

ORIGINAL

Filed

NOV 16 2012

RICHARD W. WIEKING  
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE

ADR

*[Handwritten initials]*

E-filing

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California  
2 MARK J. BRECKLER  
Chief Assistant Attorney General  
3 KATHLEEN E. FOOTE  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
4 NICOLE S. GORDON  
Deputy Attorney General  
State Bar No. 224138  
5 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004  
6 Telephone: (415) 703-5702  
7 Fax: (415) 703-5843  
E-mail: Nicole.Gordon@doj.ca.gov  
8 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
10 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

12 CV 12-5874 PSG

13 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,  
14 Plaintiff,  
15 v.  
16 EBAY, INC.,  
17 Defendant.  
18

19 COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF  
THE SHERMAN ACT, CARTWRIGHT  
ACT, AND UNFAIR COMPETITION  
LAW FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND  
CIVIL PENALTIES

20 COMES NOW, Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General for the State of California, and alleges  
21 the following:

22 INTRODUCTION

23 1. Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General, State of California, brings this action in her  
24 official capacity as the chief law enforcement officer of the State of California against eBay, Inc.  
25 ("eBay") for entering into a no-solicitation and no-hiring agreement in violation of Section 1 of  
26 the Sherman Act, the Cartwright Act, and the California Unfair Competition Law. Pursuant to  
27 the agreement, eBay and Coconspirator Intuit, Inc. ("Intuit") agreed not to recruit each other's  
28

1 employees and eBay agreed not to hire any Intuit employees, even those that approached eBay for  
2 a job. This agreement harmed employees by lowering the salaries and benefits they might  
3 otherwise have commanded, and deprived these employees of better job opportunities at the other  
4 company.

5 2. Senior executives at eBay and Intuit entered into an evolving “handshake” agreement  
6 to restrict their ability to recruit and hire employees of the other company. The agreement, which  
7 was entered into no later than 2006, prohibited either company from soliciting one another’s  
8 employees for employment opportunities, and for over a year prevented at least eBay from hiring  
9 any employees from Intuit at all. The agreement was enforced at the highest levels of each  
10 company.

11 3. The agreement reduced eBay’s and Intuit’s incentives and ability to compete for  
12 employees and restricted employees’ mobility. This agreement thus harmed employees and the  
13 public by lowering the salaries and benefits they otherwise would have commanded, and deprived  
14 these employees of better job opportunities at the other company.

15 4. This agreement between eBay and Intuit is a naked restraint of trade that is *per se*  
16 unlawful under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. It also violates the Cartwright Act  
17 and California’s Unfair Competition Law. The State of California seeks an order prohibiting any  
18 such agreement and other relief.

#### 19 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

20 5. This complaint alleges violations of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1. It is filed under,  
21 and jurisdiction is conferred upon this Court by, Sections 4, 4C, 12, and 16 of the Clayton Act, 15  
22 U.S.C. §§ 15, 15c, 22, and 26. The Plaintiff also alleges violations of State antitrust, consumer  
23 protection, and/or unfair competition and related laws, and seeks civil penalties, and/or other  
24 equitable relief under those State laws. All claims under federal and state law are based upon a  
25 common nucleus of operative facts, and the entire action commenced by this Complaint  
26 constitutes a single case that would ordinarily be tried in one judicial proceeding.





1 talent” have resulted in power “shift[ing] from the corporation to the individual,” giving “talented  
2 individuals ... the negotiating leverage to ratchet up their expectation for their careers.”

3 16. Instead of working harder to acquire this “critical and scarce” talent, eBay and Intuit  
4 called a truce in the “war for talent” to protect their own interests at the expense of their  
5 employees. eBay initially sought a limited no-solicitation agreement aimed at high-level  
6 executives, but ultimately agreed to an expansive no-solicitation and no-hire agreement. eBay  
7 valued its relationship with Intuit and the benefits eBay gained from restricting its own  
8 employees’ career mobility above the welfare of its employees.

