

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-03010-APM

HON. AMIT P. MEHTA

STATE OF COLORADO, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

GOOGLE LLC,

Defendant.

Case No. 1:20-cv-03715-APM

HON. AMIT P. MEHTA

**PLAINTIFFS' PROPOSED REMEDY FRAMEWORK**

## I. Introduction

Google’s anticompetitive conduct resulted in interlocking and pernicious harms that present unprecedented complexities in a highly evolving set of markets. These markets are indispensable to the lives of all Americans, whether as individuals or as business owners, and the importance of effectively unfettering these markets and restoring competition cannot be overstated. Plaintiffs intend to use the Court-ordered schedule to conduct vital discovery and a thoughtful evaluation of facts adduced from that discovery in addition to the significant evidentiary record that already exists. This careful, methodical approach is calibrated to ensure that the specific remedies Plaintiffs ultimately include within a Proposed Final Judgment meaningfully address and remedy Google’s violations of the antitrust laws in these vital markets.

\* \* \*

On August 5, 2024, the Court found Google liable under Section 2 of the Sherman Act for maintaining monopolies in U.S. general search services and U.S. general search text advertising. *United States v. Google LLC*, 20-cv-3010 (APM), ECF No. 1032, at 276 (“Mem. Op.”). Specifically, the Court found two violations of Section 2 as a result of Google’s illegal maintenance of monopolies in those two separate markets. Plaintiffs have a duty to seek—and the Court has the authority to impose—an order that not only addresses the harms that already exist as a result of Google’s illegal conduct, but also prevents and restrains recurrence of the same offense of illegal monopoly maintenance going forward. *See Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Rsch., Inc.*, 395 U.S. 100, 133 (1969) (“[W]hen one has been found to have committed acts in violation of a law he may be restrained from committing other related unlawful acts.” (quoting *N.L.R.B. v. Express Pub. Co.*, 312 U.S. 426, 436 (1941))); *see also* 15 U.S.C. § 4 (statutory authority to “prevent and restrain violations”).

Indeed, the Court has broad power to fashion a remedy that “prevent[s] future violations and eradicate[s] existing evils.” *United States v. Microsoft Corp.*, 253 F.3d 34, 101 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (quoting *United States v. Ward Baking Co.*, 376 U.S. 327, 330–31 (1964)). Any remedy requires a “comprehensive” “unitary framework” to restore competition and prevent future monopolization with provisions “intended to complement and reinforce each other.” *See New York v. Microsoft Corp.*, 531 F. Supp. 2d 141, 170 (D.D.C. 2008).

In its Memorandum Opinion, the Court cited a rich factual record that reflected the following market conditions, among others: (1) Google’s illegal maintenance of monopolies in these two markets has been sustained and reinforced for over ten years; (2) Google’s illegal conduct generated a significant scale gap in both markets—a gap that unlawfully enriches Google while simultaneously exacerbating the decade-long deprivation of scale to rival innovators; and (3) network effects and significant barriers to entry exist such that for a new entrant to meaningfully enter in these markets (and do so at the scale necessary), it must be able to do so at multiple levels (e.g., an index of the web, a distribution network, user data, integrated artificial intelligence, an advertiser network). *See In re Google Play Store Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 20-cv-05671-JD (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2024), ECF No. 701, at 11 (explaining how a remedy for Google’s anticompetitive conduct needed to “bridge the moat” created by network effects and other entry barriers in the market). These conditions, among the other market realities identified by the Court, necessarily inform the contours and details of an effective remedy. The interlocking, mutually reinforcing nature of these conditions also underscores the importance of developing solutions that accomplish the goals of antitrust remedies.

Under the law, once Google has been found to violate—here, twice—Section 2 for the offense of illegal monopoly maintenance, a remedy for those offenses should (1) unfetter these

markets from Google’s exclusionary conduct, (2) remove barriers to competition, (3) deny Google the fruits of its statutory violations, and (4) prevent Google from monopolizing these markets and related markets in the future. *See Microsoft*, 253 F.3d at 103. This remedy should address as well as prevent and restrain *the offense* of illegal monopoly maintenance in the relevant markets, and the scope of the remedy need not be limited to the specific means or methods of how Google achieved that illegal monopoly maintenance. *See Ford Motor Co. v. United States*, 405 U.S. 562, 573 n.8 (1972) (“[R]elief . . . is not limited to the restoration of the status quo ante. There is no power to turn back the clock. Rather, the relief must be directed to that which is ‘necessary and appropriate in the public interest to eliminate the effects . . . ,’ or which will ‘cure the ill effects of the illegal conduct, and assure the public freedom from its continuance.’” (quoting *United States v. E. I. Du Pont De Nemours & Co.*, 353 U.S. 586, 607 (1957) and *N. Sec. Co. v. United States*, 193 U.S. 197, 357 (1950))).

