

Big Tech Litigation Tracker

Updated October 16, 2023

BIG TECH LITIGATION TRACKER	1
GOOGLE/ALPHABET	3
<i>Domestic</i>	3
U.S. et al v Google LLC (search market antitrust suit)	3
U.S. et al v Google LLC (digital advertising antitrust suit)	4
State of Texas et al v Google LLC (digital advertising antitrust suit)	4
State of Colorado et al v Google LLC (search market antitrust suit)	5
Epic Games Inc v Google LLC (Play Store antitrust suit)	5
Match Group LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al. (Play Store antitrust suit)	6
State of Ohio ex rel Dave Yost v Google LLC (common carrier suit)	6
Rumble Inc. v. Google LLC (video streaming antitrust suit)	7
Dream Big Media Inc. v. Alphabet Inc. (Google Maps antitrust suit)	7
In re: Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation (Play Store antitrust suit)	8
In re: Google Digital Advertising Antitrust Litigation (Google/Meta suit)	8
State of Texas v. Google LLC, in Victoria County District Court; State of Washington v. Google LLC, in King County Superior Court; State of Indiana v. Google LLC, in Marion County Superior Court; and District of Columbia v. Google LLC, in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia	8
In re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation	9
<i>International</i>	10
European Union: Appeal Re: Google and Alphabet v Commission (Google Shopping)	10
European Union: Appeal Re: Google and Alphabet v Commission (Google Android)	10
European Union: Appeal Re: Google and Alphabet v Commission (Google Advertising)	11
European Union: “Statement of Objections to Google over abusive practices in online advertising technology”	11
Portugal: Class action in Portugal re: Play Store practices	11
South Korea: Appeal battle re: September 2021 KFTC fine	12
India: Appeal against CCI fine	12
FACEBOOK/META	13
<i>Domestic</i>	13
FTC v. Facebook Inc	13
State of Texas v. Meta Platforms Inc., dba Facebook Inc.	14
Ohio Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) v Meta Platforms, Inc. et al.	15
District of Columbia v. Mark Zuckerberg	15
Klein v. Meta Platforms Inc.	16
In re: Google Digital Advertising Antitrust Litigation (Google/Meta suit)	16
In re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation	16
School District of the Chathams v. Meta Platforms et al	17
Doe et al. v. Meta Platforms Inc.	17
E.H. et al. v. Meta Platforms Inc.	18
<i>International</i>	18
Kenya: Lawsuit in Kenya Re: Working Conditions	18
AMAZON	19
<i>Domestic</i>	19
FTC v. Amazon.com Inc.	19
California v. Amazon.com Inc.	19
FTC v. Amazon.com Inc. (ROSCA)	20
Floyd v. Amazon.com Inc. et al (Apple-Amazon Collusion Case)	20
De Coster et al v. Amazon.com Inc	20
In Re Amazon.com, Inc. eBook Antitrust Litigation	21
Angela Hogan et al. v. Amazon.com Inc.	21

Bookends & Beginnings LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al	21
Frame-Wilson et al v. Amazon.com Inc.	22
<i>International</i>	22
European Union: Appeal battle re: July 2021 CNPD fine	22
United Kingdom: UK “Buy Box Claim” class action lawsuit	23
APPLE	23
<i>Domestic</i>	23
Epic Games Inc v Apple Inc	23
Affinity Credit Union v. Apple Inc.	24
AliveCor v Apple Inc.	24
Floyd v. Amazon.com Inc. et al (Apple-Amazon Collusion Case)	25
Reportedly pending DOJ lawsuit	25
<i>International</i>	26
Appeal battle re: December 2021 antitrust ruling (Netherlands)	26
Class action in Portugal re: App Store practices	27
Class action in UK re: App Store practices	27
European Union: Reportedly pending EU lawsuit re: Apple Pay	27

Domestic

U.S. et al v Google LLC (search market antitrust suit)

Date filed: October 20, 2020

Plaintiff: Department of Justice and plaintiff states

Cause: Google's search market monopoly

Details:

Pre-trial developments (October 20, 2020 – September 12, 2023)

United States v. Google [began](#) in October 2020 after the Trump administration filed suit against Google over its search engine monopoly. The lawsuit centers on Google's anti-competitive use of exclusivity and pre-installation agreements to maintain its monopoly, including the company's "de facto exclusive" deal with Apple to be Safari's default search engine.

In December 2021, this case and a similar one (State of Colorado et al v Google LLC) were [formally bifurcated](#). In the run-up to the trial, the DOJ sought sanctions on Google over the company's alleged [deletion of texts](#) relevant to the antitrust suit. In September 2022, *Bloomberg reported* that a DOJ lawyer said that Google pays "enormous" sums to maintain its spot as the number one search engine.

In December 2022, Google [requested](#) that the case be thrown out. In February 2023, the DOJ and a coalition of states [pushed back](#) against Google's request, arguing it "would make the antitrust laws bow to admitted monopolists." In February 2023, the American Antitrust Institute (AAI) as well as a coalition of economists from institutions including Carnegie Mellon University [filed amicus briefs](#) in support of the DOJ in the suit.

Developments since beginning of trial (September 12, 2023 – present)

Per a report from [Reuters](#) published on October 12, the following revelations are among the major developments in the first half of the trial, which is set to go into mid-November:

- Representatives from Verizon, Samsung, and "Google itself testified about the company's estimated \$10 billion in annual payments to ensure that its search is the default on smartphones and browsers."
- CEOs of search engine companies DuckDuckGo and Neeva stated that these default agreements harmed their businesses.
- Google's leveraging of its search monopoly to boost its adtech advance was established, with one testimony stating that "Google dominated the market for ads placed alongside searches and has increased prices in the last 10 years"

- Microsoft CEO Satya Nadella testified that Google's search engine monopoly gives Google an unfair AI market advantage.
- Apple VP Eddy Cue defended Google's search engine while acknowledging Apple previously considered deals with Bing and DuckDuckGo. Google asserted that the company's dominance is because of the quality of their search engine, and claimed that default agreements were not a major factor in its dominance.

[Return To Top](#)

U.S. et al v Google LLC (digital advertising antitrust suit)

Date filed: January 24, 2023

Plaintiff: Department of Justice and plaintiff states

Cause: Google's digital advertising monopoly

Details: In January 2023, the DOJ [filed](#) its long-awaited antitrust suit against Google's digital advertising monopoly. The DOJ filed the suit alongside the attorneys general of Colorado, Connecticut, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Virginia. The case was filed in the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia.

The DOJ is notably seeking a [jury trial](#) in the case. In March 2023, Google's effort to move the case from Virginia to a federal court in New York was [denied](#) by judge Leonie Brinkema. In September 2023, the judge [denied](#) Google's allegations that AAG Kanter is too biased to participate in the case. A [motion](#) from Yelp in October 2023 to have Paul Weiss removed as counsel for Google in the suit over conflict of interest concerns was ultimately denied.

