

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 LIFELINE LEGACY HOLDINGS, LLC,
9 Plaintiff,
10 v.
11 OZY MEDIA, INC., SAMIR RAO, and
12 CARLOS WATSON,
13 Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-07751-BLF

14
15
16
17
**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
DISMISS FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT WITH LEAVE TO
AMEND IN PART AND WITHOUT
LEAVE TO AMEND IN PART**

[Re: ECF 31]

18 Plaintiff LifeLine Legacy Holdings, LLC sues Defendants OZY Media, Inc., Samir Rao,
19 and Carlos Watson for securities fraud under federal and state laws. OZY Media has filed a
20 motion to dismiss the first amended complaint (“FAC”) under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure
21 12(b)(6), which is joined by Rao and Watson.

22 The motion to dismiss is GRANTED WITH LEAVE TO AMEND IN PART AND
23 WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND IN PART.

24 **I. BACKGROUND¹**

25 OZY Media is a digital media company specializing in news, podcasts, television, and
26 film. FAC ¶ 13, ECF 18. The company was founded by Rao and Watson in 2013. *Id.* Rao is the
27 Chief Operating Officer, Watson is the Chief Executive Officer, and both serve on the company’s
28 Board of Directors. *Id.* ¶¶ 11-13.

29 Rao and Watson solicited LifeLine to invest in OZY Media. FAC ¶ 14. In February 2021,
30 they reached out to LifeLine via telephone and electronic correspondence, touting OZY Media’s

