

ORIGINAL
2011 AUG 29 P 2:13
RICHARD W. WILKING
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP
SHAWN A. WILLIAMS (213113)
Post Montgomery Center
One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: 415/288-4545
415/288-4534 (fax)
shawnw@rgrdlaw.com

- and -

DARREN J. ROBBINS (168593)
TRAVIS E. DOWNS III (148274)
BENNY C. GOODMAN III (211302)
ERIK W. LUEDEKE (249211)
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101-3301
Telephone: 619/231-1058
619/231-7423 (fax)
darrenr@rgrdlaw.com
travisd@rgrdlaw.com
eluedeke@rgrdlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

HRL

PATRICIA M. McKENNA, Derivatively on
Behalf of GOOGLE INC.,

Plaintiff,

vs,

LARRY PAGE, SERGEY BRIN, ERIC E.
SCHMIDT, L. JOHN DOERR, JOHN L.
HENNESSY, PAUL S. OTELLINI, K. RAM
SHRIRAM, SHIRLEY M. TILGHMAN,
NIKESH ARORA and PATRICK PICHETTE,

Defendants.

- and -

GOOGLE INC., a Delaware corporation,
Nominal Party.

E-filing

CV 11 4248

VERIFIED SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE
COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF
FIDUCIARY DUTY OF LOYALTY, ABUSE
OF CONTROL, CORPORATE WASTE AND
UNJUST ENRICHMENT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 **OVERVIEW OF THE ACTION**

2 1. In this shareholder derivative action, plaintiff seeks to recover damages and other
3 relief for nominal party Google Inc. ("Google" or the "Company") against defendants for breach of
4 loyalty (and candor and good faith), abuse of control, corporate waste and unjust enrichment.

5 2. Defendants are members of Google's Board of Directors -- defendants Larry Page,
6 Sergey Brin, Eric E. Schmidt, L. John Doerr, John L. Hennessy, Paul S. Otellini, K. Ram Shriram
7 and Shirley M. Tilghman (together, the "Google Board"); and Google's top officers -- defendants
8 Nikesh Arora and Patrick Pichette (together, "defendants").

9 3. Defendants breached their fiduciary duty of loyalty by failing to adopt and maintain
10 the internal controls and policies necessary for Google to ensure compliance with the Federal Food,
11 Drug, and Cosmetic Act, 21 U.S.C. §331(a) and (d) (Introduction into Interstate Commerce of
12 Misbranded or Unapproved Drugs), and the Controlled Substances Act, 21 U.S.C. §952 (Importation
13 of Controlled Substances) (together, "the Acts"). As a result, the Company has been damaged by the
14 violations of the Acts that transpired as a result of the absence of the aforementioned internal
15 systems and controls.

16 **SUMMARY OF THE ALLEGATIONS**

17 4. Google is an Internet search and technology corporation based in Mountain View,
18 California. Google offers various advertising services that permit advertisers to post their
19 advertising message, and a link to their website, above and next to search results in response to
20 search queries relevant to the advertiser. In turn, advertisers pay fees to the Company for each
21 advertisement.

22 5. Enacted by the U.S. Congress in 1938, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act
23 gives authority to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") to oversee the safety of food,
24 drugs, and cosmetics. Among other things, §331 of the Act prohibits the introduction or delivery for
25 introduction of any drug into interstate commerce, or the causing thereof. Similarly, enacted by U.S.
26 Congress in 1970, the Controlled Substances Act prohibits such conduct with regard to controlled
27 substances. Compliance with these Acts is not elective, but rather mandatory. Further, compliance
28

1 with the Acts is a legal duty known and readily knowable by sophisticated executives of U.S.
2 companies doing business internationally.

3 6. Although facilitating improper advertisements temporarily helped Google secure
4 millions in profits, the Company violated federal law by doing so and has now been exposed to
5 significant damages. On August 24, 2010, it was announced that Google had in fact settled with the
6 United States Department of Justice ("DOJ") and entered into a non-prosecution agreement in which
7 the Company agreed to forfeit \$500 million for facilitating the placement of advertisements from
8 online Canadian pharmacies that resulted in the unlawful importation of controlled and non-
9 controlled prescription drugs into the United States. This forfeiture – \$500 million – is one of the
10 largest ever in the United States, and is a massive burden for any company to shoulder, even one the
11 size of Google.

12 7. As corporate directors and officers, defendants owe Google fiduciary duties – the
13 highest duties known to the law. These duties include a fiduciary duty of loyalty (and its subsidiary
14 duties of candor and good faith). As one court cogently explained recently, "The affairs of Delaware
15 corporations are managed by their board of directors, who owe to shareholders duties of *unremitting*
16 loyalty. This means that their actions must be taken in the good faith belief that they are in the best
17 interests of the corporation and its stockholders, especially where conflicts with the individual
18 interests of directors are concerned. . . . When those same directors communicate with shareholders,
19 they also must do so with *complete candor*. Loyalty. Good faith. Independence. Candor. These
20 are words pregnant with obligation. The Supreme Court did not adorn them with half-hearted
21 adjectives. Directors should not take a seat at the board table prepared to offer only conditional
22 loyalty, tolerable good faith, reasonable disinterest or formalistic candor." *In re Tyson Foods, Inc.,*
23 *Consolidated Shareholder Litigation*, No. 1106-CC, 2007 Del. Ch. LEXIS 120, at *10-*11 (Del. Ch.
24 Aug. 15, 2007) (emphasis in original, footnotes omitted).

25 8. In relation to the aforementioned Acts, Google's directors and officers had a known
26 duty to act, *i.e.*, to implement and maintain internal controls and policies to prevent violations of
27 these Acts. Nevertheless, defendants failed to act, *i.e.*, did not implement and maintain such controls
28 and policies at the Company, as evidenced by the fact that Google continued to facilitate the illegal

1 importation of prescription drugs by Canadian pharmacies until it became aware of the DOJ
2 investigation and the fact that Google recently resolved the investigation by consenting to non-
3 prosecution agreement with the DOJ under which it is required to maintain policies that forbid the
4 Company from accepting advertisements from Canadian pharmacies.

5 9. Had the Google Board implemented and maintained the appropriate controls and
6 policies, as their fiduciary duty of loyalty required, these improper advertisements most likely would
7 not have occurred in the first place. Nor would the unlawful activity likely have continued for the
8 better part of the decade, without detection by Google executives. The Google Board's failure to act,
9 when faced with a known duty to act, breached their fiduciary duty of loyalty (and good faith) owed
10 to Google. As a result, these defendants are personally liable to Google for the damages resulting
11 from their misconduct.