In order to address Google’s offenses, the remedies here should account for alternative and future forms of monopoly maintenance in the affected markets and reasonably related markets in addition to the specific conduct to date. *Nat’l Soc. of Pro. Engineers v. United States*, 435 U.S. 679, 698 (1978) (“[I]t is not necessary that all of the untraveled roads to [a similar] end be left open and that only the worn one be closed.” (quoting *Int’l Salt Co. v. United States*, 332 U.S. 392, 400 (1947) (abrogated on other grounds by *Ill. Tool Works Inc. v. Indep. Ink, Inc.*, 547 U.S. 28 (2006))); *Int’l Boxing Club of N.Y., Inc. v. United States*, 358 U.S. 242, 262 (1959) (noting that “sometimes ‘relief, to be effective, must go beyond the narrow limits of the proven violation.’” (quoting *United States v. U.S. Gypsum Co.*, 340 U.S. 76 at 90 (1950))).

Further complicating matters, artificial intelligence—while not a substitute for general search—will likely become an important feature of the evolving search industry. It is, therefore,

critical that any remedy carefully consider both past, present, and emerging market realities to ensure that robust competition, not Google's past monopolization, will govern the evolution of general search and text advertising. To attain these goals, remedies and laws related to similar conduct in other jurisdictions must also be considered to determine what measures this Court should impose to prevent Google from maintaining its monopolies in the future through conduct that evades or circumvents the Court's final remedy order.

## **II. Remedies Proposal Framework**

With the governing legal framework and complex market dynamics in mind, and consistent with the Court's September 18 Order, Plaintiffs are currently considering remedies to address four categories of harms related to Google's (1) search distribution and revenue sharing, (2) generation and display of search results, (3) advertising scale and monetization, and (4) accumulation and use of data. For each area, the remedies necessary to prevent and restrain monopoly maintenance could include contract requirements and prohibitions; non-discrimination product requirements; data and interoperability requirements; and structural requirements.

As noted above, Plaintiffs have commenced discovery to ensure that its Proposed Final Judgment—including any specific remedies sought—appropriately and meaningfully addresses the harms resulting from Google's unlawful conduct in the context of current market realities. Plaintiffs will continue to engage with interested parties—in conjunction with available formal discovery tools and expert analysis—to learn not just about the relevant markets themselves but also about adjacent markets as well as remedies from other jurisdictions that could affect or inform the optimal remedies in this action. *E.g.*, *In re Google Play Store Antitrust Litig.*, Case No. 20-cv-05671-JD (N.D. Cal. Oct. 7, 2024), ECF No. 702 (enjoining Google for Play Store practices that violated various antitrust laws, including Section 2).

Plaintiffs have described the forms of remedies under consideration in good faith but this description, of course, reflects the state of the record at this phase of the remedy proceedings. As discovery proceeds, Plaintiffs reserve the right to add or remove potential proposed remedies identified in this high-level framework. Considering governing precedent aimed at providing a comprehensive and unitary framework, Plaintiffs anticipate that its Proposed Final Judgment will include a number of mutually reinforcing remedies from most, if not all, of the categories under consideration, with an aim of making the remedy effective and administrable. Plaintiffs provide these categories to illustrate the different bottlenecks that Google presently controls that must be freed from the continuing effects of anticompetitive conduct, and where Google must be barred from new actions creating new obstacles to competition in general search services and general search text ads.

**A. Search Distribution And Revenue Sharing**

The starting point for addressing Google's unlawful conduct is undoing its effects on search distribution. *See* Mem. Op. at 3 (“[M]ost devices in the United States come preloaded exclusively with Google. These distribution deals have forced Google’s rivals to find other ways to reach users.”). For more than a decade, Google has controlled the most popular distribution channels, leaving rivals with little-to-no incentive to compete for users. *Id.* at 25, 226, 236–42. Similarly, rivals cannot compete for these distribution channels because Google’s monopoly-funded revenue share payments disincentivize its partners from diverting queries to Google’s rivals. *Id.* at 233. Fully remedying these harms requires not only ending Google’s control of distribution today, but also ensuring Google cannot control the distribution of tomorrow.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs are considering remedies that would limit or end Google’s use of contracts, monopoly profits, and other tools to control or influence longstanding and emerging distribution channels and search-related products (e.g., browsers, search apps, artificial

intelligence summaries and agents). For example, Plaintiffs are evaluating remedies that would, among other things, limit or prohibit default agreements, preinstallation agreements, and other revenue-sharing arrangements related to search and search-related products, potentially with or without the use of a choice screen.