State of Texas et al v Google LLC (digital advertising antitrust suit)

Date filed: December 16, 2020

Plaintiff: Ten state attorneys general

Cause: Google's digital advertising monopoly

Details: Per the [Associated Press](#) in December 2020: "Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton announced the suit, which was filed in a federal court in Texas, saying Google is using its "monopolistic power" to control pricing of online advertisements, fixing the market in its favor and eliminating competition... And now the states contend Google intends to use its alleged stranglehold on digital ads to choke off other avenues of potential competition and innovation. The company struck an illegal deal with Facebook, a major competitor for ads, to manipulate advertising auction, according to the complaint. Facebook declined to comment."

In January 2022, Google filed a [motion](#) to dismiss the suit. In March 2022, attorneys general of 16 states and Puerto Rico urged the court to reject the request for dismissal, and [affirmed](#) that Google "did not reach its vaunted position through superior innovation or honest competition". In September 2022, Texas was able to defeat Google's push to [toss out](#) its adtech antitrust suit.

In February 2023, Texas and 16 other states [asked](#) the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to transfer the case back to the District Court for the Eastern District of Texas. In October 2023, Google [lost](#) its bid to keep Texas' ad tech lawsuit in New York.

[Return To Top](#)

State of Colorado et al v Google LLC (search market antitrust suit)

Date filed: December 17, 2020

Plaintiff: Bipartisan group of 38 state attorneys general

Cause: Google's search monopoly

Details: Per [ABC News](#) in December 2020: "The latest lawsuit is similar to the DOJ's, but goes beyond to allege that Google engaged in a multi-pronged effort to maintain its monopoly. The states said they're bringing additional claims to combat what they called "a broader range of Google's illegal conduct.""

In December 2021, this case and a similar one (United States v Google LLC) were formally [bifurcated](#). The trial is currently [ongoing](#), as is the aforementioned federal case.

[Return To Top](#)

Epic Games Inc v Google LLC (Play Store antitrust suit)

Date filed: August 13, 2020

Plaintiff: Epic Games

Cause: Google's monopoly on in-app payments

Details: [The Verge](#) reported in August 2021 that Epic Games alleged in its original complaint that "was so worried about Epic setting a precedent by abandoning the Play Store that it unleashed a broad effort to keep developers from following the company's lead." Per the report, this included "paying top game developers, including Activision Blizzard to stick around, and sharing additional chunks of its revenue with phone makers if they agreed not to preinstall any other app stores." The report mentions that Google suggested approaching "Tencent, the Chinese tech giant that currently has a 40 percent stake in Epic. The suggestions were "to either (a) buy Epic shares from Tencent to get more control over Epic", or "(b) join up with Tencent to buy 100% of Epic,"

Per [Law360](#) in January 2022: "Google and parties suing it for allegedly monopolizing its Android Play Store have agreed to a January 2023 trial", a date "later than both parties previously suggested". The report noted that "There are still some outstanding issues, including whether Google's counterclaims against Fortnite maker Epic Games should be part of the liability trial with all of the other plaintiffs, which should be "informed by factual evidence still to be obtained in discovery, expert reports and depositions, motions practice, and other developments that may occur over the next several months[.]"

Per Law360 in [May 2022](#): “Epic Games and Google reached an agreement Friday that will allow the video game company's newly acquired online record store app Bandcamp to temporarily continue using its own payment system on Android devices rather than being forced to use the Google Play Store payment system.” In October 2022, Epic Games [sought](#) sanctions against Google over alleged destruction of evidence.

In October 2023, it was reported that Google and Epic Games failed to [settle](#).

[Return To Top](#)

Match Group LLC et al. v. Google LLC et al. (Play Store antitrust suit)

Date filed: May 9, 2022

Plaintiff: Match Group

Details: According to [Law360](#) in May 2022, Match Group’s suit accuses Google of “dominating the app distribution market by charging “extortionate” in-app fees.” The report notes that “Match Group LLC and its subsidiaries accuse Google and its affiliates of using anti-competitive “bait and switch” tactics to keep developers creating apps for its Android operating system.”

Later in May 2022, it was [announced](#) that Match Group withdrew its temporary restraining order against the company after Google “concede[d] on key issues”. A new temporary agreement “prevents Google from [1. Forcing mandatory use of Google Play Billing [2.] Removing Match Group apps that offer alternate billing systems from Google Play Store [3.] Gaining unfettered access to consumer data and behavior.

In [July 2022](#), Google filed counterclaims in the case, accusing Match Group, and accused the company behind Tinder and other dating apps is just trying to escape its contractual obligations.” According to Law360 in February 2023: The suit was among those [consolidated](#) alongside the State of Utah et al v. Google LLC et al suit, as well as a “proposed class of small-business app developers.”

In October 2023, it was reported that Google and Match failed to [settle](#) their suit.

[Return To Top](#)

State of Ohio ex rel Dave Yost v Google LLC (common carrier suit)

Date filed: June 8, 2021

Plaintiff: Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost

Cause: Landmark lawsuit that seeks the court to declare Google a common carrier

Details: Per [Law360](#) In August 2021: “Google urged an Ohio judge Friday to toss the state attorney general's lawsuit seeking to declare the company a common carrier and Google Search a public utility, arguing it's a private entity free to handle search as it wants and that efforts to change that violate the First Amendment.”

[Law360](#) reported in September 2021 that “Ohio is fighting to keep alive its battle to have Google declared a common carrier and its search engine a public utility, telling a state judge that the tech behemoth's argument to get the case tossed “reads like search results compiled by Ask Jeeves.” Their general position is that Google qualifies as a common carrier and public utility under Ohio law, saying if the internet is the new public square, as the U.S. Supreme Court said, then “Google is the square's essential communications network, assuming the role that the telegraph and telephone played in earlier times.””

In May 2022, it was [reported](#) that the judge in the case would allow the case to continue “with a catch”. According to WCMH, “[w]hile Judge James P. Schuck denied Google’s motion to dismiss the lawsuit to regulate it as a public utility altogether, he also granted it partially.” In July 2022, it was [reported](#) that “Google wants to face Ohio's state court lawsuit seeking to forcibly regulate it as a “common carrier” all at once, arguing that a recent ruling keeping the suit intact demonstrates there is no reason to split the dispute, as Ohio enforcers have urged.”

In October 2022, it was [reported](#) that the lawsuit is set to go on trial in 2024.

[Return To Top](#)

Rumble Inc. v. Google LLC (video streaming antitrust suit)

Date filed: January 1, 2021

Plaintiff: Rumble

Cause: Google’s alleged monopolization of the video streaming market

Details: Per [Law360](#) in February 2023: “Video hosting service Rumble accuses Google of monopolizing video streaming by degrading the rankings of competitors to Google's YouTube service and by cutting deals to get the YouTube app pre-installed on mobile devices... Status: Discovery is proceeding after the case survived a dismissal bid last year.”

In May 2023, *MLex* [reported](#) that Rumble accused Google of “blatantly trying to delay and block full disclosure of highly relevant internal communications” in the case. The case is

[Return To Top](#)

Dream Big Media Inc. v. Alphabet Inc. (Google Maps antitrust suit)

Date filed: April 15, 2022

Plaintiff: Dream Big Media

Cause: Competition issues related to Google Maps

Details: Per [Law360](#) in April 2022: “Google and its parent company leverage their “enormous market power” to impose “staggering” price increases and force businesses that provide services using Google Maps into buying other digital products, according to a proposed antitrust class action in California federal court.” In November 2022, “Alphabet Inc. scored an early victory” [in the case](#).

