

1 Robert A. Mittelstaedt (State Bar No. 60359)
 ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com
 2 David C. Kiernan (State Bar No. 215335)
 dkiernan@jonesday.com
 3 Lin W. Kahn (State Bar No. 261387)
 linkahn@jonesday.com
 4 JONES DAY
 555 California Street, 26th Floor
 5 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 626-3939
 6 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

7 Attorneys for Defendant
 Adobe Systems Inc.
 8

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

13 IN RE: HIGH-TECH EMPLOYEE
 ANTITRUST LITIGATION

14 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
 15 ALL ACTIONS

Master Docket No. 11-CV-2509-LHK

**DEFENDANT ADOBE'S MOTION FOR
 SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Date: March 20, 2014 and
 March 27, 2014
 Time: 1:30 p.m.
 Courtroom: 8, 4th Floor
 Judge: The Honorable Lucy H. Koh

16
 17
 18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT	iv
RELIEF REQUESTED.....	iv
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES	1
INTRODUCTION	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	1
ARGUMENT	3
I. SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS REQUIRED BECAUSE PLAINTIFFS HAVE NO EVIDENCE THAT ADOBE WAS PART OF ANY GLOBAL CONSPIRACY.	6
A. No Direct Evidence.....	6
B. No Circumstantial Evidence.	6
CONCLUSION.....	11

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
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>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i>, 477 U.S. 242 (1986)..... 4</p> <p><i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i>, 550 U.S. 544 (2007)..... 4, 5, 6</p> <p><i>Beltz Travel Serv. Inc. v. Int’l Air Transp. Ass’n</i>, 620 F.2d 1360 (9th Cir. 1980) 10</p> <p><i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i>, 477 U.S. 317 (1986)..... 3, 4</p> <p><i>Dickson v. Microsoft Corp.</i>, 309 F.3d 193 (4th Cir. 2002) 5</p> <p><i>Fonda v. Gray</i>, 707 F.2d 435 (9th Cir. 1983) 4</p> <p><i>In re Elevator Antitrust Litig.</i>, 502 F.3d 47 (2d Cir. 2007)..... 9</p> <p><i>In re Ins. Brokerage Antitrust Litig.</i>, 618 F.3d 300 (3d Cir. 2010)..... 6, 9, 11</p> <p><i>In re Oracle Corp. Sec. Litig.</i>, 627 F.3d 376 (9th Cir. 2010) 4</p> <p><i>Kotteakos v. United States</i>, 328 U.S. 750 (1946)..... 5</p> <p><i>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp.</i>, 475 U.S. 574 (1986)..... 5, 7, 11</p> <p><i>Miller v. Cal., Dept. of Social Servs.</i>, 355 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2004) 4</p> <p><i>Monsanto Co. v. Spray-Rite Serv. Corp.</i>, 465 U.S. 752 (1984)..... 4</p> <p><i>Richards v. Neilsen Freight Lines</i>, 810 F.2d 898 (9th Cir. 1987) 5, 11</p> <p><i>Wilcox v. First Interstate Bank of Or.</i>, 815 F.2d 522 (9th Cir. 1987) 5</p>

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

Rules

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a) 3

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 FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on March 20, 2014 at 1:30 p.m. and/ or March 27, 2014, at 1:30 p.m., or as soon thereafter as this matter may be heard in Courtroom 8, 4th Floor, of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, located at 280 South 1st Street, San Jose, California, before the Honorable Lucy H. Koh, Defendant Adobe Systems Inc. will and hereby does move for an order granting summary judgment in its favor under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56, based on the supporting declaration of Lin Kahn and the exhibits thereto, the complete files in this action, and such further evidence and argument that may be presented.

RELIEF REQUESTED

Summary judgment in Adobe’s favor on the Consolidated Amended Complaint.