Similarly, Plaintiffs are considering behavioral and structural remedies that would prevent Google from using products such as Chrome, Play, and Android to advantage Google search and Google search-related products and features—including emerging search access points and features, such as artificial intelligence—over rivals or new entrants. Such consideration is faithful to the Court’s findings. As the Court recognized, Google’s longstanding control of the Chrome browser, with its preinstalled Google search default, “significantly narrows the available channels of distribution and thus disincentivizes the emergence of new competition.” Mem. Op. at 159. “[T]he Google Play Store is a must-have on all Android devices,” *id.* at 210; and the Android Agreements are, of course, a critical tool for Google’s anticompetitive limitations on distribution.

Lastly, Plaintiffs seek to explore remedies that will address the practices and impacts related to user behavior consistent with the evidence adduced at trial. *See, e.g.*, Mem. Op. at 24–28 (“[T]he vast majority of individual searches, or queries, are carried out [by] habit.”). Plaintiff States are also considering remedies that would require Google to provide support for educational-awareness campaigns that would enhance the ability of users to choose the general search engine that suits them best.

#### **B. Accumulation And Use Of Data**

Virtually every component and process of a general search engine benefits from data. Mem. Op. at 226 (“Scale is the essential raw material for building, improving, and sustaining a GSE.”). Google’s unlawful behavior has enabled it to accumulate and use data at the expense of

rivals. *Id.* Accordingly, Plaintiffs are considering remedies that will offset this advantage and strengthen competition by requiring, among other things, Google to make available, in whole or through an API, (1) the indexes, data, feeds, and models used for Google search, including those used in AI-assisted search features, and (2) Google search results, features, and ads, including the underlying ranking signals, especially on mobile. Plaintiffs are mindful of potential user privacy concerns in the context of data sharing; however, genuine privacy concerns must be distinguished from pretextual arguments to maintain market position or deny scale to rivals. As a result, Plaintiffs are considering remedies that would prohibit Google from using or retaining data that cannot be effectively shared with others on the basis of privacy concerns. Plaintiffs are also considering other remedies that would reduce the cost and complexity of indexing or retaining data for rival general search engines.

### **C. Generation And Display Of Search Results**

The harms of Google’s conduct also extend to the generation and display of new and developing features of general search, such as generative artificial intelligence (including on-device artificial-intelligence functionality) and retrieval-augmented-generation-based tools.<sup>1</sup> These results and features often rely on websites and other content created by third parties, who have little-to-no bargaining power against Google’s monopoly and who cannot risk retaliation or exclusion from Google. Google’s ability to leverage its monopoly power to feed artificial intelligence features is an emerging barrier to competition and risks further entrenching Google’s dominance. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are considering remedies that would, for example, prohibit

---

<sup>1</sup> Retrieval-augmented generation “is an AI framework that combines the strengths of traditional information retrieval systems (such as search and databases) with the capabilities of generative large language models.” *What is Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG)?*, Google, <https://cloud.google.com/use-cases/retrieval-augmented-generation> (last visited Oct. 8, 2024).



Google from using contracts or other practices to undermine rivals' access to web content and level the playing field by requiring Google to allow websites crawled for Google search to opt out of training or appearing in any Google-owned artificial-intelligence product or feature on Google search such as retrieval-augmented-generation-sourced summaries.

**D. Advertising Scale And Monetization**

Google's unlawful maintenance of its general search text advertising monopoly has undermined advertisers' choice of search providers as well as rivals' ability to monetize search advertising. Mem. Op. at 226, 264–65. This conduct has also enabled Google to profitably charge supracompetitive prices for text ads while degrading the quality of those ads and the related services and reporting. *Id.* at 259–64. Correcting these harms to advertisers is critical to spurring investment and opportunity. *Id.* at 23 (“As result of the extraordinary resources required to build, operate, and monetize a GSE, venture capitalists and other investors have stayed away from funding new search ventures.”).

Accordingly, Plaintiffs are considering remedies for general search text advertising that will create more competition and lower the barriers to entry, which currently require rivals to enter multiple markets at scale. These remedies may address Google's use of scale, including new advertising technologies such as artificial intelligence (e.g., Performance Max), in enhancing and protecting its general search text ad monopoly. Plaintiffs are also evaluating remedies that would involve licensing or syndication of Google's ad feed independent of its search results. Similarly, Plaintiffs are considering remedies that would allow Google search advertisers to receive transparent and detailed information (e.g., Search Query Reports and other information related to its search text ads auction and ad monetization) consistent with user privacy and to opt out of Google search features (e.g., keyword-expansion, broad match).

