

United States District Court
Northern District of California

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
San Francisco Division

O'SHEA JACKSON,
Plaintiff,

v.

ROBINHOOD MARKETS, INC. et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-02304-LB

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO
DISMISS AND DENYING MOTION TO
STRIKE AS MOOT**

Re: ECF Nos. 11 & 12

INTRODUCTION

The plaintiff O'Shea Jackson, known professionally as Ice Cube, sued Robinhood, a financial-services company, after Robinhood used his image and a paraphrase of a line from his song "Check Yo Self" to illustrate an online article that it published about a market correction for tech stocks. The line is "Check yo self before you wreck yo self," which Robinhood paraphrased as "Correct yourself before you wreck yourself." "Check yo self" is Ice Cube's "catchphrase." He claims that by using his image and catchphrase, Robinhood (1) created the false and deceptive commercial impression that Ice Cube is associated with or endorses Robinhood's services, in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(A), (2) misappropriated his likeness without his consent, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 3344(a) and California common law, and (3) engaged in unfair competition, in violation of California's Unfair Competition Law (UCL), Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 17200. The court dismisses

1 the complaint for lack of standing because the plaintiff did not plausibly plead that Robinhood’s use
2 of his identity suggested his endorsement of Robinhood’s products.

3 4 STATEMENT

5 Ice Cube is a well-known rapper, actor, entrepreneur, and social activist. His 1992 album *The*
6 *Predator* had a certified-platinum single “Check Yo Self,” which featured the line “check yo self
7 before you wreck yo self.” The phrase “Check Yo Self” is his “signature catchphrase.”¹

8 Robinhood is a financial-services company that allows commission-free trades of stocks and
9 exchange-traded funds on a mobile app. It also operates a website called “Robinhood Snacks” that
10 publishes short newsletters on financial issues. On March 8, 2021, its newsletter (titled “Why are
11 tech stocks falling?”) had three articles. The first was titled “Tech stocks move toward ‘correction’
12 territory: we break it down.” The article discussed stock market highs (led by tech stocks), the
13 market correction, and possible explanations: an overvalued tech sector, rising interest rates,
14 inflation, a concern that the Fed will raise interest rates, the vaccine rollout, and economic recovery.
15 It concluded that corrections are normal.²

16 The newsletter has a breezy, colloquial tone. For example, the article on the market correction
17 begins with this: “**Do you remember?** . . . the 21st of December (cue: Earth, Wind, and Fire jam).”
18 It ends with the observation that “[m]arkets were frothy at their peak — a correction is kind of like
19 a barista skimming off foam.” It has varied content that includes the three articles (the other two
20 are “Who’s up” and “. . . and who’s down”), links to other content (with categories titled Check,
21 Learn, Sweat, Act, Do, Achieve), a description of the Snacks Daily Podcast, the Snack Fact of the
22 Day, and a description of the week ahead.³

23
24
25 ¹ Compl. – ECF No. 1 at 5 (¶¶ 17–21). The court considers the line from the song under the incorporation-
26 by-reference doctrine. *Knievel v. ESPN*, 393 F.3d 1068, 1076–77 (9th Cir. 2005). Citations refer to
27 material in the Electronic Case File (ECF); pinpoint citations are to the ECF-generated page numbers at
28 the top of documents.

² Robinhood Snacks Newsletter, Ex. A to Compl. – ECF No. 1-1 at 1–3.

1 At the top of the newsletter — right after the title “Why are tech stocks falling?” and right
2 before the market-correction article — was this image from Ice Cube’s movie *Are We Done Yet?*⁴



16 *Correct yourself, before you wreck yourself*

17 The newsletter (characterized in the complaint as an advertisement) “creates the false impression
18 that Ice Cube supports and endorses Robinhood’s products and services.”⁵ This “is supported by the
19 fact that “Robinhood has a demonstrable pattern and practice of using established celebrities, such as
20 Nas and Jay-Z, to endorse its products and services.”⁶ Ice Cube did not authorize the use of his image
21 or catchphrase and sent a cease-and-desist letter to Robinhood. Robinhood continues to use the
22 likeness without permission, and the plaintiff has suffered financial and reputational harm.⁷

23
24
25
26
27
28

⁴ DVD for *Are We Done Yet?*, Ex. A to Req. Judicial Notice – ECF No. 13 at 1–2. The court judicially notices facts that the parties do not dispute, such as the movie. Fed. R. Evid. 201(b); *United States v. Mariscal*, 285 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2002); *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 688–89 (9th Cir. 2001).

