

1 JESSICA R. PERRY (STATE BAR NO. 209321)
ANNIE PRASAD VADILLO (STATE BAR NO. 318440)
2 JILLIAN V. KALTNER (STATE BAR NO. 324398)
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP
3 1000 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025-1015
4 Telephone: +1 650 614 7400
Facsimile: +1 650 614 7401
5 jperry@orrick.com
avadillo@orrick.com
6 jkaltner@orrick.com

7 Attorneys for Defendant
APPLE INC.

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

13 DONALD K. SHRUHAN, JR. an individual,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

16 APPLE INC., a Delaware corporation, and
DOES 1-10,

17 Defendants.

Case No. 5:22-cv-05498-EJD

**DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S NOTICE
OF MOTION AND MOTION TO
DISMISS AND/OR STRIKE
PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES**

Date: April 6, 2023

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept.: 4

Judge: Hon. Edward J. Davila

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

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY..... 2

III. RELEVANT FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS 3

IV. MOTION TO DISMISS UNDER RULE 12(B)(6) 4

 A. Legal Standard 4

 B. Shruhan Cannot Separately Pursue Two Identical Lawsuits 4

 C. Shruhan Cannot Bring California Claims 5

 1. FEHA Does Not Apply to Non-California Residents 5

 2. Business & Professions Code Section 17200 Only Applies to California Residents 6

 D. Shruhan Fails to Sufficiently Plead an Age Discrimination Claim..... 7

 E. Shruhan’s Derivative Failure to Prevent Discrimination and UCL Claims Fail 8

V. MOTION TO STRIKE 9

 A. Legal Standard 9

 1. Paragraphs 1-8 are Immaterial, Irrelevant, and Prejudicial..... 9

 2. The Court Should Strike Shruhan’s Request for Punitive Damages 11

VI. CONCLUSION 11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
Federal Cases	
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	<p><i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i>, 556 U.S. 662 (2009)..... 4, 8</p> <p><i>Balisteri v. Pacifica Police Dept</i>, 901 F.2d 696 (9th Cir. 1988)..... 4</p> <p><i>Barajas v. Carriage Servs., Inc.</i>, No. 19-CV-02035-EMC, 2020 WL 1189854 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 12, 2020)..... 9</p> <p><i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i>, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)..... 4, 11</p> <p><i>Biggins v. Wells Fargo & Co.</i>, 266 F.R.D. 399 (N.D. Cal. 2009)..... 10</p> <p><i>Buchanan v. NetJets Servs., Inc.</i>, 2018 WL 1933189 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2018) 5</p> <p><i>In Re Cyprus Semiconductor Securities Litigation</i>, 864 F.Supp. 957 (N.D. Cal. September 26, 1994) 5</p> <p><i>Dodd-Owens v. Kyphon, Inc.</i> 2007 WL 420191 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 5, 2007)..... 6</p> <p><i>Ehret v. Uber Technologies, Inc.</i>, 68 F.Supp.3d 1121 (N.D. Cal. 2014) 6</p> <p><i>Ellison v. Autozone Inc.</i>, 2007 WL 1795699 (N.D. Cal. June 20, 2007) 5</p> <p><i>Fantasy, Inc. v. Fogerty</i>, 984 F.2d 1524 (9th Cir. 1993)..... 9, 10</p> <p><i>Gonsalves v. Infosys Technologies, Ltd.</i>, 2010 WL 1854146 (N.D. Cal. May 6, 2010) 5</p> <p><i>Gulaid v. CH2M Hill, Inc.</i>, 2016 WL 5673144 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2016)..... 6</p> <p><i>Jones v. AIG Risk Mgmt.</i>, 726 F. Supp. 2d 1049 (N.D. Cal. 2010) 4</p> <p><i>McCamey v. Hewlett Packard Co.</i>, No. S-11-0702 FCD (GGH), 2011 WL 4056158 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 12, 2011)..... 10</p>

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

	Page
<i>Miller v. Uni-Pixel Inc.</i> , No. 17-CV-02187 NC, 2017 WL 3007082 (N.D. Cal. July 14, 2017)	10
<i>NetApp, Inc. v. Nimble Storage, Inc.</i> , No. 5:13-CV-05058-LHK (HRL), 2015 WL 400251 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 29, 2015).....	10, 11
<i>Oliney v. Gardner</i> , 771 F.2d 856 (5th Cir.1985).....	5
<i>Papasan v. Allain</i> , 478 U.S. 265 (1986).....	4
<i>Parkinson v. Hyundai Motor America</i> , 258 F.R.D. 580 (C.D. Cal. 2008)	6
<i>Shroyer v. New Cingular Wireless Servs., Inc.</i> , 622 F.3d 1035 (9th Cir. 2010).....	4
<i>Wathan v. Pazin</i> , 2007 WL 4181716 (E.D. Cal. November 21, 2007)	5
State Cases	
<i>Campbell v. Arco Marine</i> , 42 Cal. App. 4th 1850 (1996).....	6
<i>Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.</i> , 20 Cal. 4th 163 (1999)	8
<i>Dickson v. Burke Williams, Inc.</i> , 234 Cal. App. 4th 1307 (2015).....	8
<i>Sandell v. Taylor-Listug, Inc.</i> , 188 Cal. App. 4th 297 (2010).....	7
<i>Saunders v. Super. Ct.</i> , 27 Cal. App. 4th 832 (1994).....	8
<i>Scott v. Phoenix Schools, Inc.</i> , 175 Cal. App. 4th 702 (2009).....	11
<i>Trujillo v. N. Cnty. Trans. Dist.</i> , 63 Cal. App. 4th 280 (1998).....	8
State Statutes	
Business & Professions Code § 17200	2, 3, 6, 8, 9

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

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

Cal. Civil Code § 3294(b)	11
Cal. Code Regs. Title 2, § 11008(d)(1)(C)	5
Cal. Gov't Code § 12920	5

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 2(f)	1, 9
Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6)	1, 4

Other Authorities

<i>Donald K. Shruhan, Jr. v. Apple Inc.</i> (Case No. 5:22-cv-05481-EJD)	1, 4
---	------

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.