12 10. The Google Board also breached its fiduciary duty of loyalty (and candor) by making
13 false and misleading statements to Google shareholders in the Company's shareholder reports. For
14 example, Google's Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K for 2004-2009 artificially inflated Google's
15 publicly reported financial results because they failed to disclose: (i) that a significant portion of
16 Google's reported total revenues were being derived from illegal advertising by Canadian
17 pharmacies; and (ii) that such advertising revenue was being mischaracterized on Google's books as
18 legitimate income.

19 11. Although the facilitation of the illegal advertising increased Google's total revenues,
20 the lack of internal controls and policies ultimately damaged Google in a far greater amount. In
21 addition to including the illicit profit Google received from the Canadian pharmacies, the
22 \$500 million settlement includes the revenue the pharmacies gained from their sales through Google.
23 Further still, Google has been exposed to millions in investigative costs and expenses, and will likely
24 incur additional legal and professional fees and expenses related to further implementation of
25 remedial measures designed to correct the problems arising from the Google Board's failure to
26 implement and maintain internal controls and policies sufficient for compliance with the Acts.

27 12. Although Google has been severely injured, defendants have not fared nearly so
28 badly. During the relevant time period, defendants collectively pocketed millions in salary, fees,

1 stock options, and other payments that were not justified in light of the violations of federal law at
2 Google that occurred during their watch. These payments wasted valuable corporate assets and
3 unjustly enriched defendants.

4 13. Notwithstanding the enormous damage to Google arising from the violations of
5 federal law, the Google Board has not, and will not commence suit against defendants for breach of
6 loyalty, abuse of control, corporate waste and/or unjust enrichment, let alone vigorously prosecute
7 such claims. By this action, plaintiff seeks to vindicate Google's rights against its wayward
8 fiduciaries.

9 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

10 14. A substantial part of the events or omissions which give rise to the claims in this
11 action occurred in the county of Santa Clara, and as such this action is properly assigned to the San
12 Jose division of this Court.

13 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

14 15. This Court has jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1332(a)(1), because plaintiff and
15 defendants are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive
16 of interest and costs. This action is not a collusive action designed to confer jurisdiction on a court
17 of the United States that it would not otherwise have.

18 16. This Court has jurisdiction over each defendant named herein because each defendant
19 is either a corporation that conducts business in and maintains operations in this District, or is an
20 individual who has sufficient minimum contacts with this District so as to render the exercise of
21 jurisdiction by the courts of this District permissible under traditional notions of fair play and
22 substantial justice.

23 17. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. §1391(a) because: (i) Google maintains
24 its executive offices and principal place of business in this District; (ii) one or more of the defendants
25 either resides in or maintains offices in this District; (iii) a substantial portion of the transactions and
26 wrongs complained of herein, including the defendants' primary participation in the wrongful acts
27 detailed herein, and aiding and abetting and conspiracy in violation of fiduciary duties owed to
28

1 Google, occurred in this District; and (iv) defendants have received substantial compensation in this
2 District by doing business here and engaging in numerous activities that had an effect in this District.

3 **THE PARTIES**

4 18. Plaintiff Patricia M. McKenna is a Google shareholder and has been continuously
5 since 2005. Plaintiff is a citizen of the State of Pennsylvania.

6 19. Nominal party Google is a Delaware corporation, with its executive offices located at
7 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View, CA 94043. Google is the world's largest Internet
8 search engine that generates revenue primarily by delivering relevant, cost-effective online
9 advertising. Google is a citizen of the State of California.

10 20. Defendant Larry Page ("Page"), a Google founder, has been a Google director since
11 the Company's inception in September 1998. He has also served as the Company's CEO since April
12 4, 2011. Page previously served as Google's President, Products, from 2001 to April 3, 2011, CEO
13 from 1998 to 2001, and Chief Financial Officer ("CFO") from 1998 to 2002. As an experienced
14 business professional, Page knew or should have known that it was illegal under the Federal Food,
15 Drug and Cosmetic Act and/or the Controlled Substances Act for pharmacies outside the United
16 States to ship prescription drugs into the United States. Nonetheless, Page failed to cause Google to
17 implement and maintain internal controls and policies for compliance with these federal mandates.
18 This breached Page's fiduciary duty of loyalty (and good faith), and exposed Google to significant
19 damages and risks of loss. Page also breached his duty of loyalty (and candor) by falsely
20 representing to Google shareholders in the Company's 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-
21 K that Google's financial results were accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these shareholder reports
22 were false and misleading because, among other things, they failed to disclose that material amounts
23 of Google's total revenues were being derived by improperly assisting Canadian online pharmacy
24 advertisers in running advertisements that targeted the United States. Page signed Google's false
25 and misleading 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K. Page is a citizen of the State of
26 California.

27 21. Defendant Sergey Brin ("Brin"), a Google founder, has been a Google director since
28 the Company's inception in September 1998. Brin previously served as Google's President,

1 Technology, from 2001 to April 3, 2011, and as the Company's President and Chairman from 1998
2 to 2001. As an experienced business professional, Brin knew or should have known that it was
3 illegal under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and/or the Controlled Substances Act for
4 pharmacies outside the United States to ship prescription drugs into the United States. Nonetheless,
5 Brin failed to cause Google to implement and maintain internal controls and policies for compliance
6 with these federal mandates. This breached Brin's fiduciary duty of loyalty (and good faith), and
7 exposed Google to significant damages and risks of loss. Brin also breached his duty of loyalty (and
8 candor) by falsely representing to Google shareholders in the Company's 2004-2009 Annual Reports
9 on SEC Form 10-K that Google's financial results were accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these
10 shareholder reports were false and misleading because, among other things, they failed to disclose
11 that material amounts of Google's total revenues were being derived by improperly assisting
12 Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in running advertisements that targeted the United States.
13 Brin signed Google's false and misleading 2004-2007 and 2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K.
14 Brin is a citizen of the State of California.

15 22. Defendant Eric E. Schmidt ("Schmidt") has been a Google director since 2001. He
16 has also been the Executive Chairman of the Google Board since April 2011. Schmidt previously
17 served as Google's CEO from 2001 to 2011, and Chairman of the Google Board from 2001 to 2004
18 and 2007 to April 2011. Schmidt also serves or served as an executive or on the board of directors
19 of Novell and Sun Microsystems, Inc. As an experienced business professional, Schmidt knew or
20 should have known that it was illegal under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and/or the
21 Controlled Substances Act for pharmacies outside the United States to ship prescription drugs into
22 the United States. Nonetheless, Schmidt failed to cause Google to implement and maintain internal
23 controls and policies for compliance with these federal mandates. This breached Schmidt's fiduciary
24 duty of loyalty (and good faith), and exposed Google to significant damages and risks of loss.
25 Schmidt also breached his duty of loyalty (and candor) by falsely representing to Google
26 shareholders in the Company's 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K that Google's
27 financial results were accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these shareholder reports were false and
28 misleading because, among other things, they failed to disclose that material amounts of Google's

1 total revenues were being derived by improperly assisting Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in
2 running advertisements that targeted the United States. Schmidt signed Google's false and
3 misleading 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K. Schmidt is a citizen of the State of
4 California.

