

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP
2 Shon Morgan (Bar No. 187736)
(shonmorgan@quinnemanuel.com)
3 John W. Baumann (Bar No. 288881)
(jackbaumann@quinnemanuel.com)
4 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90017
5 Telephone: (213) 443-3000
Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

7 Cristina Henriquez (Bar No. 317445)
(cristinahenriquez@quinnemanuel.com)
8 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor
Redwood Shores, California 94065
9 Telephone: (650) 801-5000
Facsimile: (650) 801-5000

10 Attorneys for ANCESTRY.COM OPERATIONS
11 INC., ANCESTRY.COM INC., and
ANCESTRY.COM LLC

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 MEREDITH CALLAHAN and
16 LAWRENCE GEOFFREY ABRAHAM, on
behalf of themselves and all others similarly
17 situated,

18 Plaintiffs,

19 vs.

20 ANCESTRY.COM OPERATIONS INC., a
Virginia Corporation; ANCESTRY.COM,
21 INC., a Delaware Corporation;
ANCESTRY.COM LLC, a Delaware
22 Limited Liability Company; and DOES 1
through 50, inclusive,

23 Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:20-cv-08437-LB

**NOTICE OF DEFENDANTS' MOTION
AND MOTION TO DISMISS PURSUANT
TO FRCP 12 AND MOTION TO STRIKE
PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA CODE OF
CIVIL PROCEDURE § 425.16 AND
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT;**

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Hearing Date: February 18, 2021
Hearing Time: 9:30 a.m.
Location: San Francisco Courthouse, Courtroom B

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	2
BACKGROUND AND MATERIAL ALLEGATIONS IN PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT	3
LEGAL STANDARDS.....	4
ARGUMENT	6
I. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS FAIL BECAUSE THEY DID NOT SUFFER ANY INJURY AS A RESULT OF THE ALLEGED VIOLATIONS	6
II. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS UNDER CIVIL CODE SECTION 3344 AND THE UCL FAIL BECAUSE THE CHALLENGED CONDUCT FALLS UNDER THE “PUBLIC AFFAIRS” EXCEPTION	11
III. PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS ARE FORECLOSED BY SECTION 230 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS DECENCY ACT	13
IV. PLAINTIFFS' SECTION 3344 AND DERIVATIVE UCL CLAIM ARE PREEMPTED BY SECTION 301 OF THE COPYRIGHT ACT	16
V. PLAINTIFFS CANNOT PLAUSIBLY STATE A CLAIM FOR INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION	18
VI. NO STANDALONE CLAIM FOR UNJUST ENRICHMENT EXISTS	20
VII. THE COURT SHOULD STRIKE PLAINTIFFS' PRAYER FOR STATUTORY DAMAGES BECAUSE PLAINTIFFS HAVE NOT, AND CANNOT, ALLEGE MENTAL ANGUISH	20
VIII. THE COURT SHOULD STRIKE PLAINTIFFS' RESTITUTION-BASED CLAIMS BECAUSE AN ADEQUATE REMEDY AT LAW EXISTS	21
IX. THE COURT SHOULD STRIKE PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS PURSUANT TO CALIFORNIA'S ANTI-SLAPP STATUTE	22
CONCLUSION	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1	Cases	2	<u>Page</u>
3			
4			
5	<i>Aldrin v. Topps Co., Inc.</i> , 2011 WL 4500013 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2011).....	12, 13	
6	<i>Andrade v. Arby's Rest. Grp., Inc.</i> , 2015 WL 6689475 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2015).....	13	
7			
8	<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	5	
9	<i>Barrett v. Rosenthal</i> , 40 Cal. 4th 33 (2006).....	22	
10			
11	<i>Beck v. McDonald</i> , 848 F.3d 262 (4th Cir. 2017).....	9	
12			
13	<i>Bodnar v. Cty. of Riverside</i> , 2020 WL 2542871 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 3, 2020), <i>report and recommendation adopted</i> , 2020 WL 2542617 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 6, 2020).....	8	
14			
15	<i>Bosley Med. Inst., Inc. v. Kremer</i> , 403 F.3d 672 (9th Cir. 2005).....	5	
16			
17	<i>Caraccioli v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 167 F. Supp. 3d 1056 (N.D. Cal. 2016)	14	
18			
19	<i>Caraccioli v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 700 F. App'x 588 (9th Cir. 2017)	13	
20			
21	<i>Carafano v. Metrosplash.com, Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 1119 (9th Cir. 2003).....	13, 14	
22			
23	<i>Carlisle v. Fawcett Publications, Inc.</i> , 201 Cal. App. 2d 733 (1962).....	11	
24			
25	<i>Cohen v. Facebook</i> , 798 F. Supp. 2d 1090 (N.D. Cal. 2011)	9	
26			
27	<i>Ctr. for Med. Progress v. Planned Parenthood Fed'n of Am.</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1446 (2019)	6	
28			
29	<i>DC Comics v. Pac. Pictures Corp.</i> , 706 F.3d 1009 (9th Cir. 2013).....	22	
30			
31	<i>Del Vecchio v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 1997697 (W.D. Wash. June 1, 2012).....	10	
32			
33	<i>Dora v. Frontline Video, Inc.</i> , 15 Cal. App. 4th 536 (1993).....	22, 23	

