

1 **BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER**  
2 **& GROSSMANN LLP**  
3 JONATHAN D. USLANER (Bar No. 256898)  
4 (jonathanu@blbglaw.com)  
5 CAITLIN BOZMAN (Bar No. 343721)  
6 (caitlin.bozman@blbglaw.com)  
7 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2575  
8 Los Angeles, CA 90067  
9 Tel: (310) 819-3470

10 *Counsel for Lead Plaintiffs*  
11 *Ohio Public Employees Retirement System and*  
12 *PFA Pension Forsikringsaktieselskab*

13 [Additional Counsel Appear on  
14 Signature Page]

15 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
16 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
17 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

18 IN RE META PLATFORMS, INC.  
19 SECURITIES LITIGATION

20 Lead Case No. 4:21-cv-08812-JST

21 Consolidated Case No. 4:21-cv-08873-JST

22 **LEAD PLAINTIFFS' CONSOLIDATED**  
23 **AMENDED CLASS ACTION**  
24 **COMPLAINT FOR VIOLATIONS OF**  
25 **THE FEDERAL SECURITIES LAWS**

26 CLASS ACTION  
27  
28

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. JURISDICTION AND VENUE .....	15
III. PARTIES .....	16
A. Lead Plaintiffs.....	16
B. Defendants .....	16
IV. SUMMARY OF THE FRAUD .....	18
A. Before the Class Period, Meta Notices Material Negative Trends in Its User Base and Engagement that Threaten Its Profitability .....	18
B. Defendants Make a Series of Misstatements and Omissions Concerning Meta’s Content-Moderation Practices, Algorithm, the Impact of its Platforms on Its Users, and the Size of Its User Base.....	23
1. Contrary to Defendants’ Public Representations, Meta Exempted Several Million High-Profile Users from Its Content-Moderation Policies, Allowing Them to Violate “Community Standards” with Impunity .....	23
a. Defendants Assure Investors that Meta Applies Its Content Standards Equally to All Users .....	24
b. In Truth, Meta’s “Cross-Check” and “Whitelisting” Practices Exempted Several Million High-Profile Users from Content Enforcement .....	29
c. Meta’s Own Oversight Board Excoriated the Company for Misrepresenting and Concealing Cross-Check.....	34
2. Defendants Made Material Misstatements and Omissions Concerning the Fact That Meta’s News Feed Algorithm and Content-Moderation Practices Promoted Toxic Content and Misinformation .....	37
a. The News Feed Is Facebook’s Primary Content-Delivery Mechanism.....	37
b. Defendants Changed the News Feed Algorithm in 2018, Stating that the Change Prioritized “Meaningful Social Interactions” .....	38
c. Meta Quickly Determines that its 2018 Changes to the News Feed Algorithm Caused Hateful, Toxic Content and Misinformation to Be “Inordinately Prevalent”.....	39

1 d. Defendants Made Numerous False and Misleading  
 2 Representations Concerning the News Feed  
 Algorithm and Meta’s Content Moderation.....42

3 e. Copious Internal Research Documented that the  
 4 Algorithm Caused Toxic Content to Proliferate, But  
 Meta and Zuckerberg Chose Not to Fix the Problem .....47

5 f. Defendants’ Inability and Unwillingness to  
 6 Effectively Moderate Content Made It Impossible to  
 Achieve Meta’s Publicly Stated Objectives to  
 7 Support COVID-19 Vaccination.....59

8 3. Meta Falsely Touts Its Commitment to Children’s Safety and  
 Downplays and Denies the Harms Caused by Its Platforms, Despite  
 9 Knowing from Extensive Internal Research that Its Platforms  
 Severely Harm Teens, Especially Teen Girls .....61

10 a. Defendants Launch a Campaign to “Race for Teen  
 11 Users”.....62

12 b. Meta’s Internal Research Demonstrates that  
 Instagram’s Negative Impacts on Teens, Especially  
 13 Teen Girls, Are “Common” And “Severe” .....64

14 c. Defendants Conceal Meta’s Internal Research on  
 Teen Mental Health from the Public.....69

15 d. “Winning with Tweens”: Meta Works to Attract  
 16 Even Younger Users Because It Is Losing the “Race  
 for Teens”.....71

17 e. Defendants Falsely Tout Meta’s Commitment to  
 18 Children’s Safety, Assure the Public that Meta’s  
 Platforms Do Not Harm Children, and Characterize  
 19 the Research as Inconclusive .....72

20 f. Meta Doubles Down on Its Efforts to Target Young  
 Users, Its False Assurances, and Its Denials of the  
 21 Negative Impact of Its Platforms on Children .....73

22 4. Meta Misrepresents Its User Growth Metrics Due to the Prevalence of  
 Duplicate or SUMA Accounts Among New Accounts .....77

