

1 Paul J. Riehle (SBN 115199)  
2 paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com  
3 **FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**  
4 Four Embarcadero Center  
5 San Francisco, California 94111  
6 Telephone: (415) 591-7500  
7 Facsimile: (415) 591-7510

8 Gary A. Bornstein (*pro hac vice*)  
9 gbornstein@cravath.com  
10 Timothy G. Cameron (*pro hac vice*)  
11 tcameron@cravath.com  
12 Yonatan Even (*pro hac vice*)  
13 yeven@cravath.com  
14 Lauren A. Moskowitz (*pro hac vice*)  
15 lmoskowitz@cravath.com  
16 Justin C. Clarke (*pro hac vice*)  
17 jcclarke@cravath.com  
18 Michael J. Zaken (*pro hac vice*)  
19 mzaken@cravath.com  
20 M. Brent Byars (*pro hac vice*)  
21 mbyars@cravath.com

22 **CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP**  
23 375 Ninth Avenue  
24 New York, New York 10001  
25 Telephone: (212) 474-1000  
26 Facsimile: (212) 474-3700

27 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.*

28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

**IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE  
ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

*Epic Games, Inc. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case  
No. 3:20-cv-05671-JD

Case No. 3:21-md-02981-JD

**PLAINTIFF EPIC GAMES, INC.’S  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT  
GOOGLE’S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION FOR IMMEDIATE PARTIAL  
ADMINISTRATIVE STAY OF  
PERMANENT INJUNCTION;  
EXPEDITED BRIEFING ON ITS  
MOTION FOR PARTIAL STAY  
PENDING APPEAL; AND TO FILE AN  
OVERLENGTH MOTION FOR  
PARTIAL STAY PENDING APPEAL**

Judge: Hon. James Donato

1 On October 11, 2024, Google filed an administrative motion (the “Motion”  
2 (Dkt. 1021)) seeking, among other things, to stay all but one provision of this Court’s October 7,  
3 2024 Permanent Injunction (the “Injunction” (Dkt. 1017)) until 30 days after this Court rules on  
4 Google’s separate motion for a stay of the Injunction pending appeal (Dkt. 1020). This Court  
5 promptly set a hearing on the Motion for October 18, 2024. (Dkt. 1022.) Without waiting for  
6 that hearing, on October 16, 2024, Google tried to bypass this Court and sought an administrative  
7 stay directly from the Ninth Circuit. (Ex. A (No. 24-6256, Dkt. 8-1).) Google also declared it  
8 “impracticable” to seek a stay pending appeal from this Court and simultaneously filed directly  
9 with the Ninth Circuit a motion for stay pending appeal. (*Id.* at 2.) In the Ninth Circuit, as an  
10 alternative to an administrative stay, Google also seeks an expedited briefing schedule on that  
11 main stay motion. (*Id.* at 3-4.) Epic has consented to Google’s request for expedited briefing  
12 before the Ninth Circuit (with one proposed adjustment to the specific dates Google sought). (*Id.*  
13 at 4.) Google’s request for an administrative stay from this Court should be denied.<sup>1</sup>

14 *First*, Google’s filings in the Ninth Circuit effectively seek to moot both of its  
15 stay motions to this Court. In its Motion here, Google argues that an administrative stay is  
16 needed to allow sufficient time for its motion for stay pending appeal to be decided before the  
17 Injunction is effective. Google has made precisely the same argument to the Ninth Circuit and  
18 has requested that the Ninth Circuit grant the administrative stay, or expedite briefing on the  
19 motion for stay pending appeal, without the benefit of this Court’s decision on either issue. Epic  
20 believes that the Ninth Circuit would benefit from this Court’s perspective but recognizes that  
21 the Court may prefer to allow these matters to be addressed by the Court of Appeals

22 *Second*, if the Court chooses to address it, Google’s Motion for an administrative  
23 stay should be denied, because such a stay is not necessary to allow this Court to rule on the  
24 motion for stay pending appeal. While, in certain circumstances, a court may enter an

---

25  
26 <sup>1</sup> Google’s Motion also seeks an expedited briefing schedule on the underlying motion to  
27 stay and an eight-page extension for its brief on that motion. (Mot. at 3.) Epic has agreed to  
28 Google’s proposed briefing schedule and takes no position on its request for additional pages,  
though Epic requests an equivalent extension for its opposition should the Court grant Google’s  
request.

1 administrative stay to maintain the *status quo* while the court decides the merits of an ordinary  
2 stay application, Google’s Motion does not meet that standard. This is not a case in which the  
3 Court’s judgment has some immediate consequence, such as disbursing funds that cannot later be  
4 recovered, which can only be prevented through an emergency administrative stay. To the  
5 contrary, the Court’s Injunction *already* included a multi-week stay of implementation.