### **III. Administration, Anti-circumvention, and Anti-retaliation**

An effective remedy requires administration as well as protections against circumvention and retaliation, including through novel paths to preserving dominance in the monopolized markets. This is especially true in dynamic industries like the markets at issue here. Accordingly, Plaintiffs are considering additional remedies aimed to achieve these goals. These remedies could, among other things, require Google to (1) finance and report to a Court-appointed technical committee that helps administer the remedies in this action, including by monitoring any circumventive or retaliatory behavior; (2) designate a senior Google executive to be made regularly available to the Court to report on Google's compliance with the remedies in this action; (3) continue to retain relevant documents (including chat messages) and submit to inspection as requested by the Court, the technical committee, or the Plaintiffs; (4) train employees routinely on compliance with the remedies in this action; (5) prohibit Google from owning or otherwise holding a stake in the success of its search competitors; and (6) refrain from retaliating against a rival or anyone who cooperates with a rival or with the implementation, monitoring, or enforcement of the remedies in this action. In addition, should Google engage in willful or systemic violations of what is ultimately the final judgment, Plaintiffs are considering a range of provisions that would correct such non-compliance and promote the remedial objectives of the final judgment. Such provisions could include use of the full range of tools previously identified such as structural and additional behavioral remedies as well as term extensions. To be effective, these remedies, as well as others, must include some degree of flexibility because market developments are not always easy to predict and the mechanisms and incentives for circumvention are endless.

\* \* \*

Google's unlawful conduct persisted for over a decade and involved a number of self-reinforcing tactics. Unwinding that illegal behavior and achieving the goals of an effective antitrust remedy takes time, information (particularly given the informational asymmetries between Plaintiffs and Google), and careful consideration. Plaintiffs are working to investigate and evaluate the particulars of the remedies that will be necessary to resolve the serious competition issues that have plagued the relevant markets for more than a decade. In service of its obligations to the American people, Plaintiffs will continue to engage with market participants, conduct discovery, and ultimately, provide the Court with a further refined Proposed Final Judgment in November 2024 and then, in accordance with the Court's Order, a Revised Proposed Final Judgment in March 2025.

Dated: October 8, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Karl E. Herrmann

David E. Dahlquist

Adam T. Severt

Diana A. Aguilar Aldape

Travis R. Chapman

Meagan M. Glynn (D.C. Bar #1738267)

R. Cameron Gower

Karl E. Herrmann (D.C. Bar #1022464)

Ian D. Hoffman

Elizabeth S. Jensen

Ryan T. Karr

Claire M. Maddox (D.C. Bar #498356)

Michael G. McLellan (D.C. Bar #489217)

Veronica N. Onyema (D.C. Bar #979040)

Ryan S. Struve (D.C. Bar #495406)

Sara Trent

Jennifer A. Wamsley (D.C. Bar #486540)

Catharine S. Wright (D.C. Bar #1019454)

U.S. Department of Justice

Antitrust Division

Technology & Digital Platforms Section

450 Fifth Street NW, Suite 7100

Washington, DC 20530

Telephone: (202) 805-8563

David.Dahlquist@usdoj.gov

Adam.Severt@usdoj.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff*

*United States of America*

By: /s/ Christopher A. Knight  
Ashley Moody, Attorney General  
R. Scott Palmer, Special Counsel, Complex  
Enforcement Chief, Antitrust Division  
Lee Istrail, Assistant Attorney General  
Christopher A. Knight, Assistant Attorney  
General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Florida  
PL-01 The Capitol  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399  
Lee.Istrail@myfloridalegal.com  
Scott.Palmer@myfloridalegal.com  
Christopher.Knight@myfloridalegal.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Florida*

By: /s/ Diamante Smith  
Ken Paxton, Attorney General  
Brent Webster, First Assistant Attorney  
General  
Ralph Molina, Deputy First Assistant Attorney  
General  
James Lloyd, Chief, Antitrust Division  
Trevor Young, Deputy Chief, Antitrust  
Division  
Diamante Smith, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Texas  
300 West 15th Street  
Austin, Texas 78701  
Diamante.Smith@oag.texas.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Texas*

By: /s/ Carolyn D. Jeffries  
Rob Bonta, Attorney General  
Paula Blizzard, Senior Assistant Attorney  
General  
Michael Jorgenson, Supervising Deputy  
Attorney General  
Brian Wang, Deputy Attorney General  
Carolyn D. Jeffries, Deputy Attorney General  
(DC Bar No. 1600843)  
Office of the Attorney General  
California Department of Justice

455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
San Francisco, California 94102  
Cari.Jeffries@doj.ca.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of California*

By: /s/ Matthew M. Ford

Matthew M. Ford  
Arkansas Bar No. 2013180  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Arkansas Attorney General Tim  
Griffin  
323 Center Street, Suite 200  
Little Rock, AR 72201  
Matthew.Ford@arkansasag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Arkansas*

