

1 JOSEPH W. COTCHETT (SBN 36324)
 jcotchett@cpmlegal.com
 2 MARK C. MOLUMPY (SBN 168009)
 mmolumphy@cpmlegal.com
 3 BRIAN DANITZ (SBN 247403)
 bdanitz@cpmlegal.com
 4 GINA STASSI (SBN 261263)
 gstassi@cpmlegal.com
 5 TYSON REDENBARGER (SBN 294424)
 tredenbarger@cpmlegal.com
 6 ANYA THEPOT (SBN 318430)
 athepot@cpmlegal.com
 7 **COTCHETT, PITRE & MCCARTHY, LLP**
 San Francisco Airport Office Center
 8 840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
 Burlingame, CA 94010
 9 Telephone: (650) 697-6000
 10 Facsimile: (650) 697-0577
 11

12 *Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs*

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 14 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

15 **IN RE FACEBOOK, INC.**
 16 **SHAREHOLDER DERIVATIVE**
 17 **PRIVACY LITIGATION**

Lead Case No. 4:18-cv-01792-HSG

18 This Document Relates to:

19 **PLAINTIFFS' FIRST AMENDED**
CONSOLIDATED SHAREHOLDER
DERIVATIVE COMPLAINT

20 **ALL ACTIONS**

Judge: Hon. Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

21
22 Date Action Filed: March 22, 2018
23
24
25
26
27
28

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

	Page
I. SUMMARY OF THE ACTION -----	1
II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE -----	5
III. PARTIES -----	7
A. Plaintiffs -----	7
B. Nominal Defendant -----	7
C. Individual Defendants -----	7
IV. FACTUAL BACKGROUND -----	10
A. Background of the Company and Its Business -----	10
1. Facebook’s Advertising Business is the Source of Substantially All of Its Revenue -----	11
2. Facebook’s Success Depends Upon User Trust, Which Defendants Cultivated By Promising That Users Control Their Data -----	12
B. Facebook’s Practices Respecting User Data Were the Subject of an FTC Investigation and a 20-Year Consent Order Entered in 2012 -----	14
C. Defendants Announced Changes to Facebook’s Policies That Were Supposedly Implemented in 2014 to Protect User Privacy -----	17
D. The Cambridge Analytica Incident Revealed Rampant Privacy Violations at Facebook and That Defendants Failed to Comply with the FTC Consent Order ---	18
1. The Sale of Facebook Data to Cambridge Analytica -----	18
2. Facebook’s Investigation into Cambridge Analytica’s Use of Facebook Data Began in 2015 -----	20
3. Red Flags Were Subsequently Raised About Cambridge Analytica’s Other Potential Misuse of Facebook User Data -----	21
4. <i>The Guardian</i> and <i>The New York Times</i> Run Exposés on the Sale of Facebook User Data to Cambridge Analytica -----	23
E. Defendants Admit Cambridge Analytica Obtained User Data in Violation of Facebook’s Policies in a “Facebook Newsroom” Post on March 16, 2018 -----	23
F. Facebook’s 1Q18 Financial Results Suggested That Users Were Unconcerned About the Privacy Abuses Revealed by the Cambridge Analytica Scandal -----	30
G. Following Reports of Facebook’s Data-Sharing Agreements, Defendants Admit Certain Companies Still Had Access to User Data in June 2018 -----	34
H. Facebook’s 2Q18 Financial Results Reveal the Effects of the Data-Sharing Scandal on Facebook’s User Engagement, Advertising Revenues, and Earnings, Leading to a \$100 Billion Loss in Facebook’s Value -----	36
I. Additional Reports That Facebook User Data Has Been Compromised and Further Revelations of Facebook’s Data Sharing Practices Continue in 2018 -----	39

1 J. Defendants Announce Changes to Facebook’s Platform in Early 2019 in a Belated
Attempt to Mitigate Their Privacy Abuses and Reputational Harm -----42

2 K. Facebook Announces Its 1Q19 Financial Results – and Expected Losses of \$3-\$5
Billion as A Result of the Anticipated Settlement With the FTC -----45