6           In that period, the Court can resolve Google’s motion for a stay pending appeal.  
7 The parties have agreed to an expedited briefing schedule, under which the motion for stay  
8 pending appeal will be fully briefed by October 23, 2024, which leaves over one week before the  
9 November 1, 2024 effective date for the Court to decide the stay motion. Epic is mindful of the  
10 Court’s heavy workload but respectfully suggests that this is sufficient time to decide Google’s  
11 underlying stay motion, which largely recycles arguments this Court has already considered and  
12 rejected. For example, Google argues it has a likelihood of success on appeal of the liability  
13 verdict based on issue preclusion from *Epic v. Apple*, the supposed need to prove aftermarket, a  
14 claim that the jury was wrongly precluded from considering alleged procompetitive effects in  
15 other markets, and a claim that there should not have been a jury at all. (Dkt. 1020 at 3-7.) The  
16 Court has already ruled on each of these points. (Dkt. 984 at 6-9, 11, 26-28.)

17           To the extent Google seeks an administrative stay from this Court to give the  
18 *Ninth Circuit* sufficient time to decide if a stay pending appeal is warranted, its request is  
19 misdirected. It has sought that relief directly from the Ninth Circuit, which can make its own  
20 determination on whether Google has made the requisite showing for such relief. In fact, given  
21 the parties’ agreement to expedited briefing in the Ninth Circuit, even Google’s request for an  
22 administrative stay to that court is unwarranted, because expedited briefing would allow its  
23 motion to be decided before the Injunction’s effective date.<sup>2</sup> What Google is really seeking  
24 through its administrative stay motions (in both courts) is a delay in even needing to start  
25 preparing for implementation of the Injunction, even if its motion for a stay is ultimately denied.

26  
27  
28 <sup>2</sup> The Ninth Circuit briefing could be completed even earlier than Google has proposed, but Google has insisted on taking five days to file a reply on its “emergency” motion. (Ex. A at 4.)

1           *Third*, Google argues that the Injunction requires compliance on an unreasonable  
2 timeline. This is effectively a request for reconsideration of the Court’s decision and does not  
3 meet the required standard for such relief under Civil Local Rule 7-9. In addition to requiring  
4 leave of court before such a motion can be made, that Rule requires a party to show (1) “a  
5 material difference in fact or law” from what was previously presented to the court that the party  
6 could not in the “exercise of reasonable diligence” have previously known, (2) the “emergence  
7 of new material facts or a change of law” or (3) a “manifest failure by the Court to consider  
8 material facts or dispositive legal arguments”. Civil L.R. 7-9(b). Google does not even attempt  
9 to meet any of these requirements.

10           Instead, Google simply points out that, during the second hot tub proceeding, it  
11 sought 90 days to comply with any contractual remedies and argues that Epic’s proposed  
12 injunction provided Google with 90 days to advise officers of the company on how to comply.  
13 (Mot. at 2.) Even if properly presented, neither argument justifies giving Google additional time.  
14 In fact, counting from the August 14, 2024 hearing when those statements were made to  
15 November 1, 2024, Google will have had nearly 90 days to comply with these provisions. In  
16 addition, the Court did not adopt Epic’s proposed compliance oversight regime, so those  
17 proposals shed no light on the time to comply with the provisions the Court did order.

18           To the extent Google now believes it cannot comply in a timely way, that is a  
19 problem of Google’s own making. Google has been aware of the jury’s verdict since  
20 December 11, 2023 (Dkt. 866) and of the terms of Epic’s proposed injunction since at least  
21 April 11, 2024, when Epic filed it with this Court (Dkt. 952).<sup>3</sup> Google was also aware that the  
22 Court was considering many of the provisions that appear in the injunction since at least May 23,  
23 2024, when the Court held its first hot tub proceeding on potential remedies. To the extent  
24 Google chose to wait for a final order to begin the work necessary for compliance, it cannot now  
25 use that as a basis for an extension of its time to comply.

26  
27           <sup>3</sup> Pursuant to Court order (Dkt. 917), Epic had previously provided Google a proposed  
28 injunction on February 1, 2024.

1 Nor has Google provided sufficient explanation for why it needs additional time  
2 to comply with the specific provisions it seeks to stay:

