

1 KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP
2 BENJAMIN BERKOWITZ - # 244441
3 bberkowitz@keker.com
4 KHARI J. TILLERY - # 215669
5 ktillery@keker.com
6 ANJALI SRINIVASAN - # 304413
7 asrinivasan@keker.com
8 RYLEE KERCHER OLM - # 318550
9 rolm@keker.com
10 YENA LEE - # 332190
11 ylee@keker.com
12 633 Battery Street
13 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809
14 Telephone: 415 391 5400
15 Facsimile: 415 397 7188

16 Attorneys for Defendant TWITTER, INC.

17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
19 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

20 ALI AL-AHMED,

21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 TWITTER, INC.; ALI HAMAD A
24 ALZABARAH; and AHMAD ABOUAMMO,

25 Defendants.

Case No. 3:21-cv-08017-EMC

**DEFENDANT TWITTER, INC.'S
NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION
TO DISMISS**

Date: March 3, 2022
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Dept: Courtroom 5 – 17th Floor
Judge: Hon. Edward M. Chen

Date Filed: October 13, 2021
Trial Date: None Set

26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
1	
2	
3	I. INTRODUCTION 1
4	II. BACKGROUND 3
5	A. Al-Ahmed is a well-known and public critic of the KSA and, as a result of
6	his public criticism, was the subject of harassment by the KSA. 3
7	B. In 2014, the KSA recruited Abouammo and Alzabarah to gain access to
8	Twitter account information. 4
9	C. Twitter informed individuals whose accounts may have been compromised. 5
10	D. Al-Ahmed did not personally suffer harm as a result of the KSA’s
11	espionage at Twitter. 5
12	E. Al-Ahmed’s Arabic-language Twitter account was suspended in May 2018. 6
13	III. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND..... 6
14	A. <i>Al-Ahmed v. Twitter, Inc.</i> , Case No. 1:20-cv-04982-VEC (S.D.N.Y.) 6
15	B. <i>Abdulaziz v. Twitter, Inc., et al.</i> , Case No. 3:19-cv-06694-LB (N.D. Cal.)..... 6
16	IV. QUESTIONS PRESENTED..... 8
17	V. LEGAL STANDARD..... 8
18	VI. ARGUMENT 8
19	A. Al-Ahmed fails to establish Article III standing to pursue claims against
20	Twitter related to the alleged 2014-2015 KSA espionage. 8
21	B. Nearly all of Al-Ahmed’s causes of action should be dismissed as time-
22	barred. 11
23	1. Al-Ahmed was notified of the unauthorized intrusion of his Twitter
24	account more than five years before he filed this suit. 11
25	2. Al-Ahmed waited more than three years after his account
26	suspension before initiating this action. 12
27	C. Twitter is not vicariously liable for the KSA’s conduct. 13
28	1. Twitter did not aid or abet Abouammo and Alzabarah..... 13
	2. Twitter did not ratify Abouammo and Alzabarah’s misconduct. 14
	D. CDA Section 230(c)(1) bars Al-Ahmed’s account suspension-related
	claims. 15
	E. Twitter’s Limitation of Liability Clause contained within its Terms of
	Service bars many of Al-Ahmed’s claims. 17

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

F.	Al-Ahmed’s causes of action each fail for additional, independent reasons.	18
1.	Al-Ahmed fails to allege that Twitter violated the Wiretap Act as amended by the ECPA.	18
2.	Al-Ahmed fails to plead a claim under the SCA.	20
3.	Al-Ahmed fails to plead a CFAA claim against Twitter.	21
4.	Al-Ahmed’s UCL claim fails as a matter of law.	23
5.	Al-Ahmed’s claim for unjust enrichment fails as a matter of law.	26
6.	Al-Ahmed fails to plead any breach of contract by Twitter.	26
7.	Al-Ahmed cannot bring a claim for promissory estoppel.	27
8.	Al-Ahmed fails to meet the threshold elements required to state a claim for intrusion upon seclusion.	28
9.	Al-Ahmed fails to plead facts necessary to support his negligent hiring, supervision, and retention claim.	29
10.	Al-Ahmed’s negligence claims should be dismissed for the additional reason that he has failed to adequately plead proximate causation.	30
11.	There is no separate cause of action for civil conspiracy.	31
12.	Al-Ahmed’s allegations regarding his suspended account fail to state a claim for replevin.	31
VII.	CONCLUSION.....	32

