

1 Beth A. Wilkinson (*pro hac vice*)
 2 Rakesh N. Kilaru (*pro hac vice*)
 3 Kieran Gostin (*pro hac vice*)
 4 Grace Hill (*pro hac vice*)
 5 Anastasia M. Pastan (*pro hac vice*)
 6 WILKINSON STEKLOFF LLP
 7 2001 M Street NW, 10th Floor
 8 Washington, DC 20036
 9 Telephone: (202) 847-4000
 Facsimile: (202) 847-4005
 bwilkinson@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 rkilaru@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 kgostin@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 ghill@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 apastan@wilkinsonstekloff.com

10 Bambo Obaro (Bar No. 267683)
 11 WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
 12 201 Redwood Shores Parkway
 13 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
 Telephone: (650) 802-3000
 Facsimile: (650) 802-3100
 bambo.obaro@weil.com

14 *Counsel for Defendant Microsoft Corp.*

15 [Additional counsel identified on signature page in accordance with Local Rule 3-4(a)(1)]

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 18 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

19 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 MICROSOFT CORP.

23 and

24 ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC.

25 Defendants.
 26
 27
 28

Case No. 3:23-CV-2880-JSC

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
 FOR EXPEDITED CASE MANAGEMENT
 CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Jacqueline S. Corley

No Hearing Date Set Pursuant to L.R. 7-11

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

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Defendants Microsoft Corp. and Activision Blizzard, Inc. will, and hereby do, move this Court to set an expedited case management conference in this matter. The motion will be made based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities herein, the Proposed Order, all other papers and pleadings on file in this action, and any other written or oral argument or evidence that Defendants might present to the Court.

REQUESTED RELIEF

Defendants Microsoft and Activision request that the Court exercise its discretion to set an expedited case management conference in this matter.

INTRODUCTION

1
2 This case involves the Federal Trade Commission’s challenge to Microsoft Corporation’s
3 proposed acquisition of Activision Blizzard, Inc. For the express purpose of being ready to conduct
4 a fulsome hearing in federal court in the event the FTC sought a preliminary injunction (not two
5 simultaneous proceedings in a federal and an administrative court), the parties agreed to expedite
6 pretrial matters in an FTC administrative proceeding that has been pending since December. The
7 parties have completed fact discovery and exchanged witness lists, exhibit lists, and expert reports.
8 Only one step remains before the case is ready for trial: expert depositions, which are currently
9 set to take place between June 21 and 30.

10 The case has been moving at this fast pace because time is of the essence. The merger
11 agreement by which Microsoft seeks to acquire Activision has a termination date of July 18, 2023.
12 The agreement also contains a \$3 billion termination fee. The FTC filed an administrative
13 complaint in December 2022. But they chose to file this suit—seeking a court order of
14 indeterminate length to prevent the transaction from closing—6 months after filing its
15 administrative complaint and only 6 weeks before the termination date. The FTC knows that a
16 preliminary injunction decision will determine whether the transaction succeeds or fails, yet
17 counsel claims that the preliminary injunction is required only to ensure there is time to complete
18 the administrative process. Let there be no doubt, a preliminary injunction ruling is the only
19 decision that matters under these challenging deadlines.

20 As history shows, the Court’s ruling on the FTC’s request for a preliminary injunction will
21 decide the fate of this transaction, particularly in light of the termination date of July 18, 2023. If
22 Defendants prevail, the FTC’s longstanding and unbroken practice has been to walk away from its
23 challenge. On the other hand, if the Court grants a preliminary injunction, it will effectively block
24 the transaction because the FTC’s process is “glacial” and one “[n]o substantial business transaction
25 could ever survive.” *FTC v. Occidental Petroleum Corp.*, 1986 WL 952, at *13 (D.D.C. Apr. 29,
26 1986) (denying motion for preliminary injunction). This case illustrates the point. The FTC
27 hearing is set to start after the termination date. There will be no decision until late December 2023
28

1 or early January 2024 at the earliest. That decision will not be final because the FTC recently
2 concluded that such decisions are recommendations subject to the review of the Commissioners
3 who authorized the complaint—a lengthy process that always results in a decision in the FTC’s
4 favor. Defendants’ only recourse at that point is an appeal to a circuit court. Overall, this process
5 takes several years—a timeframe no merger could survive. That is why FTC preliminary injunction
6 hearings typically last at least five days—those hearings are the only hearings that will take place.

7 Defendants recognize the Court has issued an order temporarily restraining the transaction
8 and setting a hearing for June 22-23. But Defendants respectfully submit that an appropriate initial
9 step would be to hold an expedited case management conference at the Court’s earliest
10 convenience—as soon as June 15, if possible given the Court’s busy calendar—to establish an
11 appropriate schedule to resolve the FTC’s challenge.

