1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	JESSICA L. GRANT (SBN 178138) JGrant@mofo.com PENELOPE A. PREOVOLOS (SBN 87607) PPreovolos@mofo.com CLAUDIA M. VETESI (SBN 233485) CVetesi@mofo.com CAMILA A. TAPERNOUX (SBN 299289) CTapernoux@mofo.com MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP 425 Market Street San Francisco, California 94105-2482 Telephone: (415) 268-7000 Facsimile: (415) 268-7522 Attorneys for Defendant APPLE INC.	
9	UNITED STATES	S DISTRICT COURT
10 11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	SAN JOSE DIVISION	
13	DUDE, MACDOOK KEYDOADD	
14	IN RE: MACBOOK KEYBOARD LITIGATION	Case No.: 5:18-cv-02813-EJD
15 16		DEFENDANT APPLE INC.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' SECOND AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
17		
18		Consol. Compl. Filed: October 11, 2018 Am. Consol. Compl. Filed: May 13, 2019 2nd Consol. Compl. Filed: July 2, 2020
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
2627		
28		
_0		

Defendant Apple Inc. hereby answers Plaintiffs' Second Amended Consolidated Class Action Complaint ("SAC"). Any and all allegations not specifically admitted herein are denied. To the extent the SAC asserts conclusions of law, such conclusions of law require no response. To the extent any response is required to headings or other unnumbered paragraphs in the SAC, Apple denies the factual allegations, if any, contained in such headings or unnumbered paragraphs.

SUMMARY OF THE ACTION

- 1. Responding to paragraph 1 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs have brought an action on behalf of individuals who have allegedly purchased model year 2015 or later MacBook, model year 2016 or later MacBook Pro, and model year 2018 or later MacBook Air equipped with a "butterfly" keyboard (collectively, "MacBook"). Apple admits that it markets and sells MacBook notebooks and that the starting price for some models is more than \$1,200.00. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 1.
 - 2. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 2 of the SAC.
- 3. Responding to paragraph 3 of the SAC, Apple admits that it developed the butterfly keyboard, filed patent applications for its design, and sold MacBook notebooks with the butterfly keyboard. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 3.
- 4. Responding to paragraph 4 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 4 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any portion of apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Apple states that insofar as the allegations in paragraph 4 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 4.
- 5. Responding to paragraph 5 of the SAC, Apple admits that a one-year limited warranty accompanies the sale of every MacBook. Apple also admits that it implemented a Keyboard Service Program. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 5 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple

denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 5.

- 6. Responding to paragraph 6 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 6 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from online postings, websites, or any iteration of a petition on Change.org, the postings and websites speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings and websites that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 6.
- 7. Responding to paragraph 7 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs seek relief for themselves and other MacBook purchasers. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 7 of the SAC.

PARTIES

- 8. Responding to paragraph 8 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Zixuan Rao, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 9. Responding to paragraph 9 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Joseph Baruch and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 10. Responding to paragraph 10 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Bo Laurent and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 11. Responding to paragraph 11 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Ashley Marin and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 12. Responding to paragraph 12 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Kyle Barbaro, and on that basis denies those allegations.

- 13. Responding to paragraph 13 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Steve Eakin, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 14. Responding to paragraph 14 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Michael Hopkins, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 15. Responding to paragraph 15 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Adam Lee, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 16. Responding to paragraph 16 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Kevin Melkowski, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 17. Responding to paragraph 17 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Lorenzo Ferguson, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 18. Responding to paragraph 18 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiff Benjamin Gulker, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 19. Responding to paragraph 19 of the SAC, Apple admits that it is incorporated under the laws of the State of California and that it maintains its principal place of business in Cupertino, California.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

20. Responding to paragraph 20 of the SAC, Apple admits that this Court has jurisdiction pursuant to the Class Action Fairness Act of 2005 ("CAFA"), 28 U.S.C. § 1332, *et seq.*, and that Plaintiffs purport to summarize, interpret, or state the contents of CAFA. Apple denies any characterization of CAFA that is inconsistent with its content. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate or warranted. Except as otherwise admitted, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 20.

- 21. Responding to paragraph 21 of the SAC, Apple admits that its principal place of business is within the District. Apple further admits that it conducts business in California. Apple states that insofar as the allegations in paragraph 21 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required.
- 22. Responding to paragraph 22 of the SAC, Apple admits that venue is proper in this District. Apple states that insofar as the allegations in paragraph 22 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 22.
- 23. Responding to paragraph 23 of the SAC, Apple admits that decisions regarding keyboard design for the MacBook, MacBook Pro, and MacBook Air, as well as decisions regarding the Keyboard Service Program are made in California. Apple further admits that marketing materials for the MacBook, MacBook Pro, and MacBook Air are developed in California. Apple admits that the launch events for the 2015 MacBook and 2016 MacBook Pro took place in Cupertino, California. Apple further admits that decisions regarding the development, marketing, and advertising of the MacBook are made in California. Apple further admits that certain procedures and warranty policies regarding the MacBook's hardware and software are made in California. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 23.

INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

24. Responding to paragraph 24 of the SAC, Apple admits that assignment to the San Jose Division is appropriate. Apple states that insofar as the allegations in paragraph 24 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 24.

PLAINTIFF-SPECIFIC ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiff Zixuan Rao

25. Responding to paragraph 25 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Rao purchased a 2017 MacBook Pro online from B&H Photo Video in January 2018.

Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 25.

- 26. Responding to paragraph 26 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 26, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 26.
- 27. Responding to paragraph 27 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 27, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 27.
- 28. Responding to paragraph 28 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 28, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 28.
- 29. Responding to paragraph 29 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Rao brought his MacBook Pro to the Apple retail store located in Fashion Valley shopping center in San Diego, California on or about April 2, 2018. Apple further states that its records indicate Plaintiff Rao reported that the "b" key works intermittently. Apple's records further indicate that a Genius Bar representative cleaned out the keyboard, and offered to send the MacBook Pro to depot repair center for top case replacement, but that Plaintiff Rao declined the repair. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 29, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 29.
- 30. Responding to paragraph 30 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Rao has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 30 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 30, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 30.