[Return To Top](#)

In re: Google Play Consumer Antitrust Litigation (Play Store antitrust suit)

Date filed: August 17, 2020 (class approved on November 28, 2022)

Plaintiff: Certified class of 21 million consumers

Cause: Google abusing its monopoly power on Play Store

Details: Per [Law360](#): “A California federal judge on Monday certified a class of more than 21 million consumers in the multidistrict litigation accusing Google of monopolizing the market for distributing apps on Android devices and refused to exclude their economic harm expert, finding that Google's "blunderbuss" of objections "miss the mark." In a 27-page order, U.S. District Judge James Donato certified a class of more than 21 million consumers in certain states and U.S. territories who aren't represented in the litigation by attorneys general and who paid for an app through the Google Play Store or paid for in-app digital content, including subscriptions or ad-free versions of apps, through Google Play Billing since Aug. 16, 2016.”

In January 2023, Judge Donato [reportedly](#) appeared open to “sanctioning Google for failing to preserve employees' online chats” following allegations that the company was intentionally failing to preserve Google Chats of some two dozen executives.

In October 2023, per [Law360](#): “Google urged the California federal judge presiding over a multidistrict antitrust case targeting its Play Store contracts not to instruct jurors about a side dispute over missing chats among employees, saying that would make the case all about the missing messages.”

[Return To Top](#)

In re: Google Digital Advertising Antitrust Litigation (Google/Meta suit)

Date filed: May 27, 2020 (initial filing)

Plaintiff: The case is a consolidated putative class action by six advertisers

Cause: Google's anti-competitive digital advertising practices

Details: Per [Law360](#): “The six advertisers, Hanson Law Firm PC, Vitor Lindo, Cliffy Care Landscaping, Kinin, Raintree Medical and Chiropractic Center, and Rodrock Chiropractic, filed their consolidated advertiser class action complaint against Google and Facebook's parent Meta in December [2022].” The article notes that Google pushed a New York federal court to toss the case in February 2023.

[Return To Top](#)

State of Texas v. Google LLC, in Victoria County District Court; State of Washington v. Google LLC, in King County Superior Court; State of Indiana v.

Google LLC, in Marion County Superior Court; and District of Columbia v. Google LLC, in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia

Date filed: January 24, 2022

Plaintiff: Attorneys general of Texas, Washington, Indiana, and the District of Columbia (note: Google has since settled with Indiana, D.C., and Washington)

Cause: Google tracking users' locations after consumers believed they'd disabled that feature in a violation of user privacy

Details: Per [Law360](#) in January 2022: Texas, Indiana, Washington, and Washington, D.C., all filed parallel lawsuits against the tech company Monday, alleging it leads consumers to believe that turning off "location history" will keep location data from being stored, when in actuality other settings and methods continue to collect the information. All four lawsuits allege Google has been collecting the data since at least 2014 and used it to send targeted advertisements to consumers, earning Google billions in profits."

In May 2022, the suit was [amended](#) with a claim that Google was dishonest regarding its claims of private browsing.

In December 2022, Google [settled](#) with D.C. and Indiana, and settled with Washington in May 2023.

[Return To Top](#)

In re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation

Date filed: January 9, 2023

Plaintiff: Seattle School District No. 1; Kent School District No. 415; Mesa Public Schools v. Meta Platforms Inc. et al.,

Cause: Mental health harm caused by social media, with YouTube, Google LLC, and parent company Alphabet all targeted.

Details: Per [Law360](#): "Facebook, TikTok, Snap and YouTube have caused a mental health crisis among children and teenagers that is marked by higher proportions of anxiety, depression and thoughts of self-harm, severely affecting their ability to succeed in school, Seattle Public Schools said in a lawsuit Friday... Along with Facebook, Instagram, Snap, TikTok and YouTube, the complaint targets Facebook and Instagram parent Meta Platforms, as well as YouTube's sister company Google LLC and their parent Alphabet Inc."

In February 2023, the Seattle suit was conditionally [added](#) by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on Monday (JPML) to an MDL case. Per Law360: "Since the MDL was consolidated in October, more than 60 similar cases have been transferred to the Northern District of California, from more than 20 states, including California, Illinois, Florida and New York. The cases have been assigned to U.S. District Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers."

[Return To Top](#)

International

European Union: Appeal Re: Google and Alphabet v Commission (Google Shopping)

Jurisdiction: European Union

Date filed: June 27, 2017

Plaintiff: Google

Cause: Challenge to EU fine over Google's search monopoly to favor Google Shopping

Details: Per the [Associated Press](#) in November 2021: "A top European Union court on Wednesday rejected Google's appeal of a 2.4 billion euro (\$2.8 billion) fine from regulators who found the tech giant abused its massive online reach by giving its own shopping recommendations an illegal advantage in search results. The European Commission, the 27-nation bloc's top competition watchdog, punished Google in 2017 for unfairly directing visitors to its own shopping service, Google Shopping, to the detriment of competitors. The EU's General Court ruled that it "largely dismisses" Google's appeal of that antitrust penalty and is upholding the fine."

In February 2022, Google was [sued](#) by price comparison service PriceRunner for allegedly breaching the 2017 decision against Google Shopping. In July 2022, it was [reported](#) by MLex that "Google has lost a Swedish court bid to freeze a damages lawsuit by price-comparison site PriceRunner until after a final EU court ruling in the Google Shopping case, which underpins the litigation. The US search giant has an appeal pending at the EU Court of Justice over the European Commission's 2017 antitrust decision over its Shopping service, but this doesn't justify halting PriceRunner's 2.1 billion-euro lawsuit (\$2.1 billion), the Stockholm District Court has said."

In September 2023, Google [launched](#) a "last-ditch" effort to have the Court of Justice of the European Union (CJEU) overturn the decision.

[Return To Top](#)

European Union: Appeal Re: Google and Alphabet v Commission (Google Android)

Jurisdiction: European Union

Date filed: October 9, 2018

Plaintiff: Google

Cause: Challenge to EU fine over Google's abuse of its mobile OS dominance to favor Google services

Details: Per [Associated Press](#) in September 2021: “Google headed to a top European Union court Monday to appeal a record EU antitrust penalty imposed for stifling competition through the dominance of its Android operating system. The company is fighting a 2018 decision from the EU's executive Commission, the bloc's top antitrust enforcer, that resulted in the 4.34 billion-euro (\$5 billion) fine — still the biggest ever fine Brussels has imposed for anticompetitive behavior. ... The court's decision is not expected until next year.”

In September 2022, the General Court [ruled](#) against Google in what was reported as a major victory for the European Commission, though the General Court reduced the fine from 4.34 billion euros to 4.125 billion euros. In December 2022, Google [appealed](#) the case to the European Court of Justice.

