 128-29.)

Based on the above allegations, Glass Egg asserts the following seven Claims for Relief: (1) “Copyright Infringement”; (2) “Conversion”; (3) “Unfair Competition,” pursuant to Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 et seq.; (4) “Misappropriation of Trade Secrets,” pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 1836 et seq.; (5) “Misappropriation of Trade Secrets,” pursuant to Cal. Civ. Code § 3426 et seq.; (6) “Intentional Interference with Contractual Relations”; and (7) “Negligence.”

By the instant motion, Gameloft USA moves to dismiss the FAC, as alleged against Gameloft USA, pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

LEGAL STANDARD

Dismissal under Rule 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure “can be based on the lack of a cognizable legal theory or the absence of sufficient facts alleged

¹ Gameloft France is a “wholly owned subsidiary” of a fourth defendant, Vivendi SA (“Vivendi”), a French corporation with its “principal business office” in Paris, France. (See ¶¶ 14-15, 43.)

² In the FAC, “Gameloft” is used to collectively refer to Gameloft France and its subsidiaries.

under a cognizable legal theory.” See Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep’t, 901 F.2d 696, 699 (9th Cir. 1990). Rule 8(a)(2), however, “requires only ‘a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the pleader is entitled to relief.’” See Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(2)). Consequently, “a complaint attacked by a Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss does not need detailed factual allegations.” See id. Nonetheless, “a plaintiff’s obligation to provide the grounds of his entitlement to relief requires more than labels and conclusions, and a formulaic recitation of the elements of a cause of action will not do.” See id. (internal quotation, citation, and alteration omitted).

In analyzing a motion to dismiss, a district court must accept as true all material allegations in the complaint, and construe them in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party. See NL Indus., Inc. v. Kaplan, 792 F.2d 896, 898 (9th Cir. 1986). “To survive a motion to dismiss, a complaint must contain sufficient factual material, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting Twombly, 550 U.S. at 570). “Factual allegations must be enough to raise a right to relief above the speculative level[.]” Twombly, 550 U.S. at 555. Courts “are not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation.” See Iqbal, 556 U.S. at 678 (internal quotation and citation omitted).

DISCUSSION

Gameloft USA’s sole argument in support of dismissal is that the FAC improperly “lumps” the four defendants together, without establishing a theory of joint liability, and fails to “allege any conduct, let alone wrongful or unlawful conduct, by” Gameloft USA. (See Mot. at 5:8-10 (emphasis omitted).) In response, Glass Egg argues that the FAC sufficiently alleges (1) Gameloft USA’s direct liability for copyright infringement and conversion, and, (2) for the remaining claims, Gameloft USA’s joint liability with Gameloft France and Gameloft Spain, under theories of civil conspiracy, alter ego, and agency.³

³ Additionally, to the extent Gameloft USA seeks dismissal of the copyright

A. Direct Liability for Copyright Infringement and Conversion

“Copyright owners have the exclusive right ‘to reproduce the copyrighted work in copies,’ or to authorize another to do so.” See Disney Enterprises, Inc. v. VidAngel, Inc., 869 F.3d 848, 856 (9th Cir. 2017) (quoting 17 U.S.C. § 106(1)). To plead a claim for copyright infringement, a plaintiff must allege (1) its “ownership of the allegedly infringed material,” and (2) the alleged infringer’s “violat[ion] [of] at least one exclusive right granted to copyright holders.” See id.

“Conversion is the wrongful exercise of dominion over the property of another.” See Lee v. Hanley, 61 Cal. 4th 1225, 1240 (Cal. 2015) (internal quotation and citation omitted). Under California law, to plead a claim for conversion, a plaintiff must allege “(1) the plaintiff’s ownership or right to possession of the property; (2) the defendant’s conversion by a wrongful act or disposition of property rights; and (3) damages.” See id. (internal quotation and citation omitted).

Here, Gameloft USA contends the FAC, by failing to “specify which defendant was responsible for which alleged wrongful act” (see Reply at 4:10-11), “does not allege that Gameloft USA actually engaged in any conduct whatsoever, including any acts that might plausibly establish copyright infringement or conversion” (see id. at 4:16-17). The FAC alleges, for example, that “[d]efendants . . . have reproduced, without permission, the [3D digital car models at issue] in several car racing mobile games successfully published, marketed and distributed globally under the names Asphalt 8: Airborne (“A8”), Asphalt Xtreme (“AX”), and Asphalt Streetstorm.” (See FAC ¶ 3.) Although not a model pleading, the FAC does, however, go on to allege facts sufficient to give Gameloft USA notice of the wrongful acts Gameloft USA allegedly committed. In particular, Glass Egg

for copyright infringement was alleged in Glass Egg’s original complaint, to which Gameloft USA filed an answer. (See Opp. at 5:10-20.) An amended complaint, however, “supersedes the original, the latter being treated thereafter as non-existent,” see Valadez-Lopez v. Chertoff, 656 F.3d 851, 857 (9th Cir. 2011) (internal quotation and citation omitted), and, consequently, Gameloft USA’s motion to dismiss the copyright infringement claim is timely.

alleges that “[m]uch of Gameloft’s global revenue generating activities such as marketing, sales and public relations . . . are performed from its US offices” (see id. ¶ 34), that those activities encompass the “marketing and sales . . . of games for the US, including A8 and AX[,]” and that Gameloft France “directly controls the marketing and sales [of said games] through its San Francisco office” (see id. ¶ 38), which, as alleged earlier in the FAC, is Gameloft USA’s “principal business office” (see id. ¶ 7). Taken together, and read in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party,” see NL Indus., Inc., 792 F.2d at 898, these additional allegations are sufficient to allege, as to copyright infringement and conversion, Gameloft USA’s direct liability for its role in marketing and selling the infringing games in the United States.⁴

The Court next turns to the remaining claims.

B. Joint Liability for Remaining Claims

As noted, for the remaining claims, Glass Egg bases Gameloft USA’s liability on theories of civil conspiracy, alter ego, and agency.

1. Civil Conspiracy

Under California law, to plead a civil conspiracy, a plaintiff must allege: “(1) the formation and operation of the conspiracy, (2) the wrongful act or acts done pursuant thereto, and (3) the damage resulting from such act or acts.” See Wasco Prod., Inc. v. Southwall Techs., Inc., 435 F.3d 989, 992 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting Cellular Plus, Inc. v. Superior Court, 14 Cal. App. 4th 1224, 1236 (Cal. Ct. App. 1993)). To plead the “formation and operation” of a conspiracy, a plaintiff must allege an “agree[ment] to commit wrongful acts.” See id.

Here, Glass Egg alleges, “Gameloft and/or its senior management acting on behalf of [d]efendants concocted a scheme in agreement with [ALI and HT3D] . . . , resulting in harm to Glass Egg,” and that, in “mid-2014, Gameloft signed a tripartite agreement to

⁴ Given such finding, the Court does not address herein Glass Egg’s alternative theory of liability based on contributory infringement.

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.