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **INTRODUCTION**

3 Plaintiffs allege that Adobe entered into an overarching global conspiracy with Apple,
4 Google, Intel, Intuit, Lucasfilm and Pixar to suppress compensation by entering into various
5 bilateral do-not-cold-call (DNCC) agreements and that, as part of that conspiracy, Adobe entered
6 into a bilateral DNCC agreement with Apple in May 2005.

7 It is correct that Adobe entered into a bilateral DNCC agreement with Apple in May
8 2005. But the evidence shows, without contradiction, that Adobe was not part of any broader
9 agreement or conspiracy with defendants. Adobe did not know of any broader agreement or
10 conspiracy. Adobe did not know or care whether other defendants had bilateral agreements.
11 Adobe's bilateral agreement with Apple was in Adobe's self-interest without regard to what any
12 other company did or didn't do.

13 In short, Adobe is entitled to summary judgment because plaintiffs cannot carry their
14 burden of proving that Adobe was part, or even aware, of the alleged global conspiracy. Its
15 agreement with Apple was a stand-alone, bilateral agreement—nothing more.

16 **FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

17 1. In May 2005, an Adobe recruiter emailed an Apple employee about “network[ing]
18 with you for folks who might be looking for new opportunities” for a director of product
19 marketing position. Ex. 223 to Declaration of Lin W. Kahn. (All cited exhibits and deposition
20 excerpts are attached to the Kahn declaration). Apple CEO Steve Jobs obtained a copy of the
21 email and forwarded it to Bruce Chizen, Adobe CEO from 2000 to 2007.¹ Jobs stated:

22 “Adobe is recruiting from Apple. They have hired one person already and are
23 calling lots more. I have a standing policy with our recruiters that we don't
24 recruit from Adobe. It seems you have a different policy. One of us must change
our policy. Please let me know who.”

25 Kahn Decl. Ex. 223.

26
27 _____
28 ¹ Kahn Decl. Ex. B (Chizen Dep.) at 20:23–21:5.

1 Chizen responded: “I thought we agreed not to recruit any senior level employees. . . . I
2 am pretty sure your recruiters have approached more junior ones. I would propose we keep it
3 this way.” *Id.* Jobs replied: “Ok, I’ll tell our recruiters that they are free to approach any Adobe
4 employee who is not a Sr. Director or VP. Am I understanding your position correctly?” *Id.*

5 Before responding to Jobs, Chizen discussed the matter internally at Adobe. In an
6 internal Adobe email, Chizen expressed concern that “if I tell Steve it’s open season (other than
7 senior managers), he will deliberately poach Adobe just to prove a point.” Kahn Decl. Ex. 224.
8 Chizen concluded in another internal email: “We have lots of companies we can recruit from.
9 Given the reasons that I stated way below, I think we should stay away from Apple unless an
10 Apple employee approaches us.” *Id.* His goal was to “placate this guy [Jobs] and get him off
11 my back so he doesn’t call me again.” Kahn Decl. Ex. B (Chizen Dep.) at 158:17–19; *see also*
12 *id.* at 169:8–10 (purpose was to “placate Steve”).

13 Accordingly, Chizen advised Jobs on May 27, 2005: “I’d rather agree NOT to actively
14 solicit any employee from either company. If employee proactively approaches then it’s
15 acceptable.” Kahn Decl. Ex. 223.