31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
5510
5511
5512
5513
5514
5515
5516
5517
5518
5519
5520
5521
5522
5523
5524
5525
5526
5527
5528
5529
5530
5531
5532
5533
5534
5535
5536
5537
5538
5539
55310
55311
55312
55313
55314
55315
55316
55317
55318
55319
55320
55321
55322
55323
55324
55325
55326
55327
55328
55329
55330
55331
55332
55333
55334
55335
55336
55337
55338
55339
55340
55341
55342
55343
55344
55345
55346
55347
55348
55349
55350
55351
55352
55353
55354
55355
55356
55357
55358
55359
55360
55361
55362
55363
55364
55365
55366
55367
55368
55369
55370
55371
55372
55373
55374
55375
55376
55377
55378
55379
55380
55381
55382
55383
55384
55385
55386
55387
55388
55389
55390
55391
55392
55393
55394
55395
55396
55397
55398
55399
553100
553101
553102
553103
553104
553105
553106
553107
553108
553109
553110
553111
553112
553113
553114
553115
553116
553117
553118
553119
553120
553121
553122
553123
553124
553125
553126
553127
553128
553129
553130
553131
553132
553133
553134
553135
553136
553137
553138
553139
553140
553141
553142
553143
553144
553145
553146
553147
553148
553149
553150
553151
553152
553153
553154
553155
553156
553157
553158
553159
553160
553161
553162
553163
553164
553165
553166
553167
553168
553169
553170
553171
553172
553173
553174
553175
553176
553177
553178
553179
553180
553181
553182
553183
553184
553185
553186
553187
553188
553189
553190
553191
553192
553193
553194
553195
553196
553197
553198
553199
553200
553201
553202
553203
553204
553205
553206
553207
553208
553209
553210
553211
553212
553213
553214
553215
553216
553217
553218
553219
553220
553221
553222
553223
553224
553225
553226
553227
553228
553229
553230
553231
553232
553233
553234
553235
553236
553237
553238
553239
553240
553241
553242
553243
553244
553245
553246
553247
553248
553249
553250
553251
553252
553253
553254
553255
553256
553257
553258
553259
553260
553261
553262
553263
553264
553265
553266
553267
553268
553269
553270
553271
553272
553273
553274
553275
553276
553277
553278
553279
553280
553281
553282
553283
553284
553285
553286
553287
553288
553289
553290
553291
553292
553293
553294
553295
553296
553297
553298
553299
553300
553301
553302
553303
553304
553305
553306
553307
553308
553309
553310
553311
553312
553313
553314
553315
553316
553317
553318
553319
553320
553321
553322
553323
553324
553325
553326
553327
553328
553329
553330
553331
553332
553333
553334
553335
553336
553337
553338
553339
553340
553341
553342
553343
553344
553345
553346
553347
553348
553349
553350
553351
553352
553353
553354
553355
553356
553357
553358
553359
553360
553361
553362
553363
553364
553365
553366
553367
553368
553369
553370
553371
553372
553373
553374
553375
553376
553377
553378
553379
553380
553381
553382
553383
553384
553385
553386
553387
553388
553389
553390
553391
553392
553393
553394
553395
553396
553397
553398
553399
553400
553401
553402
553403
553404
553405
553406
553407
553408
553409
553410
553411
553412
553413
553414
553415
553416
553417
553418
553419
553420
553421
553422
553423
553424
553425
553426
553427
553428
553429
553430
553431
553432
553433
553434
553435
553436
553437
553438
553439
553440
553441
553442
553443
553444
553445
553446
553447
553448
553449
553450
553451
553452
553453
553454
553455
553456
553457
553458
553459
553460
553461
553462
553463
553464
553465
553466
553467
553468
553469
553470
553471
553472
553473
553474
553475
553476
553477
553478
553479
553480
553481
553482
553483
553484
553485
553486
553487
553488
553489
553490
553491
553492
553493
553494
553495
553496
553497
553498
553499
553500
553501
553502
553503
553504
553505
553506
553507
553508
553509
553510
553511
553512
553513
553514
553515
553516
553517
553518
553519
553520
553521
553522
553523
553524
553525
553526
553527
553528
553529
553530
553531
553532
553533
553534
553535
553536
553537
553538
553539
553540
553541
553542
553543
553544
553545
553546
553547
553548
553549
553550
553551
553552
553553
553554
553555
553556
553557
553558
553559
553560
553561
553562
553563
553564
553565
553566
553567
553568
553569
553570
553571
553572
553573
553574
553575
553576
553577
553578
553579
553580
553581
553582
553583
553584
553585
553586
553587
553588
553589
553590
553591
553592
553593
553594
553595
553596
553597
553598
553599
553600
553601
553602
553603
553604
553605
553606
553607
553608
553609
553610
553611
553612
553613
553614
553615
553616
553617
553618
553619
553620
553621
553622
553623
553624
553625
553626
553627
553628
553629
553630
553631
553632
553633
553634
553635
553636
553637
553638
553639
553640
553641
553642
553643
553644
553645
553646
553647
553648
553649
553650
553651
553652
553653
553654
553655
553656
553657
553658
553659
553660
553661
553662
553663
553664
553665
553666
553667
553668
553669
553670
553671
553672
553673
553674
553675
553676
553677
553678
553679
553680
553681
553682
553683
553684
553685
553686
553687
553688
553689
553690
553691
553692
553693
553694
553695
553696
553697
553698
553699
553700
553701
553702
553703
553704
553705
553706
553707
553708
553709
553710
553711
553712
553713
553714
553715
553716
553717
553718
553719
553720
553721
553722
553723
553724
553725
553726
553727
553728
553729
553730
553731
553732
553733
553734
553735
553736
553737
553738
553739
5537340
5537341
5537342
5537343
5537344
5537345
5537346
5537347
5537348
5537349
5537350
5537351
5537352
5537353
5537354
5537355
5537356
5537357
5537358
5537359
55373510
55373511
55373512
55373513
55373514
55373515
55373516
55373517
55373518
55373519
55373520
55373521
55373522
55373523
55373524
55373525
55373526
55373527
55373528
55373529
55373530
55373531
55373532
55373533
55373534
55373535
55373536
55373537
55373538
55373539
55373540
55373541
55373542
55373543
55373544
55373545
55373546
55373547
55373548
55373549
55373550
55373551
55373552
55373553
55373554
55373555
55373556
55373557
55373558
55373559
55373560
55373561
55373562
55373563
55373564
55373565
55373566
55373567
55373568
55373569
55373570
55373571
55373572
55373573
55373574
55373575
55373576
55373577
55373578
55373579
55373580
55373581
55373582
55373583
55373584
55373585
55373586
55373587
55373588
55373589
55373590
55373591
55373592
55373593
55373594
55373595
55373596
55373597
55373598
55373599
553735100
553735101
553735102
553735103
553735104
553735105
553735106
553735107
553735108
553735109
553735110
553735111
553735112
553735113
553735114
553735115
553735116
553735117
553735118
553735119
553735120
553735121
553735122
553735123
553735124
553735125
553735126
553735127
553735128
553735129
553735130
553735131
553735132
553735133
553735134
553735135
553735136
553735137
553735138
553735139
553735140
553735141
553735142
553735143
553735144
553735145
553735146
553735147
553735148
553735149
553735150
553735151
553735152
553735153
553735154
553735155
553735156
553735157
553735158
553735159
553735160
553735161
553735162
553735163
553735164
553735165
553735166
553735167
553735168
553735169
553735170
553735171
553735172
553735173
553735174
553735175
553735176
553735177
553735178
553735179
553735180
553735181
553735182
553735183<br