5 6

7 8

10

9

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25

26

27

28

Plaintiff Joseph Baruch

- 31. Responding to paragraph 31 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Baruch purchased a 2017 MacBook Pro from an Apple retail store in Sherman Oaks, California in July 2017 for \$1,799.00 plus tax.
- 32. Responding to paragraph 32 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 32, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 32.
- 33. Responding to paragraph 33 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 33, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 33.
- 34. Responding to paragraph 34 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 34, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 34.
- 35. Responding to paragraph 35 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 35, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 35.
- 36. Responding to paragraph 36 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate that Plaintiff Baruch brought his MacBook Pro to an Apple retail store in Sherman Oaks, California for repair on or about March 16, 2018. Apple further states that its records indicate that it proposed to send Plaintiff Baruch's MacBook Pro to an Apple service depot for repair. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 36.
- 37. Responding to paragraph 37 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate that Plaintiff Baruch's MacBook Pro was sent to an Apple service depot for repair, and that Apple notified Plaintiff Baruch on or about March 25, 2018 that his repaired MacBook Pro was ready for pick up. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 37, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 37.

38. Responding to paragraph 38 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Baruch has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 38 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 38, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 38.

Plaintiff Bo Laurent

- 39. Responding to paragraph 39 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Laurent purchased a 2018 MacBook Pro in November 2018. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 39.
- 40. Responding to paragraph 40 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 40, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 40.
- 41. Responding to paragraph 41 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 41, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 41.
- 42. Responding to paragraph 42 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Laurent brought her MacBook Pro to the Apple retail store in Santa Rosa, California on or about June 16, 2019 and the proposed resolution was to clean and replace the keycaps for the letters "r," "u," "c," and "e." Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 42.
- 43. Responding to paragraph 43 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Laurent went to the Apple retail store in Santa Rosa, California on or about June 21, 2019 and dropped off the notebook for a keycap replacement repair at that time. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 43.

- 44. Responding to paragraph 44 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate that Plaintiff Laurent was notified on or about June 23, 2019 by the Apple retail store in Santa Rosa, California that a repair was completed on her MacBook Pro, and that the "r," "u," "c," and "e" keys were replaced. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 44.
- 45. Responding to paragraph 45 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Laurent left her MacBook Pro at the Apple retail store in Santa Rosa, California on or about June 27, 2019 for a top case replacement, and that Plaintiff Laurent was advised on or about June 29, 2019 that it was ready for pickup. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 45.
- 46. Responding to paragraph 46 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Laurent brought her MacBook to Mobile Kangaroo, an Apple Authorized Service Provider, on or about October 25, 2019 for a top case replacement. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 46.
- 47. Responding to paragraph 47 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate that Plaintiff Laurent brought her MacBook to the Apple retail store in Santa Rosa, California on or about February 27, 2020, and that a top case repair was completed on February 29, 2020. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 47.
- 48. Responding to paragraph 48 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Laurent has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 48 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 48, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 48.

Plaintiff Ashley Marin

- 49. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 49, and on that basis denies them.
- 50. Responding to paragraph 50 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 50, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 50.
- 51. Responding to paragraph 51 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 51, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 51.
- 52. Responding to paragraph 52 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate that Ashley Marin brought the referenced MacBook to the Apple retail store located in Victoria Gardens shopping center in Rancho Cucamonga, California on or about June 23, 2017. Apple further states that its records indicate that Apple was going to replace the "i" key when she returned to the store. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 52.
- 53. Responding to paragraph 53 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 53, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 53.
- 54. Responding to paragraph 54 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 54, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 54.
- 55. Responding to paragraph 55 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Marin has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 55 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 55, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 55.

Plaintiff Kyle Barbaro

- 56. Responding to paragraph 56 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Barbaro purchased a 2016 MacBook Pro from apple.com in November 2016 for \$2,548.94 (including tax), and picked it up at an Apple retail store in Burlington, Massachusetts.
- 57. Responding to paragraph 57 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 57, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 57.
- 58. Responding to paragraph 58 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 58, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 58.
- 59. Responding to paragraph 59, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Barbaro contacted Apple Support on or about September 4, 2017 regarding his MacBook Pro, and Apple Support made a Concierge Reservation for him to take his notebook in for service. Apple further states that its Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 59, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 59.
- 60. Responding to paragraph 60 of the SAC, Apple states its records indicate Plaintiff Barbaro visited an Apple retail store on or about September 11, 2017, and reported that the "space" and "caps lock" keys of his MacBook Pro were "not typing." Apple's records further indicate that a Genius Bar representative inspected Plaintiff Barbaro's MacBook Pro, and that the MacBook Pro was sent to an Apple service depot for repair. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 60, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 60.
- 61. Responding to paragraph 61 of the SAC, Apple states its records indicate that Apple notified Plaintiff Barbaro on or about September 14, 2017 that his repaired MacBook Pro was available for pick up. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 61, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 61.

62. Responding to paragraph 62 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Barbaro has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 62 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 62, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 62.

Plaintiff Steve Eakin

- 63. Responding to paragraph 63 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Eakin purchased a 2016 MacBook Pro from apple.com in April 2017. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 63.
- 64. Responding to paragraph 64 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 64, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 64.
- 65. Responding to paragraph 65 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 65, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 65.
- 66. Responding to paragraph 66 of the SAC, Apple's records indicate that on or about June 15, 2017, Plaintiff Eakin called AppleCare and reported issues with the "n" key on his MacBook keyboard, and that AppleCare recommended service. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 66, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 66.
- 67. Responding to paragraph 67 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate on or about June 15, 2017, an Apple representative made a reservation for Plaintiff Eakin with an Apple Authorized Service Provider. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 67 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from www.ifixit.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Apple states that it is without knowledge or

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 67, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 67.

- 68. Responding to paragraph 68 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 68, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 68.
- 69. Responding to paragraph 69 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Eakin called Apple Support on or about January 3, 2018, and was referred to an Apple Authorized Service Provider for repairs. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 69, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 70. Responding to paragraph 70 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Eakin has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 70 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 70, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 70.