16 2. The 2005 Adobe/Apple bilateral DNCC agreement is the only Adobe agreement
17 that plaintiffs claim is part of the alleged conspiracy. ECF No. 65, ¶¶ 72–78; Kahn Decl. Ex. K
18 at 6:25–7:3. Adobe did not have any DNCC agreement – bilateral, multilateral or global – with
19 any other defendant. *See* Kahn Decl. Ex. F (Narayan Dep.) at 19:19–20:6 (Adobe president
20 since 2005, and CEO since Chizen stepped down in 2007); *id.* at 353:19–24 (“Putting aside the
21 agreement that you’ve discussed between Adobe and Apple, did Adobe have any agreements
22 with any other defendant in this lawsuit restricting recruiting, cold calling or solicitation of
23 employees? A. No”); Kahn Decl. Ex. C (Horner Dep.) at 22:15–24, 24:8–12 (Adobe Senior VP
24 of Engineering from 2005 to the present); *id.* at 254:1–18 (“Q. Putting [the Adobe/Apple]
25 agreement aside for the moment, are you aware of any agreement between Adobe and any other
26 defendant that would restrict recruiting, cold calling or hiring? A. No, I’m not.”). Plaintiffs do
27 not contend otherwise. Nor do they allege that Adobe was restricted in any way from recruiting
28

1 employees of defendants other than Apple, or that any defendant other than Apple was restricted
2 in any way from recruiting Adobe employees.

3 3. Adobe was not aware of any bilateral DNCC agreement between any of the other
4 defendants. Kahn Decl. Ex. B (Chizen Dep.) at 279:14–280:13 (unaware of any agreements
5 between other pairs of defendants); Kahn Decl. Ex. F (Narayan Dep.) at 353:25–354:3 (“Are you
6 aware of any agreement among the defendants that restricted recruiting, cold calling or
7 solicitation? A. No.”); *id.* at 336:16–337:11 (same). There is no evidence to the contrary.

8 4. Adobe entered into its agreement with Apple for its own reasons, specific to its
9 relationship with Apple. The existence or not of other bilateral agreements was irrelevant to
10 Adobe. *See* Kahn Decl. Ex. B (Chizen Dep.) at 289:3–9 (“[Q.] [D]id your decision to agree with
11 Jobs have anything to do with what any other company was doing? . . . [A.] Absolutely not.”).
12 This testimony is corroborated by the contemporaneous evidence showing that the bilateral
13 agreement had nothing to do with whether any other company had a similar agreement. Kahn
14 Decl. Ex. N (“Bruce and Steve Jobs have an agreement”); Kahn Decl. Ex. M (“Given our
15 relationship with Apple and assuming our partnership may grow stronger, we have reiterated the
16 importance of not poaching from Apple directly”); Kahn Decl. Ex. 223 (discussing entering the
17 agreement without concern for or constraint from what any other parties were doing); Kahn
18 Decl. Ex. 224 (same).

19 5. As conceded by plaintiffs’ purported expert Matthew Marx, Chizen had “a good
20 reason” to agree with Jobs regardless what any other company was doing. Kahn Decl. Ex. E
21 (Marx Dep.) at 221:11–222:18.

22 In the 1.825 millions of pages of documents produced in this case and the more than 100
23 depositions taken, plaintiffs cannot point to any evidence disputing the foregoing points.

24 ARGUMENT

25 Summary judgment is proper under Rule 56 when “there is no genuine dispute as to any
26 material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a);
27 *see also Celotex Corp. v. Catrett*, 477 U.S. 317, 322–23 (1986). The moving party need not
28 positively disprove the opponent’s case; rather, it may prevail by establishing the lack of

1 evidentiary support for that case. *Celotex*, 477 U.S. at 325. Where the non-moving party bears
2 the burden of proof at trial (as plaintiffs do here) and the moving party shows that there is an
3 absence of evidence to support the non-moving party’s case, the burden shifts to the non-moving
4 party to designate specific facts demonstrating genuine issues for trial. *Id.* at 324. “This burden
5 is not a light one. The non-moving party must show more than the mere existence of a scintilla
6 of evidence.” *In re Oracle Corp. Sec. Litig.*, 627 F.3d 376, 387 (9th Cir. 2010) (citing *Anderson*
7 *v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 252 (1986)). “In fact, the non-moving party must come
8 forth with evidence from which a jury could reasonably render a verdict in the non-moving
9 party’s favor.” *Id.*

