

1 Karma M. Giulianelli (SBN 184175)  
karma.giulianelli@bartlitbeck.com  
2 **BARTLIT BECK LLP**  
1801 Wewetta St., Suite 1200  
3 Denver, Colorado 80202  
Telephone: (303) 592-3100

Glenn D. Pomerantz (SBN 112503)  
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com  
**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**  
350 South Grand Avenue, Fiftieth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 683-9100

4 Hae Sung Nam (*pro hac vice*)  
5 hnam@kaplanfox.com  
**KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP**  
6 850 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022  
7 Telephone.: (212) 687-1980

Brian C. Rocca (SBN 221576)  
brian.rocca@morganlewis.com  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
One Market, Spear Street Tower  
San Francisco, CA 94105-1596  
Telephone: (415) 442-1000

8 *Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In*  
9 *re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*

*Counsel for Defendants Google LLC et al.*

Brendan P. Glackin (SBN 199643)  
10 bglackin@agutah.gov  
**OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY**  
11 **GENERAL**  
160 E 300 S, 5th Floor  
12 PO Box 140872  
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-0872  
13 Telephone: (801) 366-0260

14 *Counsel for Utah*

15 [Additional counsel appear on signature page]

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

20 **IN RE GOOGLE PLAY STORE**  
21 **ANTITRUST LITIGATION**

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

22 THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]**  
**ORDER RE DEADLINES IN**  
**CONSUMERS' AND STATES' ACTIONS**  
**IN LIGHT OF TENTATIVE**  
**SETTLEMENT**

23 *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust*  
*Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-JD

24 *State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.*,  
25 Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD

[Civil L.R. 6-2]  
Judge: Hon. James Donato

1 Plaintiffs in *State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD  
2 (“States”), Plaintiffs in *In re Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*, Case No. 3:20-cv-05761-  
3 JD (“Consumers”), and Defendants Alphabet Inc., Google LLC, Google Ireland Limited, Google  
4 Commerce Limited, Google Asia Pacific Pte. Limited, and Google Payment Corp. (collectively,  
5 “Google”), stipulate as follows under Civil Local Rule 6-2:

6 **RECITALS:**

- 7 1. On September 5, 2023, States, Consumers, and Google (“Settling Parties”) reached an  
8 agreement in principle to settle this case. The agreement is the product of mediation  
9 efforts spanning many months.
- 10 2. The settlement in principle is subject to approval by the State Attorneys General and  
11 Alphabet’s Board of Directors, execution of a long-form settlement agreement, and  
12 approval by the Court. The Settling Parties anticipate submitting a long-form settlement  
13 agreement to the Court for preliminary approval in approximately 30 days.
- 14 3. The Settling Parties anticipate that the States will seek approval of an Amended Complaint  
15 that will include all of the settling jurisdictions shortly before or at the same time the  
16 Settling Parties submit the long-form settlement agreement to the Court for preliminary  
17 approval. Because the long-form settlement agreement is anticipated to include all U.S.  
18 states and territories as well as the named consumer plaintiffs, the settlement will not  
19 require certification of a settlement class.
- 20 4. To provide the Settling Parties the opportunity to finalize and enter into a long-form  
21 agreement and develop and propose a plan for notice and Court approval of the settlement,  
22 the Settling Parties respectfully request that the Court vacate the November 6 trial date as  
23 between the Settling Parties and suspend the interim pre-trial deadlines as between the  
24 Settling Parties (including with respect to jury instructions, verdict forms, witness lists,  
25 exhibit lists, motions in limine, deposition designations, factual stipulations, proposed voir  
26 dire, glossary of specialized terms, and the joint pre-trial statement). If the Court does not  
27 approve the settlement or the settlement agreement is terminated for any reason, the parties  
28

1 shall be returned to their respective litigation positions and will meet and confer regarding  
2 whether any adjustments are needed in the schedules for their respective cases.

