

1 Fred Norton (CA SBN 224725)
fnorton@nortonlaw.com
2 Nathan Walker (CA SBN 206128)
nwalker@nortonlaw.com
3 Bree Hann (CA SBN 215695)
bhann@nortonlaw.com
4 Gil Walton (CA SBN 324133)
gwalton@nortonlaw.com
5 THE NORTON LAW FIRM PC
6 299 Third Street, Suite 200
7 Oakland, CA 94607
Telephone: (510) 906-4900

8 Attorneys for Defendant
9 PATREON, INC.

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

12
13 BRAYDEN STARK, JUDD OOSTYEN,
14 KEVIN BLACK, and MARYANN OWENS,
15 individually and on behalf of all others similarly
situated,

16 v.
Plaintiffs,
17
18 PATREON, INC.,
Defendant.

19 Case No. 3:22-cv-03131-JCS

20
21
22
**DEFENDANT PATREON, INC.'S
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
TO DISMISS COMPLAINT;
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
THEREOF**

23 Date: September 9, 2022
24 Time: 9:30 a.m.
25 Judge: Hon. Joseph C. Spero

NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION

TO THE COURT AND ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD, PLEASE
TAKE NOTICE that on September 9, 2022, at 9:30 a.m. or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard,
in Courtroom F, 15th Floor of this Court, located at 450 Golden Gate Ave., San Francisco, CA 94102,
Defendant Patreon, Inc. (“Patreon”) will, and hereby does, move for an order dismissing the Complaint
in this case (Dkt. 1) in its entirety with prejudice, under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6), for
failure to state a claim on which relief can be granted.

This motion is based on this notice of motion and motion; the following memorandum of points and authorities; Patreon’s Request for Judicial Notice (“RJN”) and its attached supporting Declaration of Tyler Layton submitted herewith; the Complaint (Dkt. 1); any evidence or argument presented at the hearing on the motion; and any other matters the Court deems proper.

STATEMENT OF RELIEF SOUGHT

Patreon moves pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(6) to dismiss the Complaint in this case in its entirety with prejudice.

1 **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

2	I.	INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF ISSUES	1
3	II.	STATEMENT OF FACTS	1
4	III.	ARGUMENT	5
5	A.	Legal Standard	5
6	B.	The Court Should Dismiss Plaintiffs' VPPA Claims	5
7		1. Overview of the VPPA.....	5
8		2. Patreon Is Not a "Video Tape Service Provider"	6
9		3. Plaintiffs Fail to Allege Patreon Disclosed Their Identities.....	9
10		4. Plaintiffs Fail to Plausibly Allege Patreon "Knowingly" Disclosed PII to Facebook	9
11		5. The VPPA, on Its Face and as Applied to Patreon, Violates the First Amendment to the United States Constitution	10
12	a.	The VPPA, on Its Face, Violates the First Amendment	11
13	b.	The VPPA, as Applied in this Case, Violates the First Amendment.....	13
14		i. The VPPA is a content- and speaker based regulation of non-commercial speech and thus it is subject to strict scrutiny...	13
15		ii. The VPPA fails to satisfy strict scrutiny on the alleged facts of this lawsuit	16
16		iii. Even if the VPPA regulates commercial speech subject to intermediate scrutiny, it fails to withstand scrutiny	18
17	C.	Plaintiffs Do Not State A Claim For Violation of the UCL or the CLRA.....	20
18	1.	Plaintiffs Do Not State a UCL Claim Based on Patreon's Alleged Disclosure of Information to Facebook.....	21
19	2.	Plaintiffs Do Not State a UCL or CLRA Claim Based on Patreon's Alleged Failure to Disclose	23
20	D.	Plaintiffs' Claim for Unjust Enrichment Should Be Dismissed	24
21	IV.	CONCLUSION.....	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