10 To survive summary judgment, plaintiffs must present evidence that Adobe agreed to join
11 the other defendants in a “common scheme.” *See Monsanto Co. v. Spray-Rite Serv. Corp.*, 465
12 U.S. 752, 764 (1984). This requires the existence of a “common scheme,” *i.e.*, a global
13 conspiracy, and a “meeting of the minds” between Adobe and the other defendants to join this
14 scheme. *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 557 (2007). This “meeting of the minds”
15 requirement applies both within and outside of the antitrust context. *See, e.g., Miller v. Cal.,*
16 *Dept. of Social Servs.*, 355 F.3d 1172, 1175 n.3 (9th Cir. 2004) (affirming dismissal of plaintiffs’
17 claim that “Yuba County and CPS social workers conspired to deny them their right to associate
18 with their grandchildren” because, among other reasons, “the evidence upon which the
19 [plaintiffs] rely at most shows hostility toward them by CPS social workers and counsel, but no
20 meeting of the minds to violate their constitutional rights”); *Fonda v. Gray*, 707 F.2d 435, 437–
21 39 (9th Cir. 1983) (affirming summary judgment against civil rights conspiracy claims—even
22 under the pre-*Celotex* standard—in favor of bank defendants who provided plaintiff Jane
23 Fonda’s financial information to federal investigators because there was no “meeting of the
24 minds” where bank employees “knew nothing more than that the FBI was carrying on a national
25 security investigation,” unaware of the FBI’s plan to discredit Fonda).

26 Parallel conduct is insufficient. Plaintiffs must establish a “preceding agreement” that
27 precipitated the parallel action. As this Court noted in denying the motion to dismiss, *Twombly*
28 reaffirmed that “when allegations of parallel conduct are set out in order to make a § 1 claim,

1 they must be placed in a context that raises a suggestion of a preceding agreement, not merely
2 parallel conduct that could just as well be independent action.” *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557; *see*
3 *also Wilcox v. First Interstate Bank of Or.*, 815 F.2d 522, 526–27 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming
4 JNOV for banks that matched “non-competitive interest rates” where plaintiffs failed to show
5 their conduct resulted from an agreement and not conscious parallelism); *Richards v. Neilsen*
6 *Freight Lines*, 810 F.2d 898, 904 (9th Cir. 1987) (affirming summary judgment in favor of
7 trucking lines that refused to do business with a competing carrier because “[a]bsent evidence
8 tending to show joint agreement rather than individual action, parallel behavior does not support
9 a finding of conspiracy” (citations omitted)). It is not enough to proffer evidence merely
10 supporting a contention that companies took similar actions or may have benefited in similar
11 ways.

12 Nor is it enough for plaintiffs to present evidence of a “rimless wheel conspiracy,” in
13 which “various defendants enter into separate agreements with a common defendant, but where
14 the defendants have no connection with one another, other than the common defendant’s
15 involvement in each transaction.” *Dickson v. Microsoft Corp.*, 309 F.3d 193, 203 (4th Cir.
16 2002). “In *Kotteakos*, the Supreme Court made clear that a rimless wheel conspiracy is not a
17 single, general conspiracy but instead amounts to multiple conspiracies between the common
18 defendant and each of the other defendants.” *Id.* (citing *Kotteakos v. United States*, 328 U.S.
19 750, 768–69 (1946)); *see also United States v. Brown*, 912 F.2d 1040, 1044 (9th Cir. 1990)
20 (defendant “could hardly be held to have agreed to that of which he knew naught.”)