By: /s/ Charles Thimmesch

Christopher Carr, Attorney General  
Logan B. Winkles, Deputy Attorney General  
Ronald J. Stay, Jr., Senior Assistant Attorney  
General  
Charles Thimmesch, Senior Assistant Attorney  
General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of  
Georgia  
40 Capitol Square, SW  
Atlanta, Georgia 30334-1300  
cthimmesch@law.georgia.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Georgia*

By: /s/ Jesse Moore

Theodore Edward Rokita, Attorney General  
Scott L. Barnhart, Chief Counsel and Director,  
Consumer Protection Division  
Jesse Moore, Deputy Attorney General  
Christi Foust, Deputy Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of Indiana  
Indiana Government Center South, Fifth Floor  
302 West Washington Street  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204

Jesse.Moore@atg.in.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Indiana*

By: /s/ Philip R. Heleringer

Russell Coleman, Attorney General  
J. Christian Lewis, Commissioner of the Office  
of Consumer Protection  
Philip R. Heleringer, Executive Director of the  
Office of Consumer Protection  
Jonathan E. Farmer, Deputy Executive Director  
of the Office of Consumer Protection  
Office of the Attorney General,  
Commonwealth of Kentucky  
1024 Capital Center Drive, Suite 200  
Frankfort, Kentucky 40601  
Philip.Heleringer@ky.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Commonwealth of  
Kentucky*

By: /s/ Patrick Voelker

Liz Murrill, Attorney General  
Patrick Voelker, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of  
Louisiana  
Public Protection Division  
1885 North Third St.  
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802  
voelkerp@ag.louisiana.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Louisiana*

By: /s/ Scott Mertens

Dana Nessel, Attorney General  
Scott Mertens, Assistant Attorney General  
Michigan Department of Attorney General  
P.O. Box 30736  
Lansing, Michigan 48909  
MertensS@michigan.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Michigan*

By:     /s/ Michael Schwalbert    

Michael Schwalbert  
Missouri Bar No. 63229  
Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Section  
Missouri Attorney General's Office  
815 Olive Street | Suite 200  
Saint Louis, Missouri 63101  
michael.schwalbert@ago.mo.gov  
Phone: 314-340-7888  
Fax: 314-340-7981

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Missouri*

By:     /s/ Crystal Utley Secoy    

Lynn Fitch, Attorney General  
Crystal Utley Secoy, Assistant Attorney  
General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of  
Mississippi  
P.O. Box 220  
Jackson, Mississippi 39205  
Hart.Martin@ago.ms.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Mississippi*

By:     /s/ Anna Schneider    

Anna Schneider  
Bureau Chief  
Montana Office of Consumer Protection  
P.O. Box 200151  
Helena, MT. 59602-0150  
Phone: (406) 444-4500  
Fax: 406-442-1894  
Anna.schneider@mt.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Montana*

By:     /s/ Mary Frances Jowers    

Alan Wilson, Attorney General  
W. Jeffrey Young, Chief Deputy Attorney  
General



C. Havird Jones, Jr., Senior Assistant Deputy  
Attorney General  
Mary Frances Jowers, Assistant Deputy  
Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General, State of South  
Carolina  
1000 Assembly Street  
Rembert C. Dennis Building  
P.O. Box 11549  
Columbia, South Carolina 29211-1549  
mfjowers@scag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of South Carolina*

By:       /s/ Laura E. McFarlane        
Joshua L. Kaul, Attorney General  
Laura E. McFarlane, Assistant Attorney  
General  
Wisconsin Department of Justice  
17 W. Main St.  
Madison, Wisconsin 53701  
mcfarlanele@doj.state.wi.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Wisconsin*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF COLORADO

PHILIP WEISER  
Attorney General of Colorado

/s/ Jonathan B. Sallet

Jonathan B. Sallet, DC Bar No. 336198  
Steven M. Kaufmann, DC Bar No. 1022365  
(inactive)  
Elizabeth W. Hereford  
Conor J. May  
Colorado Office of the Attorney  
General  
1300 Broadway, 7th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Telephone: (720) 508-6000  
E-Mail: Jon.Sallet@coag.gov  
Steve.Kaufmann@coag.gov  
Elizabeth.Hereford@coag.gov  
Conor.May@coag.gov

William F. Cavanaugh, Jr.  
PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER  
LLP  
1133 Avenue of the Americas Suite 2200  
New York, NY 10036-6710  
Telephone: (212) 335-2793  
E-Mail: wfcavanaugh@pbwt.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Colorado*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEBRASKA

MIKE HILGERS  
Attorney General of Nebraska

Colin P. Snider, Assistant Attorney General  
Nebraska Department of Justice  
Office of the Attorney General  
2115 State Capitol  
Lincoln, NE 68509  
Telephone: (402) 471-3840  
E-Mail: Colin.Snider@nebraska.gov

William F. Cavanaugh, Jr.  
PATTERSON BELKNAP WEBB & TYLER  
LLP  
1133 Avenue of the Americas Suite 2200  
New York, NY 10036-6710  
Telephone: (212) 335-2793  
E-Mail: wfcavanaugh@pbwt.com

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Nebraska*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ARIZONA

KRISTIN K. MAYES  
Attorney General of Arizona

Robert A. Bernheim, Unit Chief Counsel  
Jayme Weber, Senior Litigation Counsel  
Arizona Office of the Attorney General  
400 West Congress, Ste. S-215  
Tucson, Arizona 85701  
Telephone: (520) 628-6507  
E-Mail: Robert.bernheim@azag.gov  
Jayme.Weber@azag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Arizona*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF IOWA

BRENNA BIRD  
Attorney General of Iowa

Noah Goerlitz, Assistant Attorney General  
Office of the Attorney General of Iowa  
1305 E. Walnut St., 2nd Floor  
Des Moines, IA 50319  
Telephone: (515) 725-1018  
E-Mail: Noah.goerlitz@ag.iowa.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Iowa*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEW YORK

LETITIA JAMES  
Attorney General of New York

Elinor R. Hoffmann  
Morgan J. Feder  
Michael D. Schwartz  
Office of the Attorney General of New York  
28 Liberty Street  
New York, NY 10005  
Telephone: (212) 416-8513  
E-Mail: Elinor.hoffmann@ag.ny.gov  
Morgan.feder@ag.ny.gov  
Michael.schwartz@ag.ny.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of New York*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NORTH  
CAROLINA

JOSHUA STEIN  
Attorney General of North Carolina

Kunal Janak Choksi  
Joshua Daniel Abram  
Jessica Vance Sutton  
North Carolina Department of Justice  
114 W. Edenton St.  
Raleigh, NC 27603  
Telephone: (919) 716-6000  
E-Mail: kchoksi@ncdoj.gov  
jabram@ncdoj.gov  
jsutton2@ncdoj.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of North Carolina*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF TENNESSEE

JONATHAN SKRMETTI  
Attorney General of Tennessee

J. David McDowell

Christopher Dunbar  
Austin Ostiguy  
Tyler Corcoran  
Office of the Attorney General and Reporter  
P.O. Box 20207  
Nashville, TN 37202  
Telephone: (615) 741-8722  
E-Mail: David.McDowell@ag.tn.gov  
Chris.Dunbar@ag.tn.gov  
austin.ostiguy@ag.tn.gov  
Tyler.Corcoran@ag.tn.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Tennessee*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF UTAH

SEAN REYES  
Attorney General of Utah

Matthew Michaloski  
Marie W. L. Martin  
Utah Office of Attorney General  
160 E 300 S, 5th Floor  
P.O. Box 142320  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114  
Telephone: (801) 440-9825  
E-Mail: mmichaloski@agutah.gov  
mwmartin@agutah.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Utah*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ALASKA

TREGARRICK TAYLOR  
Attorney General of Alaska

Jeff Pickett  
State of Alaska, Department of Law  
Office of the Attorney General  
1031 W. Fourth Avenue, Suite 200  
Anchorage, Alaska 99501  
Telephone: (907) 269-5100  
E-Mail: Jeff.pickett@alaska.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Alaska*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF CONNECTICUT

WILLIAM TONG  
Attorney General of Connecticut

Nicole Demers  
Office of the Attorney General of  
Connecticut  
165 Capitol Avenue, Suite 5000  
Hartford, CT 06106  
Telephone: (860) 808-5202  
E-Mail: Nicole.demers@ct.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Connecticut*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF DELAWARE

KATHLEEN JENNINGS  
Attorney General of Delaware

Michael Andrew Undorf  
Delaware Department of Justice  
Fraud and Consumer Protection Division  
820 N. French St., 5th Floor  
Wilmington, DE 19801  
Telephone: (302) 577-8924  
E-Mail: Michael.undorf@delaware.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Delaware*

FOR PLAINTIFF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BRIAN SCHWALB  
Attorney General of the District of Columbia

Elizabeth Gentry Arthur  
Office of the Attorney General for the District of  
Columbia  
400 6th Street NW

Washington, DC 20001  
Telephone: (202) 724-6514  
E-Mail: Elizabeth.arthur@dc.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff District of Columbia*

FOR PLAINTIFF TERRITORY OF GUAM

DOUGLAS MOYLAN  
Attorney General of Guam

Fred Nishihira  
Office of the Attorney General of Guam  
590 S. Marine Corps Drive, Suite 901  
Tamuning, Guam 96913  
Telephone: (671) 475-3324

