

1 COOLEY LLP
2 MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127)
(rhodesmg@cooley.com)
3 WHITTY SOMVICHIAN (194463)
(wsomvichian@cooley.com)
4 LAUREN J. POMEROY (291604)
(lpomeroy@cooley.com)
101 California Street, 5th Floor
5 San Francisco, CA 94111-5800
Telephone: (415) 693-2000

6
7 MAYER BROWN LLP
LAUREN R. GOLDMAN (*pro hac vice*)
(lrgoldman@mayerbrown.com)
8 MICHAEL RAYFIELD (*pro hac vice*)
(mrayfield@mayerbrown.com)
9 1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10016
10 Telephone: (212) 506-2500

11 MAYER BROWN LLP
12 MATTHEW D. PROVANCE (*pro hac vice*)
(mprovance@mayerbrown.com)
71 Wacker Drive
13 Chicago, IL 60606
Telephone: (312) 701-8598

14 *Attorneys for Defendant Facebook, Inc.*

15 [Additional counsel in signature block]

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
17 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
18 **OAKLAND DIVISION**

19
20 KELLY WHALEN, S.M., a minor, by and
through her guardian, Tachah Wade, and
21 VICTORIA EDELSTEIN, individually and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 v.

24 FACEBOOK, INC.,

25 Defendant.
26
27
28

Case No. 4:20-cv-06361-JST

**FACEBOOK'S MOTION TO
COMPEL ARBITRATION AND
STAY LITIGATION**

Date: April 7, 2021
Time: 2:00pm
Location: Courtroom 6, 2nd Floor
Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar
Trial Date: None
Complaint Filed: January 26, 2021

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

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND 2

 A. Plaintiffs Agreed To The Arbitration Clause In Instagram’s 2013 Terms..... 2

 B. All Three Plaintiffs Again Agreed To Arbitrate In 2018..... 7

 1. Facebook Repeatedly Notified Users Of The Update To Instagram’s Terms In 2018 7

 2. The 2018 Terms Confirm That Disputes With Facebook Relating To Instagram Must Be Arbitrated 9

 3. The Arbitration Provision Includes Features Designed To Make Arbitration Convenient For Users 10

 C. Plaintiffs Sued Facebook Based On Their Use Of Instagram, Notwithstanding Their Arbitration Agreement..... 10

 D. Plaintiffs Agreed To The 2020 Terms After Filing This Lawsuit 12

ARGUMENT 13

 I. THE FAA REQUIRES ENFORCEMENT OF PLAINTIFFS’ ARBITRATION AGREEMENT 13

 A. Plaintiffs Entered Into A Valid Arbitration Agreement..... 13

 B. Plaintiffs’ Claims Fall Within The Arbitration Agreement 17

 C. S.M.’s Status As A Minor Does Not Permit Her To Avoid Arbitration..... 18

 II. THE FAA REQUIRES A STAY OF THIS ACTION PENDING ARBITRATION 19

CONCLUSION 20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

1		
2		
3	<i>In re Amica, Inc.</i> ,	
4	135 B.R. 534 (Bankr. N.D. Ill. 1992).....	18
5	<i>AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion</i> ,	
6	563 U.S. 333 (2011).....	13, 18
7	<i>Babu v. Petersen</i> ,	
8	4 Cal. 2d 276 (1935)	18
9	<i>C.M.D. v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,	
10	2014 WL 1266291 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2014).....	19
11	<i>C.M.D. ex rel. De Young v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,	
12	621 F. App'x 488 (9th Cir. 2015)	18, 19
13	<i>Carbajal v. H & R Block Tax Servs., Inc.</i> ,	
14	372 F.3d 903 (7th Cir. 2004).....	17
15	<i>Citizens Telecomms. Co. v. Sheridan</i> ,	
16	239 W. Va. 67 (2017).....	16
17	<i>Cox v. Ocean View Hotel Corp.</i> ,	
18	533 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2008).....	13
19	<i>E.K.D. ex rel. Dawes v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,	
20	885 F. Supp. 2d 894 (S.D. Ill. 2012)	19
21	<i>In re Facebook Biometric Info. Privacy Litig.</i> ,	
22	185 F. Supp. 3d 1155 (N.D. Cal. 2016)	15
23	<i>First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan</i> ,	
24	514 U.S. 938 (1995).....	13
25	<i>Foreman v. George Foreman Assocs.</i> ,	
26	517 F.2d 354 (9th Cir. 1975).....	18
27	<i>Friends for Health: Supporting N. Shore Health Ctr. v. PayPal, Inc.</i> ,	
28	2018 WL 2933608 (N.D. Ill. June 12, 2018)	14
	<i>Gilmer v. Interstate/Johnson Lane Corp.</i> ,	
	500 U.S. 20 (1991).....	20
	<i>Herkenrath v. Move, Inc.</i> ,	
	2018 WL 10705782 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 21, 2018).....	16

