

1 Katrina Carroll (admitted *pro hac vice*)
2 **CARLSON LYNCH LLP**
3 111 West Washington Street, Suite 1240
4 Chicago, IL 60602
5 Tel.: 312-750-1265
6 kcarroll@carsonlynch.com

7 [ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED ON SIGNATURE PAGE]

8 *Counsel for Plaintiffs*

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 OAKLAND DIVISION**

12 KELLY WHALEN, individually and on behalf
13 of all others similarly situated, and S.M., a
14 minor, by and through her guardian, Tachah
15 Wade, individually and on behalf of all others
16 similarly situated,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19 FACEBOOK, INC.,

20 Defendant.

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

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

Date: TBD
Time: TBD
Judge: Hon. Jon S. Tigar
Place: Courtroom 6, 2nd Floor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|--------------------|
| 1 INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 FACTUAL BACKGROUND | 2 |
| 5 A. EVIDENCE PRODUCED IN ARBITRATION-RELATED DISCOVERY | 3 |
| 6 1. Facebook’s Evidence | 3 |
| 7 2. Plaintiffs’ Evidence..... | 12 |
| 8 1. Ms. Whalen | 12 |
| 9 2. Minor Plaintiff S.M..... | 12 |
| 10 ARGUMENT | 13 |
| 11 A. ARBITRATION IS A MATTER OF CONTRACT AND NO CONTRACT WAS | |
| 12 ENTERED INTO BY THE PARTIES | 13 |
| 13 B. THERE IS NO COMPETENT EVIDENCE ESTABLISHING THAT EITHER | |
| 14 PLAINTIFF AGREED TO ARBITRATE..... | 14 |
| 15 1. FACEBOOK’S DECLARATIONS ARE INADMISSIBLE AND | |
| 16 SHOULD BE DISREGARDED ALTOGETHER OR ENTITLED TO | |
| 17 LITTLE WEIGHT | 14 |
| 18 2. FACEBOOK SHOULD NOT BE PERMITTED TO INTRODUCE | |
| 19 FURTHER EVIDENCE OF AN AGREEMENT TO ARBITRATE | 18 |
| 20 3. ANY PURPORTED AGREEMENT IS AN UNENFORCEABLE | |
| 21 “BROWSEWRAP” | 19 |
| 22 4. FACEBOOK HAS FAILED TO ESTABLISH THAT S.M. AGREED TO | |
| 23 ARBITRATE WHEN REGISTERING HER ACCOUNT IN 2014 | 24 |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 CONCLUSION | 25 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**Page(s)****Cases**

| | | |
|----|--|--------|
| 1 | | |
| 2 | | |
| 3 | Cases | |
| 4 | <i>Apple Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> , | |
| 5 | 2015 WL 3863249 (N.D. Cal. June 19, 2015)..... | 23 |
| 6 | <i>Applebaum v. Lyft, Inc.</i> , | |
| 7 | 263 F. Supp. 3d 454 (S.D.N.Y. 2017) | 31 |
| 8 | <i>AT&T Techs., Inc. v. Commc 'ns Workers of Am.</i> , | |
| 9 | 475 U.S. 643 (1986)..... | 13 |
| 10 | <i>Barrowman v. Wright Med. Tech. Inc.</i> , | |
| 11 | No. C15-0717JLR, 2017 WL 4161688 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 19, 2017)..... | 17 |
| 12 | <i>Berkson v. Gogo LLC</i> , | |
| 13 | 97 F. Supp. 3d 359 (E.D.N.Y. 2015) | 31 |
| 14 | <i>Billups, Inc. v. Ambassador Techs., Inc.</i> , | |
| 15 | No. 3:20-CV-00891-BR, 2021 WL 2939934 (D. Or. July 13, 2021)..... | 21 |
| 16 | <i>Chevron Corp. v. Pennzoil Co.</i> , | |
| 17 | 974 F.2d 1156 (9th Cir. 1992) | 23 |
| 18 | <i>Colgate v. JUUL Labs, Inc.</i> , | |
| 19 | 402 F. Supp. 3d 728 (N.D. Cal. 2019)..... | 31, 32 |
| 20 | <i>Comer v. Micor, Inc.</i> , | |
| 21 | 436 F.3d 1098 (9th Cir. 2006) | 16 |
| 22 | <i>Cullinane v. Uber Techs., Inc.</i> , | |
| 23 | 893 F.3d 53 (1st Cir. 2018)..... | 31 |
| 24 | <i>Doe v. Xytex Corp.</i> , | |
| 25 | No. C 16-02935 WHA, 2016 WL 3902577 (N.D. Cal. July 19, 2016)..... | 27 |
| 26 | <i>Erichsen v. RBC Capital Markets, LLC</i> , | |
| 27 | 883 F. Supp. 2d 562 (E.D.N.C. 2012) | 18 |
| 28 | <i>First Options of Chic., Inc. v. Kaplan</i> , | |
| | 514 U.S. 938 (1995)..... | 14 |
| | <i>Gonzalez v. Citigroup, Inc.</i> , | |
| | 2011 WL 4374997 (E.D.Cal.2011)..... | 15 |
| | <i>Granite Rock Co. v. Int'l Bhd. of Teamsters</i> , | |
| | 561 U.S. 287 (2010)..... | 13 |
| | <i>Hagen v U.S.</i> , | |
| | 486 F. Supp. 2d 622 (D. Md. 2007)..... | 21 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont.)**Page(s)****Cases (cont.)**