9 17. Neither eBay nor Intuit took any steps to ensure that employees affected by the  
10 agreement knew of its existence, or how it would impact them. Disclosure of the agreements to  
11 their employees could have created substantial legal problems for eBay and Intuit under  
12 California law. Many affected employees reside in California, which has a strong public policy  
13 prohibiting firms from restricting employee movement by, among other things, prohibiting  
14 employers from enforcing “no compete” agreements. California law provides that “every  
15 contract by which anyone is restrained from engaging in a lawful profession, trade, or business of  
16 any kind is to that extent void.” Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 16600. As this Court has observed,  
17 “California public policy favors employee mobility and freedom.” *Bayer Corp. v. Roche*  
18 *Molecular Sys.*, 72 F. Supp.2d 1111, 1119 (N.D. Cal. 1999). The agreement at issue here  
19 undermined such mobility.

#### 20 THE UNLAWFUL AGREEMENT

21 18. Beginning no later than 2006, and lasting at least until 2009, eBay and Intuit  
22 maintained an illegal agreement that restricted their ability to actively recruit employees from  
23 each other, and for some part of that time further restricted at least eBay from hiring any  
24 employees from Intuit. As alleged in more detail below, this agreement was entered into and  
25 enforced at the most senior levels of these companies.

26 19. In November 2005, eBay’s Chief Operating Officer, Maynard Webb, wrote to Scott  
27 Cook, Intuit’s Founder and Chairman of the Executive Committee, to “get [Mr. Cook’s] advice  
28



1 on a specific hiring situation and then see if we could establish some guidelines on an ongoing  
2 basis.” Mr. Webb asked Mr. Cook for “permission to proceed” with hiring an Intuit employee  
3 who contacted eBay regarding a job, and then proposed a “structure” to Mr. Cook for future  
4 situations, whereby eBay would “not actively recruit from Intuit.” Under Mr. Webb’s proposal,  
5 for Intuit candidates “below Senior Director level” who contacted eBay regarding employment,  
6 eBay would be permitted to hire them and would give Intuit “notice” only after a candidate  
7 accepted a job offer. For Intuit candidates “at Senior Director level or above”, eBay would not  
8 make an offer unless Intuit was notified in advance. Mr. Cook rejected this proposal insofar as it  
9 allowed hiring of any employees without prior notice to Intuit, saying that “we don’t recruit from  
10 board companies, period” and “[w]e’re passionate on this.” Mr. Cook committed that Intuit  
11 would not make an offer to anyone from eBay without first notifying eBay, and said “[w]e would  
12 ask the same.”

13 20. A month later, in December 2005, Meg Whitman, the CEO of eBay at the time, and  
14 Mr. Cook discussed the competition for two employees with an eye toward eliminating that  
15 competition altogether. As Ms. Whitman told Ms. Axelrod, Mr. Cook was “slightly miffed by  
16 our recent hire of two Intuit executives.”

17 21. No later than August 2006, the initial agreement between eBay and Intuit restricting  
18 the hiring of each other’s employees was put into effect. In August 2006, when eBay considered  
19 hiring an Intuit employee for an opening at its PayPal subsidiary, Ms. Axelrod said that while she  
20 was “happy to have a word with Meg [Whitman] about it,” Ms. Axelrod was “quite confident she  
21 will say hands off because Scott [Cook] insists on a no poach policy with Intuit.” When the  
22 PayPal executive asked Ms. Axelrod to confer with Ms. Whitman, Ms. Axelrod reported back  
23 that “I confirmed with Meg [Whitman] that we cannot proceed without notifying Scott Cook  
24 first.” eBay does not appear to have pursued the potential candidate beyond this point as  
25 everyone agreed “that it’s to[o] awkward to call Scott [Cook] when we don’t even know if the  
26 candidate has interest,” demonstrating that the non-solicitation agreement had a distinct chilling  
27 effect on recruitment and hiring between the two companies.  
28

1           22. On or about April 2007, eBay's commitment metastasized into a no-hire agreement.  
2 The impetus was a complaint from Mr. Cook to Ms. Whitman that he was "quite unhappy" about  
3 a potential offer that eBay was going to make to an Intuit employee who had approached eBay.  
4 Ms. Axelrod spoke with Ms. Whitman regarding Mr. Cook's concerns, and instructed David  
5 Knight, then eBay's Vice President, Internal Communications, to hold off on making the offer.  
6 Mr. Knight urged Ms. Axelrod to find a way to make the offer happen, as the decision put the  
7 applicant "in a tough position and us in a bad place with California law" and left eBay "another 6  
8 months away from getting another candidate" for the position. A week later, Mr. Knight wrote to  
9 Ms. Axelrod and Ms. Whitman pleading with them to at least "negotiate" any shift from a "no  
10 poaching" agreement to a "no hiring" agreement after this particular applicant was hired, as eBay  
11 "desperately need[ed] this position filled."