Plaintiff Michael Hopkins

- 71. Responding to paragraph 71 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 71, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 71.
- 72. Responding to paragraph 72 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 72, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 72.
- 73. Responding to paragraph 73 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 73, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 73.
- 74. Responding to paragraph 74 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 74, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 74.

- 75. Responding to paragraph 75 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 75, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 75.
- 76. Responding to paragraph 76 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Hopkins has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 76 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 76, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 76.

Plaintiff Adam Lee

- 77. Responding to paragraph 77 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 77, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 77.
- 78. Responding to paragraph 78 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 78, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 78.
- 79. Responding to paragraph 79 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 79, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 79.
- 80. Responding to paragraph 80 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 80, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 80.
- 81. Responding to paragraph 81 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 81, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 81.
- 82. Responding to paragraph 82 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 82, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 82.

- 83. Responding to paragraph 83 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 83, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 83.
- 84. Responding to paragraph 84 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Lee has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 84 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 84, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 84.

Plaintiff Kevin Melkowski

- 85. Responding to paragraph 85 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Melkowski purchased a 2016 MacBook Pro from apple.com in April 2017. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 85.
- 86. Responding to paragraph 86 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 86, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 86.
- 87. Responding to paragraph 87 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 87, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 87.
- 88. Responding to paragraph 88 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate that Apple set up a repair for Plaintiff Melkowski with Simply Mac, an Apple Authorized Service Provider. Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 88, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 88.
- 89. Responding to paragraph 89 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 89, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 89.

- 90. Responding to paragraph 90 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Melkowski obtained a 2017 MacBook Pro as a replacement in August 2017. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 90, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 90.
- 91. Responding to paragraph 91 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 91, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 91.
- 92. Responding to paragraph 92 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 92, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 92.
- 93. Responding to paragraph 93 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 93, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 93.
- 94. Responding to paragraph 94 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Melkowski has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 94 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 94, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 94.

Plaintiff Lorenzo Ferguson

- 95. Responding to paragraph 95 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Ferguson purchased a 2016 MacBook Pro from apple.com in February 2017 for \$1,899.00 plus tax. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 95, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 95.
- 96. Responding to paragraph 96 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 96, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 96.

19

22

23

26

- 97. Responding to paragraph 97 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 97, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 97.
- 98. Responding to paragraph 98 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate that Plaintiff Ferguson contacted Apple on or about April 21, 2017 through the Support App and reported an issue with the keyboard not working. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 98, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 98.
- 99. Responding to paragraph 99 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 99, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 99.
- 100. Responding to paragraph 100 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate that Plaintiff Ferguson contacted Apple on or about June 28, 2018 through the Support App, and that Apple referred Plaintiff to an Apple retail store for a repair. Apple further states that its records indicate that Plaintiff Ferguson went to an Apple retail store on or about July 1, 2018, and a Genius Bar representative inspected his keyboard, cleaned it, and replaced at least one key. Apple further states that its records indicate that Apple recommended to Plaintiff Ferguson that if the issue persists, he should bring his notebook back in to have the top case replaced. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 100, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 100.
- Responding to paragraph 101 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without 101. knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 101, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 101.
- 102. Responding to paragraph 102 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Ferguson has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 102 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or

information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 102, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 102.

Plaintiff Benjamin Gulker

- 103. Responding to paragraph 103 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Gulker purchased a 2016 MacBook from apple.com in June 2016 for \$1,249.00 plus tax. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 103, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 103.
- 104. Responding to paragraph 104 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 104, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 104.
- 105. Responding to paragraph 105 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 105, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 105.
- 106. Responding to paragraph 106 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Gulker brought his MacBook Pro to an Apple retail store on or about May 12, 2017, where a Genius Bar representative cleaned the keys and communicated to Plaintiff Gulker that if the issue persists, Apple could do a repair at an Apple service depot. Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Gulker declined. Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 106, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 106.
- 107. Responding to paragraph 107 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Gulker visited an Apple retail store on or about October 7, 2017, and reported that the "space bar" on his MacBook Pro was not working. Apple further states that its records indicate that a Genius Bar representative sent Plaintiff Gulker's MacBook Pro to an Apple service depot for repair. Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 107, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 107.

- 108. Responding to paragraph 108 of the SAC, Apple states that its records indicate Plaintiff Gulker visited an Apple store on or about November 10, 2017, and reported that he was having issues with the "space bar" on his MacBook Pro. Apple further states that its records indicate that the Genius Bar representative noted that in previous repair notes the bottom case was replaced, and that the Genius Bar representative advised Plaintiff Gulker that his device needed a top case replacement. Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 108, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 108.
- 109. Responding to paragraph 109 of the SAC, Apple denies that Plaintiff Gulker has suffered any injury. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 109 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 109, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 109.

COMMON FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

Plaintiffs' Common Injury and Preference

- 110. Apple denies the allegations in the heading immediately above. Responding to paragraph 110 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 110 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any portion of apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding what each Plaintiff "encountered," and on that basis denies those allegations. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 110.
 - 111. Apple denies the allegations contained in paragraph 111 of the SAC.
- 112. Responding to paragraph 112 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 112, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 112. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 112 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required.

113. Responding to paragraph 113 of the SAC, Apple admits that it has advertised the MacBook and the butterfly keyboard. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 113, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 113.

The MacBook Laptop Computer

- 114. Responding to paragraph 114 of the SAC, Apple admits that notebooks are commonly used in the United States. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 114, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 114.
- 115. Responding to paragraph 115 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 115 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any portion of a document, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 115.
- 116. Responding to paragraph 116 of the SAC, Apple admits notebooks have an integrated keyboard and offer more mobility than a desktop computer. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 116, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 116.
- 117. Responding to paragraph 117 of the SAC, Apple states that the keyboard on a notebook enables users to type and enter commands. Apple further states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 117, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 117.
- 118. Responding to paragraph 118 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 118 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any portion of apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 118.