[Return To Top](#)

European Union: Appeal Re: Google and Alphabet v Commission (Google Advertising)

Jurisdiction: European Union

Date filed: June 4, 2019

Plaintiff: Google

Cause: Challenge to EU fine over Google's advertising practices

Details: Per [Fortune](#) in June 2021: “Google's most recent big EU antitrust fine, a \$1.7 billion whopper levied in 2019, was also about advertising. However, that related to Google's management of its AdSense for Search boxes that companies can include on their websites.”

[Return To Top](#)

European Union: “Statement of Objections to Google over abusive practices in online advertising technology”

Jurisdiction: European Union

Date filed: June 14, 2023

Cause: Google’s anti-competitive behavior in the adtech market

Details: In June 2023, the European Commission filed a “statement of objections” to Google over anti-competitive practices in the adtech industry. Per the [New York Times](#), this is “one step in what could be a long process before final decisions are made about whether to impose a fine of up to 10 percent of Google’s global revenue or to order other changes to its business practices.”

[Return To Top](#)

Portugal: Class action in Portugal re: Play Store practices

Jurisdiction: Portugal

Date filed: July 27, 2022

Cause: Supracompetitive Play Store practices

Details: From the [Hausfield](#) website: "The claims have been filed by Professor Fabrizio Esposito who seeks to act as class representative on behalf of affected app purchasers in order to secure compensation for each class member... The claims allege that Apple and Google have systematically acted in contravention of competition law by overcharging millions of Portuguese purchasers of apps and in-app content and subscriptions. The damages sought on behalf of Portuguese consumers and businesses amounts to up to € 100 million in each of the two cases. Professor Esposito seeks to represent around 2.9 million Apple App Store users and 3.6 million Google Play Store users; alleging that Apple and Google's 30% commission is anticompetitive and excessive."

[Return To Top](#)

South Korea: Appeal battle re: September 2021 KFTC fine

Jurisdiction: South Korea

Date filed: September 14, 2021

Plaintiff: Google

Cause: Appeal challenge to KFTC's decision to fine Google \$177M in September 2021 over anti-competitive Android practices

Details: Per [The Hill](#) in September 2021: "A South Korean antitrust regulator on Tuesday issued a \$176.64 million fine against Google, accusing the American tech company of abusing its market dominance. ... In a statement to the The Hill, Google said it plans on appealing this fine, arguing that its agreements have spurred "incredible hardware and software innovation."

Per [MLex](#) in February 2022: "A penalty imposed on Google over its abuse of dominance and unfair trade practices in the South Korean market for the Android operating system has been increased by 8.5 percent, with the country's competition enforcer revealing today that it had recalculated the fine. In a report of its fine decision made public this week, the Korea Fair Trade Commission, or KFTC, said that Google should pay \$192 million (224.9 billion won) and that Google LLC, Google Korea and Google Asia Pacific had joint liability for the payment."

[Return To Top](#)

India: Appeal against CCI fine

Jurisdiction: India

Date filed: TBD

Plaintiff: Competition Commission of India (CCI)

Cause: Google's monopoly on in-app payments

Details: Per [The Hill](#) in September 2021: "Google had abused the dominance of its Android system in India according to a report issued by an Indian watchdog organization. The report came after a two-year antitrust investigation by Competition Commission of India (CCI). Reuters was able to review a copy of the 750-page report. According to the newswire, the CCI issued the report in June, stating that the incentives and ability for device manufacturers to create and sell Android-alternative operating products had been reduced by Google. The probe also found the system's mandatory pre-installation of apps violated India's competition statute."

Reported [Reuters](#) in December 2021: "Apple Inc has asked India's antitrust watchdog to throw out a case alleging abuse of market power in the apps market, saying it is too small a player in the South Asian country where Google is dominant, a filing seen by Reuters shows. The filing was made after the Competition Commission of India (CCI) started reviewing allegations that Apple hurts competition by forcing app developers to use its proprietary system which can charge commissions of up to 30% on in-app purchases. Apple denied the allegations in its filing to the CCI and stressed that its market share in India is an "insignificant" 0-5%, while Google commands 90-100% as its Android operating system powers most other smartphones." Apple is not dominant in the Indian market ... Without dominance, there can be no abuse," Apple said in the submission dated Nov. 16 which was signed by its Chief Compliance Officer, Kyle Andeer. ... In the coming weeks, the CCI will review Apple's response to the allegations and could order a wider investigation or dismiss the case altogether if it finds no merit in it."

In April 2022, it was [reported](#) that the CCI "found Google discriminated against developers in its Play store billing policy". In July 2022, it was [reported](#) that: "The Competition Commission is said to have found incriminating evidence in reports. Competition Commission reports find Google violating some provisions of the Competition Act. The Competition Commission has called Google on August 2 for a hearing on Director General's report."

In October 2022, the CCI [imposed a fine](#) on Google over its anti-competitive practices. The National Company Law Appellate Tribunal is set to hear Google's appeal over the fine, with the [next hearing](#) on the matter set for November 2023.

[Return To Top](#)

Domestic

FTC v. Facebook Inc

Date filed: December 9, 2020

Plaintiff: Federal Trade Commission

Cause: Anti-competitive behavior in social networking market

Details: According to the [Washington Post](#) in October 2021, Facebook demanded that the case be thrown out. The report noted that the "FTC argued that Facebook should not be compared to

popular public-facing social apps such as TikTok and YouTube. Instead it said that Facebook's most relevant rival is Snapchat, which has tens of millions fewer monthly users than either Facebook or Instagram." In January 2022, a federal judge [decided](#) that the case can proceed.

In February 2022, it was [reported](#) that Meta and the FTC "are at odds" over when to start the trial, with the FTC pushing for a December 2023 trial while Meta wants more time to prepare. In March 2022, several technology companies including LinkedIn, Twitter, and Reddit moved to shield themselves from Meta's [subpoenas](#) in the case. In June 2022, Reuters [reported](#) that FTC Chair Lina Khan would not concretely rule out the possibility of a settlement in the case, but that there would be a high bar for doing so.

In July 2022, [Law360](#) reported that "the FTC told the judge in the case that Meta "has no grounds for seeking nearly decade-old staff documents discussing the company's WhatsApp and Instagram purchases because they don't represent approval for those deals and contain no facts material to the commission's current effort to unwind those transactions." In August 2022, MLex [reported](#) that Meta and the FTC "have been ordered by a US judge to iron out what market the tech giant is alleged to have monopolized through an alleged "copy acquire kill" strategy.

In September 2022, it was reported that Meta was [denied](#) access to FTC analysis of the company's relevant acquisitions. Bloomberg [reported](#) that Meta has subpoenaed 132 companies including Snap and TikTok to defend itself. In October, a judge approved Meta's request for Snap to turn over [documents](#) in the case. In November, the judge [declined](#) an effort to squash the FTC's subpoena of Sequoia Capital executives in the case. During the same month, the judge [denied](#) Meta's effort to avoid a privilege re-review.