⁵ Compl. – ECF No. 1 at 6 (¶ 27).

⁶ *Id.* at 6 (¶ 28).

⁷ *Id.* at 6 (¶ 29).

1 The plaintiff claims that by using his image and catchphrase, Robinhood (1) created the false
 2 and deceptive commercial impression that Ice Cube is associated with or endorses Robinhood's
 3 services, in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)(1)(A), (2) misappropriated his
 4 likeness without his consent, in violation of Cal. Civ. Code § 3344(a) and California common law,
 5 and (3) engaged in unfair competition, in violation of the UCL.⁸

6 Robinhood moved to dismiss the complaint for lack of standing under Federal Rule of Civil
 7 Procedure 12(b)(1). It moved to dismiss all claims under Rule 12(b)(6) for the following reasons:
 8 (1) the article was a noncommercial report of news, and the claims protect only commercial
 9 interests; (2) the First Amendment bars the claims, again because the article was newsworthy; (3)
 10 the Lanham Act claim fails because Robinhood's use of the likeness and catchphrase was creative;
 11 (4) federal copyright law preempts the state claims; (5) the Lanham Act claim fails because only
 12 the copyright owners of the film have rights in the images; (6) it is immune under section
 13 230(c)(1) of the Communications Decency Act, 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1), because it is an interactive-
 14 computer-service provider that did not create the image; and (7) the phrase "check yo self" is not a
 15 distinctive part of Ice Cube's identity and thus is not actionable under the Lanham Act. Robinhood
 16 also moved to strike the state-law claims under California's Anti-SLAPP statute, Cal. Civ. Proc. §
 17 425.16, on the ground that the content in the newsletter is protected free speech on a matter of
 18 public interest.⁹ The court held a hearing on the motions on June 10, 2021.

19 The court has federal-question subject-matter jurisdiction over the Lanham Act claim under 28
 20 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338 and supplemental jurisdiction over state law claims under 28 U.S.C. §
 21 1367(a). All parties consented to magistrate-judge jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 636.¹⁰