3 5. The Settling Parties submit that good cause exists to grant the requested relief. In light of  
4 the settlement in principle, further litigation among the Settling Parties would waste  
5 judicial and party (including public) resources, could interfere with finalization of the  
6 settlement, and would create substantial uncertainty for all parties regarding which parties  
7 will participate in the trial.

8 6. The Settling Parties note that, in light of the settlement in principle, if the Court grants the  
9 relief requested herein, then it need not decide the following pending issues at this time:  
10 (1) Google’s Motion to Exclude Merits Opinion of Dr. Marc Rysman, ECF No. 484 (Apr.  
11 20, 2023),<sup>1</sup> (2) the portion of Google’s Motion for Partial Summary Judgment addressing  
12 the standing of Consumers and States, ECF No. 483 at pp. 17-20 (Apr. 20, 2023), and (3)  
13 States’ Motion for Approval of Notice of Pendency and Opportunity to Opt-Out For Parens  
14 Patriae Claims, ECF No. 546 (Jul. 27, 2023).

15 7. In light of the settlement in principle, Consumers have agreed not to oppose vacatur of the  
16 Court’s class certification decision.<sup>2</sup>

17  
18  
19  
20 \_\_\_\_\_  
21 <sup>1</sup> All references are to the MDL Docket, 3:21-md-02981-JD.

22 <sup>2</sup> On August 28, 2023, the Court granted Google’s motion to exclude the injury and damages  
23 opinions of Dr. Hal Singer (see ECF No. 588) and issued an order indicating that its “order  
24 granting certification should be vacated,” noting that it lacked jurisdiction to do so while Google’s  
25 appeal of the certification order was pending in the Court of Appeals, and directing the parties “to  
26 meet and confer, and be prepared to discuss proposed next steps with the Court at the September  
27 7, 2023 status conference.” (ECF No. 589 at 1). On August 31, 2023, the Ninth Circuit issued an  
28 order granting a limited remand stating: “Given the district court’s indication that it would  
reconsider class certification, the Court grants the motion to vacate the scheduled oral argument in  
the appeal and to remand the case to the district for further proceedings,” while retaining  
jurisdiction over the appeal and directing the parties to notify the Court “when the district court  
has issued an order pertaining to the class certification.” Clerk Order, Case No. 23-15285 (9th Cir.  
Aug. 31, 2023).

1           **NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS STIPULATED AND AGREED, SUBJECT TO THE**  
2 **APPROVAL OF THE COURT:**

- 3 1.       The November 6, 2023, trial date as among or between any of States, Consumers, and  
4 Google in *State of Utah et al. v. Google LLC et al.*, Case No. 3:21-cv-05227-JD and *In re*  
5 *Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*, shall be vacated, and all pre-trial deadlines  
6 relevant to those cases shall be suspended pending the status conference referenced below.  
7 2.       States, Consumers, and Google, shall appear at a status conference on October 12, 2023, to  
8 report on the status of the settlement and the plan for seeking Court approval of the  
9 settlement.  
10 3.       The Court’s class certification decision, ECF No. 383, is vacated.

11 DATED: September 5, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

**BARTLIT BECK LLP**

Karma M. Giulianelli

**KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP**

Hae Sung Nam

By:           /s/ Karma M. Giulianelli          

Karma M. Giulianelli

*Co-Lead Counsel for the Proposed Class in In re  
Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation*

20 DATED: September 5, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

**OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL**

Brendan P. Glackin

Lauren M. Weinstein

By:           /s/ Brendan P. Glackin          

Brendan P. Glackin

*Counsel for Utah*

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

DATED: September 5, 2023

Respectfully submitted,

**MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP**

Glenn D. Pomerantz  
Kuruvilla Olasa  
Emily C. Curran-Huberty  
Jonathan I. Kravis  
Justin P. Raphael  
Kyle W. Mach

By:           /s/ Glenn D. Pomerantz            
Glenn D. Pomerantz

*Defendants Google LLC et al.*

**PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

United States District Judge