5 23. Defendant L. John Doerr ("Doerr") has been a Google director since 1999. Doerr
6 also serves or served as an executive or on the board of directors of Amyris, Inc., Amazon.com, Inc.,
7 Move, Inc. and Sun Microsystems, Inc. As an experienced business professional, Doerr knew or
8 should have known that it was illegal under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and/or the
9 Controlled Substances Act for pharmacies outside the United States to ship prescription drugs into
10 the United States. Nonetheless, Doerr failed to cause Google to implement and maintain internal
11 controls and policies for compliance with these federal mandates. This breached Doerr's fiduciary
12 duty of loyalty (and good faith), and exposed Google to significant damages and risks of loss. Doerr
13 also breached his duty of loyalty (and candor) by falsely representing to Google shareholders in the
14 Company's 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K that Google's financial results were
15 accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these shareholder reports were false and misleading because,
16 among other things, they failed to disclose that material amounts of Google's total revenues were
17 being derived by improperly assisting Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in running
18 advertisements that targeted the United States. Doerr signed Google's false and misleading 2004-
19 2005 and 2007-2008 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K. Doerr is a citizen of the State of
20 California.

21 24. Defendant John L. Hennessy ("Hennessy") has been a Google director since 2004.
22 He has also been the Lead Independent Director of the Google Board since April 2007. Hennessy
23 also serves or served as the President of Stanford University and as an executive or on the board of
24 directors of Cisco Systems, Inc. and Atheros Communications, Inc. As an experienced business
25 professional, Hennessy knew or should have known that it was illegal under the Federal Food, Drug
26 and Cosmetic Act and/or the Controlled Substances Act for pharmacies outside the United States to
27 ship prescription drugs into the United States. Nonetheless, Hennessy failed to cause Google to
28 implement and maintain internal controls and policies for compliance with these federal mandates.

1 This breached Hennessy's fiduciary duty of loyalty (and good faith), and exposed Google to
2 significant damages and risks of loss. Hennessy also breached his duty of loyalty (and candor) by
3 falsely representing to Google shareholders in the Company's 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC
4 Form 10-K that Google's financial results were accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these
5 shareholder reports were false and misleading because, among other things, they failed to disclose
6 that material amounts of Google's total revenues were being derived by improperly assisting
7 Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in running advertisements that targeted the United States.
8 Hennessy signed Google's false and misleading 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K.
9 Hennessy is a citizen of the state of California.

10 25. Defendant Paul S. Otellini ("Otellini") has been a Google director since 2004.
11 Otellini also serves or served as an executive or on the board of directors of Intel Corporation. As an
12 experienced business professional, Otellini knew or should have known that it was illegal under the
13 Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and/or the Controlled Substances Act for pharmacies outside
14 the United States to ship prescription drugs into the United States. Nonetheless, Otellini failed to
15 cause Google to implement and maintain internal controls and policies for compliance with these
16 federal mandates. This breached Otellini's fiduciary duty of loyalty (and good faith), and exposed
17 Google to significant damages and risks of loss. Otellini also breached his duty of loyalty (and
18 candor) by falsely representing to Google shareholders in the Company's 2004-2009 Annual Reports
19 on SEC Form 10-K that Google's financial results were accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these
20 shareholder reports were false and misleading because, among other things, they failed to disclose
21 that material amounts of Google's total revenues were being derived by improperly assisting
22 Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in running advertisements that targeted the United States.
23 Otellini signed Google's false and misleading 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K.
24 Otellini is a citizen of the State of California.

25 26. Defendant K. Ram Shriram ("Ram") has been a Google director since 1998. Ram
26 also is on the Stanford University board of trustees and serves or served as an executive or on the
27 board of directors of Amazon.com, Inc., Junglee Corporation and Netscape Communications
28 Corporation. As an experienced business professional, Ram knew or should have known that it was

1 illegal under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and/or the Controlled Substances Act for
2 pharmacies outside the United States to ship prescription drugs into the United States. Nonetheless,
3 Ram failed to cause Google to implement and maintain internal controls and policies for compliance
4 with these federal mandates. This breached Ram's fiduciary duty of loyalty (and good faith), and
5 exposed Google to significant damages and risks of loss. Ram also breached his duty of loyalty (and
6 candor) by falsely representing to Google shareholders in the Company's 2004-2009 Annual Reports
7 on SEC Form 10-K that Google's financial results were accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these
8 shareholder reports were false and misleading because, among other things, they failed to disclose
9 that material amounts of Google's total revenues were being derived by improperly assisting
10 Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in running advertisements that targeted the United States.
11 Ram signed Google's false and misleading 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K. Ram is
12 a citizen of the State of California.

13 27. Defendant Shirley M. Tilghman ("Tilghman") has been a Google director since 2005.
14 Tilghman also serves or served as the President of Princeton University. As an experienced business
15 professional, Tilghman knew or should have known that it was illegal under the Federal Food, Drug
16 and Cosmetic Act and/or the Controlled Substances Act for pharmacies outside the United States to
17 ship prescription drugs into the United States. Nonetheless, Tilghman failed to cause Google to
18 implement and maintain internal controls and policies for compliance with these federal mandates.
19 This breached Tilghman's fiduciary duty of loyalty (and good faith), and exposed Google to
20 significant damages and risks of loss. Tilghman also breached her duty of loyalty (and candor) by
21 falsely representing to Google shareholders in the Company's 2005-2009 Annual Reports on SEC
22 Form 10-K that Google's financial results were accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these
23 shareholder reports were false and misleading because, among other things, they failed to disclose
24 that material amounts of Google's total revenues were being derived by improperly assisting
25 Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in running advertisements that targeted the United States.
26 Tilghman signed Google's false and misleading 2005-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K.
27 Tilghman is a citizen of the State of New Jersey.

28

1 28. Defendant Nikesh Arora ("Arora") has been Google's Senior Vice President and
2 Chief Business Officer since January 2011. Arora previously served as Google's President, Global
3 Sales Operations & Business Development from April 2009 to December 2010 and as President,
4 International Operations prior to that. As an experienced business professional, Arora knew or
5 should have known that it was illegal under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and/or the
6 Controlled Substances Act for pharmacies outside the United States to ship prescription drugs into
7 the United States. Nonetheless, Arora failed to cause Google to implement and maintain internal
8 controls and policies for compliance with these federal mandates. This breached Arora's fiduciary
9 duty of loyalty (and good faith), and exposed Google to significant damages and risks of loss. Arora
10 also breached his duty of loyalty (and candor) by falsely representing to Google shareholders in the
11 Company's 2004-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K that Google's financial results were
12 accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these shareholder reports were false and misleading because,
13 among other things, they failed to disclose that material amounts of Google's total revenues were
14 being derived by improperly assisting Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in running
15 advertisements that targeted the United States. Arora is a citizen of the State of California.