1 financial performance and claiming interest from large institutional investors such as Goldman
2 Sachs. *Id.* On February 15, 2021, Watson informed LifeLine that Goldman Sachs had declined to
3 invest, but stated that other institutional investors were interested. *Id.* LifeLine entered into a
4 Stock Purchase Agreement (“SPA”) with OZY Media on February 24, 2021, for the purchase of
5 approximately \$2 million of Series C Preferred Shares. *Id.* ¶ 15. In April and May 2021, Rao and
6 Watson solicited further investments from LifeLine, making oral and written representations that a
7 Google affiliate was leading the Series D financing by investing approximately \$30 million in
8 OZY Media. *Id.* ¶ 18. LifeLine entered into a second SPA with OZY Media on May 13, 2021, for
9 the purchase of approximately \$250,000 of Series D Preferred Shares. *Id.* ¶¶ 15-19.

10 LifeLine claims that Defendants failed to disclose material information regarding OZY
11 Media prior to execution of the SPAs. FAC ¶¶ 6, 22-26. Specifically, LifeLine alleges that, “At
12 no time prior to LifeLine’s execution of the Series C and Series D SPAs did Defendants disclose
13 to LifeLine that Rao attempted to impersonate an executive of YouTube in an effort to obtain a
14 substantial investment from Goldman Sachs, or that, as a result of Rao’s fraudulent conduct,
15 Goldman Sachs declined to invest in Ozy Media and that Ozy Media was under investigation by
16 government agencies.” *Id.* ¶ 24. Rao’s actions became publicly known in September 2021. *Id.* ¶
17 26. OZY Media’s Board of Directors initially decided to wind down the company’s affairs, but
18 Watson subsequently announced that the company would continue operations. *Id.*

19 LifeLine filed this suit against Ozy Media and Rao on October 4, 2021, and thereafter
20 amended as of right to add Watson as a defendant. *See* Compl., ECF 1; FAC, ECF 18. The FAC
21 asserts the following claims: (1) violations of § 10(b) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934
22 (“Exchange Act”) and Rule 10b-5 against OZY Media; (2) violations of § 10(b) of the Exchange
23 Act and Rule 10b-5 against Rao; (3) violations of § 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5
24 against Watson; (4) violations of California Corporations Code § 25401 against OZY Media; (5)
25 violations of California Corporations Code § 25401 against Rao; (6) violations of California
26 Corporations Code § 25401 against Watson; and (7) fraud by concealment against all Defendants.
27 LifeLine seeks rescission of the SPAs and damages. FAC ¶¶ 8, 32, 49.

II. LEGAL STANDARD

“A motion to dismiss under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted tests the legal sufficiency of a claim.” *Conservation Force v. Salazar*, 646 F.3d 1240, 1241-42 (9th Cir. 2011) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). While a complaint need not contain detailed factual allegations, it “must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true, to ‘state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.’” *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009) (quoting *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)). A claim is facially plausible when it “allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.” *Id.*

When evaluating a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the district court is limited to consideration of the allegations of the complaint, documents incorporated into the complaint by reference, and matters which are subject to judicial notice. *See Louisiana Mun. Police Employees’ Ret. Sys. v. Wynn*, 829 F.3d 1048, 1063 (9th Cir. 2016).

III. DISCUSSION

Defendants assert that LifeLine’s federal securities claims are not adequately pled, and that because the federal securities claims fail, so too do the state law claims based on the same allegations. In opposition, LifeLine contends that its claims are adequately pled. The Court first discusses the federal securities claims, and then it takes up the state law claims.

A. Federal Claims

Claims 1, 2, and 3 are asserted under § 10(b) of the Exchange Act and Rule 10b-5. Claim 1 is asserted against OZY Media, Claim 2 is asserted against Rao, and Claim 3 is asserted against Watson. The elements of a claim under § 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 are: “(1) a material misrepresentation or omission by the defendant; (2) scienter; (3) a connection between the misrepresentation or omission and the purchase or sale of a security; (4) reliance upon the misrepresentation or omission; (5) economic loss; and (6) loss causation.” *In re Volkswagen “Clean Diesel” Mktg., Sales Pracs., & Prod. Liab. Litig.*, 2 F.4th 1199, 1203 (9th Cir. 2021) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). “If one of these elements is missing, the claim fails.” *Id.*

1 Defendants contend that LifeLine has not alleged a material misrepresentation or omission,
2 scienter, reliance, economic loss, or loss causation. LifeLine asserts that these elements are
3 adequately alleged.