3 L. Facebook’s Internal Investigation Reveals “Tens of Thousands of Apps” Continued
4 to Access User Data After the Changes to Its Policies in 2014-----46

5 **V. FEDERAL REGULATORS CONFIRM DEFENDANTS’ VIOLATIONS**
OF LAW -----47

6 A. The FTC and DOJ Charged Facebook With Violations of the 2012 Consent Order
7 and the FTC Act, Resulting in an “Unprecedented” \$5 Billion Penalty-----47

8 1. Facebook Violated the Consent Order Through “Deceptive Privacy
Settings and Statements” – i.e., the “Very Same Conduct ... That Led to
9 the 2012 Order” -----51

10 2. Facebook Violated the 2012 Consent Order by “Fail[ing] to Maintain a
Reasonable Privacy Program” -----53

11 3. Facebook Violated the Consent Order by “Fail[ing] to Implement and
12 Maintain Appropriate Safeguards and Controls Over Third-Party ...
Access to User Data” -----54

13 4. Facebook Violated the Consent Order By Misrepresenting the Extent to
Which Users Could Control Their Data -----57

14 a. The FTC Found “Facebook Falsely Announced That Third-Party
15 Developers Would No Longer Be Able to Access [User] Data”-----57

16 b. The FTC Found Facebook “Did Not Tell Users That Sharing with
17 Their Friends Allowed Third-Party Developers to Access Their [Friends’
Data]” -----58

18 B. The FTC and DOJ Required Facebook to Implement Internal Controls and Reforms
Designed to Increase Board Oversight and Remove Zuckerberg’s “Unfettered
19 Control” Over “Decisions Affecting User Privacy”-----61

20 C. The SEC Charged Facebook with Violating Federal Securities Laws and Imposed a
\$100 Million Penalty-----69

21 1. The SEC Found That Defendants’ Statements in Facebook’s Public
Filings Were Materially False and Misleading When Made-----71

22 2. The SEC Found That Defendants’ Statements to the Press Reinforced
23 Facebook’s Misleading Public Filings -----73

24 D. The FTC Reportedly May Seek an Injunction Against Facebook, and Other
Regulators Are Also Investigating the Company, Due to Antitrust Concerns -----75

25 **VI. DEFENDANTS’ FALSE AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS AND**
OMISSIONS -----76

26 A. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements About the
27 Company’s Data Security and Privacy Policies-----77

28 B. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements Concerning Risks to

1 C. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements About Facebook’s
Investigation and Response After Learning About the Transfer of User Data to
Cambridge Analytica ----- 81

2

3 D. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements Concerning
Notifying Facebook Users Whose Accounts Were Compromised Or At Risk Of
Being Compromised ----- 82

4

5 E. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements Concerning
Facebook’s Response to Other Reported Instances Of Data Misuse ----- 82

6 F. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements Concerning
Facebook Users’ Knowledge or Consent to Providing Information to Kogan ----- 84

7 G. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements Regarding their
Compliance with the FTC Consent Decree ----- 87

8 H. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements Concerning
Facebook’s Critical DAU and MAU Metrics ----- 92

9 I. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements About the Impact of
the Scandal on Facebook’s Business and 1Q18 Financial Results ----- 94

10 J. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements That Facebook Does
Not “Sell” Users’ Data ----- 96

13 **VII. DEFENDANTS VIOLATED SECTION 14(a) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT AND SEC
RULE 14A-9 BY ISSUING MATERIALLY MISLEADING PROXY
STATEMENTS ----- 100**

14 A. The Board Issued the Materially Misleading Proxy Statement in 2017 Soliciting the
Directors’ Re-Election to Facebook’s Board ----- 101

15 B. The Board Issued the Materially Misleading Proxy Statement in 2018
Recommending a Vote Against Shareholder Proposals on the Basis of Directors’
Statements About Facebook’s Privacy Practices and Board Oversight of Risks - 102