| | | |
|----|---|--------|
| 4 | <i>Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard Feiner & Co.</i> , 896 F.2d 1542 (9th Cir.1990) | 16 |
| 6 | <i>Hill v. Quicken Loans Inc.</i> , No. ED CV 19-0163 FMO (SPx), 2020 WL 5358394 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 5, 2020)..... | 15 |
| 8 | <i>Ho v. Postmaster Gen.</i> , No. C 09-1600 MEJ, 2010 WL 309037 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2010) | 17 |
| 10 | <i>Hoffman v. Citibank (South Dakota), N.A.</i> , 546 F.3d 1078 (9th Cir. 2008) | 23 |
| 11 | <i>In re Henson</i> , 869 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2017) | 13 |
| 12 | <i>In re TFT-LCD (Flat Panel) Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. C 10-3517 SI, 2011 WL 4345316 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 15, 2011)..... | 18 |
| 13 | <i>Kilgore v. KeyBank Nat'l Ass'n</i> , 718 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2013) | 14 |
| 15 | <i>Knutson v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.</i> , 771 F.3d 559 (9th Cir. 2014) | 14 |
| 17 | <i>Long v. Provide Commerce, Inc.</i> , 245 Cal. App. 4th 855 (2016) | 27 |
| 18 | <i>Los Angeles Times Comm., LLC v. Dep't of Army</i> , 442 F. Supp. 2d 880 (C.D. Cal. 2006) | 20 |
| 20 | <i>Martin v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.</i> , No. 12-cv-06030, 2013 WL 6236762 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 2, 2013) | 30 |
| 21 | <i>McKee v. Audible, Inc.</i> , No. CV 17-1941-GW(Ex), 2017 WL 4685039 (C.D. Cal. July 17, 2017)..... | 26, 31 |
| 22 | <i>Mitchell v. U-Haul Co. of Cal.</i> , No. 16-cv-04674-JD, 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79064 (N.D. Cal. May 23, 2017)..... | 14, 27 |
| 24 | <i>Mulvany v. Live Nation Ent., Inc.</i> , No. 15-CV-04371-BLF, 2016 WL 7230898 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 14, 2016)..... | 18 |
| 25 | <i>Nguyen v. Barnes & Noble Inc.</i> , 763 F.3d 1171 (9th Cir. 2014) | passim |
| 27 | <i>Nicosia v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> , 834 F.3d 220 (2d Cir. 2016) | 32 |

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES (cont.)**Page(s)****Cases (cont.)**

| | | |
|----|--|------------|
| 4 | <i>Norcia v. Samsung Telecomms. Am., LLC</i> , No. 14-cv-00582-JD, 2014 WL 4652332 | 15, 16, 24 |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | <i>Opperman v. Path, Inc.</i> , 205 F. Supp. 3d 1064 (N.D. Cal. 2016) | 27 |
| 7 | <i>Pearson v. United Debt Holdings, LLC</i> , No. 14 C 10070, 2015 WL 4960315 (N.D. Ill. Aug. 19, 2015) | 18 |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | <i>Rushing v. Viacom Inc.</i> , No. 17-CV-04492-JD, 2018 WL 4998139 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 15, 2018) | 30 |
| 10 | <i>Snow v. Eventbrite, Inc.</i> , No. 3:20-cv03698, 2020 WL 6135990 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 19, 2020) | 32, 33 |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | <i>Specht v. Netscape Commc'ns Corp.</i> , 306 F.3d 17 (2d Cir. 2002) | 24, 28 |
| 13 | <i>Texaco Antilles Ltd. v. Creque</i> , 273 F. Supp. 2d 660 (D.V.I. 2003) | 21 |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | <i>Totten v. Kellogg Brown & Root, LLC</i> , 152 F. Supp. 3d 1243 (C.D. Cal. 2016) | 15 |
| 16 | <i>Volt Info. Scis., Inc. v. Bd. of Trs. of Leland Stanford Junior Univ.</i> , 489 U.S. 468 (1989) | 13 |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | <i>Wicker v. Oregon ex rel. Bureau of Lab.</i> , 543 F.3d 1168 (9th Cir. 2008) | 17 |
| 19 | <i>Wilson v. Huuuge, Inc.</i> , 944 F.3d 1212 (9th Cir. 2019) | 26 |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | <i>Windsor Mills, Inc. v. Collins & Aikman Corp.</i> , 25 Cal. App. 3d 987 (1972) | 24 |

Statutes

| | | |
|----|---------------------|---|
| 23 | 740 ILCS 14/1 | 2 |
|----|---------------------|---|

Rules

| | | |
|----|------------------------------------|------------|
| 25 | Federal Rule of Evidence 602 | 16, 17, 20 |
|----|------------------------------------|------------|

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.