In March 2023, Meta [asked](#) the judge to force *The New York Times* to provide documents that Meta claims is "critical" to proving it is not social networking monopolist, in contrast to the FTC's market definition position. In [response](#), the FTC told the judge that Meta was mischaracterizing the agency's market definition position. In May 2023, the FTC was [ordered](#) to produce 'fundamental' information to the Meta case.

[Return To Top](#)

State of Texas v. Meta Platforms Inc., dba Facebook Inc.

Date filed: February 14, 2022

Plaintiff: Ohio Attorney General Ken Paxton

Cause: Facebook's collection of biometric data of users without consent

Details: Per the [Wall Street Journal](#) in February 2022: "The Texas attorney general filed a suit against Facebook parent Meta Platforms Inc. on Monday, charging that the social-media giant's longstanding and now discontinued use of facial-recognition technology violated that state's privacy protections for personal biometric data. The lawsuit, filed in state district court in Marshall by Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton, seeks civil penalties in the hundreds of billions of dollars, according to a person familiar with the matter. In a statement, Mr. Paxton said the company's capture of facial geometry in photographs that users uploaded from 2010 to late last year resulted in "tens of millions of violations" of Texas law."

In June 2022, Meta [pushed back](#) against the lawsuit, “argu[ing] Paxton's February lawsuit consists of "vague allegations" that failed to properly notify the company that it was being accused of violating the state's Capture or Use of Biometric Identifier Act and its Deceptive Trade Practices Act.”

Ohio Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) v Meta Platforms, Inc. et al.

Date filed: November 2021

Plaintiff: Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost on behalf of OPERS

Cause: Misleading the public about how the company controls its proprietary algorithm, thereby defrauding investors

Details: Per [CNBC](#) in November 2021: “The lawsuit from Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost alleges Facebook misled the public on the negative effects its apps can have on kids’ wellbeing. Yost filed the case as a federal class action suit on behalf of an Ohio public pension fund and other Facebook investors. ... The lawsuit alleges CEO Mark Zuckerberg and other company officials knowingly made false statements about the safety and security of its services. It says the declining value of Facebook’s stock since the documents were first released caused the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System (OPERS) and other investors to lose more than \$100 billion. Yost is seeking to recover the lost value and require Facebook to change its practices to ensure it doesn’t mislead the public in the future.”

July 28, 2022 [update](#): “A federal judge in California yesterday agreed to consolidate a series of lawsuits against Facebook and appointed Ohio the lead plaintiff in the securities class-action case against the social-media giant. Attorney General Yost will lead the class action on behalf of Ohio and any other affected investors. The decision in U.S. District Court of Northern California means that Yost’s office – representing the Ohio Public Employees Retirement System and Facebook investors – will lead the effort to recover millions of dollars in losses and to compel Mark Zuckerberg, owner of Facebook, to reform its internal practices.”

[Return To Top](#)

District of Columbia v. Mark Zuckerberg

Date filed: May 23, 2022

Plaintiff: DC Attorney General Karl Racine

Cause: Meta founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg’s failure to protect user data as evidenced by the Cambridge Analytica leak

Details: From the D.C. AG’s [office](#): “Attorney General Karl A. Racine today sued Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg for directly participating in decision-making that allowed the Cambridge Analytica data breach – the largest consumer privacy scandal in the nation’s history – while Facebook misled users with claims of privacy and data protection. In the lawsuit, the Office of the Attorney General (OAG) recounts evidence compiled across a sweeping investigation to allege Mr. Zuckerberg contributed to Facebook’s lax oversight of user data and implementation

of misleading privacy agreements. As a result, it allowed third-parties, such as political consulting firm Cambridge Analytica, to obtain personal data from 87 million Americans, including over half of District residents, and use that data to manipulate the 2016 election.”

[Return To Top](#)

Klein v. Meta Platforms Inc.

Date filed: December 3, 2020

Plaintiff: Maximilian Klein et al.

Cause: Facebook leveraging its control over consumer data to monopolize the social media market

Details: From [Law360](#) in September 2022: “Meta Platforms told a California federal judge this week that advertisers keep dropping from an antitrust lawsuit against the company when they are about to be compelled to hand over information, saying the latest plaintiff to suddenly withdraw should be required to sit for a scheduled deposition. Meta is pushing to depose the plaintiff — a pastor who allegedly purchased a pool single advertisement for his church, costing \$6.98 — arguing that the company is entitled to explore his “unusual” claims.”

In January 2023, Apple [pushed back](#) against a request for information from consumers in the case. In April 2023, the advertisers [requested](#) that the court force Netflix to comply with “discovery requests regarding communications between the companies in support of the advertisers’ allegations that the media giants made anti-competitive deals.”

[Return To Top](#)

In re: Google Digital Advertising Antitrust Litigation (Google/Meta suit)

Date filed: May 27, 2020 (initial filing)

Plaintiff: The case is a consolidated putative class action by six advertisers

Cause: Google’s anti-competitive digital advertising practices

Details: Per [Law360](#): “The six advertisers, Hanson Law Firm PC, Vitor Lindo, Cliffy Care Landscaping, Kinin, Raintree Medical and Chiropractic Center, and Rodrock Chiropractic, filed their consolidated advertiser class action complaint against Google and Facebook’s parent Meta in December [2022].” The article notes that Google pushed a New York federal court to toss the case in February 2023.

[Return To Top](#)

In re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation

Date filed: January 9, 2023

Plaintiff: Seattle School District No. 1; Kent School District No. 415; Mesa Public Schools v. Meta Platforms Inc. et al.,

Cause: Mental health harm caused by social media, with Instagram, Facebook, and parent company Meta Platforms all targeted.

Details: Per [Law360](#): “Facebook, TikTok, Snap and YouTube have caused a mental health crisis among children and teenagers that is marked by higher proportions of anxiety, depression and thoughts of self-harm, severely affecting their ability to succeed in school, Seattle Public Schools said in a lawsuit Friday... Along with Facebook, Instagram, Snap, TikTok and YouTube, the complaint targets Facebook and Instagram parent Meta Platforms, as well as YouTube's sister company Google LLC and their parent Alphabet Inc.”

In February 2023, the Seattle suit was conditionally [added](#) by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation on Monday (JPML) to an MDL case. Per Law360: “Since the MDL was consolidated in October, more than 60 similar cases have been transferred to the Northern District of California, from more than 20 states, including California, Illinois, Florida and New York. The cases have been assigned to U.S. District Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers.”

[Return To Top](#)

School District of the Chathams v. Meta Platforms et al

Date filed: February 17, 2023

Plaintiff: School District of the Chathams in Chathams, New Jersey

Cause: Mental health harm caused by social media, with Instagram, Facebook, and parent company Meta Platforms all targeted

Details: Per [Law360](#): “A New Jersey school district on Thursday hit social media companies Facebook, Instagram, TikTok and others with a suit alleging that the apps fail to protect minors from mental health harm and knowingly exploit and addict children with their algorithms, creating a public nuisance. The School District of the Chathams in Morris County said that the social media platforms knowingly take advantage of minors' developing brains to keep them hooked on their apps, fueling a growing mental health crisis among the nation's youth.”

[Return To Top](#)

Doe et al. v. Meta Platforms Inc.