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

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

Abdulaziz v. Twitter, Inc.,
Case No. 3:19-cv-06694-LB, 2020 WL 6947929 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 12, 2020)..... *passim*

Abdulaziz v. Twitter, Inc.,
Case No. 3:19-cv-06694-LB, 2021 WL 2986400 (N.D. Cal. July 15, 2021).....7, 10, 31

Abdulaziz v. Twitter, Inc.,
Case No. 3:19-cv-06694-LB, 2021 WL 633812 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 18, 2021).....7, 12, 30

Al-Ahmed v. Twitter, Inc.,
Case No. 1:20-cv-04982-VEC, 2021 WL 3604577 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 11, 2021)6, 7

Am. Freedom Def. Initiative v. Lynch,
217 F. Supp. 3d 100 (D.D.C. 2016)16

Andrews v. Sirius XM Radio Inc.,
932 F.3d 1253 (9th Cir. 2019)23

In re Apple Inc. Device Performance Litig.,
386 F. Supp. 3d 1115 (N.D. Cal. 2020)25

Ashcroft v. Iqbal,
556 U.S. 662 (2009).....8, 13, 30, 31

Astiana v. Hain Celestial Grp., Inc.,
783 F.3d 753 (9th Cir. 2015)26

Bank of New York v. Fremont Gen. Corp.,
523 F.3d 902 (9th Cir. 2008)32

Bass v. Facebook, Inc.,
394 F. Supp. 3d 1024 (N.D. Cal. 2019)18

Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly,
550 U.S. 544 (2007).....8

Bennett v. Google, LLC,
882 F.3d 1163 (D.C. Cir. 2018)17

Boon Rawd Trading Int’l Co. v. Paleewong Trading Co.,
688 F. Supp. 2d 940 (N.D. Cal. 2010)11

Boruta v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.,
No. 19-CV- 03164-WHO, 2019 WL 4010367 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 26, 2019)13

1 *Brittain v. Twitter, Inc.*,
 2 No. 19-CV-00114-YGR, 2019 WL 2423375 (N.D. Cal. June 10, 2019)16

3 *Brodsky v. Apple Inc.*,
 4 No. 19-CV-00712, 2019 WL 4141936 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 30, 2019)25

5 *Butera & Andrews v. Int’l Bus. Machines Corp.*,
 6 456 F. Supp. 2d 104 (D.D.C. 2006)20

7 *Cahen v. Toyota Motor Corp.*,
 8 147 F. Supp. 3d 955 (N.D. Cal. 2015)28

9 *Calhoun v. Google LLC*,
 10 526 F. Supp. 3d 605 (N.D. Cal. 2021)11, 20, 21

11 *Chevron Corp. v. Donziger*,
 12 No. 12-MC-80237 CRB (NC), 2013 WL 4536808 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 22, 2013)29

13 *CRV Imperial-Worthington, LP v. Gemini Ins. Co.*,
 14 770 F. Supp. 2d 1074 (S.D. Cal. 2010).....32

15 *Darnaa, LLC v. Google LLC*,
 16 756 F. App’x 674 (9th Cir. 2018)18

17 *Doe v. Dartmouth Hitchcock Medical Center*,
 18 Case No. CIV. 00-100-M, 2001 WL 873063 (D.N.H. July 19, 2001).....22

19 *Ewert v. eBay, Inc.*,
 20 602 F. App’x 357 (9th Cir. 2015)26

21 *In re Facebook Internet Tracking Litig.*,
 22 263 F. Supp. 3d 836 (9th Cir. 2017)28

23 *In re Facebook Privacy Litig.*,
 24 791 F. Supp. 2d 705 (N.D. Cal. 2011)23

25 *Fair Hous. Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommates.Com, LLC*,
 26 521 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2008)17

27 *Fields v. Twitter, Inc.*,
 28 200 F. Supp. 3d 964 (N.D. Cal. 2016)16

G.S. Rasmussen & Assocs., Inc. v. Kalitta Flying Serv., Inc.,
 958 F.2d 896 (9th Cir. 1992)32

Garamendi v. SDI Vendome S.A.,
 276 F. Supp. 2d 1030 (C.D. Cal. 2003)11, 12

Gonzales v. Uber Tech., Inc.,
 305 F. Supp. 3d 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2018)19

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.