21 After the extensive discovery produced in this case, plaintiffs have failed to provide any
22 evidence to justify an inference of conspiracy or to extrapolate a conspiracy even if this were not
23 an antitrust case. But this is especially true here because “antitrust law limits the range of
24 permissible inferences from ambiguous evidence in a § 1 case.” *Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v.*
25 *Zenith Radio Corp.*, 475 U.S. 574, 588 (1986). “To survive a motion for summary
26 judgment . . . , a plaintiff seeking damages for a violation of § 1 must present evidence ‘that
27 tends to exclude the possibility’ that the alleged conspirators acted independently,” *id.* at 588
28 (citation omitted), or engaged in “other combinations” or “collateral conspiracies” that “say[]

1 little, if anything, about the existence” of the challenged conspiracy, *id.* at 595–96. A
2 defendant’s justification for its conduct need not be “praiseworthy—or even lawful.” *In re Ins.*
3 *Brokerage Antitrust Litig.*, 618 F.3d 300, 335–36 (3d Cir. 2010). Nor need it be procompetitive.
4 *See Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 551, 567–68 (dismissing antitrust claims against conduct consistent
5 with conscious parallelism, notwithstanding “former Government-sanctioned
6 monopolists . . . sitting tight, expecting their neighbors to do the same thing,” resulting in
7 markets that were “highly compartmentalized geographically, with minimal competition”).

8 **I. SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS REQUIRED BECAUSE PLAINTIFFS HAVE NO**
9 **EVIDENCE THAT ADOBE WAS PART OF ANY GLOBAL CONSPIRACY.**

10 **A. No Direct Evidence.**

11 As shown above, plaintiffs have no direct evidence that Adobe was part of the alleged
12 conspiracy.

13 **B. No Circumstantial Evidence.**

14 Nor is there any circumstantial evidence to support plaintiffs’ claim. Contrary to
15 plaintiffs’ allegation that “defendants” including Adobe “entered into the overarching conspiracy
16 with **knowledge** of the other Defendants’ participation,” ECF No. 65, ¶ 55 (emphasis added),
17 Adobe was not aware of any bilateral DNCC agreements between any of the other defendants.

18 Of the six other alleged conspirators, Adobe had a bilateral agreement with only Apple.
19 If other defendants entered into bilateral agreements with other defendants, that is not evidence
20 of a global conspiracy—let alone any global conspiracy including Adobe—where companies
21 plausibly, indeed readily, could do so without an overarching conspiracy.

22 That is the import of the Third Circuit’s decision in *Insurance Brokerage*. The plaintiffs
23 in that case alleged that the defendant insurance brokers and insurers engaged in a series of hub-
24 and-spoke kickback conspiracies in which insurers paid brokers unlawful contingent
25 commissions for steering customers to them. 618 F.3d at 308. The plaintiffs further alleged a
26 “global conspiracy” between the hubs not to compete with each other by disclosing any
27 competing broker's contingent commission schemes. *Id.* at 313. The Third Circuit affirmed
28 dismissal, holding that parallel kickback conspiracies, although not necessarily “praiseworthy—

1 or even lawful,” did not plausibly suggest a “global conspiracy” among the defendants not to
2 compete or to keep quiet about the “pernicious industry practice.” *Id.* at 348–51. The court
3 reasoned that each defendant’s self-interest in protecting its own local conspiracy provided a
4 reason independent from any global conspiracy not to reveal what other defendants were doing:
5 “Reaping ‘enormous profits’ from their own furtive use of contingent commission agreements,
6 the brokers had no desire to upset the apple cart,” *id.* at 349, because “no broker could expose its
7 competitors’ contingent commission agreements without drawing unwelcome attention to its own
8 golden-egg-laying goose,” *id.* at 348.

9 Similarly, *Matsushita* found evidence of “*other* combinations” to fix prices and allocate
10 markets was “consistent with other, equally plausible explanations” independent of the alleged
11 predatory pricing conspiracy. 475 U.S. at 595–98 (emphasis original). Despite the contention
12 that the price fixing and market allocation schemes enabled the predatory pricing scheme, the
13 Supreme Court held that, “unless, in context, evidence of these ‘other’ conspiracies raises a
14 genuine issue concerning the existence of a predatory pricing conspiracy, that evidence cannot
15 defeat petitioners’ summary judgment motion.” *Id.* at 586.