Date filed: December 22, 2022

Plaintiff: Two anonymous Facebook users

Cause: Facebook unlawfully sharing consumer information with tax prep. websites

Details: Per [Law360](#): “Two anonymous Facebook users accused the social media giant's parent company of collecting sensitive information from popular tax filing websites H&R Block, TaxAct and Tax Slayer to feed its advertising algorithm, breaking privacy and taxpayer

protection laws. The unnamed users — who live in California and Georgia — both used H&R Block to file their tax returns online. Both claimed Meta Platforms Inc. recorded private information from their returns, including about their health savings accounts and dependents' college tuition grants, according to the proposed class action complaint lodged Thursday in a California federal court. Neither user said they gave Meta permission to collect the information, and the users further accused companies TaxAct and TaxSlayer of collecting other financial data from e-filers, including income and return amounts."

[Return To Top](#)

E.H. et al. v. Meta Platforms Inc.

Date filed: September 20, 2023

Plaintiff: Consumers

Cause: Facebook unlawfully collecting sensitive personal health data

Details: Per [Law360](#): "Consumers who have chosen not to use Facebook claim Meta Platforms Inc. is nevertheless violating their privacy by secretly collecting information about prescriptions, diagnoses and other health data through the use of an "invisible tracker" on third-party websites, according to a new proposed class action filed in California federal court. Through the use of its "invisible tracker" Meta Pixel, which third-party businesses can place on their websites to transmit any number of details about consumers to the social media behemoth for its advertising business, Meta has been collecting consumers' detailed sensitive health information — even when they do not have Facebook accounts, consumers E.H. and C.S. allege in their complaint filed Monday."

[Return To Top](#)

International

Kenya: Lawsuit in Kenya Re: Working Conditions

Jurisdiction: Kenya

Date filed: May 2022

Plaintiff: Daniel Motaung

Cause: Facebook abusing its social network market monopoly to harvest user data

Details: Per [The Guardian](#) in May 2022: "A former Facebook moderator has filed a lawsuit against its owner, Meta Platforms, alleging poor working conditions for contracted content moderators violate the Kenyan constitution. The petition, also filed against Meta's local outsourcing company Sama, alleges that workers moderating Facebook posts in Kenya have been subjected to unreasonable working conditions including irregular pay, inadequate mental health support, union-busting, and violations of their privacy and dignity."

In July 2022, it was [reported](#) that “Facebook was accused in court this week of misunderstanding basic human rights law after it tried to claim it wasn’t responsible for traumatising a content moderator who watched a beheading video.”

In February 2023, a Nairobi court [ruled](#) that the case can be heard in Kenya. In October 2023, the lawyer representing the moderators [told the court](#) that “Meta has not been sincere in trying to reach an out-of-court settlement as agreed in the last court session.”

[Return To Top](#)

Domestic

FTC v. Amazon.com Inc.

Date filed: September 26, 2023

Plaintiff: Federal Trade Commission alongside 17 state attorneys general

Cause: Amazon’s “interlocking anticompetitive and unfair strategies to illegally maintain its monopoly power” (from the FTC’s [press release](#))

Details: According to [Bloomberg](#), “Amazon received the initial investigation notice in June 2019” regarding the FTC’s investigation into the company’s anti-competitive practices. After years of anticipation, the FTC filed suit against Amazon on September 26, 2023 alongside 17 state attorneys general. Per the FTC’s [website](#), “Amazon’s actions allow it to stop rivals and sellers from lowering prices, degrade quality for shoppers, overcharge sellers, stifle innovation, and prevent rivals from fairly competing against Amazon.”

[Return To Top](#)

California v. Amazon.com Inc.

Date filed: September 14, 2022

Plaintiff: State of California

Cause: Amazon’s creation of artificial pricing floors and the company’s barring of sellers from selling their products for cheaper prices on other platforms

Details: From [Law360](#) in September 2022: “California on Wednesday became the second state or local government to bring an antitrust lawsuit against Amazon, accusing it of creating artificial pricing floors by barring sellers from offering their goods cheaper on other platforms. Following on the heels of a D.C. attorney general suit tossed earlier this year but currently on appeal, California Attorney General Rob Bonta called the case filed in San Francisco “one of the most significant and far-reaching lawsuits to protect California consumers.” California’s attorney general said Amazon’s merchant contracts have “effectively set a price floor,” that is “costing Californians more for just about everything.”

In December 2022, Amazon pushed back against the suit, arguing that the California Attorney General's office doesn't [adequately](#) make out a claim via the state Cartwright Act. On March 31, 2023, a judge [rejected](#) Amazon's efforts to dismiss the case.

[Return To Top](#)

FTC v. Amazon.com Inc. (ROSCA)

Date filed: June 21, 2023

Plaintiff: Federal Trade Commission

Cause: Amazon's use of "manipulative, coercive, or deceptive user-interface designs known as "dark patterns" to trick consumers into enrolling in automatically-renewing Prime subscriptions." ([FTC press release](#))

Details: Under the Restore Online Shoppers' Confidence Act (ROSCA), the FTC filed suit against Amazon for using 'dark patterns' to it unreasonably difficult to subscribe from Amazon Prime. The suit [highlights](#) Amazon's "Project Iliad", its intentionally difficult cancellation process named after the poem by Homer.

In an amended complaint in September 2023, the FTC [named](#) three senior executives in its suit against the company.

[Return To Top](#)

Floyd v. Amazon.com Inc. et al (Apple-Amazon Collusion Case)

Date filed: November 9, 2022

Plaintiff: Steven Floyd

Note: Proposed class against both Amazon and Apple.

Details: Per [Law360](#), the suit alleges that "Amazon eliminated nearly all third-party Apple resellers in its Marketplace after reaching a horizontal, anti-competitive agreement under which Apple provides it with devices at up to 10% discounts, a proposed class of iPhone and iPad buyers said in Washington federal court Wednesday."

In February 2023, plaintiff Floyd [urged](#) the court to reject Apple and Amazon's motion to vacate early discovery deadlines in the case. The case [survived](#) a second dismissal bid in June 2023.

[Return To Top](#)

De Coster et al v. Amazon.com Inc

Date filed: May 26, 2021

Plaintiff: Elizabeth De Coster

Details: Per [Law360](#): The consumer class action suit alleges that Amazon's merchant contracts cause them to pay higher prices. Filed in May 2021, U.S. District Judge Ricardo S. Martinez denied Amazon's motion to dismiss the suit in January 2023.

[Return To Top](#)

In Re Amazon.com, Inc. eBook Antitrust Litigation

Date filed: January 14, 2021

Plaintiff: E-book purchasers

Details: Per [Law360](#) in January 2021: "Amazon was hit Thursday with a proposed class action accusing the tech giant of putting a "stranglehold" on the e-book business by scheming with book publishers on price restraints that caused customers to overpay for digital books if they didn't shop on Amazon's website."

In January 2023, Amazon [urged](#) judge Gregory H. Woods to dismiss the suit.

[Return To Top](#)

Angela Hogan et al. v. Amazon.com Inc.