Overview of Keyboard Technology and Technological Advances

- 119. Responding to paragraph 119 of the SAC, Apple states that it is aware of computer keyboards that have utilized a buckling spring mechanism. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 119, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 119.
- 120. Responding to paragraph 120 of the SAC, Apple admits that it has used new technology to make notebooks that are sleeker and more portable. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 120, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 120.
- 121. Responding to paragraph 121 of the SAC, Apple states that it has sold notebooks with keyboards that utilized a "scissor" mechanism. Apple further states that it is aware the mechanism has been described as involving two pieces that interlock in a "scissor"-like fashion. Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in paragraph 121, and on that basis denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 121.
 - 122. Apple admits the allegations contained in paragraph 122 of the SAC.

Apple Launches the MacBook Without Disclosing the Keyboard Defect

- 123. Apple denies the allegations in the heading immediately above. Responding to paragraph 123 of the SAC, Apple states that it released its first MacBook with a butterfly keyboard in March 2015. Apple admits that the launch event for the 2015 MacBook was broadcasted from Apple headquarters in Cupertino, California on March 9, 2015. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 123 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from a statement made by Apple's Senior Vice President Phil Schiller, the document speak for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 123.
- 124. Responding to paragraph 124 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 124 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an Apple press release, the document speak for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that

is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 124.

- 125. Responding to paragraph 125 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 125 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 125.
- 126. Responding to paragraph 126 of the SAC, Apple admits that it first sold MacBooks equipped with butterfly keyboards on April 10, 2015. Apple further states that it released 2016 and 2017 MacBook models on April 19, 2016 and June 5, 2017, respectively. Apple further admits that the price of these products started at \$1,299.00. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 126.
- 127. Responding to paragraph 127 of the SAC, Apple states that it introduced a new MacBook Pro on October 27, 2016. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 127 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an Apple press release, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 127.
- 128. Responding to paragraph 128 of the SAC, Apple admits that the launch event for the MacBook Pro occurred on October 27, 2016 in Cupertino, California. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 128 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from a statement made by Apple's Senior Vice President Phil Schiller, the document speak for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 128.
- 129. Responding to paragraph 129 of the SAC, Apple states it released 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 MacBook Pro models equipped with a butterfly keyboard on October 27, 2016, June 5, 2017, July 12, 2018, May 21, 2019, and July 9, 2019 respectively. Apple admits that the prices of these products started at \$1,299.00, depending on the model. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 129.

- 130. Responding to paragraph 130 of the SAC, Apple admits it released MacBook Air models equipped with butterfly keyboards on October 30, 2018 and July 9, 2019. Apple further admits that pre-2018 model MacBook Airs were not equipped with a butterfly keyboard. Apple further states that the price of the 2018 MacBook Air started at \$1,199.00 and the 2019 MacBook Air started at \$1,099.00. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 130.
- 131. Responding to paragraph 131 of the SAC, Apple admits that MacBook and MacBook Pro with butterfly keyboard can be purchased directly from Apple at Apple retail stores and on apple.com. Apple further admits that certain models of MacBook and MacBook Pro with butterfly keyboard can be purchased from third-party retailers such as B&H Photo Video, Amazon, and Best Buy. Except as otherwise admitted, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 131.
- 132. Responding to paragraph 132 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 132 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any document, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 132.
- 133. Responding to paragraph 133 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 133, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 133. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 133 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any portion of apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 133.
- 134. Responding to paragraph 134 of the SAC, Apple states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 134, and on that basis denies the allegations in paragraph 134. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 134 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any

portion of the packaging of the MacBook, the packaging speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the packaging that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 134.

- 135. Responding to paragraph 135 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 135 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a basis as to the truth of the allegations regarding Plaintiffs' actions, and on that basis denies those allegations. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 135 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any portion of information provided by Apple during the setup process, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 135.
 - 136. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 136 of the SAC.
- 137. Responding to paragraph 137 of the SAC, Apple states that customers can return notebook computers purchased directly from Apple for a refund within 14 calendar days from the date of purchase, subject to certain requirements. Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a basis as to the truth of the allegations regarding third party retailers' return policy, and on that basis denies those allegations. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 137.

The Keyboard Defect Manifests Soon After Launch

- 138. Apple denies the allegations in the heading immediately above. Responding to paragraph 138 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 138 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 138 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from online postings, the postings speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings that is inconsistent with their content. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 138.
 - 139. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 139 of the SAC.
- 140. Responding to paragraph 140 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 140 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an online article, the

document speak for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the article that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 140.

- 141. Responding to paragraph 141 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 141 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an online article, the document speak for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the article that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 141.
- 142. Responding to paragraph 142 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 142 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an online article, the document speak for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the article that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 142.
- 143. Responding to paragraph 143 of the SAC, Apple states that the model year 2015 or later MacBook laptops, model year 2016 or later MacBook Pro laptops, and model year 2018 or later MacBook Air laptops have a butterfly keyboard mechanism, which has been modified since it was first introduced. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 143.
- 144. Responding to paragraph 144 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a basis as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 144, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 145. Responding to paragraph 145 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 145 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote online postings, the postings speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to

13

17

19

22

24

26

27 28 the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 145.

- Responding to paragraph 146 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 146 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from online postings, the postings speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 146.
- Responding to paragraph 147 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent 147. paragraph 147 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from online postings, the postings speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 147.
- 148. Responding to paragraph 148 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 148 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from online postings, the postings speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 148, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them.
- Responding to paragraph 149 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 149 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from online postings, the postings speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 149, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them.
- Responding to paragraph 150 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent 150. paragraph 150 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from a Change.org

petition, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 150.

- 151. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 151 of the SAC.
- 152. Apple states that the terms of use for Apple Support Communities provide as follows with respect to Apple's involvement: "Apple may respond to questions but does not formally provide technical support on the Site." Apple further states that customers have contacted Apple by phone, online (https://getsupport.apple.com/), or at an Apple retail store for support or service relating to the butterfly keyboard shortly after the first MacBook with the butterfly keyboard was sold. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 152 of the SAC.

Apple Knew About the Defect and Actively Concealed It

- 153. Apple denies the allegations in the heading immediately above. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 153 of the SAC.
- 154. Responding to paragraph 154 of the SAC, Apple states that it designed the butterfly keyboard mechanism and filed a patent application in connection with that technology. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 154 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from Apple's patent application, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 154.
- and modified the butterfly mechanism after releasing the 2015 MacBook. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 155 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from Apple's patent applications, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 155.