16 Based on their arguments at the motion to dismiss stage, we anticipate that plaintiffs will
17 rely on the following items. These items are insufficient, whether taken separately or as a whole,
18 to create a genuine triable issue that Adobe agreed with the other defendants for those companies
19 to enter into other bilateral agreements.

20 *First*, although plaintiffs may have set forth the “who, what, to whom, where, and when”
21 of pairs of bilateral agreements, they have not done so for the overarching conspiracy. Missing
22 is any evidence of who Adobe agreed with at other companies to enter into an overarching
23 conspiracy, its terms, or where and when it was formed. In other words, plaintiffs have alleged
24 that Chizen and Jobs entered into a bilateral agreement in May 2005. ECF No. 65, ¶ 73. But,
25 after millions of documents and hundreds of hours of depositions, there is no evidence that
26 Adobe also entered into the alleged conspiracy.

27 *Second*, in alleging conspiracy against some defendants, plaintiffs emphasized that Jobs
28 served on Pixar’s board and that there were overlapping board members among some of the

1 other defendants. None of that is relevant to Adobe. There is no claim or evidence it had
2 overlapping board members with any defendant.²

3 *Third*, plaintiffs' allegation that the Adobe/Apple and Pixar/Lucasfilm agreements were
4 similar in timing and content has proven false. The Court relied on that allegation in denying the
5 motion to dismiss, finding "it strains credulity that Apple and Adobe reached an agreement in
6 May 2005 that was identical to the 'Do Not Cold Call' agreement Pixar entered into with
7 Lucasfilm in January 2005 without some communication or coordination between these two sets
8 of Defendants." ECF No. 119, at 14, citing Complaint ¶¶ 58, 72. The allegation on which the
9 Court relied was off by at least two decades. Plaintiffs now claim that "[t]he conspiracy began in
10 approximately 1985 . . . when George Lucas and Ed Catmull agreed that Lucasfilm and Pixar
11 would not compete for each other's employees." Kahn Decl. Ex. K at 5:9–10. That was 20
12 years before the May 2005 Adobe/Apple agreement challenged by plaintiffs. Nor is it accurate
13 that the terms of the Pixar/Lucasfilm and Adobe/Apple agreements were the same. Indeed,
14 according to plaintiffs, unlike the Adobe/Apple "no cold call" agreement, the Pixar/Lucasfilm
15

16 ² Although not necessary for Adobe to prevail on this motion, the record shows other
17 defendants were unaware of Adobe's agreement with Apple. *See, e.g.*, Kahn Decl. Ex. G
18 (Otellini Dep.) at 11:17–12:6 (Intel president from early 2000s and CEO from May 2005 to
19 present); *id.* at 80:1–5 ("At any point in time between the time you became the Intel CEO and
20 today, did you become aware that there was a -- an agreement of the type set forth here between
21 Apple and Adobe? A. No."); Kahn Decl. Ex. H (Page Dep.) at 65:9–15 (Google CEO from 2011
22 to present); *id.* at 85:8–11 ("Q. Were you aware . . . that, for example, Adobe was on Apple's do-
23 not-call list? A. I do not recall being aware of that."); *id.* at 201:9–15 ("[T]he other defendant
24 companies in this case are Adobe, Apple, Intel, Intuit, Pixar, and Lucasfilms. In the 2001 to
25 2009 period, were you aware of any do-not-call agreements existing between any of those
26 companies with one another? A. I don't recall being aware of any such agreements between
27 those companies."); Kahn Decl. Ex. I (Schmidt Dep.) at 12:7–18 (Google CEO 2001 to 2011 and
28 present board chair); *id.* at 221:19–222:1 (Q. The other companies in this case are Adobe, Apple,
Intel, Intuit, Pixar, and Lucasfilm. . . . In the 2001 to 2009 period, were you aware of any do-not-
cold-call agreements between any of those two companies, other than Google? A. No. I'm not
aware of any . . ."); *id.* at 222:2–12 ("Q. Did you ever agree with any company that it would
have a do-not-cold-call agreement with any of the defendants in this case? . . . A. No."); Kahn
Decl. Ex. A (Campbell Dep.) at 12:23–25, 21:3 (former CEO of Intuit); *id.* at 16:11–17:11 ("Did
Apple have an agreement with any other company that limited Apple's independent ability to
recruit employees proactively from other companies? . . . [A.] I just don't know. . . . Q. [Did]
Adobe? A. Don't know.").