12 To be clear, Defendants have no interest in delaying the resolution of this matter. But
13 Defendants respectfully submit that a hearing of two days is not enough time to present the issues
14 in this case and that further discussion of the schedule is warranted. The stakes of this case are
15 high, and it involves important legal, factual, and economic issues. At minimum, Defendants
16 believe the Court should allow the hearing to extend into the week of June 26, to permit expert
17 discovery to conclude before the conclusion of the hearing, particularly given that the FTC’s motion
18 for a temporary restraining order relies heavily on the reports submitted by their expert, Dr. Robin
19 Lee.

20 As demonstrated in the schedule below, Defendants believe that the hearing could be
21 scheduled for a minimum of five days beginning on June 22 and running through the week of June
22 26 (or the soonest dates thereafter, based on the Court’s busy schedule). To ensure the case
23 proceeds on a viable schedule, Defendants request that the Court set a case management conference
24 as soon as possible to further discuss the format and length of the hearing.

25 **BACKGROUND AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

26 Defendant Microsoft Corporation is a technology company that competes in the gaming
27 industry through its Xbox division. Defendant Activision Blizzard, Inc. is a video game developer
28

1 and publisher. On January 18, 2022, Microsoft signed a Merger Agreement to acquire 100% of
2 Activision for \$68.7 billion. The Agreement requires the parties to close by July 18, 2023.

3 Shortly after the deal was announced, the FTC opened an investigation into the proposed
4 acquisition. During the FTC’s nearly yearlong investigation, Defendants produced millions of
5 documents and sat for several investigational hearings. On December 8, 2022, the FTC filed an
6 administrative complaint before the FTC’s Office of Administrative Law Judges, seeking to bar the
7 transaction under Section 7 of the Clayton Act and Section 5 of the FTC Act. *See* 16 CFR Part 3.
8 Unlike in most other merger challenges where the FTC simultaneously files a case in federal
9 court—because only a federal court has the power to preliminarily enjoin the transaction, *see* 15
10 U.S.C. § 53(b)—the FTC delayed filing a federal action until Monday. Instead, the FTC initially
11 scheduled an administrative hearing before the FTC’s Chief ALJ on an eight-month calendar rather
12 than a five-month calendar (the “Part 3 proceeding”). *See* 16 CFR § 3.11(b)(4). That had the effect
13 of setting the hearing for August 2, 2023—when there was no preliminary-injunction proceeding
14 and when it was clear that the transaction’s termination date (July 18, 2023) was weeks before the
15 hearing would even begin.

16 The FTC’s administrative process is lengthy. In this case, the proceedings before the ALJ
17 would last until at least December 2023 (at the absolute earliest). Due to a recent rule change by
18 the FTC, that proceeding would culminate in a “recommended decision” to the Commissioners that
19 has no legal force of its own. FTC, *Federal Register Notice: Amendments to Part 3 Rules* (June 2,
20 2023), [https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/p072104-amendments-to-part-3-rules-](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/p072104-amendments-to-part-3-rules-frn.pdf)
21 [frn.pdf](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/p072104-amendments-to-part-3-rules-frn.pdf). The ALJ’s recommended decision would then be subject to automatic review by the
22 Commissioners. That review takes a long time: As of several decades ago, “the average time from
23 the initial decision to the final Commission decision exceeded 13 ½ months,” *Occidental*, 1986 WL
24 952, at *13, and things have not improved materially since then. And as a former FTC
25 Commissioner has recognized, the Commissioners’ review always results in a ruling in favor of the
26 FTC. *See* Joshua D. Wright, *Section 5 Revisited*, at 6 (Feb. 26, 2015),
27 <https://tinyurl.com/y2v2m449> (describing FTC’s undefeated record adjudicating complaints it
28

1 voted out, regardless of the ALJ’s decision). After that, Defendants would have a right to appeal
2 to a federal circuit court and the U.S. Supreme Court, which would take still longer.

3 Overall, this process would take several years, which no merger could survive. *See, e.g.,*
4 *FTC v. Foster*, 2007 WL 1793441, at *51 (D.N.M. May 29, 2007) (denying motion for preliminary
5 injunction and dissolving temporary restraining order, and noting that “the grant of a temporary
6 injunction in a Government antitrust suit is likely to spell the doom of an agreed merger.” (citation
7 omitted)). For that reason, federal court proceedings under Section 13(b) are outcome
8 determinative. When the FTC wins, the transaction collapses. *See, e.g., FTC v. Sysco Corp.*, 113
9 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2015) (granting FTC request for preliminary injunction of proposed merger);
10 *In re Sysco Corp.*, FTC Docket No. 9364 (describing the defendants’ decision to abandon the deal
11 after losing at the preliminary-injunction hearing). When the FTC loses, it abandons its
12 administrative challenge. *See, e.g., FTC v. Meta Platforms Inc.*, No. 5:22-CV-04325-EJD, 2023
13 WL 2346238 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 3, 2023) (denying FTC request for preliminary injunction of proposed
14 merger); *In re Meta Platforms, Inc.*; FTC Docket No. 9411 (noting that FTC dismissed its
15 administrative complaint).

