

1 QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP

2 Shon Morgan (Bar No. 187736)

3 (shonmorgan@quinnemanuel.com)

4 John W. Baumann (Bar No. 288881)

5 (jackbaumann@quinnemanuel.com)

6 865 South Figueroa Street, 10th Floor

Los Angeles, California 90017

Telephone: (213) 443-3000

Facsimile: (213) 443-3100

7 Cristina Henriquez (Bar No. 317445)

8 (cristinahenriquez@quinnemanuel.com)

9 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5th Floor

Redwood Shores, California 94065

Telephone: (650) 801-5000

Facsimile: (650) 801-5000

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

13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

15 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

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

20 Plaintiffs,

21 vs.

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

28 Defendants.

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

**REPLY IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'
MOTION TO DISMISS FIRST AMENDED
COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO FRCP 12;**

Hearing Date: May 27, 2021

Hearing Time: 9:30 a.m.

Location: San Francisco Courthouse, Courtroom B

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT1

ARGUMENT1

I. PLAINTIFFS STILL CANNOT ALLEGE A COGNIZABLE INJURY1

II. PLAINTIFFS OFFER NO REASON TO REVISIT THE COURT’S
DETERMINATION THAT ANCESTRY IS IMMUNE PURSUANT TO
SECTION 230 OF THE CDA8

III. PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS ARE PREEMPTED BY THE COPYRIGHT ACT12

IV. NO PLAUSIBLE CLAIM EXISTS FOR INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION14

V. PLAINTIFFS ARE NOT ENTITLED TO STATUTORY DAMAGES15

CONCLUSION15

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page(s)</u>
<u>Cases</u>	
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	
	7
	4, 12
	8
	11
	9, 10
	3
	15
	2
	8
	2, 5
	9
	4, 13
	3
	2
	11
	11

1 *Fair v. Roommates*,
 2 521 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2008)..... 9

3 *Fairfield v. American Photocopy Equipment Co.*,
 4 138 Cal. App. 2d 82 (1955)..... 6

5 *Fleet v. CBS, Inc.*,
 6 50 Cal. App. 4th 1911 (1996)..... 12

7 *Fraley v. Facebook, Inc.*,
 8 830 F. Supp. 2d 785 (N.D. Cal. 2011) 2, 3, 5, 6, 12, 15

9 *Frank v. Gaos*,
 10 139 S. Ct. 1041 (2019) 3

11 *Gabiola v. Sarid*,
 12 2017 WL 4264000 (N.D. Ill. Sep. 26, 2017)..... 4

13 *Gionfriddo v. Major League Baseball*,
 14 94 Cal. App. 4th 400 (2001)..... 2

15 *In re Facebook, Inc., Consumer Privacy User Profile Litig.*,
 16 402 F. Supp. 3d 767 (N.D. Cal. 2019) 4, 14

17 *In re Google, Inc. Privacy Policy Litig.*,
 18 2013 WL 6248499 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 3, 2013) 4

19 *In re Google, Inc. Privacy Policy Litig.*,
 20 58 F. Supp. 3d 968 (N.D. Cal. 2014) 15

21 *Jones v. Dirty World Entm’t Recordings LLC*,
 22 755 F.3d 398 (6th Cir. 2014)..... 10

23 *Jules Jordan Video, Inc. v. 144942 Canada Inc.*,
 24 617 F.3d 1146 (9th Cir. 2010)..... 12, 13

25 *La Asociacion de Trabajadores de Lake Forest v. City of Lake Forest*,
 26 624 F.3d 1083 (9th Cir. 2010)..... 7

27 *Low v. LinkedIn Corp.*,
 28 2011 WL 5509848 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 11, 2011)..... 6

Lukis v. Whitepages,
 454 F. Supp. 3d 746 (N.D. Ill. 2020) 4, 10

Maloney v. T3Media, Inc.,
 853 F.3d 1004 (9th Cir. 2017)..... 12, 13

Miller v. Collectors Univ.,
 159 Cal. App. 4th 988 (2008)..... 6

Monster Energy Co. v. Integrated Supply Network, LLC,
 82 Fed. Appx. 730 (9th Cir. July 22, 2020) 8

1 *Newcombe v. Adolf Coors Co.*,
 157 F.3d 686 (9th Cir. 1998)..... 1, 2

2

3 *Perkins v. LinkedIn Corp.*,
 53 F. Supp. 3d 1190 (N.D. Cal. 2014) 5, 6, 15

4 *Silha v. ACT, Inc.*,
 807 F.3d 169 (7th Cir. 2015)..... 4

5

6 *Slivinsky v. Watkins-Johnson Co.*,
 221 Cal. App. 3d 799 (1990)..... 1, 2

7 *Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins*,
 136 S. Ct. 1540 (2016) 3

8

9 *Thane Int’l, Inc. v. Hartford Fire Ins. Co.*,
 2008 WL 11335049 (C.D. Cal. Mar. 15, 2008) 2

10 *Toney v. L’Oreal USA, Inc.*,
 406 F.3d 905 (7th Cir. 2005)..... 13

11

12 *Uzuegbunam v. Preczewski*,
 2021 WL 850106 (U.S. Mar. 8, 2021) 3, 4

13

14 **Statutory Authorities**

15 47 U.S.C. § 230 1, 8, 9, 10

16 47 U.S.C. § 230(a)(1) 10

17 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1) 8

18 Business Code § 17200 13

19 Cal. Civ. Code § 3344 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, 15

20 Cal. Civ. Code § 3344(a)..... 1

21

22 **Other Authorities**

23 McCarthy, *The Rights of Publicity and Privacy* 2d § 5.67 8

24

25

26

27

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.