1	<i>Dutta v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 895 F.3d 1166 (9th Cir. 2018).....	6
2	<i>Ebeid v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 2059662 (N.D. Cal. May 9, 2019)	13
4	<i>Endemol Entm't B.V. v. Twentieth Television Inc.</i> , 1998 WL 785300 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 1998).....	17
5	<i>Evans v. B.F. Perkins Co.</i> , 166 F.3d 642 (4th Cir. 1999).....	5
7	<i>Fair Hous. Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommates.Com, LLC</i> , 521 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2008).....	15, 16
9	<i>Felix v. State Comp. Ins. Fund</i> , 2007 WL 3034444 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 3, 2007)	20
10	<i>Fleet v. CBS, Inc.</i> , 50 Cal. App. 4th 1911 (1996).....	17
12	<i>Folgelstrom v. Lamps Plus, Inc.</i> , 195 Cal. App. 4th 986 (2011).....	20
13	<i>Four Navy Seals v. Associated Press</i> , 413 F. Supp. 2d 1136 (S.D. Cal. 2005)	18
15	<i>Fraley v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 830 F. Supp. 2d 785 (N.D. Cal. 2011)	15, 16
16	<i>Fus v. CafePress, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 7027653 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 30, 2020).....	8
18	<i>FW/PBS, Inc. v. Dallas</i> , 493 U.S. 215 (1990)	5
19	<i>Gates v. Discovery Commc'ns, Inc.</i> , 34 Cal. 4th 679 (2004).....	23
21	<i>Gionfriddo v. Major League Baseball</i> , 94 Cal. App. 4th 400 (2001).....	24
23	<i>Gladstone, Realtors v. Village of Bellwood</i> , 441 U.S. 91 (1979)	4
24	<i>Goddard v. Google, Inc.</i> , 640 F. Supp. 2d 1193 (N.D. Cal. 2009)	14
25	<i>In re Google, Inc. Privacy Policy Litig.</i> , 2013 WL 6248499 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2013)	10
27	<i>In re Google, Inc. Privacy Policy Litig.</i> , 58 F. Supp. 3d 968 (N.D. Cal. 2014)	19

1	<i>Gordon v. F.B.I.</i> , 388 F. Supp. 2d 1028 (N.D. Cal. 2005)	18
2	<i>Guglielmi v. Spelling-Goldberg Productions</i> , 25 Cal. 3d 860 (1979).....	11
4	<i>Hernandez v. Hillsides, Inc.</i> , 47 Cal. 4th 272 (2009).....	20
5	<i>Hicks v. Richard</i> , 39 Cal. App. 5th 1167 (2019).....	23
7	<i>Jackson v. Loews Hotels, Inc.</i> , 2019 WL 2619656 (C.D. Cal. Jan. 4, 2019).....	8
9	<i>Jones v. Dirty World Entm't Recordings LLC</i> , 755 F.3d 398 (6th Cir. 2014).....	14
10	<i>Jules Jordan Video, Inc. v. 144942 Canada, Inc.</i> , 617 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2010).....	17
11	<i>Jurin v. Google Inc.</i> , 695 F. Supp. 2d 1117 (E.D. Cal. 2010).....	13
13	<i>KEMA, Inc. v. Koperwhats</i> , 2010 WL 3464737 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 1, 2010).....	21
14	<i>Kimzey v. Yelp! Inc.</i> , 836 F.3d 1263 (9th Cir. 2016).....	14
16	<i>Kodadek v. MTV Networks, Inc.</i> , 152 F.3d 1209 (9th Cir. 1998).....	17
17	<i>Low v. LinkedIn Corp.</i> , 900 F. Supp. 2d 1010 (N.D. Cal. 2012)	20
19	<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	4, 6, 10
20	<i>Makaeff v. Trump Univ., LLC</i> , 715 F.3d 254 (9th Cir. 2013).....	22, 24
22	<i>Maloney v. T3Media, Inc.</i> , 853 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2017).....	16, 17
23	<i>Mayron v. Google LLC</i> , 54 Cal. App. 5th 566 (2020).....	6
25	<i>Med. Lab. Mgmt. Consultants v. Am. Broad. Companies, Inc.</i> , 306 F.3d 806 (9th Cir. 2002).....	19
26	<i>Miller v. Collectors Universe, Inc.</i> , 159 Cal. App. 4th 988 (2008).....	20, 21
28		

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.