16 29. Defendant Patrick Pichette ("Pichette") has been Google's Senior Vice President and
17 CFO since 2008. As an experienced business professional, Pichette knew or should have known that
18 it was illegal under the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act and/or the Controlled Substances Act
19 for pharmacies outside the United States to ship prescription drugs into the United States.
20 Nonetheless, Pichette failed to cause Google to implement and maintain internal controls and
21 policies for compliance with these federal mandates. This breached Pichette's fiduciary duty of
22 loyalty (and good faith), and exposed Google to significant damages and risks of loss. Pichette also
23 breached his duty of loyalty (and candor) by falsely representing to Google shareholders in the
24 Company's 2008-2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K that Google's financial results were
25 accurately and fairly stated. In fact, these shareholder reports were false and misleading because,
26 among other things, they failed to disclose that material amounts of Google's total revenues were
27 being derived by improperly assisting Canadian online pharmacy advertisers in running

28

1 advertisements that targeted the United States. Pichette signed Google's false and misleading 2008-
2 2009 Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K. Pichette is a citizen of the State of California.

3 **AIDING AND ABETTING AND CONCERTED ACTION**

4 30. In committing the wrongful acts particularized herein, defendants have pursued or
5 joined in the pursuit of a common course of conduct, and have acted in concert with one another in
6 furtherance of their common plan or design. In addition to the wrongful conduct particularized
7 herein as giving rise to primary liability, defendants further aided and abetted and/or assisted each
8 other in breach of their respective duties.

9 31. Each of the defendants aided and abetted and rendered substantial assistance in the
10 wrongs detailed herein. In taking such actions to substantially assist the commission of the
11 wrongdoing detailed herein, each defendant acted with knowledge of the primary wrongdoing,
12 substantially assisted the accomplishment of that wrongdoing, and was aware of his, her, or its
13 overall contribution to and furtherance of the wrongdoing.

14 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

15 32. Based in Mountain View, California, Google is the world's largest Internet search and
16 technology company. Google offers various advertising services that permit advertisers, including
17 Canadian online pharmacies, to post their advertising message and a link to their website above and
18 next to search results in response to search queries relevant to the advertiser. The Company's largest
19 advertising program, AdWords, displays sponsored advertisements in response to queries by the
20 Company's search engine users. In addition, advertisers are able to geo-target their advertising
21 campaigns, selecting the countries where the advertisements will display. In return for these
22 services, advertisers pay fees to Google for each advertisement.

23 33. Due to its status as a U.S. company, Google is subject to federal laws, including the
24 Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Controlled Substances Act, which prohibit the
25 shipment of prescription drugs from pharmacies outside the United States to customers in the United
26 States, or the causing thereof.

27

28

1 **Google's Violations of Federal Law**

2 34. On August 19, 2011, Google entered into a non-prosecution agreement with the DOJ
3 resulting from its "investigation into the Company's acceptance of advertisements placed by online
4 pharmacy advertisers that did not comply with United States law regarding the importation and
5 dispensation of prescription drugs." According to the Company and federal authorities, as set forth
6 in the non-prosecution agreement, Google was aware of the illegality associated with the importation
7 of prescription drugs into the United States. In fact, the parties to the non-prosecution agreement
8 agreed upon the following:

9 (f) As early as 2003, the Company was aware that in most circumstances
10 it was illegal for pharmacies to ship controlled and non-controlled prescription drugs
11 into the United States from Canada. For example, in March 2003 and again in
December 2008, the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy advised the
Company that the importation of prescription drugs from foreign countries is illegal.

12 (g) The Company was aware that importation of prescription drugs to
13 consumers in the United States is almost always unlawful because the United States
14 Food and Drug Administration ("FDA") cannot ensure the safety and effectiveness
15 of foreign prescription drugs that are not FDA-approved and because the drugs may
16 not meet FDA's labeling requirements, may not have been manufactured, stored, and
distributed under proper conditions, and may not have been dispensed pursuant to a
valid prescription. While Canada had its own regulatory regime for prescription
drugs, Canadian pharmacies that ship prescription drugs to U.S. residents are not
subject to Canadian regulatory authority, and many sell drugs obtained from
countries other than Canada, which lack adequate pharmacy regulations.

17 35. Despite defendants' knowledge of the federal mandates regulating the importation of
18 prescription drugs, between 2003 and 2009 Google repeatedly accepted and/or assisted in optimizing
19 advertisements placed by online Canadian pharmacy advertisers that did not comply with the Federal
20 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Controlled Substances Act. As the non-prosecution
21 agreement provides:

22 (h) As early as 2003, the Company was on notice that online Canadian
23 pharmacies were advertising prescription drugs to the Company's users in the United
24 States through the Company's AdWords advertising program. Although the
25 Company took steps to block pharmacies in countries other than Canada from
advertising in the United States through AdWords, the Company continued to allow
Canadian pharmacy advertisers to geo-target the United States in their AdWords
advertising campaigns. The Company knew that U.S. consumers were making
26 online purchases of prescription drugs from these Canadian online pharmacies. For
27 example, in a November 18, 2003 email, a Company employee discussed the
advertising budgets of several Canadian online pharmacy advertisers and noted that
28 "[a]ll ship from Canada into the US via Express Mail." In an August 23, 2005 email,
an employee in the Company's policy group stated, "the majority of Canadian

1 Pharmacies are in business to drive pharmacy traffic from the United States to
2 Canada" and "target the US in their geo-targeting."

3 * * *

4 (k) From 2003 through 2009, the Company provided customer support to
5 some of these Canadian online pharmacy advertisers to assist them in placing and
6 optimizing their AdWords advertisements and improving the effectiveness of their
7 websites. For example, on or about April 23, 2004, a Google employee based in
8 Canada reported in an email concerning the advertisements of a large Canadian
9 pharmacy advertiser that "the Google team is proactively adjusting creative and
10 optimizing with Square Trade policy in mind." On or about June 4, 2004, the same
11 employee emailed a member of the Company's policy group and stated, "The Max
12 team and [customer support] are sort of furiously working on creative to appease our
13 new policy before approvals gets to them and disapproves."

14 36. Defendants also knew that many of their Canadian pharmacy advertisers distributed
15 prescription drugs based on an online consultation rather than a valid prescription from a treating
16 medical practitioner and that many of these pharmacies charged a premium for doing so, because
17 individuals seeking to obtain prescription drugs without a valid prescription were willing to pay
18 higher prices for the drugs.