*Counsel for Plaintiff Territory Guam*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF HAWAI'I

ANNE E. LOPEZ  
Attorney General of Hawai'i

Rodney I. Kimura  
Department of the Attorney General, State of  
Hawai'i Commerce & Economic Development  
425 Queen Street  
Honolulu, HI 96813  
Telephone (808) 586-1180  
E-Mail: Rodney.i.kimura@hawaii.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Hawai'i*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF IDAHO

RAÚL LABRADOR  
Attorney General of Idaho

John K. Olson  
Office of the Idaho Attorney General  
Consumer Protection Division  
954 W. State St., 2nd Floor  
P.O. Box 83720

Boise, ID 83720  
Telephone: (208) 334-4114  
E-Mail: John.olson@ag.idaho.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Idaho*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF ILLINOIS

KWAME RAOUL  
Attorney General of Illinois

Elizabeth Maxeiner  
Brian Yost  
Jennifer Coronel  
Office of the Attorney General of Illinois  
100 W. Randolph St.  
Chicago, IL 60601  
Telephone: (773) 590-7935  
E-Mail: Elizabeth.maxeiner@ilag.gov  
Brian.yost@ilag.gov  
Jennifer.coronel@ilag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Illinois*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF KANSAS

KRIS W. KOBACH  
Attorney General of Kansas

Lynette R. Bakker  
Kansas Office of the Attorney General  
120 S.W. 10th Avenue, 2nd Floor  
Topeka, KS 66612  
Telephone: (785) 296-3751  
E-Mail: Lynette.bakker@ag.ks.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Kansas*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MAINE

AARON M. FREY  
Attorney General of Maine



Christina M. Moylan  
Office of the Attorney General of Maine  
6 State House Station  
August, ME 04333  
Telephone: (207) 626-8800  
E-Mail: Christina.moylan@maine.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Maine*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MARYLAND

ANTHONY G. BROWN  
Attorney General of Maryland

Schonette J. Walker  
Gary Honick  
Office of the Attorney General of Maryland  
200 St. Paul Place, 19th Floor  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
Telephone: (410) 576-6480  
E-Mail: swalker@oag.state.md.us  
ghonick@oag.state.md.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Maryland*

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF  
MASSACHUSETTS

ANDREA CAMPBELL  
Attorney General of Massachusetts  
William T. Matlack  
Michael B. MacKenzie  
Office of the Attorney General of Massachusetts  
One Ashburton Place, 18th Floor  
Boston, MA 02108  
Telephone: (617) 727-2200  
E-Mail: William.matlack@mass.gov  
Michael.Mackenzie@mass.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Massachusetts*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF MINNESOTA

KEITH ELLISON  
Attorney General of Minnesota

Zachary William Biesanz  
Office of the Minnesota Attorney General  
Consumer, Wage, and Antitrust Division  
445 Minnesota Street, Suite 1400  
St. Paul, MN 55101  
Telephone: (651) 757-1257  
E-Mail: Zach.biesanz@ag.state.mn.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Minnesota*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEVADA

AARON D. FORD  
Attorney General of Nevada

Michelle C. Badorine  
Lucas J. Tucker  
Nevada Office of the Attorney General  
100 N. Carson Street  
Carson City, NV 89701  
Telephone: (775) 684-1164  
E-Mail: mnewman@ag.nv.gov  
ltucker@ag.nv.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Nevada*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEW  
HAMPSHIRE

JOHN FORMELLA  
Attorney General of New Hampshire

Brandon Garod  
Office of Attorney General of New  
Hampshire  
33 Capitol Street

Concord, NH 03301  
Telephone: (603) 271-1217  
E-Mail: Brandon.h.garod@doj.nh.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of New Hampshire*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEW JERSEY

MATTHEW PLATKIN  
Attorney General of New Jersey

Isabella R. Pitt  
Deputy Attorney General  
New Jersey Attorney General's Office  
124 Halsey Street, 5th Floor  
Newark, NJ 07102  
Telephone: (973) 648-7819  
E-Mail: Isabella.Pitt@law.njoag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of New Jersey*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NEW  
MEXICO

RAÚL TORREZ  
Attorney General of New Mexico

Judith E. Paquin Cholla Khoury  
Assistant Attorney General  
New Mexico Office of the Attorney General  
408 Galisteo St.  
Santa Fe, NM 87504  
Telephone: (505) 490-4885  
E-Mail: jpaquin@nmag.gov  
ckhoury@nmag.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of New Mexico*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF NORTH  
DAKOTA