12           23. While Ms. Axelrod ultimately authorized Mr. Knight to extend an offer to this Intuit  
13 employee, eBay did expand the agreement to prohibit eBay from hiring any employee from Intuit,  
14 regardless of how that employee applied for the job. A few months later, for example, an eBay  
15 human resources manager alerted Ms. Axelrod to a potential "situation" and wanted to know if  
16 eBay "continue[d] to be sensitive to Scott [Cook]'s request" or if there was "any flexibility on  
17 hiring from Intuit." The Intuit candidate was "getting a lot of responses from managers directly"  
18 before the human resource manager's team was involved as his "education is fantastic." Ms.  
19 Axelrod confirmed, however, that even when an Intuit employee was "dying" to work for eBay  
20 and had proactively reached out to eBay, hiring managers had "no flexibility" and must keep their  
21 "hands off" the potential applicant.

22           24. Two eBay staffers sought to clarify the situation with Ms. Axelrod shortly thereafter.  
23 Ms. Axelrod said: "We have an explicit hands off[f] that we cannot violate with any Intuit  
24 employee. There is no flexibility on this." The staff asked for further clarification: "This applies  
25 even if the Intuit employee has reached out and specifically asked? If so then I assume that  
26 person could NEVER be hired by ebay unless they quit Intuit first." Ms. Axelrod confirmed this  
27 was "correct." Ms. Axelrod similarly explained the impact of the agreement to Ms. Whitman: "I  
28

1 keep getting inquiries from our folks to recruit from Intuit and I am firmly holding the line. No  
2 exceptions even if the candidate proactively contacts us.” In another email exchange, Ms.  
3 Axelrod explained that she was responding to all inquiries regarding hiring from Intuit by “firmly  
4 holding the line and saying absolutely not (including to myself since their comp[ensation] and  
5 ben[efits] person is supposed to be excellent!).”

6 25. Mr. Cook was a driving force behind eBay’s no-hire agreement with Intuit. In one  
7 2007 e-mail, an eBay recruiter confirmed to Intuit that the message to Intuit candidates should be  
8 that eBay was “not allowed to hire from Intuit per Scott Cook regardless of whether the candidate  
9 applies directly or if we reach out.” eBay recruiting personnel understood that “Meg [Whitman]  
10 and Scott Cook entered into the agreement (handshake style, not written) that eBay would not  
11 hire from Intuit, period.” Mr. Cook and Intuit, on the other hand, agreed that Intuit would not  
12 recruit from eBay. Mr. Cook explained to one applicant who had decided to work for eBay but  
13 expressed a future interest in joining Intuit, that “Intuit is precluded from recruiting you” unless  
14 eBay has decided it does not need the employee or where the employee informs his management  
15 and then proactively contacts Intuit.

16 26. eBay insisted that Intuit refrain from recruiting its employees in exchange for the  
17 limitation on eBay’s ability to recruit and hire Intuit employees. On August 27, 2007, Ms.  
18 Axelrod wrote Ms. Whitman to complain that while eBay was sticking to its agreement to not hire  
19 Intuit employees, “it is hard to do this when Intuit recruits our folks.” Ms. Axelrod forwarded  
20 Ms. Whitman a recruiting flyer that Intuit had sent to an eBay employee. Ms. Whitman forwarded  
21 Ms. Axelrod’s e-mail to Mr. Cook the same day asking him to “remind your folks not to send this  
22 stuff to eBay people.” Mr. Cook responded quickly: “#@!%\$#^&!!! Meg my apologies. I’ll  
23 find out how this slip up occurred again....”

24 27. Throughout the course of the agreement, eBay repeatedly declined opportunities to  
25 hire or even interview Intuit employees, even when eBay had open positions for “quite some  
26 time,” when the potential employee “look[ed] great,” or when “the only guy who was good was  
27 from [I]ntuit.” eBay employees were instructed to not pursue potential hires that came from  
28



1 Intuit and to discard their resumes. When a candidate applied for a position and told eBay that  
2 she had left Intuit, Ms. Axelrod went so far as to write Mr. Cook to confirm that the applicant  
3 had, in fact, left the company.

