

1 Joseph R. Saveri (State Bar No. 130064)  
2 **JOSEPH SAVERI LAW FIRM, LLP**  
3 601 California Street, Suite 1505  
4 San Francisco, CA 94108  
5 Telephone: (415) 500-6800  
6 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
7 Email: jsaveri@saverilawfirm.com

8 Matthew Butterick (State Bar No. 250953)  
9 1920 Hillhurst Avenue, #406  
10 Los Angeles, CA 90027  
11 Telephone: (323) 968-2632  
12 Facsimile: (415) 395-9940  
13 Email: mb@buttericklaw.com

14 Laura M. Matson (*pro hac vice* pending)  
15 **LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN PLLP**  
16 100 Washington Avenue South, Suite 2200  
17 Minneapolis, MN 55401  
18 Telephone: (612) 339-6900  
19 Facsimile: (612) 339-0981  
20 Email: lmmatson@locklaw.com

21 *Counsel for Individual and Representative*  
22 *Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class*  
23 *(continues on signature page)*

24 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
25 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
26 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

27 **Jingna Zhang**, an individual;  
28 **Sarah Andersen**, an individual;  
**Hope Larson**, an individual; and  
**Jessica Fink**, an individual;

Individual and Representative Plaintiffs,

v.

**Google LLC**, a Delaware limited liability company; and  
**Alphabet Inc.**, a Delaware corporation;

Defendants.

Case No.

**COMPLAINT**

**CLASS ACTION**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

1 Plaintiffs Jingna Zhang, Sarah Andersen, Hope Larson, and Jessica Fink (together “Plaintiffs”),  
2 on behalf of themselves and all others similarly situated, bring this class-action complaint  
3 (“Complaint”) against defendants Google LLC (“Google”) and Alphabet Inc. (“Alphabet”) (together  
4 “Defendants”).

## 6 OVERVIEW

7 1. *Artificial intelligence*—commonly abbreviated “AI”—denotes software that is designed  
8 to algorithmically simulate human reasoning or inference, often using statistical methods.

9 2. Imagen is an AI software product created, maintained, and sold by Google. Imagen is a  
10 *text-to-image diffusion model*. A text-to-image diffusion model takes as input a short text description of  
11 an image (also known as a *text prompt*) and then uses a machine-learning technique called *diffusion* to  
12 generate an image in response to the prompt.

13 3. Rather than being programmed in the traditional way—that is, by human programmers  
14 writing code—a diffusion model is *trained* by copying an enormous quantity of digital images with  
15 associated text captions, extracting protected expression from these works, and transforming that  
16 protected expression into a large set of numbers called *weights* that are stored within the model. These  
17 weights are entirely and uniquely derived from the protected expression in the training dataset.  
18 Whenever a diffusion model generates an image in response to a user prompt, it is performing a  
19 computation that relies on these stored weights, with the goal of imitating the protected expression  
20 ingested from the training dataset.

21 4. Training a model first requires amassing a huge corpus of data, called a *dataset*. The AI  
22 models at issue in this complaint were trained on datasets containing millions of images paired with  
23 descriptive captions. In this complaint, each image–caption pair is called a *training image*. During  
24 training of the model, the training images in the dataset are directly copied in full and then completely  
25 ingested by the model, meaning that protected expression from every training image enters the model.  
26 As it copies and ingests billions of training images, the model progressively develops the ability to  
27 generate outputs that mimic the protected expression copied from the dataset.

1 5. Plaintiffs and Class members are visual artists. They own registered copyrights in  
2 certain training images that Google has admitted copying to train Imagen. Plaintiffs and Class members  
3 never authorized Google to use their copyrighted works as training material.

4 6. These copyrighted training images were copied multiple times by Google during the  
5 training process for Imagen. Because Imagen contains weights that represent a transformation of the  
6 protected expression in the training dataset, Imagen is itself an infringing derivative work.

7 7. Alphabet, as the corporate parent of Google, also commercially benefits from these acts  
8 of massive copyright infringement.

### 9

## 10 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11 8. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 because this case  
12 arises under the Copyright Act (17 U.S.C. § 501).

13 9. Jurisdiction and venue are proper in this judicial district under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(c)(2)  
14 because Defendants are headquartered in this district. Google created the Imagen model and, in  
15 cooperation with Alphabet, distributes it commercially. Therefore, a substantial part of the events  
16 giving rise to the claim occurred in this District. A substantial portion of the affected interstate trade  
17 and commerce was carried out in this District. Defendants have transacted business, maintained  
18 substantial contacts, and/or committed overt acts in furtherance of the illegal scheme and conspiracy  
19 throughout the United States, including in this District. Defendants' conduct has had the intended and  
20 foreseeable effect of causing injury to persons residing in, located in, or doing business throughout the  
21 United States, including in this District.

22 10. Under Civil Local Rule 3-2(c), assignment of this case to the San Francisco Division is  
23 proper because this case pertains to intellectual-property rights, which under General Order No. 44 is  
24 deemed a district-wide case category, and therefore venue is proper in any courthouse in this District.

### 25

## 26 PLAINTIFFS

27 11. Plaintiff Jingna Zhang is a photographer who lives in Washington.

28 12. Plaintiff Sarah Andersen is a cartoonist and illustrator who lives in Oregon.

1 13. Plaintiff Hope Larson is a cartoonist and illustrator who lives in North Carolina.

2 14. Plaintiff Jessica Fink is a cartoonist and illustrator who lives in New York.

3 15. A nonexhaustive list of registered copyrights owned by Plaintiffs is included as  
4 **Exhibit A: Plaintiff Copyright Registrations**. A nonexhaustive list of copyrighted images registered  
5 by Plaintiffs and infringed by Defendants is included as **Exhibit B: Plaintiff Images in LAION-400M**.

6 16. The images shown in Exhibit B are offered as a representative sample of works by  
7 Plaintiffs that appear in the LAION-400M dataset—not an exhaustive or complete list. Plaintiffs  
8 confirmed that these particular images were in the LAION-400M dataset by searching for their own  
9 names on two websites that allow searching of the LAION datasets: <https://haveibeenentrained.com> and  
10 <https://rom1504.github.io/clip-retrieval/>. On information and belief, all of Plaintiffs' works that were  
11 registered as part of the collections in Exhibit A and were online were scraped into the LAION-400M  
12 dataset.

## 13 14 DEFENDANTS

15 17. Defendant Google LLC is a Delaware limited liability company with its principal place  
16 of business at 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View CA 94043.

17 18. Defendant Alphabet Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at  
18 1600 Amphitheatre Parkway, Mountain View CA 94043. In 2015, Google became a subsidiary of  
19 Alphabet.

## 20 21 AGENTS AND CO-CONSPIRATORS

22 19. The unlawful acts alleged against the Defendants in this Complaint were authorized,  
23 ordered, or performed by the Defendants' respective officers, agents, employees, representatives, or  
24 shareholders while actively engaged in the management, direction, or control of the Defendants'  
25 businesses or affairs. The Defendants' agents operated under the explicit and apparent authority of  
26 their principals. Each Defendant, and its subsidiaries, affiliates, and agents operated as a single unified  
27 entity.  
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.