

1 BROWNE GEORGE ROSS  
2 [O'BRIEN ANNAGUEY & ELLIS LLP](#)  
3 Peter Obstler (State Bar No. 171623)  
4 [pobstler@bgrfirm.com](mailto:pobstler@bgrfirm.com)  
5 ~~44 Montgomery Street, Suite 1280~~  
6 ~~San Francisco, California 94104~~  
7 ~~Telephone: (415) 391-7100; Facsimile: (415) 391-7198~~

8 ~~BROWNE GEORGE ROSS LLP~~  
9 ~~[Pete Wilson \(State Bar No. 35742\)](#)~~  
10 ~~[pwilson@bgrfirm.com](mailto:pwilson@bgrfirm.com)~~  
11 Eric M. George (State Bar No. 166403)  
12 ~~[egeorge@bgrfirm.com](mailto:egeorge@bgrfirm.com)~~  
13 ~~[Dennis S. Ellis \(State Bar No. 178196\)](#)~~  
14 ~~[dellis@bgrfirm.com](mailto:dellis@bgrfirm.com)~~  
15 Debi A. Ramos (State Bar No. 135373)  
16 ~~[dramos@bgrfirm.com](mailto:dramos@bgrfirm.com)~~  
17 2121 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2800  
18 Los Angeles, California 90067  
19 ~~Telephone: (310) 274-7100; Facsimile: (310) 275-5697~~

20 Attorneys for Plaintiffs Divino Group LLC, Chris  
21 Knight, Celso Dulay, Cameron Stiehl,  
22 BriaAndChrissy LLC, Bria Kam, Chrissy  
23 Chambers, Chase Ross, Brett Somers, and Lindsay  
24 Amer, Stephanie Frosch, Sal Cinequemani,  
25 Tamara Johnson and Greg Scarnici

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

18 DIVINO GROUP LLC, a California limited  
19 liability company, CHRIS KNIGHT, an  
20 individual, CELSO DULAY, an individual,  
21 CAMERON STIEHL, an individual,  
22 BRIAANDCHRISSY LLC, a Georgia limited  
23 liability company, BRIA KAM, an individual,  
24 CHRISSY CHAMBERS, an individual,  
25 CHASE ROSS, an individual, BRETT  
26 SOMERS, an individual, and LINDSAY  
27 AMER, an individual, STEPHANIE FROSCH,  
28 an individual, SAL CINEQUEMANI, an  
individual, TAMARA JOHNSON, an  
individual, and GREG SCARNICI, an  
individual,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GOOGLE LLC, a Delaware limited liability  
company, YOUTUBE, LLC, a Delaware  
limited liability company, and DOES 1-25,

Case No. 5:19-cv-004749-VKD

**~~SECOND~~ THIRD AMENDED CLASS  
ACTION COMPLAINT ~~FOR DAMAGES,~~  
~~INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, RESTITUTION,~~  
~~AND DECLARATORY JUDGMENT~~**

**JURY TRIAL DEMANDED**

Judge: Hon. Virginia DeMarchi  
Crtrm: 2

~~Action Filed: August 13, 2019~~  
Trial Date: None Set

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Continued)**

**Page**

Defendants.

**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

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	1
II. PARTIES .....	15
III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE .....	19
<u><a href="#">A. Federal Question Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. §1331.....</a></u>	<u>19</u>
<u><a href="#">B. Class Action Fairness Act Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. §1332(d)(2).....</a></u>	<u>20</u>
<u><a href="#">C. Supplemental Jurisdiction Under 28 U.S.C. §1367.....</a></u>	<u>21</u>
IV. FACTS COMMON TO ALL CLAIMS .....	<u>1922</u>
A. The YouTube Platform .....	<u>1922</u>
B. YouTube Holds Itself Out As A Quintessential Forum For Freedom Of Expression.....	<u>2024</u>
C. Defendants Flout The Fundamental “Free Expression” Bargain They Made With YouTubers.....	<u>2326</u>
D. Defendants Begin To Compete With YouTubers In The Proposed Class.....	<u>2528</u>
E. Defendants’ Tool Kit Of Unlawful Speech Suppression.....	<u>2629</u>
1. Restricted Mode .....	<u>2630</u>
2. Advertising Restrictions.....	<u>3034</u>
3. AI Filtering Under Restricted Mode And Advertising Restrictions .....	<u>3135</u>
4. Demonetizing Channels Wholesale .....	<u>3337</u>
5. Shadow Banning .....	<u>3338</u>
6. Deleting Thumbnail Images.....	<u>3438</u>
7. Cancelling And Stopping Subscribers’ New Video Notifications.....	<u>3539</u>
8. Excluding Content From The “Up Next” Recommended Application .....	<u>3741</u>
9. Recommending Anti- Hate Speech In The “Up Next” Application Alongside Videos.....	<u>3741</u>
10. Playing Anti- Advertisements Immediately Before Videos .....	<u>3842</u>
11. Including Anti- Hate Speech In Comments Appearing With Videos.....	<u>3842</u>
12. Other Unlawful Speech-Restricting Tools.....	<u>4145</u>

