

1 Michael F. Ram (SBN 104805)
2 mram@forthepeople.com
3 Marie N. Appel (SBN 187483)
4 mappel@forthepeople.com
5 MORGAN & MORGAN
6 COMPLEX LITIGATION GROUP
7 711 Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500
8 San Francisco, CA 94102
9 Telephone: (415) 358-6913
10 Telephone: (415) 358-6293

11 Benjamin R. Osborn (appearing *Pro Hac Vice*)
12 102 Bergen St.
13 Brooklyn, NY 11201
14 Phone: (347) 645-0464
15 Email: ben@benosbornlaw.com

16 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*
17 *and the Proposed Class*

18 THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
19 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
20 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

21 MEREDITH CALLAHAN and LAWRENCE
22 GEOFFREY ABRAHAM, individually and on
23 behalf of all others similarly situated,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 v.

26 ANCESTRY.COM OPERATIONS INC., a
27 Virginia Corporation; ANCESTRY.COM, INC.,
28 a Delaware Corporation; ANCESTRY.COM
LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company;
and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No.: 3:20-cv-8437-LB

OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO DISMISS
AND MOTION TO STRIKE AND
MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

Hearing Date: February 18, 2021

Time: 9:30 A.M.

Location: Courtroom B

The Honorable Laurel Beeler

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT 1

II. LEGAL STANDARD FOR MOTION TO DISMISS 2

III. ARGUMENT 3

 A. Plaintiffs have properly alleged Article III standing..... 3

 B. The Newsworthy exception does not apply because there is no legitimate public interest in Plaintiffs’ likenesses, and Ancestry is exploiting them for a commercial purpose. 8

 C. Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act does not apply because Ancestry did not obtain yearbooks from authors, and Ancestry created the illegal content. 11

 D. Plaintiffs’ claims are not preempted by copyright because Ancestry does not own or license yearbook copyrights, and Plaintiffs’ likenesses are not copyrightable..... 13

 E. Plaintiffs have stated a claim for intrusion upon seclusion..... 15

 F. California recognizes a claim for unjust enrichment. 16

 G. Plaintiffs have properly alleged statutory damages. 16

 H. Plaintiffs’ restitution claim should not be struck because at this early stage we do not know if Plaintiffs have an adequate remedy at law. 19

 I. This Court should deny Ancestry’s anti-SLAPP motion to strike..... 19

IV. CONCLUSION..... 22

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

Abdul-Jabbar v. General Motors Corporation,
85 F.3d 407 (9th Cir. 1996) 10

Aldrin v. Topps Co., Inc.,
2011 WL 4500013 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2011) 9, 10

also Columbia Broadcasting v. Democratic Comm.,
412 U.S. 94, 201 (1973) 10

Astiana v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.,
783 F.3d 753 (9th Cir. 2015) 17

Badella v. Deniro Marketing LLC,
No. C 10-03908 CRB, 2011 WL 227668 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 24, 2011) 6

Batzel v. Smith,
333 F.3d 1018, 1031 n. 18 (9th Cir. 2003) 13

Davis v. Facebook, Inc.,
956 F.3d 589 (9th Cir. 2020) 3, 4

Del Amo v. Baccash,
2008 WL 4414514 (C.D. Cal. Sept. 16, 2008) 19

Deteresa v. Am. Broad. Cos., Inc.,
121 F.3d 460, 465 (9th Cir. 1997) 16

Dora v. Frontline Video, Inc.,
15 Cal. App. 4th 536 (1993) 21

Downing v. Abercrombie & Fitch,
265 F.3d 994 (9th Cir. 2001) 8, 9, 14, 15

ESG Capital Partners, LP v. Stratos,
828 F.3d 1023 (9th Cir. 2016) 17

Fair v. Roommates,
521 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2008) 12, 13

