

1 Rudolph A. Telscher, Jr.*
2 rudy.telscher@huschblackwell.com
3 Kara R. Fussner*
4 kara.fussner@huschblackwell.com
5 HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP
6 190 Carondelet Plaza, Suite 600
7 St. Louis, MO 63105
8 314-480-1500 Telephone

Stephen P. Bosco*
stephen.bosco@huschblackwell.com
HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP
750 17th Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20006
202-378-2300 Telephone

**admitted pro hac vice*

6 David E. Anderson*
7 david.anderson@huschblackwell.com
8 HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP
9 120 South Riverside Plaza Suite 2200
10 Chicago, IL 60606
11 312-655-1500 Telephone

Karl Kronenberger (CA Bar No. 226112)
karl@krinternetlaw.com
Jeffrey M. Rosenfeld (CA Bar No. 222187)
jeff@krinternetlaw.com
KRONENBERGER ROSENFELD, LLP
150 Post Street, Suite 520
San Francisco, CA 94108
415-955-1155 Telephone
415-955-1158 Facsimile

10 Dustin L. Taylor*
11 dustin.taylor@huschblackwell.com
12 David Stauss*
13 david.stauss@huschblackwell.com
14 HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP
15 180 1 Wewatta Street, Suite 1000
16 Denver, CO 80202
17 303-749-7200 Telephone

*Attorneys for Defendants/Counterclaim
Plaintiffs BrandTotal, Ltd. and Unimania,
Inc.*

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
17 **SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND DIVISION**

18 META PLATFORMS, INC., a Delaware
19 corporation,

20 *Plaintiff/Counterclaim*
21 *Defendant,*

21 v.

22 BRANDTOTAL, LTD., an Israeli
23 corporation, and
24 UNIMANIA, INC., a Delaware
25 corporation,

25 *Defendants/Counterclaim*
26 *Plaintiffs.*

Case No.: 3:20-CV-07182-JCS

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSED MOTION TO
ENLARGE TIME PURSUANT TO
LOCAL CIVIL RULE 6-3**

Judge: The Hon. Joseph C. Spero
Ctrm.: Courtroom F – 15th Floor

27
28 DEFENDANTS' OPPOSED MOTION TO

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Not content that BrandTotal has made the strategic decision to cease all business activity
3 and wind down its operations, Meta is now attempting to use its limitless resources to further
4 strong-arm BrandTotal into an unfavorable settlement by forcing it to respond to premature, pre-
5 judgment motions seeking attorneys' fee and injunctive relief without allowing BrandTotal a full
6 and fair opportunity to respond. These motions seek to impose massive new financial penalties,
7 conduct restrictions, and property disgorgements upon BrandTotal based on theories and evidence
8 that were not previously disclosed to BrandTotal—all before any judgment has even been entered
9 in this matter. In view of the new theories, evidence, and draconian relief sought in Meta's
10 motions, and given that BrandTotal has been focused on winding down its operations and
11 preparing for a scheduled mediation on August 29 intended to resolve the parties' dispute without
12 further judicial intervention, BrandTotal requested a modest-under-the-circumstances 30-day
13 extension to the deadline for its response.

14 Meta's response—which it has refused to budge from even after further compromise offers
15 from BrandTotal— was a miserly nine-day extension that was conditional upon BrandTotal
16 accepting Meta's arbitrary and unilateral decision that the hearing on these motions should be held
17 on September 30. BrandTotal cannot reasonably evaluate and respond to Meta's new theories,
18 evidence, and argument in that time frame and should not have to agree to these unacceptable
19 conditions. There is no urgent need to resolve these issues—to the contrary, as is explained in
20 more detail below, many are likely not even ripe for adjudication—and Meta had more than 2.5
21 months to develop its arguments after entry of the Court's Order on the parties' partial summary
22 judgment motions. There is no reason that BrandTotal should be prohibited from using a fraction
23 of that time to respond to incredibly impactful motions that seek to impose lifelong and invasive
24 conduct restrictions on BrandTotal and its officers and agents, in addition to financial penalties that
25 are almost twenty times larger than the actual damages Meta has claimed. Accordingly, and for all
26 the reasons set forth below and in the accompanying declaration of Kara Fussner, BrandTotal files
27 this opposed motion under Local Civil Rule 6-3 and asks the Court to enlarge the time for
28