- 156. Responding to paragraph 156 of the SAC, Apple admits that it introduced the 2016 MacBook on April 19, 2016, and that the MacBook used the butterfly keyboard mechanism. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 156 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 156.
- 157. Responding to paragraph 157 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 157 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from Apple's May 2016 patent application, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 157.
- 158. Responding to paragraph 158 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 158 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from Apple's September 2016 patent application, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 158.
- 159. Responding to paragraph 159 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 159 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from Apple's patent applications, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Apple further states that it released the 2017 MacBook and MacBook Pro in June 2017, and that both models incorporated the second-generation butterfly keyboard. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 159.
- 160. Responding to paragraph 160 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 160 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 160.

- 161. Responding to paragraph 161 of the SAC, Apple states that it released a new version of the MacBook Pro on July 12, 2018, and that the model contained a third-generation butterfly keyboard. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 161 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 161.
- 162. Responding to paragraph 162 of the SAC, Apple admits that the 2018 MacBook Pro has a silicone membrane as a part of the butterfly keyboard. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 162 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an online article, the article speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the article that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 162.
- 163. Responding to paragraph 163 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 163 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an online posting or documents, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the posting or documents that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 163.
- 164. Responding to paragraph 164 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 164 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 164.
- 165. Responding to paragraph 165 of the SAC, Apple admits that it released a new version of the MacBook Air on October 30, 2018 with the third-generation butterfly keyboard. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 165 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the

website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 165.

- 166. Responding to paragraph 166 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 166 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 166.
- 167. Responding to paragraph 167 of the SAC, Apple states that it performs reliability testing on each MacBook, MacBook Pro, and MacBook Air model prior to release. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 167 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an online article, the article speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the article that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 167.
- 168. Responding to paragraph 168 of the SAC, Apple states that it conducted testing on its butterfly keyboard before releasing it. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 168.
- 169. Responding to paragraph 169 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 169 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speaks for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 169.
- 170. Responding to paragraph 170 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 170 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speaks for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 170.
- 171. Responding to paragraph 171 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 171 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the

documents speaks for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 171.

- 172. Responding to paragraph 172 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 172 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speaks for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 172 of the SAC.
- 173. Responding to paragraph 173 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 173 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple further states that to the extent paragraph 173 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speaks for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 173.

Apple Has Failed to Adequately Address the Keyboard Defect in the MacBook

- 174. Apple denies the allegations in the heading immediately above. Responding to paragraph 174 of the SAC, Apple admits that it provides a one-year limited warranty for the MacBook models identified in the SAC.
- 175. Responding to paragraph 175 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 175 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any iteration of Apple's one-year limited warranty, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content.
- 176. Responding to paragraph 176 of the SAC, Apple states that under the one-year limited warranty, Apple has the option to either: (i) repair the Apple Product, (ii) replace the Apple Product, or (iii) exchange the Apple Product. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 176.
 - 177. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 177 of the SAC.

- 178. Responding to paragraph 178 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 178 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from support.apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content.
- 179. Responding to paragraph 179 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 179 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from online articles or postings, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 179.
- 180. Apple states that it is aware that certain customers required a key cap repair or topcase replacement where a keyboard cleaning did not address the keyboard behavior the customer was experiencing. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 180 of the SAC.
 - 181. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 181 of the SAC.
 - 182. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 182 of the SAC.
- 183. Responding to paragraph 183 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a basis as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 183, and on that basis denies those allegations.
- 184. Responding to paragraph 184 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 184 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from online postings, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 184.

The Keyboard Service Program

185. Responding to paragraph 185 of the SAC, Apple admits that it announced its Keyboard Service Program on June 22, 2018, and that the program covers the MacBook model years 2015 to 2017 and the MacBook Pro model years 2016 to 2019. Apple denies that the

5

7

12

15

17

18

21

25

26

27

28

Keyboard Service Program does not cover the 2018 to 2019 MacBook Air notebooks. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 185.

- 186. Responding to paragraph 186 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 186 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any portion of apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 186.
- 187. Responding to paragraph 187 of the SAC, Apple states that under the Keyboard Service Program, the type of service offered may involve the replacement of one or more keys or the whole keyboard. To the extent paragraph 187 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from any portion of apple.com, the website speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the website that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 187.
- 188. Responding to paragraph 188 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 188 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 188.
- 189. Responding to paragraph 189 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 189 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 189.
 - 190. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 190 of the SAC.
- 191. Responding to paragraph 191 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 191 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from various third-party websites, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to

form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 191.

- 192. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 192 of the SAC.
- 193. Responding to paragraph 193 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 193 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from a Change.org petition, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 193.
- 194. Responding to paragraph 194 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 194 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote online postings, the postings speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 194.
 - 195. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 195 of the SAC.
- 196. Responding to paragraph 196 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 196 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an online article or other documents, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 196.
- 197. Responding to paragraph 197 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 197 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from documents, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 197.

- 198. Responding to paragraph 198 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 198 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote online postings, the postings speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the postings that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 198.
- 199. Responding to paragraph 199 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 199 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from a third-party website, the document speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 199.
- 200. Responding to paragraph 200 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 200 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from an online poll and article, the documents speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the documents that is inconsistent with their content, or lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of those allegations, and on that basis, denies them. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 200.
- 201. Responding to paragraph 201 of the SAC, Apple states that to the extent paragraph 201 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote from the terms of Apple's Keyboard Service Program, the document speak for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the document that is inconsistent with its content. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 201.
- 202. Responding to paragraph 202 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a basis as to the truth of the allegations regarding whether Plaintiffs have paid for external keyboards or repairs, and on that basis denies those allegations. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 202.