1 agreement had three parts including an “agreement not to counter-offer above the other
2 compan[y’s] original offer.” ECF No. 65, ¶¶ 59–61; Kahn Decl. Ex. K at 5:9–22. So the two
3 agreements were more different than similar, and they were entered into at least two decades
4 apart in entirely different circumstances and different industries. *See, e.g.*, Kahn Decl. Ex. D
5 (Lucas Dep.) at 12:17–13:11 (Lucasfilm CEO from 1971 to 2013); *id.* at 206:4–19 (“Q. Okay.
6 You said that you had a wish not to raid other digital companies. . . . Did you have that same
7 wish with respect to five of the other defendants in this case, which are companies Apple, Intel,
8 Google, Adobe, and Intuit? A. No. I was only worried about graphic artists and other visual
9 effects industry . . . companies and animation companies.”).

10 *Fourth*, even aside from the Pixar/Lucasfilm agreement, the alleged similarities in
11 content between the Adobe/Apple agreement and the other bilateral agreements does not permit
12 an inference of conspiracy. The terms of an agreement not to cold call another company’s
13 employees are not so complicated, detailed or unusual as to suggest a conspiracy, much less
14 require a conspiracy. *See In re Elevator Antitrust Litig.*, 502 F.3d 47, 51 (2d Cir. 2007) (finding
15 “similarities in contractual language . . . do not constitute ‘plausible grounds to infer an
16 agreement’” because “[s]imilar contract terms can reflect similar bargaining power and
17 commercial goals (not to mention boilerplate”); *Ins. Brokerage*, 618 F.3d at 335 (rejecting
18 defendants’ use of “similar strategies” of concealment as evidence of conspiracy because “each
19 had access to the same effective model of how” to achieve that objective). To the contrary, as
20 plaintiffs know from discovery in this action, Adobe had DNCC agreements that predated the
21 May 2005 agreement challenged by plaintiffs. For example, Adobe had a DNCC agreement with
22 Apple in 1983 when Adobe was in its infancy. *See* Kahn Decl. Ex. J (Warnock Dep.) at 80:24–
23 81:3; *id.* at 8:22–25, 9:12–21, 87:19–21 (Adobe co-founder, board chair since 1982, and CEO
24 from 1984 until 2000).³ It also had DNCC agreements with non-defendants predating its 2005
25 agreement with Apple.⁴

26
27 ³ As noted, plaintiffs do not contend that this agreement was part of the alleged conspiracy.
28 Any such contention would fail in light of the discovery record. As explained by Adobe’s co-
founder John Warnock, in 1983 Adobe and Apple “were entering in a live-or-die kind of

(cont’d)

1 In *Beltz Travel Serv. Inc. v. Int’l Air Transp. Ass’n*, 620 F.2d 1360, 1366-67 (9th Cir.
2 1980), cited in the Court’s order on the motion to dismiss, the Ninth Circuit ruled that, “if [a
3 plaintiff] can establish the existence of a conspiracy . . . and that [the defendant was] part of such
4 a conspiracy,” the defendant would be liable for the co-conspirators’ acts in furtherance of the
5 conspiracy even if it did not participate “in every detail” in executing the conspiracy. Here, the
6 defect in plaintiffs’ case against Adobe is at the threshold step. No evidence exists that Adobe
7 was part of any global conspiracy, so the question of the scope of liability for the other
8 companies’ conduct act never arises.