- 3 • Paragraphs 4-7 and 9-10 of the Injunction, which were also included in Epic's  
4 proposed injunction, merely prohibit Google from engaging in conduct that was  
5 found illegal by the jury or that accomplishes similar ends to conduct found illegal by  
6 the jury. Google is silent as to why it could not have anticipated these provisions in  
7 the nearly ten months since the jury verdict or the six months since Epic filed its  
8 proposed injunction. Nor does it adequately explain why compliance with any of  
9 these provisions could not be accomplished by November 1. Google fails to show,  
10 for example, why it cannot comply immediately with Paragraphs 4-7, which require it  
11 not to enter into or enforce certain types of agreements. These provisions are no  
12 different in kind than Paragraph 8, which Google does not seek to stay because it is  
13 similar to a provision found in the proposed settlement between Google and State  
14 Plaintiffs. (Mot. at 1 n.1.) Likewise, Paragraphs 9-10 bar Google from prohibiting  
15 developers from engaging in certain conduct. Google can comply with most of those  
16 provisions by simply allowing developers to do those things (*e.g.*, communicate  
17 payment and download information to users). Paragraph 9's requirement that Google  
18 allow alternative in-app payment methods is a change that Google knew was coming  
19 since the December 2023 jury verdict and should have been working on.
- 20 • Paragraphs 11 and 12 of the Injunction, which provide for catalog access and  
21 distribution of third-party stores through Google Play, provide for remedies that were  
22 in Epic's proposed injunction and were extensively briefed in Google's proffer. It  
23 strains credulity that Google is only now beginning to work on them. Moreover, the  
24 eight months of lead time provided for in the Injunction is longer than Google needs  
25 to comply. Dr. Michael Ernst testified that taking a practical approach, Google could  
26 design and build these provisions in just three months and roll them out over another  
27 four months. (Dkt. 985 at 12.) In any event, emergency administrative relief is not  
28 warranted for these provisions given that Google's underlying motion to stay the

1 injunction pending appeal would certainly be decided well before the expiration of  
2 the eight-month lead time period provided for in the Injunction.

- 3 • Paragraph 13 merely requires the appointment of members to a Technical Committee.  
4 Google provides no reason—nor can it—why it cannot meet that deadline.<sup>4</sup>

5 Google also points to the fact that Apple received 90 days from the entry of the  
6 permanent injunction to comply in *Epic v. Apple*. (Mot. at 2.) But Google ignores that in *Epic v.*  
7 *Apple*, the final decision on liability and the injunction were entered on the same day. *Epic*  
8 *Games, Inc. v. Apple Inc.*, 559 F. Supp. 3d 898 (N.D. Cal. 2021) (Dkt. 812 and 813). Here,  
9 Google will have had almost 11 months to prepare to comply when measured from the time it  
10 was found liable by the jury.

11 A further stay of the remedy in this case would harm Epic, other developers and  
12 consumers. It has been over four years since Epic filed its complaint and almost a year since the  
13 jury rendered its verdict, finding Google liable on all counts. Now that the implementation of the  
14 Injunction is imminent, Epic and other developers have launched or announced plans to launch  
15 stores on Android. For example, Epic launched the Epic Games Store on Android on August 16,  
16 2024 in anticipation of this Court's Injunction.<sup>5</sup> In response to the issuance of the Injunction,  
17 Microsoft announced its intent to update its mobile app to allow users to purchase and play Xbox  
18 games on their Android smartphones.<sup>6</sup> A delay in implementing the remedies will prevent those  
19 stores from competing in a market free from Google's anticompetitive conduct and delay the  
20 benefits that Epic, developers and consumers have been waiting on for years.

21 Google's effort to further delay the Injunction is no surprise. Google knows that  
22 the longer it puts off compliance with the Injunction, the longer it can enjoy the fruits of its  
23 anticompetitive conduct. Delay in implementing the jury's verdict will serve only to further  
24 damage developers and consumers. Google's Motion should be denied on the merits.

25  
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>4</sup> Paragraphs 1-3 and 14 do not require any action by Google.

28 <sup>5</sup> <https://www.epicgames.com/site/en-US/news/the-epic-games-store-launches-on-mobile>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.theverge.com/2024/10/10/24267339/microsoft-xbox-android-purchase-games-us-court-ruling>

1 Dated: October 17, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

2 By: /s/ Gary A. Bornstein

3  
4 **FAEGRE DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH**  
5 **LLP**

6 Paul J. Riehle ( SBN 115199)  
paul.riehle@faegredrinker.com

7 Four Embarcadero Center  
8 San Francisco, California 94111  
9 Telephone: (415) 591-7500  
Facsimile: (415) 591-7510

10 **CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP**

11 Gary A. Bornstein (*pro hac vice*)  
12 gbornstein@cravath.com  
13 Timothy G. Cameron (*pro hac vice*)  
tcameron@cravath.com  
14 Yonatan Even (*pro hac vice*)  
yeven@cravath.com  
15 Lauren A. Moskowitz (*pro hac vice*)  
lmoskowitz@cravath.com  
16 Justin C. Clarke (*pro hac vice*)  
jcclarke@cravath.com  
17 Michael J. Zaken (*pro hac vice*)  
mzaken@cravath.com  
18 M. Brent Byars (*pro hac vice*)  
mbyars@cravath.com

19 375 Ninth Avenue  
20 New York, New York 10001  
21 Telephone: (212) 474-1000  
Facsimile: (212) 474-3700

22 *Attorneys for Plaintiff Epic Games, Inc.*