23 a. User Growth Was a Key Metric for Investors .....77

24 b. Meta Sold Facebook as a “Real Identity” Platform  
 25 Where Advertisers Could Reliably Target Key  
 Demographics like Teens and Young Adults .....78

26 c. Meta Misstates Facebook’s User Growth Metrics.....79

27 d. In Truth, Meta Knew that Duplicate Accounts Were  
 28 Far More Prevalent in New Accounts than Reported,  
 and Teen and Young Adult Use and Engagement  
 Was Actually in Decline .....81

1	C.	Meta Stock Price Declines in Response to the Publication of the Facebook Files and Additional Disclosures Connected to the Fraud.....	83
2			
3	1.	<i>The Wall Street Journal</i> Publishes the Facebook Files and Defendants Push Back with Denials.....	83
4			
5	a.	September 13, 2021: the September 13 Facebook File Describes Internal Documents Showing that Meta Allowed Millions of Users to Violate Its Community Standards and Post Harmful Content with Impunity.....	85
6			
7	b.	September 14, 2021: the September 14 Facebook File Showcases How Meta Profited by Making Instagram “Toxic” for Teens, Causing New Congressional Scrutiny.....	88
8			
9	c.	September 15, 2021: the September 15 Facebook File Describes How Meta’s Changes to Its News Feed Algorithm and Content Moderation Failures Generated Prevalent Toxic Content.....	96
10			
11			
12	2.	Meta’s Stock Price Declines Further in Response to Subsequent Disclosures Connected to the Fraud.....	99
13			
14	a.	September 21-22, 2021: Meta’s Oversight Board Calls for More “Transparency” on X-Check, While Senators Grill Meta over How Facebook Harms Teens.....	99
15			
16	b.	September 27-28, 2021: Meta Pauses Instagram Kids, <i>The Wall Street Journal</i> Reveals How Meta Planned to Attract Preteens to Its Platforms, and Meta Seeks a Review of X-Check by the Oversight Board.....	101
17			
18			
19	c.	October 3, 2021: the Facebook Files Whistleblower Is Revealed.....	105
20			
21	d.	October 6, 2021: Meta Halts New Product Launches and European Regulators Work with the Whistleblower.....	110
22			
23	e.	October 21, 2021: the Oversight Board Condemns Meta for Withholding Relevant Information About X-Check, Meta Admits that Its Statements to the Oversight Board Were Misleading, and <i>The Wall Street Journal</i> Releases New Information About Meta’s User Metrics.....	112
24			
25			
26	(1)	The Oversight Board Formally Reviews X-Check.....	112
27	(2)	<i>The Wall Street Journal</i> Reveals That Up to 56% of New Accounts Are Created by Existing Users.....	113
28			

1 V. POST-CLASS PERIOD DEVELOPMENTS.....115

2 A. Another Whistleblower Corroborates Haugen’s Complaints and the

3 Facebook Files .....115

4 B. A News Outlet Consortium Gains Access to the Facebook Papers,

5 Corroborating the Facebook Files and Expanding on the Platforms’ Harms .....115

6 C. Analysts React to the Facebook Files and Ensuing Developments .....116

7 D. Investigations Concerning Meta’s Promotion of Instagram to Children and

8 Young Adults Commence as Scrutiny Intensifies .....117

9 VI. DEFENDANTS’ MATERIALLY FALSE AND MISLEADING STATEMENTS

10 AND OMISSIONS .....119

11 A. False and Misleading Statements Representing that Meta Applied Its

12 Content-Moderation Policies Consistently to All Users.....119

13 B. False and Misleading Statements Concerning Presence and Impact of

14 Misinformation and Harmful Content on Meta’s Platforms.....132

15 1. Defendants’ False and Misleading Statements Concerning Meta’s

16 Algorithms and Harmful Content on Meta’s Platforms.....132

17 2. Additional False and Misleading Statements Concerning Meta’s

18 Ability and Willingness to Moderate Misinformation and Harmful

19 Content on Its Platforms .....141

20 C. False and Misleading Statements Denying Instagram’s Harm to Young

21 Users .....150

22 D. False and Misleading Statements Representing that Meta’s Metrics for

23 Counting Users Were Accurate and Reliable .....160

24 VII. ADDITIONAL LOSS CAUSATION ALLEGATIONS .....163

25 VIII. ADDITIONAL SCIENTER ALLEGATIONS.....166

26 IX. INAPPLICABILITY OF STATUTORY SAFE HARBOR .....186

27 X. THE PRESUMPTION OF RELIANCE .....187

28 XI. CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS .....188

XII. CLAIMS FOR RELIEF .....190

COUNT I .....190

COUNT II.....192

XIII. PRAYER FOR RELIEF .....193

# 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.