1392054-1

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Continued)**

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

		<u>Page</u>
F.	Defendants Were Caught Censoring Users In 2017 .....	<a href="#">4246</a>
G.	YouTube’s Promises To the YouTubers Were “Lip Service” .....	<a href="#">4448</a>
H.	Defendants Have And Continue To Violate The Rights Of Plaintiffs And The Community .....	<a href="#">4549</a>
1.	Divino (GlitterBombTV.com’s GNews!) .....	<a href="#">4549</a>
2.	BriaAndChrissy LLC (BriaAndChrissy) .....	<a href="#">5155</a>
3.	Chase Ross .....	<a href="#">6367</a>
4.	Brett Somers a/k/a AMP (Watts The Safeword).....	<a href="#">7073</a>
5.	Lindsay Amer (Queer Kid Stuff) .....	<a href="#">7579</a>
6.	Stephanie Frosch (ElloSteph, ElloStephExtras and StephFrosch).....	<a href="#">7982</a>
7.	Sal Cinquemani (SalBardo) .....	<a href="#">8286</a>
8.	Tamara Johnson (SVTV Network) .....	<a href="#">8790</a>
9.	Greg Scarnici (GregScarnici and Undercover Music).....	<a href="#">9194</a>
V.	CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS .....	<a href="#">9497</a>
	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION Declaratory Judgment: 47 U.S.C. § 230(c) Violates The First And Fourteenth Amendments Of The U.S. Constitution (On Behalf Of Plaintiffs Individually And The YouTube Community Class).....	<a href="#">98101</a>
A.	Plaintiffs Served Rule 5.1 Notice On The U.S. Attorney General. ....	<a href="#">99102</a>
B.	Legal Controversies Currently Exist Regarding The Scope And Constitutionality Of 47 U.S.C. § 230(c). ....	<a href="#">100104</a>
1.	An Actual Controversy Exists As To Whether 47 U.S.C. § 230(c) Immunizes Filtering And Restricting Internet Speech Based On The Identity Or Viewpoint Of The Speaker.....	<a href="#">103106</a>
2.	An Actual Controversy Exists As To Whether Defendants’ Determination That Plaintiffs’ Content Is “Otherwise Objectionable” Is Subject To Good Faith Review.....	<a href="#">105108</a>
3.	An Actual Controversy Exists As To Whether 47 U.S.C. § 230(c) Is Unconstitutional As Applied To Plaintiffs On These Facts.....	<a href="#">106109</a>
	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION <del>Viewpoint Based Discrimination In</del> Violation Of <del>The First Amendment To U. S. Constitution Pursuant To 42 U.S.C. § 1983 (On Behalf Of Plaintiffs Individually And The YouTube Community Class)</del> .....	<del>107</del>

1392054.1

Case No. 5:19-cv-04749-VKD

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
**(Continued)**

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**

~~THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION~~ ~~Violation Of California Constitution Article I, Section 2 (On~~  
~~Behalf Of Plaintiffs Individually And The YouTube Community Class) ..... ~~112~~110~~

~~FOURTH~~THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION Violation Of California Unruh Civil Rights  
 Act—Civil Code §§ 51, *et seq.* (On Behalf Of Plaintiffs And The YouTube  
 Community Class) ..... ~~115~~112

~~FIFTH~~FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION Unfair Competition In Violation Of California  
 Business And Professions Code §§ 17200, *et seq.* (On Behalf Of Plaintiffs And The  
 YouTube Community Class) ..... ~~117~~114

~~SIXTH~~FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION Breach Of Implied Covenant Of Good Faith And Fair  
 Dealing (On Behalf Of Plaintiffs And The YouTube Community Class)..... ~~118~~115

~~SEVENTH~~SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION Violation Of The Lanham Act — 15 U.S.C. §§  
 1125 *et seq.* (On Behalf Of Plaintiffs ) ..... ~~119~~117

~~EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION Request For Declaratory Relief (On Behalf Of Plaintiffs~~  
~~And The YouTube Community Class) ..... ~~122~~~~

PRAYER FOR RELIEF ..... ~~123~~121

JURY DEMAND ..... ~~125~~122

# 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.