19 37. Google's unlawful advertising practices continued unabated until 2011. Then, on
20 May 10, 2011, in its first quarter 2011 Quarterly Report on Form 10-Q, Google revealed that it had
21 set aside \$500 million for a possible resolution of a DOJ investigation. Specifically, the Company
22 provided:

23 In May 2011, in connection with a potential resolution of an investigation by
24 the United States Department of Justice into the use of Google advertising by certain
25 advertisers, we accrued \$500 million for the three month period ended March 31,
26 2011. Although we cannot predict the ultimate outcome of this matter, we believe it
27 will not have a material adverse effect on our business, consolidated financial
28 position, results of operations, or cash flows.

38. In announcing its settlement with Google, the DOJ stated:

Online search engine Google Inc. has agreed to forfeit \$500 million for allowing
online Canadian pharmacies to place advertisements through its AdWords program
targeting consumers in the United States, resulting in the unlawful importation of
controlled and non-controlled prescription drugs into the United States, announced
Deputy Attorney General James M. Cole; Peter F. Neronha, U.S. Attorney for the
District of Rhode Island; and Kathleen Martin-Weis, Acting Director of the U.S.
Food and Drug Administration's Office of Criminal Investigations (FDA/OCI). The
forfeiture, one of the largest ever in the United States, represents the gross revenue
received by Google as a result of Canadian pharmacies advertising through Google's
AdWords program, plus gross revenue made by Canadian pharmacies from their
sales to U.S. consumers.

1 The shipment of prescription drugs from pharmacies outside the United States
 2 to customers in the United States typically violates the Federal Food, Drug and
 3 Cosmetic Act and in the case of controlled prescription drugs, the Controlled
 4 Substances Act. Google was aware as early as 2003, that generally, it was illegal for
 5 pharmacies to ship controlled and non-controlled prescription drugs into the United
 6 States from Canada.

* * *

7 "The Department of Justice will continue to hold accountable companies who
 8 in their bid for profits violate federal law and put at risk the health and safety of
 9 American consumers," said Deputy Attorney General Cole. "This settlement ensures
 10 that Google will reform its improper advertising practices with regard to these
 11 pharmacies while paying one of the largest financial forfeiture penalties in history."

12 "This investigation is about the patently unsafe, unlawful, importation of
 13 prescription drugs by Canadian on-line pharmacies, with Google's knowledge and
 14 assistance, into the United States, directly to U.S. consumers," said U.S. Attorney
 15 Neronha. "It is about taking a significant step forward in limiting the ability of rogue
 16 on-line pharmacies from reaching U.S. consumers, by compelling Google to change
 17 its behavior. It is about holding Google responsible for its conduct by imposing a
 18 \$500 million forfeiture, the kind of forfeiture that will not only get Google's
 19 attention, but the attention of all those who contribute to America's pill problem."

* * *

20 In 2009, after Google became aware of the investigation by the Rhode Island
 21 U.S. Attorney's Office and the FDA/OCI Rhode Island Task Force of its advertising
 22 practices in the online pharmacy area, and as a result of that investigation, Google
 23 took a number of steps to prevent the unlawful sale of prescription drugs by online
 24 pharmacies to U.S. consumers. Among other things, Google began requiring online
 25 pharmacy advertisers to be certified by the National Association of Boards of
 26 Pharmacy's *Verified Internet Pharmacy Practices Sites* program, which conducts site
 27 visits; has a stringent standard against the issuance of prescriptions based on online
 28 consultations; and, most significantly, does not certify Canadian online pharmacies.
 In addition, Google retained an independent company to enhance detection of
 pharmacy advertisers exploiting flaws in the Google's screening systems.

Under the terms of an agreement signed by Google and the government,
 Google acknowledges that it improperly assisted Canadian online pharmacy
 advertisers to run advertisements that targeted the United States through AdWords,
 and the company accepts responsibility for this conduct. In addition to requiring
 Google to forfeit \$500 million, the agreement also sets forth a number of compliance
 and reporting measures which must be taken by Google in order to insure that the
 conduct described in the agreement does not occur in the future.

39. Thereafter, on August 23, 2011, Google paid \$500 million to federal authorities to
 resolve the DOJ's probe into Google's advertising practices. Due to defendants' fiduciary failures,
 Google has been severely damaged. Accordingly, Google is entitled to damages.

1 **Defendants' Breach of Loyalty**
2 **(and Candor and Good Faith)**

3 40. As the directors and officers of Google, defendants owed Google a fiduciary duty to
4 implement and maintain internal controls and policies to ensure compliance with the Federal Food,
5 Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Controlled Substances Act. This is because compliance with the
6 statutes, laws, rules and regulations applicable to Google's business and affairs was not an option for
7 the Google Board. Instead, they were duty bound to implement and maintain the internal controls
8 and policies that Google needed to discharge its legal obligations under federal law.

9 41. Moreover, defendants were fully aware that the advertising done by Canadian
10 pharmacies on AdWords triggered compliance obligations under the Acts. Defendants knew this
11 because they are, for the most part, seasoned business professionals with extensive experience
12 overseeing the business and affairs of U.S. companies. In addition, as the non-prosecution
13 agreement makes clear, the Company was aware as early as 2003 that the importation of prescription
14 drugs to consumers in the United States is almost always illegal; that Canadian pharmacies were
15 advertising prescription drugs to the Company's users in the United States; and that many of these
16 Canadian pharmacies distributed prescription drugs to consumers without a prescription and at a
17 premium.

18 42. Thus, defendants knew that, pursuant to federal mandates, they faced a known duty to
19 act, *i.e.*, to implement and maintain internal controls and policies to ensure compliance with federal
20 law. However, defendants did not proactively manage Google's risk and/or compliance associated
21 with the importation of prescription drugs. As a result, Google has been severely injured by the
22 violations of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Controlled Substances Act that arose
23 in the absence of the aforementioned internal systems and policies. To date, Google has incurred
24 more than \$500 million in damages due to defendants' fiduciary failures.

25 43. Defendants' failure to implement and maintain the required internal controls and
26 policies is not in serious doubt either. First, the government and Google entered into a non-
27 prosecution agreement under which Google acknowledged that it improperly assisted Canadian
28 online pharmacy advertisers in running advertisements that geo-targeted the United States through

1 AdWords and accepted responsibility for the Company's conduct. Moreover, "Company policy now
2 forbids accepting advertisements from pharmacies located in Canada, or elsewhere outside the
3 United States, to run in the United States on AdWords." These admissions and remediation
4 measures would not have existed if, after investigating, federal authorities had found evidence
5 showing that Google had, in fact, adopted internal controls and policies needed to prevent violations
6 of federal law. Taken together, they present *prima facie* evidence that defendants did not implement
7 the required controls and policies at Google during the time period involved in this case.
8 Alternatively, these facts support an inference that such internal controls and policies for compliance
9 did not exist at Google during the Google Board's watch.

