

1 **NEWMAN & NEWMAN, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, LLP**
Derek A. Newman (190467)
2 S. Christopher Winter (190474)
Venkat Balasubramani (189192)
3 505 Fifth Avenue South, Suite 610
Seattle, WA 98104
4 Telephone: (206) 274-2800
Facsimile: (206) 274-2801

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
6
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10
11 **REGISTERSITE.COM**, an Assumed
Name of **ABR PRODUCTS INC.**, a
12 New York Corporation, *et al.*,

13 Plaintiffs,

14 v.

15 **INTERNET CORPORATION FOR**
ASSIGNED NAMES AND
16 **NUMBERS**, a California corporation,
et al.,

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

Case No. CV 04-1368 ABC (CWx)

Hon. Audrey B. Collins

**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 **I. INTRODUCTION** 1

4 **II. FACTS** 2

5 A. Alleged Facts Relevant to Defendants’ Motion 2

6 B. Factual Inaccuracies Alleged in Defendants’ Motion 4

7 **III. ARGUMENT** 5

8 A. Plaintiffs Have Standing under Article III 7

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

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

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

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

13 2. Plaintiffs State a Claim for Violation of B&P 17200
Predicated on the Consumers Legal Remedies Act 14

14 a. Plaintiffs Need Not Be Consumers but Are 14

15 b. Plaintiffs Suffered Damages and Alleged
Accordingly 14

16 c. Plaintiffs Allege a Representation by Verisign 15

17 d. Defendants’ Representations Are Deceptive 16

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

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

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

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

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

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

24 b. Plaintiffs Properly Alleged an FTC Act Violation 22

25 C. Plaintiffs State a Claim for Tying 23

26 1. Plaintiffs Have Standing to Allege the Tying Claim 23

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

28 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 26

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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) 8

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

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