

1 CHRISTINE A. VARNEY (*pro hac vice*)
 cvarney@cravath.com
 2 KATHERINE B. FORREST (*pro hac vice*)
 kforrest@cravath.com
 3 GARY A. BORNSTEIN (*pro hac vice*)
 gbornstein@cravath.com
 4 YONATAN EVEN (*pro hac vice*)
 yeven@cravath.com
 5 LAUREN A. MOSKOWITZ (*pro hac vice*)
 lmoskowitz@cravath.com
 6 JUSTIN C. CLARKE (*pro hac vice*)
 jcclarke@cravath.com
 7 M. BRENT BYARS (*pro hac vice*)
 mbyars@cravath.com
 8 **CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP**
 825 Eighth Avenue
 9 New York, New York 10019
 Telephone: (212) 474-1000
 10 Facsimile: (212) 474-3700

11 PAUL J. RIEHLE (SBN 115199)
 paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com
 12 **FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**
 Four Embarcadero Center
 13 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: (415) 591-7500
 14 Facsimile: (415) 591-7510

15 *Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-defendant*
 16 *Epic Games, Inc.*

17 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 18 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 19 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

20 EPIC GAMES, INC.,
 21 Plaintiff, Counter-defendant,
 22 v.
 23 APPLE INC.,
 24 Defendant, Counterclaimant.

Case No. 4:20-CV-05640-YGR-TSH
**PLAINTIFF EPIC GAMES, INC.’S
 OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT APPLE
 INC.’S MOTION FOR STAY OF
 INJUNCTION PENDING APPEAL AND
 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
 AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT THEREOF**
 Date: Nov. 16, 2021, 2 p.m. (noticed date)
 Nov. 9, 2021, 2 p.m. (stipulated date
 pending Court approval)
 Courtroom: 1, 4th Floor
 Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....3

 A. The Court Found Apple Liable under the UCL and Issued a Permanent Injunction after Trial.3

 B. Apple Celebrated the Court’s Ruling and Injunction.5

 C. Epic Agrees To Comply with Apple’s Rules, But Apple Refuses Epic’s Return to the App Store.5

 D. Apple Files Its Motion To Maintain Its Anti-Steering Rules.6

LEGAL STANDARD.....6

I. APPLE HAS NOT DEMONSTRATED THAT IT WOULD BE IRREPARABLY INJURED ABSENT A STAY.7

II. APPLE IS UNLIKELY TO SUCCEED ON THE MERITS OF ITS CROSS-APPEAL.12

 A. Epic Continues to Have Standing.12

 B. Epic Proved a Violation of the UCL.....15

 C. Granting the UCL Injunction Was Within the Court’s Equitable Authority.20

III. EPIC WOULD BE HARMED BY A STAY.....23

IV. THE PUBLIC INTEREST WEIGHS IN FAVOR OF ENFORCING THE INJUNCTION AGAINST APPLE.23

V. THE COURT SHOULD DENY APPLE’S ALTERNATIVE REQUEST FOR A TEMPORARY STAY.25

CONCLUSION.....25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

Page(s)

Cases

<i>In re Adobe Sys., Inc. Privacy Litig.</i> , 66 F. Supp. 3d 1197 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	15
<i>Biovail Corp. v. U.S. Food & Drug Admin.</i> , 448 F. Supp. 2d 154 (D.D.C. 2006)	9
<i>Bos. Sci. Corp. v. BioCardia, Inc.</i> , 524 F. Supp. 3d 914 (N.D. Cal. 2021)	13
<i>Bresgal v. Brock</i> , 843 F.2d 1163 (9th Cir. 1987)	22
<i>Campbell v. Nat'l Passenger R.R. Corp.</i> , No. 05-CV-5434, 2009 WL 4546673 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2009)	25
<i>Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.</i> , 20 Cal. 4th 163 (1999)	15, 16
<i>Church & Dwight Co. v. SPD Swiss Precision Diagnostics, GmbH</i> , No. 14-CV-585 AJN, 2015 WL 5051769 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 26, 2015)	11, 12
<i>Costco Wholesale Corp. v. Hoen</i> , No. C04-360P, 2006 WL 2645183 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 14, 2006)	8
<i>Dameron Hosp. Ass'n v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , No. 12-CV-2246, 2013 WL 5718886 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 15, 2013)	25
<i>In re Data Gen. Corp. Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. MDL 369 (MHP), 1986 WL 10899 (N.D. Cal. July 30, 1986)	20
<i>Deckers Outdoor Corp. v. Ozwear Connection Pty, Ltd.</i> , No. CV 14-2307 RSWL, 2014 WL 4679001 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 18, 2014)	23
<i>Dickson, Carlson & Campillo v. Pole</i> , 83 Cal. App. 4th 436 (2000)	22
<i>Doe #1 v. Trump</i> , 957 F.3d 1050 (9th Cir. 2020)	7
<i>Easyriders Freedom F.I.G.H.T. v. Hannigan</i> , 92 F.3d 1486 (9th Cir. 1996)	22
<i>Franchise Tax Bd. of California v. Alcan Aluminium Ltd.</i> , 493 U.S. 331 (1990)	13