22
 23
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28
 29
 30
 31
 32
 33
 34
 35
 36
 37
 38
 39
 40
 41
 42
 43
 44
 45
 46
 47
 48
 49
 50
 51
 52
 53
 54
 55
 56
 57
 58
 59
 60
 61
 62
 63
 64
 65
 66
 67
 68
 69
 70
 71
 72
 73
 74
 75
 76
 77
 78
 79
 80
 81
 82
 83
 84
 85
 86
 87
 88
 89
 90
 91
 92
 93
 94
 95
 96
 97
 98
 99
 100
 101
 102
 103
 104
 105
 106
 107
 108
 109
 110
 111
 112
 113
 114
 115
 116
 117
 118
 119
 120
 121
 122
 123
 124
 125
 126
 127
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133
 134
 135
 136
 137
 138
 139
 140
 141
 142
 143
 144
 145
 146
 147
 148
 149
 150
 151
 152
 153
 154
 155
 156
 157
 158
 159
 160
 161
 162
 163
 164
 165
 166
 167
 168
 169
 170
 171
 172
 173
 174
 175
 176
 177
 178
 179
 180
 181
 182
 183
 184
 185
 186
 187
 188
 189
 190
 191
 192
 193
 194
 195
 196
 197
 198
 199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205
 206
 207
 208
 209
 210
 211
 212
 213
 214
 215
 216
 217
 218
 219
 220
 221
 222
 223
 224
 225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231
 232
 233
 234
 235
 236
 237
 238
 239
 240
 241
 242
 243
 244
 245
 246
 247
 248
 249
 250
 251
 252
 253
 254
 255
 256
 257
 258
 259
 260
 261
 262
 263
 264
 265
 266
 267
 268
 269
 270
 271
 272
 273
 274
 275
 276
 277
 278
 279
 280
 281
 282
 283
 284
 285
 286
 287
 288
 289
 290
 291
 292
 293
 294
 295
 296
 297
 298
 299
 300
 301
 302
 303
 304
 305
 306
 307
 308
 309
 310
 311
 312
 313
 314
 315
 316
 317
 318
 319
 320
 321
 322
 323
 324
 325
 326
 327
 328
 329
 330
 331
 332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338
 339
 340
 341
 342
 343
 344
 345
 346
 347
 348
 349
 350
 351
 352
 353
 354
 355
 356
 357
 358
 359
 360
 361
 362
 363
 364
 365
 366
 367
 368
 369
 370
 371
 372
 373
 374
 375
 376
 377
 378
 379
 380
 381
 382
 383
 384
 385
 386
 387
 388
 389
 390
 391
 392
 393
 394
 395
 396
 397
 398
 399
 400
 401
 402
 403
 404
 405
 406
 407
 408
 409
 410
 411
 412
 413
 414
 415
 416
 417
 418
 419
 420
 421
 422
 423
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 430
 431
 432
 433
 434
 435
 436
 437
 438
 439
 440
 441
 442
 443
 444
 445
 446
 447
 448
 449
 450
 451
 452
 453
 454
 455
 456
 457
 458
 459
 460
 461
 462
 463
 464
 465
 466
 467
 468
 469
 470
 471
 472
 473
 474
 475
 476
 477
 478
 479
 480
 481
 482
 483
 484
 485
 486
 487
 488
 489
 490
 491
 492
 493
 494
 495
 496
 497
 498
 499
 500
 501
 502
 503
 504
 505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510
 511
 512
 513
 514
 515
 516
 517
 518
 519
 520
 521
 522
 523
 524
 525
 526
 527
 528
 529
 530
 531
 532
 533
 534
 535
 536
 537
 538
 539
 540
 541
 542
 543
 544
 545
 546
 547
 548
 549
 550
 551
 552
 553
 554
 555
 556
 557
 558
 559
 560
 561
 562
 563
 564
 565
 566
 567
 568
 569
 570
 571
 572
 573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583
 584
 585
 586
 587
 588
 589
 590
 591
 592
 593
 594
 595
 596
 597
 598
 599
 600
 601
 602
 603
 604
 605
 606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617
 618
 619
 620
 621
 622
 623
 624
 625
 626
 627
 628
 629
 630
 631
 632
 633
 634
 635
 636
 637
 638
 639
 640
 641
 642
 643
 644
 645
 646
 647
 648
 649
 650
 651
 652
 653
 654
 655
 656
 657
 658
 659
 660
 661
 662
 663
 664
 665
 666
 667
 668
 669
 670
 671
 672
 673
 674
 675
 676
 677
 678
 679
 680
 681
 682
 683
 684
 685
 686
 687
 688
 689
 690
 691
 692
 693
 694
 695
 696
 697
 698
 699
 700
 701
 702
 703
 704
 705
 706
 707
 708
 709
 710
 711
 712
 713
 714
 715
 716
 717
 718
 719
 720
 721
 722
 723
 724
 725
 726
 727
 728
 729
 730
 731
 732
 733
 734
 735
 736
 737
 738
 739
 740
 741
 742
 743
 744
 745
 746
 747
 748
 749
 750
 751
 752
 753
 754
 755
 756
 757
 758
 759
 760
 761
 762
 763
 764
 765
 766
 767
 768
 769
 770
 771
 772
 773
 774
 775
 776
 777
 778
 779
 780
 781
 782
 783
 784
 785
 786
 787
 788
 789
 790
 791
 792
 793
 794
 795
 796
 797
 798
 799
 800
 801
 802
 803
 804
 805
 806
 807
 808
 809
 810
 811
 812
 813
 814
 815
 816
 817
 818
 819
 820
 821
 822
 823
 824
 825
 826
 827
 828
 829
 830
 831
 832
 833
 834
 835
 836
 837
 838
 839
 840
 841
 842
 843
 844
 845
 846
 847
 848
 849
 850
 851
 852
 853
 854
 855
 856
 857
 858
 859
 860
 861
 862
 863
 864
 865
 866
 867
 868
 869
 870
 871
 872
 873
 874
 875
 876
 877
 878
 879
 880
 881
 882
 883
 884
 885
 886
 887
 888
 889
 890
 891
 892
 893
 894
 895
 896
 897
 898
 899
 900
 901
 902
 903
 904
 905
 906
 907
 908
 909
 910
 911
 912
 913
 914
 915
 916
 917
 918
 919
 920
 921
 922
 923
 924
 925
 926
 927
 928
 929
 930
 931
 932
 933
 934
 935
 936
 937
 938
 939
 940
 941
 942
 943
 944
 945
 946
 947
 948
 949
 950
 951
 952
 953
 954
 955
 956
 957
 958
 959
 960
 961
 962
 963
 964
 965
 966
 967
 968
 969
 970
 971
 972
 973
 974
 975
 976
 977
 978
 979
 980
 981
 982
 983
 984
 985
 986
 987
 988
 989
 990
 991
 992
 993
 994
 995
 996
 997
 998
 999
 1000