16 1. The Board’s Statements about Stockholder Proposal #4 Regarding a Risk
Oversight Committee Are Materially Misleading ----- 104

17 2. The Board’s Statements about Stockholder Proposal #6 Regarding a
Content Governance Report Are Materially Misleading ----- 105

21 **VIII. DEFENDANTS VIOLATED SECTION 10(b) OF THE EXCHANGE ACT AND SEC
RULE 10B-5 BY AUTHORIZING AND EFFECTUATING MANIPULATIVE
SHARE REPURCHASES AND OTHER TRANSACTIONS IN FACEBOOK
SECURITIES ----- 108**

22 A. Defendants Made Materially False and Misleading Statements and Omissions That
Caused Facebook’s Stock Price to Trade At Artificially Inflated Prices During the
Relevant Period ----- 108

23 B. Defendants Authorized, Effectuated and Approved Manipulative Share
Repurchases Totaling More Than \$24 Billion ----- 110

24 1. The Board Approved a \$6 Billion Share Repurchase Program That
Commenced in 2017 ----- 110

25

26

27

28

1	2.	The Board Increased the Authorization by an Additional \$9 Billion in April 2018-----	111
2	3.	The Board Approved Another \$9 Billion Increase to the Share Repurchase Authorization in April 2018 -----	111
3	C.	While Causing Facebook to Repurchase Shares at Artificially Inflated Prices, Certain Defendants Sold Their Own Shares of Facebook Stock -----	115
4	D.	Facebook Suffered Economic Loss and Other Damages As a Result of Defendants’ Manipulation of the Market for Facebook Stock Through False and Misleading Statements and Omissions, Repurchases, and Insider Sales -----	119
5	1.	Market Efficiency-----	120
6	2.	Loss Causation and Damages -----	122
7			
8	IX.	ADDITIONAL ALLEGATIONS OF DEFENDANTS’ SCIENTER -----	128
9	A.	Defendants Oversaw an Illegal Business Strategy Based on “Reciprocity” – <i>i.e.</i> , Granting Access to Facebook User Data in Exchange for Something of Value --	129
10	1.	The FTC Found That Defendants Immediately Violated the FTC Consent Order After It Was Entered in 2012 -----	130
11	2.	Facebook’s Internal Documents Confirm Defendants’ Decision to Exchange Data for Reciprocal Value -----	132
12	B.	Defendants Continued to Allow “Whitelisted” Third-Party Apps to Access User Data While Representing That Facebook’s More Restrictive Policies Prohibited Such Unauthorized Access-----	136
13	1.	The FTC Found “Financial Considerations Influenced Facebook’s Decisions Regarding Whether to Restrict ... Access to User Data”-----	138
14	2.	The FTC Found That “Facebook Was Aware That Giving Millions of Third-Party Developers Access to [User] Data Posed Privacy Risks” --	139
15	C.	Defendants Received Multiple “Red Flag” Warnings of Potential Violations of Facebook’s Policies (and the FTC Consent Order) Throughout the Relevant Period -----	140
16	1.	Facebook’s Adjudicated Violations of Foreign Privacy Laws -----	142
17	2.	Warnings From Facebook Employees -----	144
18	3.	Facebook’s Chief Information Security Officer Resigned After His 2017 Warnings to the Board Were Ignored -----	145
19	4.	Defendant Andreessen Admitted That He Consciously Disregarded Warnings From Whistleblower Wylie in 2016 and 2018 -----	147
20	D.	Defendants Agreed to Pay a \$5 Billion Penalty to Resolve Claims That They Personally Violated the FTC Consent Order and Section 5 of the FTC Act-----	148
21	E.	Defendants Personally Benefited From Their Insider Sales of Facebook Stock and Other Transactions in Facebook Securities During the Relevant Period While Facebook’s Stock Price Was Artificially Inflated By Their Misrepresentations--	150
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27	X.....	INDIVIDUAL DEFENDANTS’ COMPENSATION AND STOCK OWNERSHIP -----	152
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.