DREW WRIGLEY  
Attorney General of North Dakota

Elin S. Alm  
Assistant Attorney General  
Consumer Protection and Antitrust Division  
Office of the Attorney General of North Dakota  
1720 Burlington Drive, Suite C  
Bismarck, ND 58504  
Telephone: (701) 328-5570  
E-Mail: ealm@nd.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of North Dakota*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF OHIO

DAVID YOST  
Attorney General of Ohio

Jennifer Pratt  
Beth Ann Finnerty  
Mark Kittel  
Office of the Attorney General of Ohio  
30 E Broad Street, 26<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Columbus, OH 43215  
Telephone: (614) 466-4328  
E-Mail:  
Jennifer.pratt@ohioattorneygeneral.gov  
Beth.finnerty@ohioattorneygeneral.gov  
Mark.kittel@ohioattorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Ohio*

FOR THE PLAINTIFF STATE OF  
OKLAHOMA

GENTNER DRUMMOND  
Attorney General of Oklahoma

Caleb J. Smith  
Office of the Oklahoma Attorney General  
313 NE 21st Street  
Oklahoma City, OK 73105  
Telephone: (405) 522-1014  
E-Mail: Caleb.Smith@oag.ok.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Oklahoma*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF OREGON  
ELLEN ROSENBLUM  
Attorney General of Oregon

Cheryl Hiemstra  
Oregon Department of Justice  
1162 Court St. NE  
Salem, OR 97301  
Telephone: (503) 934-4400  
E-Mail: Cheryl.hiemstra@doj.state.or.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Oregon*

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA

MICHELLE HENRY  
Attorney General of Pennsylvania

Tracy W. Wertz  
Joseph S. Betsko  
Pennsylvania Office of Attorney General  
Strawberry Square  
Harrisburg, PA 17120  
Telephone: (717) 787-4530  
E-Mail: jbetsko@attorneygeneral.gov  
twertz@attorneygeneral.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Commonwealth of  
Pennsylvania*

FOR PLAINTIFF TERRITORY OF PUERTO  
RICO

DOMINGO EMANUELLI HERNANDEZ  
Attorney General of Puerto Rico

Guarionex Diaz Martinez

Assistant Attorney General Antitrust Division  
Puerto Rico Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 9020192  
San Juan, Puerto Rico 00902  
Telephone: (787) 721-2900, Ext. 1201  
E-Mail: gdiaz@justicia.pr.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff Territory Puerto Rico*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

PETER NERONHA  
Attorney General of Rhode Island

Stephen Provazza  
Rhode Island Office of the Attorney General  
150 South Main Street  
Providence, RI 02903  
Telephone: (401) 274-4400  
E-Mail: SProvazza@riag.ri.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Rhode Island*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

MARTIN J. JACKLEY  
Attorney General of South Dakota

Yvette K. Lafrentz  
Office of the Attorney General of South Dakota  
1302 E. Hwy 14, Suite 1  
Pierre, SD 57501  
Telephone: (605) 773-3215  
E-Mail: Yvette.lafrentz@state.sd.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of South Dakota*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF VERMONT

CHARITY R. CLARK  
Attorney General of Vermont

Christopher J. Curtis, Assistant Attorney  
General  
Office of the Attorney General of Vermont  
109 State St.  
Montpelier, VT 05609  
Telephone: (802) 828-3170  
E-Mail: christopher.curtis@vermont.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Vermont*

FOR PLAINTIFF COMMONWEALTH OF  
VIRGINIA

JASON S. MIYARES  
Attorney General of Virginia

Tyler T. Henry  
Office of the Attorney General of Virginia  
202 N. 9th Street  
Richmond, VA 23219  
Telephone: (804) 692-0485  
E-Mail: thenry@oag.state.va.us

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Virginia*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROBERT FERGUSON  
Attorney General of Washington

Amy Hanson  
Washington State Attorney General  
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104  
Telephone: (206) 464-5419  
E-Mail: Amy.hanson@atg.wa.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Washington*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

PATRICK MORRISEY  
Attorney General of West Virginia

Douglas Lee Davis  
Office of the Attorney General, State of  
West Virginia  
1900 Kanawha Boulevard  
East Building 6, Suite 401  
P.O. Box 1789  
Charleston, WV 25305  
Telephone: (304) 558-8986  
E-Mail: Douglas.l.davis@wvago.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of West Virginia*

FOR PLAINTIFF STATE OF WYOMING

BRIDGET HILL  
Attorney General of Wyoming

Amy Pauli  
Wyoming Attorney General's Office  
2320 Capitol Avenue  
Kendrick Building Cheyenne, WY 82002  
Telephone: (307) 777-6397  
E-Mail: amy.pauli@wyo.gov

*Counsel for Plaintiff State of Wyoming*