4 **1. Material Misrepresentation or Omission**

5 The FAC alleges that Rao and Watson made several oral representations to LifeLine
6 regarding OZY Media, and the § 10(b) claims appear to be based at least in part on those oral
7 representations. FAC ¶¶ 14, 18, 30, 36, 42. However, LifeLine’s counsel clarified at the hearing
8 that the § 10(b) claims are not based on any oral representations, but instead are based on alleged
9 material omissions. *See* Hrg. Tr. 17:8-18, ECF 55.

10 Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5 “do not create an affirmative duty to disclose any and all
11 material information.” *Matrixx Initiatives, Inc. v. Siracusano*, 563 U.S. 27, 44 (2011). “The
12 person who omitted the material information must have had a duty to disclose it to the person
13 supposedly harmed by the omission.” *Desai v. Deutsche Bank Sec. Ltd.*, 573 F.3d 931, 939 (9th
14 Cir. 2009). “Such a duty may arise from a relationship of trust and confidence between parties to
15 a transaction.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Alternatively, disclosure is
16 required “when necessary to make . . . statements made, in the light of the circumstances under
17 which they were made, not misleading.” *Matrixx*, 563 U.S. at 44 (internal quotation marks and
18 citation omitted).

19 Claim 7 of the FAC, for fraud by concealment under state law, alleges that “a fiduciary and
20 confidential relationship existed between Defendants, and each of them, and Plaintiff.” FAC ¶ 61.
21 That allegation does not appear in Claims 1-3 for federal securities fraud. LifeLine’s counsel
22 stated at the hearing that its claims are not premised on an alleged fiduciary relationship, and that
23 the allegations of breach of fiduciary duty “will be withdrawn.” Hrg. Tr. 17:8-18. Counsel stated
24 that “this is a case about the failure to disclose the conduct that rendered representations in the
25 actual document itself[,] the Stock Purchase Agreements, misleading or false.” *Id.* The Court
26 therefore focuses on the representations and warranties of the SPAs in evaluating the adequacy of
27 LifeLine’s claims. The Court understands LifeLine to be withdrawing its fiduciary duty theory as
28 to all claims, including Claim 7 for fraud by concealment.

1 The FAC identifies only one representation and warranty that is set forth in the SPAs: “to
2 the Company’s knowledge, the Company is not in violation of any federal or state statute, rule or
3 regulation applicable to the Company.” FAC ¶¶ 16, 20. LifeLine does not explain how this
4 statement was rendered false or misleading by Defendants’ failure to disclose the Rao
5 impersonation and resulting government investigations. LifeLine does not identify any statute,
6 rule, or regulation that was violated by Rao’s impersonation of a YouTube executive. Nor has
7 LifeLine tied the alleged failure to disclose government investigations to the alleged representation
8 and warranty. LifeLine must clearly connect the alleged nondisclosure of investigations to the
9 specific statement allegedly rendered false or misleading by that nondisclosure. *See Metzler Inv.*
10 *GMBH v. Corinthian Colleges, Inc.*, 540 F.3d 1049, 1071 (9th Cir. 2008) (falsity not sufficiently
11 pled where “the TAC’s connection between the falsity of these statements and the regulatory
12 investigations is extraordinarily vague”).

13 In its opposition to the motion, LifeLine identifies *other* representations and warranties in
14 the SPAs that LifeLine contends were rendered false or misleading by Defendants’ failure to
15 disclose. When evaluating a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the Court cannot consider representations and
16 warranties that are not alleged in the FAC.

17 As currently framed, Claims 1, 2, and 3 are subject to dismissal for failure to allege an
18 actionable omission.

19 **2. Scienter**

20 “[T]o adequately plead scienter, a complaint must state with particularity facts giving rise
21 to a strong inference that the defendant acted with the required state of mind.” *Prodanova v. H.C.*
22 *Wainwright & Co., LLC*, 993 F.3d 1097, 1106 (9th Cir. 2021) (internal quotation marks and
23 citation omitted). Where the plaintiff claims that the defendant omitted material facts necessary to
24 make a statement not misleading, the court “must first determine who was the maker of the
25 statement for purposes of Section 10(b) and Rule 10b-5(b) and whether the complaint adequately
26 alleged that the maker omitted material information knowingly, intentionally, or with deliberate
27 recklessness.” *In re Alphabet, Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 1 F.4th 687, 705 (9th Cir. 2021).