4 28. The companies acknowledged that throughout the agreement, they “passed” on  
5 “talented” applicants, consistent with their anticompetitive agreement. The repeated requests  
6 from lower level employees at both companies to be allowed to recruit employees from the other  
7 firm demonstrates that the agreement denied employees the opportunity to compete for better job  
8 opportunities.

9 29. The agreement between eBay and Intuit remained in effect for at least some period of  
10 time after a United States Department of Justice investigation of agreements between technology  
11 companies that restricted hiring practices became public. One eBay employee asked another in  
12 June 2009 if she had been “able to connect with Beth [Axelrod] re our policies around hiring from  
13 Intuit with respect to” a former employee at eBay’s PayPal division who “wishes to return” and  
14 noted press reports of the Department of Justice investigation. The employee responded back:  
15 “It’s a no go....too complicated. We should move to plan b.” (Ellipses in original.)

16 30. The agreement between eBay and Intuit harmed employees by lowering the salaries  
17 and benefits they might otherwise have been offered, and deprived these employees of job  
18 opportunities at the other company. Injunctive relief would make clear to eBay that such  
19 restraints on the economy of California are not permitted.

20 **VIOLATIONS ALLEGED**

21 **I. (VIOLATION OF SECTION 1 OF THE SHERMAN ACT)**

22 31. The State of California hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 31.

23 32. eBay and Intuit are direct competitors for employees, including specialized computer  
24 engineers and scientists, covered by the agreements at issue here. eBay and its coconspirators  
25 entered into a naked no-solicitation and no-hire agreement, thereby reducing their ability and  
26 incentive to compete for employees. This agreement suppressed competition between eBay and  
27  
28

1 its coconspirators, thereby limiting affected employees' ability to secure better compensation,  
2 benefits, and working conditions.

3 33. eBay's agreement with Intuit is *per se* unlawful under Section 1 of the Sherman Act,  
4 15 U.S.C. § 1. No elaborate industry analysis is required to demonstrate the anticompetitive  
5 character of this agreement.

6 34. The no-solicitation and no-hire agreement between eBay and Intuit is also an  
7 unreasonable restraint of trade that is unlawful under Section 1 of the Sherman Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1  
8 under an abbreviated or "quick look" rule of reason analysis. The principal tendency of the  
9 agreement between eBay and Intuit is to restrain competition as the nature of the restraint is  
10 obvious and the agreement has no legitimate pro-competitive justification. It is clear that the  
11 agreement would have an anticompetitive effect on employees and harm the competitive process.

12 35. For the purpose of forming and effectuating the alleged agreement, understanding, or  
13 conspiracy, eBay and its co-conspirators did those things that they combined and conspired to do,  
14 including, but not limited to the acts, practices, and course of conduct set forth above, and the  
15 following, among others:

- 16 a. not actively recruit Intuit or eBay employees; and  
17 b. not hire Intuit employees.

18 36. The combination and conspiracy has had, among other things, the following effects:

- 19 a. Suppressed competition between eBay, Intuit, and their co-conspirators for  
20 employees;  
21 b. Limited affected employees' ability to secure employment, as well as better  
22 compensation, benefits, and working conditions.

23 37. Natural persons employed in the high tech industry were injured, and will continue to  
24 be injured, in their business and property by lower wages and benefits, and fewer opportunities, to  
25 which they would have had access, as a direct and indirect result of the actions of eBay and its co-  
26 conspirators. This includes the future deprivation of competition arising from the failure of eBay  
27 to discontinue its wrongful conduct until the USDOJ investigation.  
28

1 38. Plaintiff is entitled to an injunction against eBay, preventing and restraining the  
2 violations alleged herein, as well as enjoining it from engaging in similar conduct in the future.

3 **II. (VIOLATION OF THE CARTWRIGHT ACT, BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION**  
4 **16720)**

5 39. The State of California hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 39.

6 40. eBay and its co-conspirators' contract, combination, trust, or conspiracy was  
7 substantially carried out and effectuated within the State of California, and eBay's conduct within  
8 California injured natural persons.