Date filed: July 2021 (original case)

Plaintiff: Consumers

Details: Per [Law360](#): "A case from consumers targeting the requirements for sellers to use Amazon's fulfillment services is also now in front of Judge Chun. Filed in July 2021, that case accuses Amazon of violating antitrust law by requiring sellers to use its fulfillment service to gain access to the "Buy Box" feature, where it says 90% of Amazon sales are made. Judge Martinez was overseeing that case as well and dismissed the suit in April, finding the consumers lacked standing because they do not purchase the fulfillment services at the heart of the case, since sellers are the ones paying for the service. Consumers have since filed an amended complaint, still bringing claims under Sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Act, and argued on Oct. 2 that they purchase the fulfillment services because they pay for shipping, whether it's included in the product prices or through their Prime membership fees."

In January 2023, Amazon [urged](#) judge Gregory H. Woods to dismiss the suit.

[Return To Top](#)

Bookends & Beginnings LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al

Date filed: March 25, 2021

Plaintiff: E-book purchasers

Details: Per [Law360](#) in September 2021: “Bookends initially filed suit in March seeking to represent a class of retail booksellers that purchased from the publishers starting in 2017. The store alleges that the publishers give Amazon steeper discounts and more favorable terms than they offer competing retailers, while raising the list price of books. The result, Bookends claims, is that booksellers pay higher wholesale prices and that Amazon is isolated from retail competition by its discounts.”

In January 2023, Amazon [urged](#) judge Gregory H. Woods to dismiss the suit.

[Return To Top](#)

Frame-Wilson et al v. Amazon.com Inc.

Date filed: March 19, 2020

Plaintiff: Deborah Frame-Wilson and Christian Sabot (class action lawsuit)

Cause: Class action suit Amazon of costing shoppers between \$55 to \$172 billion by imposing anti-competitive restrictions on retailers

Details: Per [Law360](#) in March 2022: “A Washington federal judge has trimmed a proposed class action accusing Amazon of costing shoppers between \$55 billion and \$172 billion by imposing anti-competitive restrictions on retailers, though the judge gave consumers leave to fix their complaint. U.S. District Judge Richard A. Jones on Friday granted in part and denied in part Amazon's motion to dismiss the suit, which alleges that Amazon effectively prohibits third-party retailers from offering lower prices on other sites. In particular, Judge Jones refused to throw out several of the consumers' Sherman Act claims. “Plaintiffs state facts, which, if taken as true, are sufficient to demonstrate that the conduct at issue has resulted in and continues to result in the suppression of competition and increase of prices on external platforms,” Judge Jones said in his order.”

[Return To Top](#)

International

European Union: Appeal battle re: July 2021 CNPD fine

Jurisdiction: European Union

Date filed: October 15, 2021

Plaintiff: Amazon

Cause: Appeal over \$865 million EU fine over data violations issued in July 2021 by Luxembourg's National Commission for Data Protection

Details: Per [Bloomberg](#) in October 2021: “Amazon.com Inc. appealed a record 746 million-euro (\$865 million) penalty for allegedly violating the European Union's tough data-protection rules...”

The challenge comes after CNPD, Luxembourg’s data protection regulator, where Amazon has its EU base, slapped the U.S. tech giant with the fine in July.”

Per [Bloomberg](#) in December 2021: “Amazon.com Inc. won an early round of its fight over a record 746 million-euro (\$844 million) privacy fine after a Luxembourg judge suspended orders threatening to rack up extra daily fines of 0.1% that amount. The president of the Luxembourg administrative tribunal on Friday suspended the orders obliging Amazon to make a number of changes to its data processes by Jan. 15 or risk the additional penalties. The orders by the Luxembourg data protection authority weren’t “sufficiently clear, precise and without uncertainty” to allow Amazon to meet the ultimatum, the tribunal said in a statement.”

In July 2022, it was [reported](#) that “It’s been one year since online retailer Amazon announced it was on the receiving end of the largest fine so far under the European Union’s punitive privacy legislation, but details about the decision—as well as the actual complaint—remain sketchy.”

[Return To Top](#)

United Kingdom: UK “Buy Box Claim” class action lawsuit

Jurisdiction: United Kingdom

Date filed: October 20, 2022

Plaintiff: Julie Hunter

Cause: Class action alleging that millions of UK customers have to pay more than necessary because of Amazon’s alleged self-preferencing

Details: Per [CNBC](#): “Amazon faces a \$1 billion class action lawsuit in the U.K., where the company has been accused of using a “secretive” algorithm to abuse its dominant position in e-commerce. Amazon harms its customers by directing them to its “featured offer,” resulting in better-value deals being hidden and consumers ending up paying more for products, according to the suit, which is expected to be filed with the Competition Appeal Tribunal in October.”

Domestic

Epic Games Inc v Apple Inc

Date filed: August 14, 2020

Plaintiff: Epic Games

Cause: Apple’s monopoly on in-app purchases

Details: CNBC reported in September 2021 that judge Yvonne Gonzalez Roger [ruled](#) that Apple won’t be permitted to stop app developers “from providing links or other communications that direct users away from Apple in-app purchasing”. The report also noted that “Apple won on

nine of 10 counts but was found to engage in anticompetitive conduct under California law, and will be forced to change its App Store policies and loosen its grip over in-app purchases.”

[AppleInsider](#) reported in December 2021 that “Apple has succeeded in its bid to temporarily stay a court order forcing it to make changes to App Store payment guidelines” following the ruling, though “the changes required by the ruling allowing developers to contact users through information “obtained voluntarily” is unaffected by Wednesday’s stay.” In January 2022, Epic Games [urged the court](#) to overturn its September ruling.

In March 2022, Apple [urged](#) the court to reject Epic Games’ appeal. According to the [Wall Street Journal](#), 35 state attorneys general have sided with Epic Games in the legal battle. In April 2022, it was reported that Epic Games’ parallel lawsuit against Apple in Australia was [pushed](#) to a 2024 trial date. In June 2022, Epic Games [accused](#) Apple of ‘delaying’ key U.S. 9th Circuit Court of Appeals hearing.

In August 2022, it was reported that the appeal hearing in the case would be [set](#) for October 21, 2022. In September 2022, the Department of Justice was granted the [opportunity](#) for an oral argument in the case. In November 2022, it was [reported](#) that Epic Games and Apple revisited relevant market definitions in the case.

In September 2023, Epic Games [asked](#) the Supreme Court to hear its case.

[Return To Top](#)

Affinity Credit Union v. Apple Inc.

Date filed: July 18, 2022

Plaintiff: Affinity Credit Union

Cause: Apple’s illegal monopoly of the “tap and pay” mobile wallet market

Details: From [Law360](#): “Apple Inc. was hit Monday with a proposed antitrust class action in California federal court from a credit payment card issuer that claims it unlawfully monopolizes the “tap and pay” mobile wallet market for its own devices by blocking any competition. The suit filed by Affinity Credit Union is brought on behalf of a proposed class of issuers, including banks, credit unions and other institutions offering payment cards enabled for Apple Pay. Apple has market power in the U.S. for its mobile devices — such as the iPhone, iPad and Apple Watch — and requires its mobile device customers to use its Apple Pay wallet, according to the suit. With Google’s Android devices, users can select among competing mobile wallets, including Google Pay and Samsung Pay. “Apple did not secure preeminence for Apple Pay by building a better product,” the complaint states. “Apple Pay is mostly indistinguishable from Google Pay and Samsung Pay from a functionality standpoint.”

