Media > News Releases > December 2020 > Attorney General Dave Yost Joins Lawsuit Seeking to End Google's Illegal Monopoly

News Releases

Search News Releases:	Search >
-----------------------	----------

Attorney General Dave Yost Joins Lawsuit Seeking to End Google's Illegal Monopoly

12/17/2020

(COLUMBUS, Ohio) — Ohio Attorney General Dave Yost today joined a bipartisan coalition of 37 other attorneys general in suing Google LLC for anticompetitive conduct in violation of Section 2 of the Sherman Act.

The states allege that Google illegally maintains its monopoly power over general search engines and related advertising markets through a series of anticompetitive exclusionary contracts and conduct. As a result, Google has deprived consumers of competition that could lead to greater choice, innovation, and better privacy protections. Furthermore, Google has exploited its market position to accumulate and leverage data to the detriment of consumers.

"Exclusion and discrimination are by their nature anti-competitive," Yost said. "When you add those tactics to Google's dominance, you're stepping on the market, not competing in it."

The states' complaint is consistent with the lawsuit filed by the U.S. Department of Justice on October 20, which alleged that Google improperly maintains its monopoly power in general search and search advertising through the use of exclusionary agreements.

But the state's filing asserts additional allegations and describes Google's monopoly maintenance scheme as a multi-part effort. The lawsuit alleges that Google:

- Uses exclusionary agreements and other practices to limit the ability of rival general search engines and potential rivals to reach consumers. This conduct cements Google as the goto search engine on computers and mobile devices.
- Discriminates against specialized search sites such as those that provide travel, home repair, or entertainment services by depriving them access to prime real estate on the search results screen because these competing sites threaten Google's revenue and dominant position.
- Disadvantages users of its search-advertising management tool, SA360, by continuously favoring advertising on its own platform and inflating its profits to the detriment of
 advertisers and consumers, despite its promises to the contrary that it would not favor Google search advertising over that of competing search engines such as Bing.

The attorneys general argue that more competition in the general search engine market would benefit consumers, for example, though improved privacy protections and more targeted results and opportunities for consumers. Competitive general search engines also could offer better quality advertising and lower prices to advertisers.

The attorneys general expand on the U.S. DOJ's allegation that Google's anticompetitive conduct continues. As explained in the complaint, the company seeks to deploy the same exclusionary contracting tactics to monopolize the emerging ways consumers access general search engines, such as through their home smart speakers, televisions, or in their cars. In so doing, Google is depriving consumers of competitive choices and blocking innovation.

The states also go further than the U.S. DOJ in explaining how Google's acquisition and command of vast amounts of data – obtained in increasing part because of consumers' lack of choice – has fortified Google's monopoly and created significant barriers for potential competitors and innovators.

The attorneys general ask the court to halt Google's illegal conduct and restore a competitive marketplace. The states also seek to unwind any advantages that Google gained as a result of its anticompetitive conduct, including divestiture of assets as appropriate. Finally, the court is asked to provide any additional relief it determines appropriate, as well as reasonable fees and costs to the states.

The complaint was filed in the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, in conjunction with a Motion to Consolidate seeking to combine the states' case with the pending U.S. DOJ case.

The attorneys general joining the lawsuit include the states and territories of: Alaska, Arizona, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wyoming, the District of Columbia, and the territories of Guam and Puerto Rico.

MEDIA CONTACT: Luke Sullivan: 614-270-2662



Individuals & Families	Business & Economic Development	Law Enforcement	Legal Community	State & Local Government
Consumers	Background Check	BCI	Antitrust	Formal Opinions
Military & Veterans	Services for Bingo	Concealed Carry	Ballot Initiatives	Ohio School Threat Assessment
Seniors	Collections	Missing Persons	Outside Counsel	Training
Tipster	Professional Solicitors &	Ohio Law Enforcement Gateway	Prosecution	Services for Schools
Victims	Fundraisers	OOCIC	Sunshine Laws	
	Services for Charities	ОРОТА		
	Services for Business	Unsolved Homicides		
About AG	Services	Training & Education	Media	Career & Employee Resources
Dave Yost	Webcheck Locations	Nonprofit Board	Events	AG Employee Portal
Administration	File a Consumer Complaint	Governance Webinars	News Releases	myOhio.gov
Public Records Access	File a Charitable Complaint	Ohio's Charitable Registration System Webinars	Newsletters	Diversity & Inclusion
Regional Offices	Charitable Registration	OPOTA Courses	Reports	Job Opportunities
Service Divisions	Tobacco Enforcement	Victim Service Provider Training	Videos	

PROTECTING ★ THE ★ UNPROTECTED











Victim Service Provider Training