28 LifeLine’s theory is that Defendants failed to disclose material facts – the Rao

1 impersonation and government investigations – that were necessary to make certain
2 representations of the SPAs not misleading. The FAC refers to only one such representation: “to
3 the Company’s knowledge, the Company is not in violation of any federal or state statute, rule or
4 regulation applicable to the Company.” FAC ¶¶ 16, 20. Thus, the Court’s scienter inquiry is
5 limited to identifying the maker of that statement and determining whether the FAC adequately
6 alleges that the maker “omitted material information knowingly, intentionally, or with deliberate
7 recklessness.” *In re Alphabet*, 1 F.4th at 705.

8 LifeLine has not alleged who signed the SPAs, and has not attached them to the FAC.
9 Defendants have submitted the SPAs, however, and the Court may consider them under the
10 incorporation by reference doctrine. *See Knievel v. ESPN*, 393 F.3d 1068, 1076 (9th Cir. 2005).
11 The SPAs were signed by Watson as CEO of OZY Media. *See* Eidelman Decl. Exhs. B, C, ECF
12 33. Accordingly, both Watson and OZY Media may be considered makers of the statement at
13 issue. *See In re Alphabet*, 1 F.4th at 705.

14 The FAC alleges that Watson knew about the Rao impersonation as of February 2, 2021 –
15 a date prior to execution of the SPAs – but the FAC does not allege that Watson knew Rao’s
16 conduct violated a statute, rule, or regulation applicable to the company. FAC ¶ 22. In fact, as
17 discussed above in section III.A.1., the FAC does not even allege that Rao’s conduct *did* violate a
18 statute, rule, or regulation. Moreover, while the FAC alleges that Watson knew “that government
19 agency investigations of the company’s and Rao’s actions had been initiated,” the FAC does not
20 say when Watson became aware those investigations. *Id.* Finally, knowledge of investigations
21 does not equate to knowledge that a statute, rule, or regulation has been violated. Consequently,
22 LifeLine’s allegations are insufficient to show that Watson acted with the requisite scienter.

23 As to OZY Media, the scienter of its senior controlling officers may be attributed to it. *See*
24 *In re Alphabet*, 1 F.4th at 705. Scienter is not adequately alleged as to Watson for the reasons
25 discussed above. Nor is scienter adequately alleged as to Rao. While Rao clearly knew about his
26 own impersonation of a YouTube executive, the FAC does not allege facts showing that Rao knew
27 that his conduct violated a statute, rule or regulation. Accordingly, LifeLine’s allegations are
28 insufficient to show the requisite scienter as to OZY Media.

1 LifeLine argues that scienter is established by the FAC’s allegations that Watson and Rao
2 had actual knowledge of Rao impersonation. The flaw in LifeLine’s argument is that it is not
3 tethered to the specific representation of the SPAs that LifeLine claims gave rise to a duty to
4 disclose. See *In re Alphabet*, 1 F.4th at 705 (scienter inquiry must focus on the statement that was
5 made and allegedly rendered false or misleading by omissions).

6 Defendants contend that there is an additional deficiency in LifeLine’s scienter allegations,
7 namely, the failure to plead a plausible motive for the alleged material omissions. In the Ninth
8 Circuit, allegation of a plausible motive generally is required to plead scienter. See *Prodanova v.*
9 *H.C. Wainwright & Co., LLC*, 993 F.3d 1097, 1106-08 (9th Cir. 2021). “[A] complaint lacking a
10 plausible motive allegation may still meet its burden of pleading a strong inference of scienter.”
11 *Id.* at 1108. “But the lack of a plausible motive certainly makes it much less likely that a plaintiff
12 can show a strong inference of scienter.” *Id.* The Ninth Circuit has stated that “[o]nly where a
13 complaint otherwise asserts compelling and particularized facts showing fraudulent intent or
14 deliberate recklessness will we overlook the failure to allege a plausible motive.” *Id.* The FAC
15 does not use the word “motive.” In their opposition, LifeLine argues that the FAC discloses a
16 pecuniary motive for not disclosing Rao’s misconduct, that is, the desire to obtain financing from
17 LifeLine. *See Opp.* at 13, ECF 37. “[A]llegations of routine corporate objectives such as the
18 desire to obtain good financing and expand are not, without more, sufficient to allege scienter; to
19 hold otherwise would support a finding of scienter for any company that seeks to enhance its
20 business prospects.” *In re Rigel Pharms., Inc. Sec. Litig.*, 697 F.3d 869, 884 (9th Cir. 2012).
21 LifeLine’s failure to allege a plausible motive under Ninth Circuit standards is an additional basis
22 for finding the scienter allegations to be inadequate.