9 41. Beginning at least in or around January, 2006, and continuing thereafter at least up to  
10 and including June, 2009, eBay and its co-conspirators entered into and engaged in a continuing  
11 unlawful trust for the purpose of unreasonably restraining trade in violation of Section 16720 of  
12 the California Business and Professions Code.

13 42. These violations of Section 16720 of the California Business and Professions Code,  
14 consisted, without limitation, of a continuing unlawful trust and concert of action among eBay  
15 and Intuit, the substantial terms of which were to create and carry out restrictions on commerce in  
16 the hiring of high tech employees.

17 43. For the purpose of forming and effectuating the unlawful trust, eBay conspired to:

- 18 a. not actively recruit Intuit or eBay employees.  
19 b. not hire Intuit employees.

20 44. The combination and conspiracy has had, among other things, the following effects:

- 21 a. Suppressed competition between eBay and Intuit for employees  
22 b. Limited affected employees' ability to secure employment, as well as better  
23 compensation, benefits, and working conditions.

24 45. As a direct and proximate result of eBay's violations of Section 16720 of the  
25 California Business and Professions Code, natural persons residing in the State of California were  
26 injured in their business and property in that they were deprived of competition between  
27  
28

1 companies for employees. The State of California brings this claim pursuant to Section 16760  
2 and injunctive relief and the costs of suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees.

3 **III. (FOR VIOLATION OF THE UNFAIR COMPETITION LAW BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS**  
4 **CODE SECTION 17200)**

5 46. The State of California hereby incorporates paragraphs 1 through 46.

6 47. Beginning at least in or around January, 2006, and continuing thereafter at least up to  
7 and including June, 2009, Defendants committed acts of unfair competition, as defined by  
8 Sections 17200, *et seq.* of the California Business and Professions Code.

9 48. The acts, omissions, misrepresentations, practices and non-disclosures of  
10 eBay, as alleged herein, constituted unfair competition by means of unfair, unlawful and/or  
11 fraudulent business acts or practices within the meaning of California Business and Professions  
12 Code, Sections 17200, *et seq.*, including, but not limited to, the following:

13 a. The violations of Sections 16720, *et seq.*, of the California Business and  
14 Professions Code, thus constituting unlawful acts within the meaning of section 17200 of the  
15 California Business and Professions Code;

16 b. The violation of Section 16600 of the California Business and Professions  
17 Code, thus constituting unlawful acts within the meaning of Section 17200 of the California  
18 Business and Professions Code.

19  
20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 California requests that:

22 (A) the Court adjudge and decree that the agreement between eBay and Intuit not to  
23 compete constitutes an illegal restraint of interstate trade and commerce in violation of Section 1  
24 of the Sherman Act;

25 (B) the Court adjudge and decree that eBay 'scontract, conspiracy, or combination  
26 constitutes an illegal restraint of trade in violation of the Cartwright Act, Sections 16720, *et seq.*,  
27 of the Business & Professions Code;

1 (C) the Court adjudge and decree that eBay's contract, conspiracy, or combination  
2 violates the Unfair Competition Law, Sections 17200, *et seq.* of the Business & Professions  
3 Code;

4 (D) that Defendants be permanently enjoined and restrained from establishing any  
5 similar agreement unreasonably restricting competition for employees enforcing or adhering to  
6 existing agreements that unreasonably restrict competition for employees except as prescribed by  
7 the Court;

8 (E) that Plaintiff be awarded civil penalties, pursuant to California Business and  
9 Professions Code Section 17206 in the dollar amount of two thousand five hundred dollars and  
10 zero cents, (\$2,500.00) for each violation of the Unfair Competition Law as set forth in this  
11 Complaint;

12 (F) that Plaintiff be awarded such other relief as the Court may deem just and  
13 proper to redress and prevent recurrence of the alleged violation and to dissipate the  
14 anticompetitive effects of the illegal agreement entered into by eBay; and

15 (G) that Plaintiff be awarded the costs of this action and reasonable attorneys' fees.

16  
17 **JURY TRIAL DEMAND**

18 Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff demands a trial by  
19 jury for all issues so triable.

20  
21 Dated: November 14, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

22 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
23 Attorney General of California

24 

25 KATHLEEN E. FOOTE  
26 Senior Assistant Attorney General  
27 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

28 SF2012401678  
40612707.doc