9 In short, to prevail on its overarching conspiracy claim—a claim that the DOJ did not
10 allege⁵—plaintiffs must do more than show that Adobe and Apple agreed to a bilateral non-
11 solicitation agreement. They must also show that Adobe agreed with Apple, Google, Intel,
12 Intuit, Lucasfilm and Pixar to enter into the Adobe/Apple bilateral agreement and for those other
13 companies to enter into the bilateral agreements those companies entered into. The evidence,
14 however, refutes that claim. Evidence that Adobe entered into a bilateral DNCC agreement with

15 _____
16 environment [in which Adobe employees] were exposed to all of the details of the
17 Macintosh . . . and worked hand in hand with [Apple’s] engineers. [Apple employees] were
18 exposed to a lot of the details in PostScript and . . . in order to establish trust, [Adobe co-
19 founders Warnock and Chuck Geschke] had a handshake agreement with Steve [Jobs] not to cold
20 call their employees. . . . I think it was a statement of trust. I think we wanted to make
21 statements to say, we trust you, you trust us, and you can rely on that.” Kahn Decl. Ex. J
22 (Warnock Dep.) at 80:24–81:10, 82:3–5. Mr. Jobs never indicated “whether Apple had any other
do-not-cold-call agreements with any company other than Adobe.” *Id.* at 269:18–21. Mr.
Warnock did not know whether Apple had any, and that issue did not influence his decision
whether to enter into the DNCC agreement with Apple. *Id.* at 269:22–270:3. Warnock did not
discuss DNCC calls with any other company. *Id.* at 270:4–10; *see also* Kahn Decl. Ex. Q at
ADOBE_110348 (1994 addendum to the 1990 Adobe/Apple Master Agreement for Mutual
Disclosure of Information, which includes a non-solicitation provision).

23 ⁴ *See, e.g.*, Kahn Decl. Ex. L § 16(b) (October 2003 reciprocal master services agreement
24 between Adobe and Accenture barring the solicitation or hiring of each others’ employees for
25 one year after the expiration of the contract with certain exceptions); Kahn Decl. Ex. P (March
26 2004 engagement letter between executive recruiter Heidrick & Struggles and Adobe with an
“off limits” provision restricting Heidrick & Struggles from recruiting Adobe executives for a 12
month period); Kahn Decl. Ex. O (May 2004 email chain agreeing to stop targeting candidates
from the University of San Francisco).

27 ⁵ Competitive Impact Statement, *United States v. Adobe*, 10-cv-01629 (D.D.C.), Sept. 24,
28 2010 ECF No. 2.

1 Apple is not evidence of entering into a seven-way conspiracy. *See Matsushita*, 475 U.S. at 596
2 (“Evidence that tends to support any of these collateral conspiracies thus says little, if anything,
3 about the existence of a conspiracy to charge below-market prices in the American market over a
4 period of two decades.”); *Ins. Brokerage*, 618 F.3d at 351 (“Plaintiffs’ attack on the pervasive
5 use of contingent commissions to exploit insurance brokers’ power over their clients—and the
6 use of similar techniques to disguise this activity—may allege a ‘pernicious industry practice,’
7 but they do not plausibly imply an industry-wide conspiracy.”); *Richards*, 810 F.2d at 903–06
8 (affirming summary judgment, finding “discrete, bilateral agreements” between trucking lines
9 and local carriers were a plausible justification for “smoking gun” evidence of a “gentlemen’s
10 agreement”).

11 CONCLUSION

12 Summary judgment should be granted in favor of Adobe.

13 Dated: January 9, 2014

JONES DAY

14
15 By: /s/ Robert A. Mittelstaedt
16 Robert A. Mittelstaedt
17 Attorneys for Defendant
ADOBE SYSTEMS INC.

18 SFI-848757v1
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28