16 To be prepared for the possibility that the FTC might eventually file a motion for
17 preliminary injunction in federal court in this matter, the parties have been cooperating to expedite
18 pretrial matters so that a federal judge can decide the matter in a timely fashion. Fact discovery is
19 complete. And expert discovery will close on June 23 (with one deposition taking place on June
20 30, by agreement of the parties). The FTC has disclosed one expert who has submitted over 350
21 pages of reports (currently set to be deposed on June 21), and whom they principally rely upon in
22 seeking emergency relief from this Court. Defendants have disclosed three experts (currently set
23 to be deposed between June 21 and 30).

24 ARGUMENT

25 The hearing on the FTC’s motion for a preliminary injunction is not a trivial event. It is
26 “well recognized that the issuance of a preliminary injunction prior to a full trial on the merits is an
27 extraordinary and drastic remedy,” and that this is “particularly true in the acquisition and merger
28

1 context, because, as a result of the short life-span of most tender offers, the issuance of a preliminary
2 injunction blocking an acquisition or merger may prevent the transaction from ever being
3 consummated.” *FTC v. Exxon Corp.*, 636 F.2d 1336, 1343–44 (D.C. Cir. 1980) (citations and
4 internal quotation marks omitted). Defendants are aware of no situation where (1) a merger has
5 closed after an unfavorable federal court decision on a preliminary injunction or (2) the FTC has
6 pursued its administrative proceeding after losing in federal court.

7 While Defendants appreciate the Court’s willingness to move quickly, Defendants
8 respectfully submit that an expedited case management conference would assist in setting an
9 appropriate schedule for efficiently and effectively resolving a case of this magnitude. Defendants
10 see two issues with the Court’s suggested path forward, both of which would benefit from further
11 discussion.

12 *First*, the hearing date is currently set during expert discovery. While Defendants are
13 prepared to accelerate the pace of expert discovery, Defendants submit that the parties and Court
14 would benefit from having the experts deposed prior to the close of trial. That is particularly so
15 because the FTC’s motion for a temporary restraining order relies heavily on the testimony of its
16 expert and the reports he submitted—making it all the more important that the Court have a full
17 and complete expert record when adjudicating the FTC’s motion.

18 *Second*, while Defendants believe the evidence can be presented expeditiously, Defendants
19 are not aware of situations where a matter of this scope and importance was decided on just two
20 days of testimony. On the contrary, federal court preliminary injunction hearings typically last at
21 least five days, presumably because the hearing is the only one that will ever take place. *See, e.g.*,
22 *Meta Platforms Inc.*, 2023 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 29832 (7-day hearing); *FTC v. Hackensack Meridian*
23 *Health, Inc.*, Civil Action No. 20-18140, 2021 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 158158 (D.N.J. Aug. 4, 2021) (7-
24 day hearing); *FTC v. Thomas Jefferson Univ.*, 2020-2 Trade Cas. (CCH) 81,469 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 8,
25 2020) (6-day hearing); *FTC v. RAG-Stiftung*, Civil Action No. 19-2337, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS
26 18346 (D.D.C. Jan. 24, 2020) (two-week evidentiary hearing).

1 Given the significance of this Court's decision on the FTC's preliminary injunction
2 motion, Defendants propose the following schedule:

Event	Deadline/Date
Joint Case Management Statement	June 14, 2023
Initial Case Management Conference	June 15, 2023
Opposition to Preliminary Injunction	June 16, 2023
Reply in Support of Preliminary Injunction	June 20, 2023 (noon)
Pre-Hearing Conference	June 21, 2023
Close of Expert Discovery	June 23, 2023 ¹
Hearing	June 22, 2023 (running for a minimum of five days as soon thereafter as convenient for the Court)
Proposed Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law	Submitted two days after the close of evidence

14 Defendants would also be available to take trial days when the Court has availability rather than
15 setting the case in one full block.

16 In conclusion, because the preliminary injunction hearing will decide the fate of the
17 transaction, Defendants submit that a longer hearing is warranted and that the parties and Court
18 would benefit from an opportunity to discuss and set an appropriate schedule for resolving this
19 important matter.