1 BrandTotal’s opposition to the following motions—(1) Plaintiff Meta Platforms, Inc.’s Motion for
2 Attorney’s Fees (ECF No. 368, “Fee Motion”) and (2) Plaintiff Meta Platforms, Inc.’s Motion for
3 Permanent Injunction (ECF No. 367, “Injunction Motion) (collectively, “the Motions”)—to
4 September 30 or a date to be determined after the Court enters judgment.

5 **II. RELEVANT FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

6 The Court issued its Order on the parties’ partial summary judgment motions on May 27.
7 In that Order, the Court granted aspects of both parties’ summary judgment motions, denied other
8 aspects, and expressly deferred resolution of substantial legal and factual issues for subsequent
9 proceedings. Specifically, on Meta’s breach of contract claim, the Court granted Meta summary
10 judgment as to BrandTotal’s liability, but made clear that “the amount of any actual damages [is]
11 to be proven at trial.” ECF No. 339 at 41. As to Meta’s Computer Fraud and Abuse Act (“CFAA”)
12 claim and Penal Code § 502 claim (sometimes called the “CDAFA” claim), the Court granted
13 BrandTotal’s request for summary judgment that its UpVoice 2021 data collection does *not* violate
14 the CFAA, holding that “the statute does not encompass UpVoice 2021’s data collection, at least
15 where it is installed by individuals who are not subject to any sort of direction by BrandTotal.” *Id.*
16 at 43. The Court also held that BrandTotal’s accessing of non-password protected Facebook and
17 Instagram pages did not violate the CFAA. *Id.* at 43-44. The Court applied both of these holdings
18 in full to Facebook’s Penal Code claim, which the Court recognized as substantially “co-
19 extensive” with Meta’s CFAA claim. *Id.* at 45.

20 As to Meta’s motion for summary judgment on its CFAA and Penal Code claims, the Court
21 denied it as to CFAA entirely based on disputed issues of fact relating to damages and denied
22 summary judgment on the merits as to substantial aspects of both of Meta’s CFAA and Penal Code
23 claims. For example, the Court denied Meta’s summary judgment claim on the CFAA and Penal
24 Code “[t]o the extent it seeks judgment that BrandTotal’s collection of data from panelists using
25 UpVoice 2021, or its direct access to non-password-protected portions of Meta’s platforms violates
26 those statutes.” *Id.* at 47. Further, the Court held that “Meta’s motion for summary judgment is
27 DENIED as to the question of whether BrandTotal’s use of the RPE violates the CFAA or the
28

1 CDAFA.” *Id.* at 57. Indeed, the Court only granted summary judgment in Meta’s favor on a
2 narrow subset of the conduct for which Meta sought relief, and even as to that conduct made clear
3 that “relief [is] to be determined at trial”:

4 Meta’s motions for summary judgment is GRANTED *as to the question of whether active*
5 *collection of data from password-protected portions of Meta’s services by BrandTotal’s*
6 *legacy programs, and by BrandTotal directly*, violated the CFAA and the CDAFA. *Meta’s*
7 *motion is otherwise DENIED as to these claims.* Meta will be entitled to judgment in its
8 favor on the CDAFA claim based on its legacy programs and direct access to password-
9 protected material, *with relief to be determined at trial.* Meta’s CFAA claim *remains*
10 *contingent on showing at trial at least \$5,000 in loss caused by BrandTotal’s violations.*

11 *Id.* at 57 (emphasis added). The Court’s grant of summary judgment as to Meta’s UCL claim was
12 narrowly circumscribed to the same limited conduct, and the Court granted BrandTotal summary
13 judgment “as to a finding that its use of UpVoice 2021 does not violate the UCL.” *Id.* at 59.
14 Critically, the Court has not entered judgment in this action as to any of the parties’ claims.