23 Claims 1, 2, and 3 are subject to dismissal for failure to allege scienter with adequate
24 particularity.

25 **3. Reliance**

26 “Reliance establishes the causal connection between the alleged fraud and the securities
27 transaction.” *Desai*, 573 F.3d at 939. “To say that a plaintiff relied on a defendant’s bad act is to
28 say that the defendant’s actions played a substantial part in the plaintiff’s investment decision.”

1 *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). Reliance may be presumed in certain limited
2 circumstances. *See In re Volkswagen*, 2 F.4th at 1203-04. Pursuant to the Supreme Court’s
3 decision in *Affiliated Ute Citizens v. United States*, 406 U.S. 128 (1972), the Ninth Circuit has
4 “recognized the presumption of reliance is generally available to plaintiffs alleging violations of
5 section 10(b) based on omissions of material fact.” *In re Volkswagen*, 2 F.4th at 1204. However,
6 “the *Affiliated Ute* presumption is limited to cases that primarily allege omissions and present
7 plaintiffs with the difficult task of proving a speculative negative.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks
8 and citation omitted). Such “pure omissions” cases are distinguishable from “mixed” cases
9 involving both omissions and affirmative misrepresentations. *See id.* The district court must
10 “analytically characterize” the case before it “as either primarily a nondisclosure case (which
11 would make the presumption applicable), or a positive misrepresentation case (where the
12 presumption would be unavailable).” *Id.* at 1204-05 (internal quotation marks and citation
13 omitted).

14 LifeLine asserts that this is an omissions case, and therefore that it is entitled to a
15 presumption of reliance. Defendants contend that this is a mixed case, involving both alleged
16 omissions and misrepresentations, and therefore that the presumption does not apply. The Court
17 agrees with Defendants. LifeLine’s theory is that certain representations and warranties in the
18 SPAs were false or misleading because Defendants failed to disclose the Rao impersonation and
19 the government investigations. Based on LifeLine’s framing of its claims, the Court finds that
20 LifeLine must allege facts showing that it relied on the false or misleading representations in the
21 SPAs when making its investment decision. LifeLine has not alleged facts showing that it relied
22 on the sole representation of the SPAs identified in the complaint – that the Company was not in
23 violation of any statute, rule or regulation – in deciding to invest in OZY Media.

24 Claims 1, 2, and 3 are subject to dismissal for failure to allege reliance.

25 **4. Economic Loss / Loss Causation**

26 “The causation requirement for Rule 10b-5 actions includes both transaction causation, that
27 the violations in question caused the plaintiff to engage in the transaction, and loss causation, that
28 the misrepresentation or omissions caused the harm.” *Livid Holdings Ltd. v. Salomon Smith*

1 *Barney, Inc.*, 416 F.3d 940, 949 (9th Cir. 2005) (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

2 In the present case, LifeLine alleges that had it known about the Rao impersonation, “it
3 would never have invested in Ozy Media and LifeLine is now, therefore, entitled to rescission of
4 its investments and/or damages all as provided under applicable law.” FAC ¶ 8. With respect to
5 damages, LifeLine alleges that ‘Rao’s fraudulent conduct, once disclosed resulted in damage to
6 the value of Ozy Media and, as a result, Plaintiff has incurred damage in an amount according to
7 proof at trial, but not less than the difference between the amount paid by Plaintiff for the shares in
8 Ozy Media and the value of the shares following the disclosure of Rao’s fraudulent conduct, plus
9 interest thereon.’’ FAC ¶ 38.