1	<i>Freitag v. Ayers</i> , 468 F.3d 528 (9th Cir. 2006)	14
2	<i>Golden Gate Rest. Ass'n v. San Francisco</i> ,	
3	512 F.3d 1112 (9th Cir. 2008)	8
4	<i>Haas Automation v. Denny</i> ,	
5	No. 12-cv-04779, 2014 WL 2966989 (S.D. Cal. July 1, 2014)	20
6	<i>Herr v. Nestle U.S.A., Inc.</i> ,	
7	109 Cal. App. 4th 779 (2003)	23
8	<i>High Sierra Hikers Ass'n v. Blackwell</i> ,	
9	390 F.3d 630 (9th Cir. 2004)	20
10	<i>Hunt v. Check Recovery Sys., Inc.</i> ,	
11	No. 05-CV-4993, 2008 WL 2468473 (N.D. Cal. June 17, 2008)	25
12	<i>Kilgore v. KeyBank, Nat'l Ass'n</i> ,	
13	718 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2013)	20
14	<i>Landis v. N. Am. Co.</i> ,	
15	299 U.S. 248 (1936)	23
16	<i>LegalForce RAPC Worldwide P.C. v. UpCounsel, Inc.</i> ,	
17	No. 18-cv-02573-YGR, 2019 WL 160335 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 10, 2019)	16
18	<i>Leiva-Perez v. Holder</i> ,	
19	640 F.3d 962 (9th Cir. 2011)	6, 7
20	<i>Lozano v. AT&T Wireless Servs., Inc.</i> ,	
21	504 F.3d 718 (9th Cir. 2007)	15
22	<i>Montano v. Bonnie Brae Convalescent Hosp., Inc.</i> ,	
23	79 F. Supp. 3d 1120 (C.D. Cal. 2015)	23
24	<i>Natural Res. Def. Council v. Sw. Marine, Inc.</i> ,	
25	236 F.3d 985 (9th Cir. 2000)	20
26	<i>Nken v. Holder</i> ,	
27	556 U.S. 418 (2009)	6, 7
28	<i>ODonnell v. Harris Cty.</i> ,	
29	260 F. Supp. 3d 810 (S.D. Tex. 2017)	10
30	<i>Ohio v. Am. Express Co.</i> ,	
	138 S. Ct. 2274 (2018)	19
	<i>Oracle USA, Inc. v. Rimini St., Inc.</i> ,	
	No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-VCF, 2016 WL 6650835 (D. Nev. Nov. 9, 2016)	7, 12, 24

1 *Pipe Restoration Techs., LLC v. Coast Bldg. & Plumbing, Inc.*,
 No. 8:13-CV-00499-JDE, 2018 WL 6012219 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 16, 2018) 22

2 *Rubio v. Cap. One Bank*,
 3 613 F.3d 1195 (9th Cir. 2010) 12, 13

4 *S. Or. Barter Fair v. Jackson Cty., Or.*,
 5 372 F.3d 1128 (9th Cir. 2004) 14

6 *Shell Offshore, Inc. v. Greenpeace, Inc.*,
 709 F.3d 1281 (9th Cir. 2013) 12

7 *Sundance Image Tech., Inc. v. Inkjetmall.com, Ltd.*,
 8 No. 02-cv-2258, 2005 WL 8173280 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 13, 2005)..... 16

9 *Ticconi v. Blue Shield of Cal. Life & Health Ins. Co.*,
 10 160 Cal. App. 4th 528 (2008) 22

11 *United States v. Am. Express*,
 838 F.3d 179 (2d Cir. 2016)..... 19

12 *United States v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Hosp. Auth.*,
 13 248 F. Supp. 3d 720 (W.D.N.C. 2017) 19

14 *United States v. Mitchell*,
 15 971 F.3d 993 (9th Cir. 2020) 7

16 *Wang Labs. Inc. v. Mitsubishi Elecs. Am. Inc.*,
 No. CV 92-4698, 1993 WL 574424 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 24, 1993)..... 9

17 *Wash. Metro. Area Transit Comm’n v. Holiday Tours, Inc.*,
 18 559 F.2d 841 (D.C. Cir. 1977)..... 9

19 **Statutes & Rules**

20 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 16

21 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17203 22

22 Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17204 12

23

24

25

26

27

28

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.