⁸ *Id.* at 7–11 (¶¶ 33–61).

⁹ Mot. to Dismiss – ECF No. 12; Mot. to Strike – ECF No. 11.

¹⁰ Mot. to Dismiss – ECF No. 12; Mot. to Strike – ECF No. 11.

1 **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

2 A complaint must contain a short and plain statement of the ground for the court’s jurisdiction.
3 Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1). The plaintiff has the burden of establishing jurisdiction. *Kokkonen v.*
4 *Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377 (1994); *Farmers Ins. Exch. v. Portage La*
5 *Prairie Mut. Ins. Co.*, 907 F.2d 911, 912 (9th Cir. 1990).

6 A defendant’s Rule 12(b)(1) jurisdictional attack can be facial or factual. *White v. Lee*, 227 F.3d
7 1214, 1242 (9th Cir. 2000). “A ‘facial’ attack asserts that a complaint’s allegations are themselves
8 insufficient to invoke jurisdiction, while a ‘factual’ attack asserts that the complaint’s allegations,
9 though adequate on their face to invoke jurisdiction, are untrue.” *Courthouse News Serv. v. Planet*,
10 750 F.3d 776, 780 n.3 (9th Cir. 2014). This is a facial attack. The court thus “accept[s] all allegations
11 of fact in the complaint as true and construe[s] them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff[.]”
12 *Warren v. Fox Family Worldwide, Inc.*, 328 F.3d 1136, 1139 (9th Cir. 2003) (citation omitted).

13 Robinhood contends that the plaintiff lacks standing. Standing pertains to the court’s subject-
14 matter jurisdiction and thus is properly raised in a Rule 12(b)(1) motion to dismiss. *Chandler v.*
15 *State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 598 F.3d 1115, 1121–22 (9th Cir. 2010).

16 Dismissal of a complaint without leave to amend should be granted only if the jurisdictional
17 defect cannot be cured by amendment. *Eminence Capital, LLC v. Aspeon, Inc.*, 316 F.3d 1048,
18 1052 (9th Cir. 2003).

19 **ANALYSIS**

20 The court dismisses the complaint for lack of standing because the plaintiff did not plausibly
21 plead that Robinhood’s use of his identity suggested his endorsement of Robinhood’s products.

22 “The ‘irreducible constitutional minimum’ of standing consists of three elements.” *Spokeo, Inc.*
23 *v. Robins*, 136 S. Ct. 1540, 1547 (2016) (citing *Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560
24 (1992)). “The plaintiff must have (1) suffered an injury in fact, (2) that is fairly traceable to the
25 challenged conduct of the defendant, and (3) that is likely to be redressed by a favorable judicial
26 decision.” *Id.* “The plaintiff, as the party invoking federal jurisdiction, bears the burden of
27 establishing these elements.” *Id.* (citing *FW/PBS, Inc. v. City of Dallas*, 493 U.S. 215, 231 (1990)).

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.