10 44. Corporate directors may be held personally liable to the corporation for damages
11 arising from their failure to timely act when faced with a known duty to act, such as the
12 corporation's obligation to comply with the statutes, laws, rules and regulations applicable to its
13 business and affairs. The duty to implement internal systems and policies for compliance with the
14 Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act and the Controlled Substances Act fell squarely upon the
15 Google Board; yet, they failed to act. Accordingly, defendants breached their duty of loyalty to
16 Google and are liable for the resulting damages.

17 **Defendants' False and Misleading**
18 **Statements to Shareholders**

19 45. During the course of Google's long-standing scheme to generate revenue by allowing,
20 and assisting, its advertisers to violate federal laws related to the importation and dispensation of
21 prescription drugs, defendants issued a number of reports to Google shareholders regarding the
22 status of the Company's business and financial condition. For example, between 2003 and 2009,
23 Google filed Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K, reporting, among other things, the Company's
24 financial results for the then-current fiscal year and updating the status of the Company's business
25 and operations. These reports were signed by defendants, as indicated below, and consistently
26 represented that the Form 10-Ks fairly and accurately presented the Company's business and
27 financial condition. In fact, the 2004-2009 Form 10-K reports were false and misleading when
28 issued, because defendants failed to disclose that Google had derived significant revenues and profits

1 (ultimately estimated to be \$500 million when combined with proceeds Canadian online pharmacies
 2 generated from advertising through Google's AdWords program) resulting from improper
 3 advertising by Canadian pharmacies Nor did the Form 10-Ks disclose that such advertising revenue
 4 was being mischaracterized on Google's books as legitimate income. The dates and authors of each
 5 of the specific false and misleading annual reports on SEC Form 10-K follow below:

- 6 • 2004 Form 10-K filed with the SEC on March 30, 2005, and authored by defendants
 7 Page, Brin, Schmidt, Doerr, Hennessy, Otellini, and Ram;
- 8 • 2005 Form 10-K filed with the SEC on March 16, 2006, and authored by defendants
 9 Page, Brin, Schmidt, Doerr, Hennessy, Otellini, Ram and Tilghman;
- 10 • 2006 Form 10-K filed with the SEC on March 1, 2007, and authored by defendants
 11 Page, Brin, Schmidt, Doerr, Hennessy, Otellini, Ram and Tilghman;
- 12 • 2007 Form 10-K filed with the SEC on February 15, 2008, and authored by
 13 defendants Page, Brin, Schmidt, Doerr, Hennessy, Otellini, Ram and Tilghman;
- 14 • 2008 Form 10-K filed with the SEC on February 13, 2009, and authored by
 15 defendants Page, Schmidt, Doerr, Hennessy, Otellini, Ram, Tilghman and Pichette;
 16 and
- 17 • 2009 Form 10-K filed with the SEC on February 12, 2010, and authored by
 18 defendants Page, Brin, Schmidt, Hennessy, Otellini, Ram, Tilghman and Pichette.

19 46. Defendants also caused Google to issue false and misleading proxy statements to
 20 Google shareholders. In each of the proxy statements, defendants described, among other things, the
 21 compensation being paid to Google's directors and top officers, as well as provided information in
 22 support of the election or re-election of certain defendants to the Google Board. The 2005-2009
 23 proxy statements were false and misleading when issued to Google shareholders. This is because the
 24 proxy statements systematically failed to disclose the existence of the long-standing scheme to
 25 generate revenue by allowing, and assisting, Google advertisers to violate federal laws related to the
 26 importation and dispensation of prescription drugs and/or the false reporting of the Company's
 27 revenues and expenses as a result of the improper revenue Google was generating as a result. The
 28 specific false and misleading proxy statements are identified by date below:

- 29 • 2005 Proxy Statement, filed with the SEC on April 8, 2005;
- 30 • 2006 Proxy Statement, filed with the SEC on March 31, 2006;
- 31 • 2007 Proxy Statement, filed with the SEC on April 4, 2007;

- 1 • 2008 Proxy Statement, filed with the SEC on March 25, 2008; and
- 2 • 2009 Proxy Statement, filed with the SEC on March 24, 2009.

3 **DAMAGE TO GOOGLE**

4 47. Google has been, and will continue to be, severely damaged and injured by
 5 defendants' misconduct. Further, as a direct and proximate result of defendants' breach of loyalty,
 6 Google has expended and will continue to expend significant sums of money. These expenditures
 7 include, but are not limited to: (i) costs incurred from the investigations into the Company's
 8 acceptance of advertisements placed by online pharmacy advertisers that violated federal law;
 9 (ii) costs incurred from the compensation and benefits paid to the defendants that breached their
 10 fiduciary duties to the Company; (iii) the fines, penalties and disgorgement resulting from the
 11 Company's violations of the federal law; and (iv) the cost of implementing the settlements with the
 12 DOJ.

13 48. In addition, Google's business, goodwill, and reputation with its business partners,
 14 regulators, and shareholders have been gravely impaired. Moreover, these actions have irreparably
 15 damaged Google's corporate image and goodwill. For at least the foreseeable future, Google will
 16 suffer from what is known as the "liar's discount," a term applied to the stocks of companies who
 17 have been implicated in improper behavior and have misled the investing public, such that Google's
 18 ability to raise equity capital or debt on favorable terms in the future is now impaired.

19 49. Nevertheless, the Google Board has taken no action against the directors and officers
 20 responsible for the damage and injury to the Company, including themselves. By this action,
 21 plaintiff seeks redress for and vindication of Google's rights against its wayward fiduciaries.

22 **DERIVATIVE AND DEMAND FUTILITY ALLEGATIONS**

23 50. Plaintiff incorporates ¶¶1-49.

24 51. Pursuant to Rule 23.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedures, plaintiff brings this
 25 action for the benefit of Google to redress injuries suffered, and to be suffered, by Google as a result
 26 of the defendants' breaches of fiduciary duty, abuse of control, corporate waste and unjust
 27 enrichment. Google is named as a nominal party in this action.

28

1 52. Plaintiff will adequately and fairly represent the interests of Google in enforcing and
2 prosecuting its rights.

3 53. A pre-suit demand on the Google Board to commence this action is excused as a
4 useless and futile act for several reasons. First, a pre-suit demand is excused because defendants
5 ignored, consciously disregarded and/or were reckless in failing to establish and maintain internal
6 controls and policies at Google that complied with the requirements of the federal law. On
7 defendants' watch, a long-standing scheme, involving millions of dollars in improper revenue
8 generated from advertising done in violation of federal law, occurred. This scheme could not have
9 succeeded and endured for as long as it did had the Google Board caused internal controls and
10 policies to be adopted. As a result of the Google Board's failure to act, when faced with a known
11 duty to act, *i.e.*, Google's compliance with the legal requirements of federal laws related to the
12 importation of prescription drugs, the members of the Google Board breached their fiduciary duty of
13 loyalty owed to Google. As a result, under the circumstances of the case, the Google Board faces a
14 substantial likelihood of liability for breach of loyalty. Therefore, a pre-suit demand on the Google
15 Board is excused as futile.