44 <i>Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode Island</i> , 517 U.S. 484 (1996).....	19
5 <i>Abuelhawa v. Santa Clara Univ.</i> , 529 F. Supp. 3d 1059 (N.D. Cal. 2021)	24
6 <i>Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coal.</i> , 535 U.S. 234 (2002).....	11
7 <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	5, 10, 25
9 <i>Austin-Spearman v. AMC Network Ent. LLC</i> , 98 F. Supp. 3d 662 (S.D.N.Y. 2015).....	14, 18
10 <i>Bank of New York Mellon v. Citibank, N.A.</i> , 8 Cal. App. 5th 935, 214 Cal.Rptr.3d 504 (2017).....	25
12 <i>Barr v. Am. Ass'n of Pol. Consultants, Inc.</i> , 140 S.Ct. 2335 (2020).....	14
13 <i>Bartnicki v. Vopper</i> , 532 U.S. 514 (2001).....	14
15 <i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	5
16 <i>Berger v. City of Seattle</i> , 569 F.3d 1029 (9th Cir. 2009)	14
18 <i>Bolger v. Youngs Drug Prod. Corp.</i> , 463 U.S. 60 (1983).....	15
19 <i>Brodsky v. Apple Inc.</i> , 445 F. Supp. 3d 110 (N.D. Cal. 2020)	24, 25
20 <i>Brown v. Ent. Merchants Ass'n</i> , 564 U.S. 786 (2011).....	15, 17
22 <i>Cappello v. Walmart Inc.</i> , No. 18-CV-06678-RS, 2019 WL 11687705 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 5, 2019).....	22
23 <i>Cent. Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Pub. Serv. Comm'n of N.Y.</i> , 447 U.S. 557 (1980).....	19
25 <i>Collins v. eMachines, Inc.</i> , 202 Cal. App. 4th 249 (2011)	24
26 <i>Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn</i> , 420 U.S. 469 (1975).....	13

1	<i>Crittenden v. Apple, Inc.</i> , No. 5:21-CV-04322-EJD, 2022 WL 2132224 (N.D. Cal. June 14, 2022).....	9
2	<i>Davis v. HSBC Bank Nevada, N.A.</i> , 691 F.3d 1152 (9th Cir. 2012)	21
3	<i>De Havilland v. FX Networks, LLC</i> , 21 Cal. App. 5th 845, 230 Cal.Rptr.3d 625 (2018).....	25
4	<i>Eichenberger v. ESPN, Inc.</i> , 876 F.3d 979 (9th Cir. 2017)	5, 7, 9, 12
5	<i>Ellis v. Cartoon Network, Inc.</i> , 803 F.3d 1251 (11th Cir. 2015)	14, 18
6	<i>ESG Cap. Partners, LP v. Stratos</i> , 828 F.3d 1023 (9th Cir. 2016)	25
7	<i>Forsyth Cnty., Ga. v. Nationalist Movement</i> , 505 U.S. 123 (1992).....	11
8	<i>Garrison v. Louisiana</i> , 379 U.S. 64 (1964).....	12
9	<i>Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.</i> , 418 U.S. 323 (1974).....	13, 17
10	<i>Hill v. Roll Int'l Corp.</i> , 195 Cal. App. 4th 1295, 128 Cal.Rptr.3d 109 (2011).....	25
11	<i>Hunt v. City of Los Angeles</i> , 638 F.3d 703 (9th Cir. 2011)	15
12	<i>IMDb.com Inc. v. Becerra</i> , 962 F.3d 1111 (9th Cir. 2020)	<i>Passim</i>
13	<i>In re Google Android Consumer Priv. Litig.</i> , No 11-MD-02264 JSW, 2013 WL 1283236 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2013)	23
14	<i>In re Google Inc. St. View Elec. Commc 'ns Litig.</i> , 794 F. Supp. 2d 1067 (N.D. Cal. 2011)	22
15	<i>In re Grand Jury Subpoena to Kramerbooks & Afterwords Inc.</i> , 26 Med. L. Rptr. 1599 (D.D.C. 1998).....	18
16	<i>In re Hulu Priv. Litig.</i> , 86 F. Supp. 3d 1090 (N.D. Cal. 2015)	6, 9
17	<i>In re iPhone Application Litig.</i> , No. 11-md-2250, 2011 WL 4403963 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 20, 2011).....	22
18	<i>In re Nickelodeon Consumer Priv. Litig.</i> , 827 F.3d 262 (3d Cr. 2016).....	9
19	<i>In re Vizio, Inc., Consumer Privacy Litigation</i> , 238 F. Supp. 3d 1204 (C.D. Cal. 2017)	8

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.