- 203. Responding to paragraph 203 of the SAC, Apple states that particle ingress could get in the way of key movement. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 203 of the SAC.
- 204. Responding to paragraph 204 of the SAC, Apple states that the November 2019, March 2020, and May 2020 MacBook Pro and MacBook Air notebooks were not equipped with a "butterfly" keyboard. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 204 of the SAC.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 205. Responding to paragraph 205 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a class action against Apple and seek to represent a purported class and subclasses as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 205.
- 206. Responding to paragraph 206 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs seek to exclude certain persons from their proposed class and subclasses. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 206.
- 207. Responding to paragraph 207 of the SAC, Apple admits that it has sold hundreds of thousands of MacBook notebooks. Apple admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a class action against Apple. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate. Insofar as the allegations in paragraph 207 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 207.
- 208. Responding to paragraph 208 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a class action against Apple. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate. Insofar as the allegations in paragraph 208 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 208.
- 209. Responding to paragraph 209 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a class action against Apple. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate. Insofar as the allegations in paragraph 209 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple

states it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations, and on that basis denies those allegations.

- 210. The Court dismissed the following claims with prejudice: Plaintiffs' UCL claim in its entirety and remaining claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 210 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 210 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Responding to paragraph 210 (including subparagraphs 210a through 210j) of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a class action against Apple. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate. Insofar as the allegations in paragraph 210 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 210.
- 211. Responding to paragraph 211 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a class action against Apple. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate, and denies that Plaintiffs or the members of the purported class have been injured or damaged in any way and further denies that Plaintiffs or the members of the purported class are entitled to relief of any kind. Insofar as the allegations in paragraph 211 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 211.
- 212. Responding to paragraph 212 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a class action against Apple. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate. Insofar as the allegations in paragraph 212 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 212.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the Unfair Competition Law CAL. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200, et seq. ("UCL")

- 213. Responding to paragraph 213 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 214. Responding to paragraph 214 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with

prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.

215. Responding to paragraph 215 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.

Unlawful

216. Responding to paragraph 216 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.

Unfair

- 217. Responding to paragraph 217 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.
- 218. Responding to paragraph 218 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.
- 219. Responding to paragraph 219 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.
- 220. Responding to paragraph 220 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.

221. Responding to paragraph 221 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.

Fraud by Omission

- 222. Responding to paragraph 222 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.
- 223. Responding to paragraph 223 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.
- 224. Responding to paragraph 224 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.
- 225. Responding to paragraph 225 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.
- 226. Responding to paragraph 226 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.
- 227. Responding to paragraph 227 of the SAC, Apple states that Plaintiffs' First Claim for Relief for Violations of the Unfair Competition Law has been dismissed in its entirety with

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
- 2	5
2	_
- 2	7
~ つ	8

prejudice (ECF 248). Therefore, no response is required or permitted to the allegations in paragraphs 213 through 227 of the SAC.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the Consumers Legal Remedies Act CAL. CIV. CODE § 1750, et seq. ("CLRA")

- 228. Responding to paragraph 228 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 229. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 229 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 229 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits that Plaintiffs have brought a claim on behalf of the Class or, in the alternative, the California Subclass as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.
- 230. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 230 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 230 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 230 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 230 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 230.
- 231. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 231 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 231 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 231 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of

the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 231 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 231.

- 232. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 232 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 232 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 232 of the SAC.
- 233. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 233 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 233 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 233 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 233.
- 234. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 234 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 234 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 234 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 234.
- 235. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 235 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 235 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 235 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 235.
- 236. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in

Paragraph 236 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 236 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that Plaintiff Rao sent a CLRA notice to Apple dated May 12, 2018 and Plaintiff Baruch sent a CLRA notice to Apple dated July 30, 2018. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 236.

- 237. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 237 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 237 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits that Plaintiff Rao and Plaintiff Baruch's CLRA notices were sent via certified mail to Apple. Apple states that to the extent paragraph 237 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote those notices, the notices speak for themselves, and Apple denies any characterization of the notices that is inconsistent with their content. Apple admits that Plaintiffs seek monetary relief under the CLRA. Apple denies that Plaintiffs have suffered any injury or are entitled to any monetary or other relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 237.
- 238. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 238 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 228 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 238 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 238.
- 239. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 239 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 239 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that Exhibits A through I to Plaintiffs' SAC are CLRA venue declarations. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 239.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF Fraudulent Concealment

Responding to paragraph 241 of the SAC, Apple admits that Plaintiffs have

240. Responding to paragraph 240 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.

brought a claim on behalf of the Class under California law or, alternatively, the law of state in which each Plaintiff purchased a MacBook, as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.

242. Responding to paragraph 242 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 242 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 242.

243. Responding to paragraph 243 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 243 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 243.

244. Responding to paragraph 244 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 244 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 244.

245. Responding to paragraph 245 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 245 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple states that it conducted pre-release testing of the MacBook models identified in the SAC. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 245.

246. Responding to paragraph 246 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 246 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 246.

247. Responding to paragraph 247 of the SAC, Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 247, and on that basis denies those allegations.

248. Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 248.

- 249. Responding to paragraph 249 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 249 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 249.
- 250. Responding to paragraph 250 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 250 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 250.
- 251. Responding to paragraph 251 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 251 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 251.
- 252. Responding to paragraph 252 of the SAC, Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 252 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple admits Plaintiffs seek punitive damages, but denies that Plaintiffs have suffered any injury or are entitled to punitive damages or other relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 252.

FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the Song-Beverly Consumer Warranty Act CAL. CIV. CODE § 1792, et seq.

- 253. Responding to paragraph 253 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 254. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 254 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 254 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits that Plaintiffs Rao, Baruch, Laurent, and Marin have brought a claim on behalf of themselves and the California Subclass as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.
- 255. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in

Paragraph 255 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 255 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits that Plaintiffs Rao, Baruch, and Laurent purchased a MacBook Pro in California. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 255 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Except as otherwise stated, Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 255.

- 256. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 256 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 256 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 256 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 256.
- 257. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 257 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 257 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 257 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 257.
- 258. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 258 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 258 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 258 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 258.
- 259. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 259 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 259 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as

follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 259 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 259.