20 CIVIL LOCAL RULE 16 STATEMENT

21 Counsel for Microsoft have conferred with all other counsel. Defendant Activision supports
22 this request for an expedited Initial Case Management Conference. Plaintiff Federal Trade
23 Commission has declined to join a request for an expedited Initial Case Management Conference.
24 Subject to the Court's order, the parties will meet and confer pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-3 and
25 submit a Joint Case Management Statement setting out their respective scheduling proposals no
26 later than June 14, 2023, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 16-9 and the Standing Order for All Judges
27

28 ¹ As noted above, the parties have agreed to one expert deposition currently slated for June 30, 2023.

1 of the Northern District of California.

2 **CONCLUSION**

3 Based on the circumstances described above, Microsoft and Activision jointly and
4 respectfully request that the Court issue the accompanying proposed Order setting an initial case
5 management conference on June 15 or 16, 2023, and requiring the submission of a joint case
6 management statement on June 14, 2023.

7
8 DATED: June 14, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

9 By: /s/ Beth A. Wilkinson

10 Beth A. Wilkinson (*pro hac vice*)

11 Rakesh N. Kilaru (*pro hac vice*)

12 Kieran Gostin (*pro hac vice*)

13 Grace Hill (*pro hac vice*)

14 Anastasia Pastan (*pro hac vice*)

15 WILKINSON STEKLOFF LLP

2001 M Street NW, 10th Floor

Washington, DC 20036

Telephone: (202) 847-4000

Facsimile: (202) 847-4005

16 bwilkinson@wilkinsonstekloff.com

17 rkilaru@wilkinsonstekloff.com

kgostin@wilkinsonstekloff.com

ghill@wilkinsonstekloff.com

18 apastan@wilkinsonstekloff.com

19 Bambo Obaro (Bar No. 267683)

WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP

201 Redwood Shores Parkway

Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Telephone: (650) 802-3000

Facsimile: (650) 802-3100

21 bambo.obaro@weil.com

22
23 *Counsel for Defendant Microsoft Corp.*

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

Caroline Van Ness (Bar No. 281675)
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
525 University Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94301
Telephone: (650) 470-4500
Facsimile: (650) 470-4570
caroline.vanness@skadden.com

Steven C. Sunshine (*pro hac vice*)
Julia K. York (*pro hac vice*)
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
1440 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005
Telephone: (202) 371-7860
Fax: (202) 661-9126
steve.sunshine@skadden.com
julia.york@skadden.com

Michael J. Sheerin (*pro hac vice*)
Matthew M. Martino (*pro hac vice*)
Evan R. Kreiner (*pro hac vice*)
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP
One Manhattan West
New York, NY 10001
Telephone: (212) 735-2425
Fax: (917) 777-2425
michael.sheerin@skadden.com
matthew.martino@skadden.com
evan.kreiner@skadden.com

Counsel for Activision Blizzard, Inc.

1 Beth A. Wilkinson (*pro hac vice*)
 2 Rakesh N. Kilaru (*pro hac vice*)
 3 Kieran Gostin (*pro hac vice*)
 4 Grace Hill (*pro hac vice*)
 5 Anastasia Pastan (*pro hac vice*)
 6 WILKINSON STEKLOFF LLP
 7 2001 M Street NW, 10th Floor
 8 Washington, DC 20036
 9 Telephone: (202) 847-4000
 Facsimile: (202) 847-4005
 bwilkinson@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 rkilaru@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 kgostin@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 ghill@wilkinsonstekloff.com
 apastan@wilkinsonstekloff.com

10 Bambo Obaro (Bar No. 267683)
 11 WEIL, GOTSHAL & MANGES LLP
 12 201 Redwood Shores Parkway
 13 Redwood Shores, CA 94065
 Telephone: (650) 802-3000
 Facsimile: (650) 802-3100
 bambo.obaro@weil.com

14
15 *Counsel for Defendant Microsoft Corp.*

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
 18 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

19 FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

20 Plaintiff,

21 v.

22 MICROSOFT CORP.

23 and

24 ACTIVISION BLIZZARD, INC.

25 Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-CV-2880-JSC

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
MOTION FOR EXPEDITED INITIAL
CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

Judge: Hon. Jacqueline S. Corley

No Hearing Date Set

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

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Having considered the Defendants’ Motion for Expedited Initial Case Management Conference, the Court hereby GRANTS the Motion and ORDERS that an Initial Case Management Conference shall be scheduled for Thursday, June 15 or Friday, June 16.

The Court FURTHER ORDERS the parties to submit a Joint Case Management Statement on or before Wednesday, June 14, 2023.

Date: _____

Hon. Jacqueline S. Corley
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT JUDGE