10 Defendants argue that these allegations are insufficient to show that LifeLine suffered
11 economic loss caused by Defendants’ conduct. LifeLine argues that its allegations are sufficient,
12 relying on *Livid Holdings*, in which the plaintiff alleged that it would not have purchased stock in
13 a privately held company but for the concealment of the company’s dire financial situation. *See*
14 *Livid Holdings*, 416 F.3d at 949. The company eventually went bankrupt, causing the plaintiff to
15 lose the entire value of its investment. *See id.* The Ninth Circuit found the plaintiffs’ allegations
16 sufficient to withstand a Rule 12(b)(6) motion. *See id.* *Livid Holdings* is distinguishable from the
17 present case, because the plaintiff in *Livid Holdings* identified specific economic loss caused by
18 the defendants’ conduct – loss of the plaintiff’s investment. Here, LifeLine has not alleged facts
19 showing similar loss or even that the value of its shares has decreased.

20 Lifeline also relies on *WPP Lux*, in which the plaintiff alleged that it bought shares in a
21 privately held company while the company’s founders secretly were selling their own shares. *See*
22 *WPP Luxembourg Gamma Three Sarl v. Spot Runner, Inc.*, 655 F.3d 1039, 1054 (9th Cir. 2011),
23 abrogated by *Lorenzo v. Sec. & Exch. Comm’n*, 139 S. Ct. 1094 (2019). The plaintiff alleged that
24 when the company revealed that its founders had engaged in this “pump and dump” scheme, the
25 plaintiff’s shares in the company immediately became worthless, as no investor would buy them
26 under those circumstances. *See id.* The Ninth Circuit found these allegations to be adequate,
27 holding that “[a]lthough these allegations do not provide detailed share prices, the number of
28 shares currently held, or whether attempts to sell the Spot Runner shares were made, the amended

1 complaint includes a statement of loss causation sufficient to provide some assurance that the
2 theory has a basis in fact.” *Id.* In contrast, LifeLine has not alleged facts showing that its
3 conclusory allegation of economic loss has a basis in fact.

4 While LifeLine need not allege a great amount of factual detail, it must allege facts
5 sufficient to provide some assurance that it suffered economic loss as a result of Defendants’
6 alleged material omissions.

7 Claims 1, 2, and 3 are subject to dismissal for failure to allege economic loss and loss
8 causation.

9 **5. Conclusion Re Federal Claims**

10 For the reasons discussed above, Defendants’ motion to dismiss is GRANTED as to
11 Claims 1-3, WITH LEAVE TO AMEND to the extent the claims are based on the theory that the
12 alleged omissions rendered false and misleading representations and warranties in the SPAs, and
13 WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND to the extent the claims are based on oral representations or an
14 alleged fiduciary duty.

15 **B. State Law Claims**

16 Claims 4, 5, and 6 are asserted under California Corporations Code § 25401, and Claim 7
17 is for fraud by concealment under California common law. Defendants argue that because these
18 state law claims merely repackage LifeLine’s federal securities claims, dismissal of the federal
19 securities claims warrants dismissal of the state law claims as well. Defendants’ argument is
20 supported by decisions from district courts within the Ninth Circuit. *See, e.g., Mohebbi v. Khazen,*
21 50 F. Supp. 3d 1234, 1252 (N.D. Cal. 2014) (“The Court agrees with Defendants that Plaintiff’s
22 inability to state a claim for fraud under Section 10b-5 is also fatal to his § 25401 claims.”);
23 *Wallack v. Idexx Lab’ys, Inc.*, No. 11CV2996-GPC KSC, 2013 WL 5206190, at *12 (S.D. Cal.
24 Sept. 12, 2013) (finding dismissal of state securities claims and fraud claims warranted following
25 dismissal of federal securities claims).

26 Accordingly, Defendants’ motion to dismiss is GRANTED as to Claims 4-7, WITH
27 LEAVE TO AMEND to the extent the claims are based on the theory that the alleged omissions
28 rendered false and misleading representations and warranties in the SPAs, and WITHOUT

1 LEAVE TO AMEND to the extent the claims are based on oral representations or an alleged
2 fiduciary duty.

3 **IV. ORDER**

- 4 (1) The motion to dismiss is GRANTED, WITH LEAVE TO AMEND IN PART AND
5 WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND IN PART, as stated herein;
- 6 (2) Any amended pleading shall be filed by July 29, 2022. Leave to amend is limited
7 to the defects identified in this order. LifeLine may not add new claims or parties
8 absent express leave of the Court.
- 9 (3) This order terminates ECF 31.

10
11 Dated: June 13, 2022


12 BETH LABSON FREEMAN
13 United States District Judge