- 260. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 260 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 260 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 260 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 260.
- 261. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 261 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 261 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 261 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 261 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 261.
- 262. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 262 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 262 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 262 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 262.
- 263. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 263 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 263 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits Plaintiffs Rao, Baruch, Laurent, and Marin seek costs and expenses,

	1	
	2	
	3	
	4	
	5	
	6	
	7	
	8	
	9	
l	0	
1	1	
l	2	
l	3	
l	4	
l	5	
l	6	
l	7	
l	8	
l	9	
2	0	
2	1	
2	2	
2	3	
2	4	
2	5	
2	6	
2	7	

including attorneys' fees. Apple denies that Plaintiffs Rao and Baruch have suffered any injury or are entitled to any relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 263.

FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the Washington Consumer Protection Act WASH. REV. CODE § 19.86.010, et seq. ("WCPA")

- 264. Responding to paragraph 264 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 265. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 265 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 265 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits that Plaintiff Melkowski has brought a claim on behalf of himself and the Washington Subclass as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.
- 266. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 266 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 266 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 266 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 266.
- 267. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 267 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 267 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 267 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 267.
- 268. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in

Paragraph 268 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 268 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 268 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 268 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 268.

269. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 269 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 269 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple realleges and incorporates by reference paragraph 217–224 of this Answer as if fully set forth herein. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 269 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 269.

270. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 270 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 270 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 270 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 270.

271. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 271 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 271 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 271 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 271.

- 272. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 272 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 272 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 272 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 272.
- 273. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 273 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 273 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 273 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 273.
- 274. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 274 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 274 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 274 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 274.
- 275. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 275 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 275 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits Plaintiff Melkowski seeks monetary relief as well as attorneys' fees. Apple denies that Plaintiff Melkowski has suffered any injury or is entitled to any relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 275.
- 276. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 276 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent

the allegations in Paragraph 276 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 276, and on that basis denies those allegations.

SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the Florida Deceptive and Unfair Trade Practices Act FLA. STAT. § 501.201, et seq. ("FDUTPA")

- 277. Responding to paragraph 277 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 278. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 278 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 278 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: admits that Plaintiff Lee has brought a claim on behalf of himself and the Florida Subclass as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.
- 279. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 279 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 279 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 279 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 279.
- 280. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 280 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 280 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 280 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 280.
- 281. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in

Paragraph 281 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 281 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 281 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 281 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 281.

- 282. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 282 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 282 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple realleges and incorporates by reference paragraph 217–224 of this Answer as if fully set forth herein. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 282 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 282.
- 283. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 283 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 283 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 283 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 283.
- 284. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 284 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 284 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 284 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 284.
- 285. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in

Paragraph 285 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 285 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 285 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 285.

- 286. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 286 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 286 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple denies the allegations in paragraph 286 of the SAC.
- 287. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 287 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 287 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple denies that Plaintiff Lee has suffered any injury or is entitled to any relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 287.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the Illinois Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act 815 Ill. COMP. STAT. § 505/1, et seq. ("ICFA")

- 288. Responding to paragraph 288 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 289. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 289 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 289 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits that Plaintiff Hopkins has brought a claim on behalf of himself and the Illinois Subclass as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.
- 290. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in

Paragraph 290 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 290 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 290 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 290.

- 291. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 291 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 291 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 291 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 291.
- 292. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 292 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 292 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 292 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 292.
- 293. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 293 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 293 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 293 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 293 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 293.
- 294. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 294 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent

the allegations in Paragraph 294 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple realleges and incorporates by reference paragraph 217–224 of this Answer as if fully set forth herein. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 294 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 294.

- 295. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 295 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 295 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 295 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 295.
- 296. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 296 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 296 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 296 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 296.
- 297. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 297 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 297 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 297 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 297.
- 298. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 298 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 298 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 298 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 298.

299. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 299 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 299 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits Plaintiff Hopkins seeks monetary relief as well as attorneys' fees. Apple denies that Plaintiff Hopkins has suffered any injury or is entitled to any relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 299.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Violations of the New Jersey Consumer Fraud Act N.J. STAT. ANN. § 56:8-1, et seq. ("NJCFA")

- 300. Responding to paragraph 300 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.
- 301. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 301 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 301 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits that Plaintiff Ferguson has brought a claim on behalf of himself and the New Jersey Subclass as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.
- 302. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 302 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 302 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 302 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 302.
- 303. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 303 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 303 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as

follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 303 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 303.

304. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 304 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 304 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 304 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 304.

305. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 305 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 305 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 305 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 305.

306. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 306 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 306 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 306 references or purports to summarize, interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 306 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 306.

307. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 307 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 307 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as

follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 307 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 307.

- 308. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 308 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 308 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 308 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 308.
- 309. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 309 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 309 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 309 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 309.
- 310. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 310 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 310 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 310 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 310.
- 311. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 311 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 311 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits Plaintiff Ferguson seeks monetary relief as well as attorneys' fees. Apple denies that Plaintiff Ferguson has suffered any injury or is entitled to any relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 311.

NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

2 3

Violations of New York General Business Law § 349 N.Y. GEN. BUS. LAW § 349

4

5

Responding to paragraph 312 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by 312.

6

7 8

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

22

21

23 24

25

26

27

28

reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.

- 313. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 313 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 313 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits that Plaintiff Eakin has brought a claim on behalf of himself and the New York Subclass as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.
- The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 314 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 314 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 314 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 314.
- The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 315 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 315 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 315 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 315.
- 316. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 316 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 316 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 316 references or purports to summarize,

16

17

20

22

23

26

27

28

interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies any characterization of the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 316 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 316.

- The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an 317. injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 317 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 317 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 317 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 317.
- 318. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 318 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 318 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 318 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 318.
- 319. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 319 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 319 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 319 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 319.
- 320. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 320 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 320 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 320 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 320.

- 321. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 321 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 321 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 321 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 321.
- 322. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 322 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 322 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 322 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 322.
- 323. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 323 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 323 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 323 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 323.
- 324. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 324 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 324 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple admits Plaintiff Eakin seeks monetary relief as well as attorneys' fees. Apple denies that Plaintiff Eakin has suffered any injury or is entitled to any relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 324.

TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

2

Violations of the Michigan Consumer Protection Act MICH. COMP. LAWS § 445.901, et seq. ("MCPA")

The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an

The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an

4 5

326.

