

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

The Apple iPod iTunes Antitrust Litigation      NO. C 05-00037 JW

**ORDER VACATING CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE;  
CLARIFYING AND CORRECTING  
CLASS CERTIFICATION ORDER;  
SETTING BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

\_\_\_\_\_/

On January 16, 2009, the parties are scheduled to appear for a Case Management Conference. The parties timely filed a Joint Case Management Statement. (See Docket Item No. 197). The Court considers the issues raised in the parties’ Joint Statement in turn.

**A. Motion for Reconsideration**

In their Joint Statement, the parties suggest alternatives methods to deal with the Court’s *sua sponte* decision to reconsider Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs’ first cause of action for unlawful tying. (See December 22, 2008 Order at 9, hereafter, “Dec. 22 Order,” Docket Item No. 196.) In its December 22 Order, however, the Court expressly stated the means by which the parties should approach reconsideration. In particular, the Court stated that a motion should be made pursuant to either Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) or 12(c).<sup>1</sup> (*Id.*) Furthermore, the Court stated that two discrete legal issues would be open to reconsideration: (1) whether “market-level

\_\_\_\_\_  
<sup>1</sup> Although technically a motion for reconsideration of the Court’s December 20, 2006 Order Denying Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss (See Docket Item No. 27 in Case No. C 06-04457 JW), the Court suggests that Defendant frame this motion as one to dismiss for failure to state a claim or for judgment on the pleadings pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) or 12(c), respectively.

1 coercion” can be the basis of a cognizable tying claim under Section 1 of the Sherman Act; and (2)  
 2 whether, as a matter of law, coercion can be found where there is no requirement that the tying and  
 3 tied product be purchased together. (Id.)

4 Accordingly, the Court sets a hearing for Defendant’s anticipated Motion for  
 5 Reconsideration on **March 23, 2009 at 9:00 a.m.** The parties shall confine their briefs to the two  
 6 legal issues identified by the Court above. Defendant shall file and serve its motion in accordance  
 7 with the Civil Local Rules of the Court.

8 **B. Clarifications of Court’s December 22, 2008 Order**

9 In addition, the parties Joint Statement represents that Defendants seek clarification or  
 10 reconsideration of several items relating to the Court’s December 22, 2008 Order.<sup>2</sup> First, the Court  
 11 notes that it did certify a class as to Counts V and VI of Plaintiffs’ Complaint. (See Dec. 22 Order at  
 12 13-14.) Second, in ruling on class certification, the Court considered Defendant’s contentions that  
 13 resellers should be excluded from the class definition. In declining to address this issue in the  
 14 December 22 Order, the Court implicitly included resellers in the certified class.

15 Finally, the Court acknowledges that there is a material difference between definition of the  
 16 class sought in Plaintiffs’ Motion for Class Certification (See Docket Item No. 165 at 3) and the  
 17 definition of the injunctive class certified by the Court (See Dec. 22 Order at 13). In light of the fact  
 18 that Plaintiffs did not move to certify the full scope of the class granted by the Court, the Court  
 19 grants Defendant’s request to amend its December 22 Order. The Court strikes lines 11-15 on page  
 20 13 and replaces them with the following class definition:

21 The Court certifies a Rule 23(b)(2) injunctive relief class with the following definition: All  
 22 persons or entities in the United States (excluding federal, state and local governmental  
 23 entities, Apple, its directors, officers and members of their families) who since April 28,  
 2003 purchased an iPod directly from Apple.


---

24  
 25  
 26 <sup>2</sup> The Court notes that the proper method for reconsideration or clarification is through a  
 27 regularly noticed motion before the Court. See Civ. L.R. 7-9, 7-11. In this instance, however, the  
 28 Court finds that it can address the issues raised by Defendant most expediently by directly  
 addressing those issues at the present time.

1 **C. Case Management Conference**

2 In light of this Order, the Court finds that the Case Management Conference scheduled for  
3 January 16, 2009 is unnecessary. Accordingly, the Court VACATES the January 16 Case  
4 Management Conference.

5  
6 Dated: January 14, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES WARE  
United States District Judge

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

- 2 Adam Richard Sand invalidaddress@invalidaddress.com
- Alreen Haeggquist alreenh@zhlaw.com
- 3 Andrew S. Friedman afriedman@bffb.com
- Bonny E. Sweeney bonnys@csgrr.com
- 4 Brian P Murray bmurray@murrayfrank.com
- Caroline Nason Mitchell cnmitchell@jonesday.com
- 5 Craig Ellsworth Stewart cestewart@jonesday.com
- Francis Joseph Balint [fbalint@bffb.com](mailto:fbalint@bffb.com)
- 6 Helen I. Zeldes helenz@zhlaw.com
- Jacqueline Sailer jsailer@murrayfrank.com
- 7 John J. Stoia jstoia@csgrr.com
- Michael David Braun service@braunlawgroup.com
- 8 Robert Allan Mittelstaedt ramittelstaedt@jonesday.com
- Roy A. Katriel rak@katriellaw.com
- 9 Thomas J. Kennedy tkennedy@murrayfrank.com
- Tracy Strong tstrong@jonesday.com

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Dated: January 14, 2009**

**Richard W. Wieking, Clerk**

By:           /s/ JW Chambers            
**Elizabeth Garcia**  
**Courtroom Deputy**