In October 2022, Apple filed a motion to [dismiss](#) the lawsuit. In September 2023, Judge Jeffrey White of the Northern District of California partially [denied](#) Apple’s request to dismiss the suit.

[Return To Top](#)

AliveCor v Apple Inc.

Date filed: May 25, 2021

Plaintiff: Alivecor

Details: In May 2021, healthtech company [AliveCor](#) sued Apple, accusing the tech giant of stealing the company's heart health tracking technology and unfairly locking competitors out of the App Store. In 2022, a California federal judge [ruled](#) that Apple will not be permitted to dodge the bulk of AliveCor's lawsuit. The court set a February 2024 discovery schedule for the case.

[Return To Top](#)

Floyd v. Amazon.com Inc. et al (Apple-Amazon Collusion Case)

Date filed: November 9, 2022

Plaintiff: Steven Floyd

Note: Proposed class against both Amazon and Apple.

Details: Per [Law360](#), the suit alleges that "Amazon eliminated nearly all third-party Apple resellers in its Marketplace after reaching a horizontal, anti-competitive agreement under which Apple provides it with devices at up to 10% discounts, a proposed class of iPhone and iPad buyers said in Washington federal court Wednesday."

In February 2023, plaintiff Floyd [urged](#) the court to reject Apple and Amazon's motion to vacate early discovery deadlines in the case. The case [survived](#) a second dismissal bid in June 2023.

[Return To Top](#)

Reportedly pending DOJ lawsuit

Date filed: TBD

Plaintiff: Department of Justice

Cause: Apple's anti-competitive behavior

Details: [The Information](#) reported in October 2021 that "In the last several months the U.S. Department of Justice has accelerated its two-year-old antitrust probe of the iPhone maker, according to two people with knowledge of the investigation, increasing the likelihood of a lawsuit." The same publication reported in [December 2021](#) that "prosecutors are looking for instances in which the company is unevenly enforcing rules for app developers in ways that could hurt its potential rivals. One example they're focused on is Apple's hands-off approach with gaming firm Roblox, which compares starkly to how it deals with other gaming app developers."

According to [Politico](#) in December 2021, the potential DOJ lawsuit against Apple has faced delays due to budget constraints, with the article noting: "The Justice Department is still months away from deciding whether to sue Apple or file a new suit against Google over antitrust

concerns, two people familiar with the discussions said — a question facing new financial complications after the collapse of President Joe Biden's social spending bill. DOJ antitrust prosecutors had earlier aimed to wrap up their probes of the two tech giants by Dec. 31, culminating years of scrutiny by the department into Apple's App Store and Google's command of the online ad market.”

In July 2022, [Axios](#) reported that companies have urged the DOJ to move forward with its lawsuit. Per the report, “[c]ompanies that have raised concerns about Apple tell Axios that the investigation has been slow-moving and the San Francisco field office leading the inquiry does not have the resources of the main D.C. office.” In August 2022, Politico [reported](#) that Apple was facing an increased likelihood of the suit going through.

In February 2023, the DOJ reportedly [accelerated](#) its investigation.

[Return To Top](#)

International

Appeal battle re: December 2021 antitrust ruling (Netherlands)

Jurisdiction: Netherlands

Date filed: December 27, 2021

Plaintiff: Apple

Cause: From [Reuters](#): “The Netherlands' top competition regulator on Friday said Apple broke the country's competition laws and ordered changes to the iPhone maker's App Store payment policies.”

Details: An update in January 2022 from [Reuters](#) noted that Apple is appealing the December ruling. Enforcement was initiated in January 2022, when the Dutch competition regulator fined Apple 5 million euros (\$5.65 million) for failing to open its app store to allow dating app developers in the country to use alternative payment methods.

Per [Reuters](#) on March 28, 2022: “The Dutch consumer watchdog on Monday levied a 10th weekly fine against Apple (AAPL.O) for failure to comply with an order to make it possible for dating app providers in the Netherlands to use non-Apple payment methods. The Authority for Consumers and Markets said its fines against the company in the long-running dispute now total 50 million euros (\$55 million), the maximum possible under its current order.”

In June 2022, the ACM provided an update where the agency indicated it is, per [TechCrunch](#), “finally happy with concessions by Apple to allow dating apps in the market to use alternative payment technologies.” Apple has indicated it opposes the changes it made, with the company stating “We don’t believe some of these changes are in the best interests of our users’ privacy or data security. Because Apple is committed to constructive engagement with regulators, we’re making the additional changes at the ACM’s request.” Apple additionally noted that “we disagree with the ACM’s original order and are appealing it”, indicating that the legal battle would drag on.

Class action in Portugal re: App Store practices

Jurisdiction: Portugal

Date filed: July 27, 2022

Cause: Supracompetitive App Store practices

Details: From the [Hausfield](#) website: "The claims have been filed by Professor Fabrizio Esposito who seeks to act as class representative on behalf of affected app purchasers in order to secure compensation for each class member... The claims allege that Apple and Google have systematically acted in contravention of competition law by overcharging millions of Portuguese purchasers of apps and in-app content and subscriptions. The damages sought on behalf of Portuguese consumers and businesses amounts to up to € 100 million in each of the two cases. Professor Esposito seeks to represent around 2.9 million Apple App Store users and 3.6 million Google Play Store users; alleging that Apple and Google's 30% commission is anticompetitive and excessive."

[Return To Top](#)

Class action in UK re: App Store practices

Jurisdiction: United Kingdom

Date filed: July 24, 2023

Cause: Anti-competitive App Store practices

Details: Per [Reuters](#): "Apple (AAPL.O) on Tuesday found itself the target of a 785-million-pound (\$1 billion) class action lawsuit brought by more than 1,500 apps developers in the UK over its App Store fees. Apple's services business, which includes the App Store, has seen revenues grow at a rapid pace in the last few years and now hovers around \$20 billion per quarter. However, the commissions of 15% to 30% that the company charges some app makers for use of an in-app payment system has been criticised by apps developers and targeted by antitrust regulators in several countries."

[Return To Top](#)

European Union: Reportedly pending EU lawsuit re: Apple Pay

Jurisdiction: European Union

Date filed: TBD

Plaintiff: European Commission

Cause: Competition concerns regarding Apple Pay

Details: Per [TechCrunch](#) in May 2022: The European Commission has shared the preliminary findings of an antitrust case focused on Apple Pay on iOS devices. According to antitrust investigators, Apple abused its dominant position, as competitors can't provide NFC-enabled contactless payments on the iPhone to develop other mobile wallets and compete fairly with Apple Pay. The Commission says NFC is a standard technology for contactless payments and should be opened to anyone. While third-party developers can take advantage of APIs to read and write NFC tags, they can't use the NFC antenna in their apps to build Apple Pay competitors.

[Return To Top](#)