328.

329.

325. Responding to paragraph 325 of the SAC, Apple realleges and incorporates by reference each and every preceding paragraph of this Answer as if fully set forth herein.

67

injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 326 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent

Michigan Subclass as stated. Apple denies that class treatment is appropriate.

9

8

follows: Apple admits that Plaintiff Gulker has brought a claim on behalf of himself and the

the allegations in Paragraph 326 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as

11

327. Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 327 state conclusions of law,

13

12

no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 327.

1415

injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 328 and its subparts relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required.

1617

To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 328 and its subparts relate to claims that have not been

18

dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that to the extent paragraph 328 references or

19

purports to summarize, interpret, or quote a statute, the statute speaks for itself, and Apple denies

20

any characterization of the statute that is inconsistent with its content. Apple further states that

21

insofar as allegations in paragraph 328 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required.

22

Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 328.

2324

injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in

25

Paragraph 329 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent

The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an

26

the allegations in Paragraph 329 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as

27

follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 329 state conclusions of law, no

28

response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 329.

- 330. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 330 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 330 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 330 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 330.
- 331. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 331 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 331 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: Apple states that insofar as allegations in paragraph 331 state conclusions of law, no response thereto is required. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 331.
- 332. The Court dismissed with prejudice Plaintiffs' claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 332 relate to claims that have been dismissed, no response is required. To the extent the allegations in Paragraph 332 relate to claims that have not been dismissed, Apple responds as follows: admits Plaintiff Gulker seeks monetary relief and attorneys' fees. Apple denies that Plaintiff Gulker has suffered any injury or is entitled to any relief in this action. Apple denies the remaining allegations in paragraph 332.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The Court dismissed the following claims with prejudice: Plaintiffs' UCL claim in its entirety and remaining claims to the extent they seek an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief (ECF 248). Accordingly, Plaintiffs are not entitled to an injunction, restitution, or other equitable relief. Apple denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the requested relief, including the relief requested in paragraphs A through F under the section entitled "Prayer for Relief."

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

As to affirmative defenses to the SAC, Apple does not, by stating the matters set forth in these defenses, allege or admit that it has the burden of proof or persuasion with respect to any of

1	these matters, and does not assume the burden of proof or persuasion on any matters as to which	
2	Plaintiffs have the burden of proof or persuasion. The following affirmative defenses are based	
3	on Apple's knowledge, information, and belief at this time, and Apple specifically reserves the	
4	right to modify, amend, or supplement any affirmative defense contained in this Answer. Apple	
5	reserves the right to assert other defenses as information is gathered through discovery and	
6	investigation.	
7	FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
8	(Lack of Standing)	
9	The claims of Plaintiffs and the claims of the purported class are barred, in whole or in	
0	part, because they lack of standing to assert any or all of the causes of action alleged in the SAC,	
1	including pursuant to standing requirements under specific state statutes.	
2	SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
3	(Waiver, Acquiescence, Estoppel)	
4	The SAC, and each of its purported causes of action, is barred, in whole or in part, by the	
5	doctrines of waiver, acquiescence, or estoppel.	
6	THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
7	(Failure to Mitigate)	
8	Plaintiffs and the purported class have failed to mitigate damages, if any, including by	
9	failing to take advantage of Apple's Keyboard Service Program.	
20	FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
21	(Misuse)	
22	The claims of Plaintiffs and the claims of the purported class are barred by the doctrine of	
23	misuse to the extent they misused or abused their MacBook, MacBook Pro, or MacBook Air.	
24	FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE	
25	(Economic Loss Doctrine)	
26	The claims of Plaintiffs and the claims of the purported class are barred, in whole or in	
27	part, by the Economic Loss Doctrine.	
28		

1 SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Offset) 2 Any claims for damages or other monetary recovery by Plaintiffs or the purported class 3 4 must be offset and reduced by the value received. 5 SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Adequate Remedy) 6 Plaintiffs and the purported class have an adequate remedy at law for the claimed damages 7 (if any) and cannot seek equitable restitution, injunctive relief or other equitable relief. 8 9 EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Statute of Limitations) 10 The class definition includes putative class members whose claims are time-barred under 11 the applicable statutes of limitations. 12 13 NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Contractual Defenses) 14 The claims of Plaintiffs and the claims of the purported class are barred, in whole or in 15 part, by the terms of Apple's express warranty. Further, the claims of the purported New Jersey 16 subclass are barred to the extent that they occurred after the expiration of Apple's express 17 warranty. 18 19 TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (California Civil Code Section 1784) 20 Plaintiffs' claims, and those of the purported class, are barred, in whole or in part, 21 because, although Apple denies each and every claim of Plaintiffs and the purported class and 22 denies that it engaged in any wrongdoing or error of any kind, if any occurred, it was not 23 intentional and occurred notwithstanding Apple's use of reasonable preventative procedures and 24 Apple has made an appropriate correction, repair, replacement or other remedy. 25 26 ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE (Reasonableness) 27 The claims of Plaintiffs and the claims of the purported class are barred because Apple's 28 63

1	conduct was reasonable, including under the reasonableness standards pursuant to Washington		
2	Consumer Protection Act. (Wash. Rev. Code § 19.86.920.)		
3		DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	
4	App	le hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues upon which trial by jury may be had.	
5		PRAYER FOR RELIEF	
6	WH	EREFORE, Apple prays for the following relief:	
7	1.	That judgment on the SAC, and on each cause of action herein, be entered in favor	
8	of Apple;		
9	2.	That this Court finds that this suit cannot be maintained as a class action;	
10	3.	That this Court denies Plaintiffs or the members of the purported Class and	
11	Subclasses	relief of any kind;	
12	4.	That the request for equitable relief be denied;	
13	5.	That Apple be awarded its costs incurred, including reasonable attorneys' fees; and	
14	6.	For such other or further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.	
15			
16	Dated: Jun	ne 2, 2021 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP	
17		Λ_{I} , Λ_{i}	
18		By: Claudia M. Vetesi	
19		Attorneys for Defendant Apple Inc.	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		$\mathcal{C}\Lambda$	