1 *Fairfield v. American Photocopy Etc. Co.*,
 2 138 Cal. App. 2d 82 (1955) 17

3 *Fausto v. Credigy Services Corp.*,
 4 598 F. Supp. 2d 1049, 1056 (N.D. Cal. 2009)..... 16

5 *Fleet v. CBS, Inc.*,
 6 50 Cal. App. 4th 1911 (1996) 13, 14

7 *Fraley v. Facebook, Inc.*,
 8 830 F. Supp. 2d 785, 796 (N.D. Cal. 2011)..... 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 13, 17, 18, 19

9 *Gates v. Discovery Communications, Inc.*,
 10 34 Cal. 4th 679 (2004)..... 21

11 *Guglielmi v. Spelling-Goldberg Productions*,
 12 25 Cal. 3d 860 (1979) 10

13 *Hicks v. Richard*,
 14 39 Cal. App. 5th 1167 (2019) 21

15 *Hilton v. Hallmark Cards*,
 16 599 F.3d 894 (9th Cir. 2009) 20, 21

17 *In re Facebook, Inc., Consumer Privacy User Profile Litig.*,
 18 402 F. Supp. 3d 767, 797 (N.D. Cal. 2019)..... 16, 17

19 *IntegrityMessageBoards.com v. Facebook, Inc.*,
 20 No. 18-cv-05286-PJH, 2020 WL 6544411 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 6, 2020)..... 20

21 *Jordan Video, Inc. v. 144942 Canada Inc.*,
 22 617 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2010) 14

23 *KNB Enterprises v. Matthews*,
 24 78 Cal. App. 4th 362 (2000) 4, 5, 7, 12, 13, 15, 19

25 *Lectrodryer v. SeoulBank*,
 26 77 Cal. App. 4th 723 (2000) 17

27 *Makaeff v. Trump University, LLC*,
 28 715 F.3d 254 (9th Cir. 2013) 21

Maloney v. T3Media, Inc.,
 853 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2017) 14, 15

Manzarek v. Marine,
 519 F.3d 1025, 1031 (9th Cir. 2008) 2

1 *Miller v. Collectors Univ,*
 2 159 Cal. App. 4th 988 (2008) 17, 18

3 *Nayab v. Capital One Bank,*
 4 942 F.3d 480 (9th Cir. 2019) 2

5 *New Kids on the Block v. News Am. Pub.,*
 6 745 F. Supp. 1540 (C.D. Cal. 1990) 9, 10

7 *Perfect 10, Inc. v. Talisman Communications, Inc.,*
 8 2000 WL 364813 (C.D. Cal. March 27, 2000)..... 5, 11, 12, 15, 19

9 *Perkins v. LinkedIn Corp.,*
 10 53 F. Supp. 3d 1222 (N.D. Cal. 2014)..... 17, 18

11 *Rivero v. Am. Fed’n of State, County, Mun. Emps.,*
 12 105 Cal. App. 4th 913 (2003) 20

13 *Scott v. Metabolife Int’l Inc.,*
 14 115 Cal. App. 4th 404 (2004) 21

15 *Shulman v. Group W Productions, Inc.,*
 16 18 Cal. 4th 200 (1998)..... 8, 9

17 *Smith v. Levine Leichtman Capital Partners, Inc.,*
 18 723 F. Supp. 2d 1205 (N.D. Cal. 2010)..... 22

19 *Solano v. Playgirl, Inc.,*
 20 292 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 2002). 7

21 *Sonner v. Premier Nutrition Corp.,*
 22 971 F.3d 834 (9th Cir. 2020) 20

23 *Weinberg v. Feisel,*
 24 110 Cal. App. 4th 1122 (2003) 20

25 **Statutes**

26 Cal. Civ. Code § 3344..... 2

27 17 U.S.C. §§ 103..... 14

28 17 U.S.C. §§ 102..... 14

47 U.S.C. § 230..... 11, 12

Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200 "UCL" 19

Cal. Civ. Code § 3344..... 1, 2, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 19

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.