16 54. A presuit demand upon the Google Board is also excused because the entire Google
17 Board breached its fiduciary duty of loyalty (and candor) by making false and misleading statements
18 in Google's shareholder reports. In particular, Google's Annual Reports on SEC Form 10-K for
19 2004-2009 were false and misleading when issued, because they did not disclose: (i) that a
20 significant portion of Google's reported total revenues were being derived from illegal advertising
21 by Canadian pharmacies; and (ii) that such advertising revenue was being mischaracterized on
22 Google's books as legitimate income.

23 55. Moreover, a majority of the Google Board issued false and misleading proxy
24 statements to Google shareholders between 2005 and 2009. These proxy statements failed to
25 disclose that the Google Board had not implemented internal controls for Google's compliance with
26 the federal laws related to the importation of prescription drugs. These false and misleading proxy
27 statements breached the Google Board's fiduciary duty of loyalty (and candor). Accordingly, a
28 presuit demand upon the Google Board is excused on this basis as well.

COUNT I

**Against All Defendants for Breach of Fiduciary Duty of Loyalty
(and Candor and Good Faith)**

56. Plaintiff incorporates ¶¶1-55.

57. Defendants owed Google and its shareholders a fiduciary duty of loyalty (and candor and good faith). Under this duty, defendants, when faced with a known duty to act, here Google's legal duty to comply with the federal laws related to the importation of prescription drugs, were duty bound to proactively implement internal controls and policies designed to ensure Google's compliance with these laws.

58. However, defendants failed to implement and maintain the aforementioned systems and controls.

59. As a result of defendants' disloyalty, Google has been injured. Accordingly, Google is entitled to damages.

COUNT II

Against All Defendants for Abuse of Control

60. Plaintiff incorporates ¶¶1-59.

61. Defendants' misconduct alleged herein constituted an abuse of their ability to control and influence Google, for which they are legally responsible.

62. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' abuse of control, Google has sustained and continues to sustain significant damages. As a result of the misconduct alleged herein, defendants are liable to the Company.

COUNT III

Against All Defendants for Corporate Waste

63. Plaintiff incorporates ¶¶1-62.

64. As a result of the foregoing misconduct, defendants have caused Google to waste valuable corporate assets.

65. As a direct and proximate result of defendants' corporate waste, Google has sustained and continues to sustain significant damages. As a result of the misconduct alleged herein, defendants are liable to the Company.

COUNT IV

Against All Defendants for Unjust Enrichment

66. Plaintiffs incorporate ¶¶1-65.

67. By their wrongful acts and omissions, defendants were unjustly enriched at the expense of and to the detriment of Google. Defendants were unjustly enriched as a result of the salary, fees, stock options and other payments they received while breaching their fiduciary duty owed to Google.

68. Plaintiffs, as shareholders of Google, seek restitution from defendants, and each of them, and seek an order of this Court disgorging all profits, benefits, and other improper payments obtained by defendants, and each of them, from their wrongful conduct and fiduciary breaches.

69. As a result of defendants' unjust enrichment, Google has been injured and is entitled to damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, plaintiff demands judgment in the Company's favor against all defendants as follows:

A. Declaring that plaintiff may maintain this action on behalf of Google and that plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Company;

B. Declaring that the defendants have breached and/or aided and abetted the breach of their fiduciary duties to Google;

C. Determining and awarding to Google the damages sustained by it as a result of the violations set forth above from each of the defendants, jointly and severally, together with interest thereon;

D. Determining and awarding to Google exemplary damages in an amount necessary to punish defendants and to make an example of defendants to the community according to proof at trial:

1 E. Awarding Google restitution from defendants, and each of them;

2 F. Awarding plaintiff the costs and disbursements of this action, including reasonable
3 attorneys' and experts' fees, costs and expenses; and


4 G. Granting such other and further equitable relief as this Court may deem just and
5 proper.

6 **JURY DEMAND**

7 Plaintiff demands a trial by jury.

8 DATED: August 29, 2011

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
& DOWD LLP
SHAWN A. WILLIAMS

9
10
11 

SHAWN A. WILLIAMS

12 Post Montgomery Center
13 One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
14 San Francisco, CA 94104
15 Telephone: 415/288-4545
415/288-4534 (fax)

16 ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
17 & DOWD LLP
18 DARREN J. ROBBINS
19 TRAVIS E. DOWNS III
20 BENNY C. GOODMAN III
21 ERIK W. LUEDEKE
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101-3301
Telephone: 619/231-1058
619/231-7423 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff

22 S:\CptDraft\Derivative\Cpt Google.doc
23
24
25
26
27
28

VERIFICATION

I, Patricia H. McKenna, hereby declare as follows:

I am a shareholder of Google Inc. I was a shareholder at the time of the wrongdoing complained of and I remain a shareholder. I have retained competent counsel and I am ready, willing and able to pursue this action vigorously on behalf of Google Inc. I have reviewed the Verified Shareholder Derivative Complaint. Based upon discussions with and reliance upon my counsel, and as to those facts of which I have personal knowledge, the Complaint is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

DATED: August 27, 2011


Patricia H. McKenna

ORIGINAL

CIVIL COVER SHEET

JS 44 (Rev. 12/07) (CAND Rev 1/10)

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

PATRICIA M. McKENNA, Derivatively on Behalf of GOOGLE INC.

DEFENDANTS

LARRY PAGE, SERGEY BRIN, ERIC E. SCHMIDT, L. JOHN DOERR,
(See ATTACHMENT A)(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Pennsylvania
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE
LAND INVOLVED.