15 Following the Court’s Order, BrandTotal repeatedly met and conferred with Meta in good
16 faith to resolve the outstanding issues and allow the parties to proceed with an appeal without
17 requiring the expenditure of resources required by a trial. While no comprehensive agreement was
18 reached, substantial progress was made regarding the scope of a proposed an injunction—an
19 agreement that Meta seemingly ignores in filing its motion for a permanent injunction that fails to
20 include many of BrandTotal’s revisions—the parties have been unable to agree on the scope of
21 damages. BrandTotal maintains that Meta’s request for millions in “unjust enrichment” is legally
22 improper, depends on improper methodology, and factually absurd considering that BrandTotal
23 was never profitable. BrandTotal’s motion to exclude the opinions of Meta’s damages expert
24 remains pending. ECF No. 249.

25 After several such meet and confers, Meta raised—for the first time in this litigation—its
26 intent to seek attorneys’ fees under the Penal Code. Meta did not even include a claim under the
27 California State Penal Code in its original State court complaint. Nor did Meta plead any
28 entitlement to attorneys’ fees in either its original or amended Federal complaint.

1 **III. THERE ARE NO EXIGENT CIRCUMSTANCES JUSTIFYING META’S**
 2 **REFUSAL TO GRANT THE REQUESTED EXTENSION AND ITS DEMAND FOR**
 3 **COMPRESSED BRIEFING AND HEARING SCHEDULE**

4 Until Meta unilaterally altered the status quo by filing the Motions, there were no
 5 significant upcoming pre-trial deadlines on the case calendar apart from the August 29 mediation.
 6 Negotiations were ongoing on remaining disputes and BrandTotal at least was optimistic that the
 7 mediation could lead to amicable resolution of the remaining issues. Trial is not set to begin until
 8 October 31. In short, BrandTotal’s requested extension would have no negative impact on the case
 9 schedule, and there is no basis in the schedule for Meta’s sudden insistence that its pre-judgment
 10 demands for attorney’s fees and injunctive relief be heard on September 30.

11 Meta’s proffered reasons for its sudden urgency and its refusal to grant the requested
 12 extension—(1) that BrandTotal might somehow restart its business in the interim and (2) that it
 13 might not have funds to pay Meta the attorneys’ fees to which it is purportedly “entitled”—are
 14 illogical and internally contradictory. It is undisputed and indisputable that BrandTotal has ceased
 15 all operations. *See* Injunction Motion at 13 (quoting unequivocal BrandTotal notice on website
 16 stating that “BrandTotal has ceased operating and has shut down all operations, including
 17 UpVoice, effective June 29, 2022”). Indeed, in its Fee Motion Meta flatly represented that “Meta’s
 18 summary judgment victories on the merits of its claims have...caused BrandTotal to shut down its
 19 entire scraping operation” and argued that Meta qualifies as a “prevailing party” on that basis
 20 alone. ECF No. 368 at 8 n.3. Meta’s purported concern that granting BrandTotal a modest 30-day
 21 extension for its Response to the Motions creates a risk that BrandTotal will resume operations is
 22 disingenuous and unserious.

23 As to the notion that BrandTotal might not have the funds sufficient to cover the attorneys’
 24 fees to which Meta claims it is “entitled” merely because it “prevailed on its CDFA claim,” ECF
 25 No. 368 at 7, Meta knows better. BrandTotal has shared its insurance policy with Meta and there
 26 are ample funds available (i.e., several *million* remaining on the policy). Further, it would be
 27 fundamentally unjust if Meta were permitted to use the very financial difficulties it created as a
 28 sword to deny BrandTotal a full and fair opportunity to respond to Meta’s Fee Motion, which is
 based on a previously undisclosed legal theory and relies on over 4,000 fee entries which Meta

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.