1	<i>Kaufman v. Am. Express Travel Related Servs. Co.</i> ,	
2	2008 WL 687224 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 7, 2008).....	14
3	<i>Kindred Nursing Ctrs. Ltd. P'ship v. Clark</i> ,	
4	137 S. Ct. 1421 (2017).....	13
5	<i>Kohler v. Leslie Hindman, Inc.</i> ,	
6	80 F.3d 1181 (7th Cir. 1996).....	14, 18
7	<i>Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Varela</i> ,	
8	139 S. Ct. 1407 (2019).....	17, 18
9	<i>Moses H. Cone Mem'l Hosp. v. Mercury Constr. Corp.</i> ,	
10	460 U.S. 1 (1983).....	17
11	<i>Nguyen v. Barnes & Noble Inc.</i> ,	
12	763 F.3d 1171 (9th Cir. 2014).....	14, 15
13	<i>NYC Mgmt. Grp. v. Brown-Miller</i> ,	
14	2004 WL 1087784 (S.D.N.Y. May 14, 2004).....	18
15	<i>Paster v. Putney Student Travel, Inc.</i> ,	
16	1999 WL 1074120 (C.D. Cal. June 9, 1999)	18
17	<i>Peers v. McLaughlin</i> ,	
18	88 Cal. 294 (1891)	18
19	<i>Ramirez v. Freescore, LLC</i> ,	
20	2011 WL 3812608 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 30, 2011).....	16
21	<i>Rodman v. Safeway Inc.</i> ,	
22	2015 WL 604985 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 12, 2015) (Tigar, J.).....	16
23	<i>Rodriguez v. Instagram, LLC</i> ,	
24	No. 13-53287 (Cal. Super. Ct. Feb. 28, 2014)	15
25	<i>Sgouros v. TransUnion Corp.</i> ,	
26	817 F.3d 1029 (7th Cir. 2016).....	14, 15, 16
27	<i>Sherman v. AT&T Inc.</i> ,	
28	2012 WL 1021823 (N.D. Ill. Mar. 26, 2012).....	15
	<i>Silverman v. Move Inc.</i> ,	
	2019 WL 2579343 (N.D. Cal. June 24, 2019)	16
	<i>Snow v. Eventbrite, Inc.</i> ,	
	2020 WL 6135990 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2020).....	14
	<i>Spencer v. Collins</i> ,	
	156 Cal. 298 (1909)	19

1	<i>Toon v. Mack Int’l Motor Truck Corp.</i> ,	
2	87 Cal. App. 151 (1927).....	18
3	<i>Tortoriello v. Gerald Nissan of N. Aurora, Inc.</i> ,	
4	379 Ill. App. 3d 214 (2008).....	17
5	<i>United States v. Borrero</i> ,	
6	771 F.3d 973 (7th Cir. 2014).....	13
7	<i>United States v. Sutcliffe</i> ,	
8	505 F.3d 944 (9th Cir. 2007).....	13
9	<i>Van Tassell v. United Mktg. Grp., LLC</i> ,	
10	795 F. Supp. 2d 770 (N.D. Ill. 2011)	15
11	<i>Woodling v. Garret Corp.</i> ,	
12	813 F.2d 543 (2d Cir. 1987).....	18
13	Statutes	
14	740 ILCS 14/5	11
15	740 ILCS 14/10	11
16	740 ILCS 14/15	11
17	9 U.S.C. § 2	13
18	9 U.S.C. § 3	20
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
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.