(c) Attorney's (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

Shawn A. Williams (213113)
Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP
One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94104 415/288-4545

HRL

E-filing

ADR

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff ☐ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant ☒ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- PTF DEF
Citizen of This State ☐ 1 ☒ 1 Incorporated or Principal Place of Business in This State ☐ 4 ☐ 4
Citizen of Another State ☒ 2 ☐ 2 Incorporated and Principal Place of Business in Another State ☐ 5 ☐ 5
Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country ☐ 3 ☐ 3 Foreign Nation ☐ 6 ☐ 6

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury—Med. Malpractice	<input type="checkbox"/> 610 Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	<input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment
<input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine	<input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury—Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 620 Other Food & Drug	<input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	<input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust
<input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	PROPERTY RIGHTS	<input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking
<input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument	<input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud	<input type="checkbox"/> 630 Liquor Laws	<input type="checkbox"/> 432 Copyrights	<input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce
<input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment	<input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending	<input type="checkbox"/> 640 R.R. & Truck	<input type="checkbox"/> 433 Patent	<input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation
<input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage	<input type="checkbox"/> 650 Airline Regs.	<input type="checkbox"/> 440 Trademark	<input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations
<input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	<input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 660 Occupational Safety/Health	SOCIAL SECURITY	<input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit
<input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits	<input type="checkbox"/> 390 Other Civil Rights	<input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff)	<input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV
<input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits	PRISONER PETITIONS	LABOR	<input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923)	<input type="checkbox"/> 510 Selective Service
<input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract	<input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence	<input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 550 Securities/Commodities/Exchange
<input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 530 General	<input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI	<input type="checkbox"/> 575 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410
<input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	<input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty	<input type="checkbox"/> 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g))	<input type="checkbox"/> 590 Other Statutory Actions
REAL PROPERTY	<input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other	<input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	<input type="checkbox"/> 591 Agricultural Acts
<input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation	<input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights	<input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation	<input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant)	<input type="checkbox"/> 592 Economic Stabilization Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure	<input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition	<input type="checkbox"/> 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	<input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 593 Environmental Matters
<input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment		IMMIGRATION		<input type="checkbox"/> 594 Energy Allocation Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land		<input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application		<input type="checkbox"/> 595 Freedom of Information Act
<input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability		<input type="checkbox"/> 463 Habeas Corpus—Alien Detainee		<input type="checkbox"/> 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice
<input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property		<input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions		<input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding ☐ 2 Removed from State Court ☐ 3 Removed from Appellate Court ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened ☐ 5 Transferred from another district (specify) ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation ☐ 7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

28 U.S.C. §1332(a)(1)

Brief description of cause:

VERIFIED SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE COMPLAINT

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:
JURY DEMAND: ☐ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

PLEASE REFER TO CIVIL L.R. 3-12 CONCERNING REQUIREMENT TO FILE "NOTICE OF RELATED CASE".

IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT (CIVIL L.R. 3-2) (PLACE AND "X" IN ONE BOX ONLY)

☐ SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND☒ SAN JOSE☐ EUREKA

DATE

August 29, 2011

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

JS 44 Reverse (Rev. 12/07)

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ATTORNEYS COMPLETING CIVIL COVER SHEET FORM JS 44**Authority For Civil Cover Sheet**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replaces nor supplements the filings and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. Consequently, a civil cover sheet is submitted to the Clerk of Court for each civil complaint filed. The attorney filing a case should complete the form as follows:

I. (a) Plaintiffs-Defendants. Enter names (last, first, middle initial) of plaintiff and defendant. If the plaintiff or defendant is a government agency, use only the full name or standard abbreviations. If the plaintiff or defendant is an official within a government agency, identify first the agency and then the official, giving both name and title.

(b) County of Residence. For each civil case filed, except U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county where the first listed plaintiff resides at the time of filing. In U.S. plaintiff cases, enter the name of the county in which the first listed defendant resides at the time of filing. (NOTE: In land condemnation cases, the county of residence of the "defendant" is the location of the tract of land involved.)

(c) Attorneys. Enter the firm name, address, telephone number, and attorney of record. If there are several attorneys, list them on an attachment, noting in this section "(see attachment)".

II. Jurisdiction. The basis of jurisdiction is set forth under Rule 8(a), F.R.C.P., which requires that jurisdictions be shown in pleadings. Place an "X" in one of the boxes. If there is more than one basis of jurisdiction, precedence is given in the order shown below.

United States plaintiff. (1) Jurisdiction based on 28 U.S.C. 1345 and 1348. Suits by agencies and officers of the United States are included here.

United States defendant. (2) When the plaintiff is suing the United States, its officers or agencies, place an "X" in this box.

Federal question. (3) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1331, where jurisdiction arises under the Constitution of the United States, an amendment to the Constitution, an act of Congress or a treaty of the United States. In cases where the U.S. is a party, the U.S. plaintiff or defendant code takes precedence, and box 1 or 2 should be marked.

Diversity of citizenship. (4) This refers to suits under 28 U.S.C. 1332, where parties are citizens of different states. When Box 4 is checked, the citizenship of the different parties must be checked. (See Section III below; federal question actions take precedence over diversity cases.)

III. Residence (citizenship) of Principal Parties. This section of the JS 44 is to be completed if diversity of citizenship was indicated above. Mark this section for each principal party.

IV. Nature of Suit. Place an "X" in the appropriate box. If the nature of suit cannot be determined, be sure the cause of action, in Section VI below, is sufficient to enable the deputy clerk or the statistical clerks in the Administrative Office to determine the nature of suit. If the cause fits more than one nature of suit, select the most definitive.

V. Origin. Place an "X" in one of the seven boxes.

Original Proceedings. (1) Cases which originate in the United States district courts.

Removed from State Court. (2) Proceedings initiated in state courts may be removed to the district courts under Title 28 U.S.C., Section 1441. When the petition for removal is granted, check this box.

Remanded from Appellate Court. (3) Check this box for cases remanded to the district court for further action. Use the date of remand as the filing date.

Reinstated or Reopened. (4) Check this box for cases reinstated or reopened in the district court. Use the reopening date as the filing date.

Transferred from Another District. (5) For cases transferred under Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1404(a). Do not use this for within district transfers or multidistrict litigation transfers.

Multidistrict Litigation. (6) Check this box when a multidistrict case is transferred into the district under authority of Title 28 U.S.C. Section 1407. When this box is checked, do not check (5) above.

Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment. (7) Check this box for an appeal from a magistrate judge's decision.

VI. Cause of Action. Report the civil statute directly related to the cause of action and give a brief description of the cause. Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity. Example: U.S. Civil Statute: 47 USC 553
Brief Description: Unauthorized reception of cable service

VII. Requested in Complaint. Class Action. Place an "X" in this box if you are filing a class action under Rule 23, F.R.Cv.P.

Demand. In this space enter the dollar amount (in thousands of dollars) being demanded or indicate other demand such as a preliminary injunction.

Jury Demand. Check the appropriate box to indicate whether or not a jury is being demanded.

VIII. Related Cases. This section of the JS 44 is used to reference related pending cases if any. If there are related pending cases, insert the docket numbers and the corresponding judge names for such cases.

Date and Attorney Signature. Date and sign the civil cover sheet.

ATTACHMENT A

Defendants (cont.)

JOHN L. HENNESSY, PAUL S. OTELLINI, K. RAM SHRIRAM, SHIRLEY M. TILGHMAN,
NIKESH ARORA and PATRICK PICHETTE,

Defendants.

— and —

GOOGLE INC., a Delaware corporation,

Nominal Party.