

1 **NEWMAN & NEWMAN, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLP**

2 Derek A. Newman (190467)
3 S. Christopher Winter (190474)
4 Venkat Balasubramani (189192)
5 505 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 610
6 Seattle, WA 98104
7 Telephone: (206) 274-2800
8 Facsimile: (206) 274-2801

9 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

10
11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
12 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

13 **REGISTERSITE.COM, an Assumed**
14 **Name of ABR PRODUCTS INC., a**
15 **New York Corporation, *et al.*,**

16 Plaintiffs,

17 v.

18 **INTERNET CORPORATION FOR**
19 **ASSIGNED NAMES AND**
20 **NUMBERS, a California corporation,**
21 ***et al.*,**

22 Defendants.

Case No. CV 04-1368 ABC (CWx)

Hon. Audrey B. Collins

[CORRECTED] PLAINTIFFS'
OPPOSITION TO MOTION BY
DEFENDANTS VERISIGN, INC.
AND NETWORK SOLUTIONS,
INC. TO DISMISS FIRST
AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR
FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM
PURSUANT TO FED. R. CIV. P.
12(b)(6)

DATE: July 12, 2004
TIME: 10:00 a.m.
COURTROOM: Room 680 –
Roybal Bldg.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. FACTS 2

 A. Alleged Facts Relevant to Defendants’ Motion 2

 B. Factual Inaccuracies Alleged in Defendants’ Motion 4

III. ARGUMENT 5

 A. Plaintiffs Have Standing under Article III 6

 B. Plaintiffs Allege Facts Sufficient to State Seven UCL Claims 9

 1. Plaintiffs State a Claim for Violation of B&P 17200
 predicated on Illegal Lottery 10

 a. There Are Multiple Participants in the WLS Lottery .. 11

 b. The WLS Lottery Relies on Chance from the
 Perspective of the Consumer 12

 2. Plaintiffs State a Claim for Violation of B&P 17200
 Predicated on the Consumers Legal Remedies Act 13

 a. Plaintiffs Need Not Be Consumers but Are 14

 b. Plaintiffs Suffered Damages and Alleged
 Accordingly 14

 c. Plaintiffs Allege a Representation by Verisign 15

 d. Defendants’ Representations Are Deceptive 16

 3. Plaintiffs State a Claim for Deception re Likelihood of
 Success 17

 4. Plaintiffs State a Claim for Deception re Expiration Dates ... 19

 5. Plaintiffs State a UCL Claim Based on Defendants’
 Marketing of WLS as “Protection” 19

 6. Plaintiffs State a UCL Claim Based on Defendants’ Sales
 of Property They Do Not Own 20

 7. Plaintiffs State a UCL Claim Based on FTC Act
 Violations 21

 a. Plaintiffs May Allege the FTC Act as a Predicate to
 a UCL Claim 21

 b. Plaintiffs Properly Alleged an FTC Act Violation 22

 C. Plaintiffs State a Claim for Tying 23

 1. Plaintiffs Have Standing to Allege the Tying Claim 23

 2. Plaintiffs Properly Allege the Elements of a Tying Claim 23

 D. Plaintiffs State a Claim for Tortious Interference 24

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

E. Plaintiffs Are Entitled to Declaratory Relief on the Eleventh Claim 25

IV. CONCLUSION 25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

SUPREME COURT CASES

Babbitt v. United Farm Workers Nat'l Union,
442 U.S. 289 (1979) 9

Bennett v. Spear,
520 U.S. 154 (1997) 7

Conley v. Gibson,
355 U.S. 41 (1957) 5, 6

Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood,
441 U.S. 91 (1979) 7

L.A. v. Lyons,
461 U.S. 95 (1983) 7

Leatherman v. Tarrant County Narcotics Intelligence & Coordination Unit,
507 U.S. 163 (1993) 6

Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife,
504 U.S. 555 (1992) 7

Moore v. N.Y. Cotton Exch.,
270 U.S. 593 (1926) 21

Northern Pacific Railway Co. v. United States,
356 U.S. 1 (1958) 23

Public Clearing House v. Coyne,
194 U.S. 497 (1904) 13

Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.,
534 U.S. 506 (2002) 6

Warth v. Seldin,
422 U.S. 490 (1975) 8

Wyoming v. Oklahoma,
502 U.S. 437 (1992) 7

Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Research, Inc.,
395 U.S. 100 (1969) 23

///
///
///
///