

1 COOLEY LLP
 2 MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127)
 (rhodesmg@cooley.com)
 3 TRAVIS LEBLANC (251097)
 (tleblanc@cooley.com)
 4 KATHLEEN R. HARTNETT (314267)
 (khartnett@cooley.com)
 5 BENJAMIN H. KLEINE (257225)
 (bkleine@cooley.com)
 6 DANIELLE C. PIERRE (300567)
 (dpierre@cooley.com)
 7 JOSEPH D. MORNIN (307766)
 (jmornin@cooley.com)
 8 EVAN G. SLOVAK (319409)
 (eslovak@cooley.com)
 9 KELSEY R. SPECTOR (321488)
 (kspector@cooley.com)
 10 101 California Street, 5th Floor
 San Francisco, California 94111-5800
 Telephone: +1 415 693 2000
 11 Facsimile: +1 415 693 2222

12 Attorneys for Defendant
 ZOOM VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

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

18 *IN RE: ZOOM VIDEO COMMUNICATIONS*
 19 *INC. PRIVACY LITIGATION,*

Master Case No. 5:20-cv-02155-LHK

20 This Documents Relates To:
 21 All Actions

**DEFENDANT ZOOM VIDEO
 COMMUNICATIONS, INC.’S NOTICE OF
 MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS THE
 FIRST AMENDED CONSOLIDATED CLASS
 ACTION COMPLAINT; MEMORANDUM OF
 POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT
 THEREOF**

Date: February 4, 2021
 Time: 1:30 p.m.
 Courtroom: 8, 4th Floor
 Judge: Hon. Lucy H. Koh

26
 27
 28

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page(s)
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	
	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS 1
	STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE DECIDED 1
	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES 1
	I. INTRODUCTION 1
	II. BACKGROUND 3
	A. Zoom’s Videoconferencing Services 3
	B. Plaintiffs’ Allegations 3
	III. MOTION TO DISMISS STANDARD 4
	IV. ARGUMENT 4
	A. Section 230 Bars All of Plaintiffs’ Claims to the Extent They Are Predicated on Unwanted Meeting Disruptions. 4
	1. Zoom is a quintessential interactive computer service. 5
	2. Plaintiffs impermissibly seek to hold Zoom liable as the publisher of content supplied by the meeting disruptors. 6
	3. Zoom does not contribute to meeting disruptions. 8
	B. Plaintiffs’ Claims All Fail Because Plaintiffs Do Not Allege That Zoom Harmed Plaintiffs. 8
	1. Plaintiffs fail to allege personal harm from alleged data sharing. 8
	2. Plaintiffs fail to allege personal harm caused by Zoom from meeting disruptions. 9
	3. Plaintiffs fail to allege personal harm from Zoom’s alleged misrepresentations and omissions concerning encryption. 10
	C. Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim for Invasion of Privacy Under the California Constitution or Common Law (Count 1). 10
	1. Plaintiffs have not alleged an actionable intrusion into any material over which they have a legally protected privacy interest. 11
	2. Plaintiffs fail to allege that Zoom’s purported disclosure of device data constituted an egregious breach of social norms. 12
	3. The two institutional Plaintiffs may not maintain privacy claims. 13
	D. Plaintiffs’ Negligence Claims Should Be Dismissed (Count 2). 13
	1. The economic loss rule bars Plaintiffs’ claim to the extent they seek recovery for financial injury. 13
	2. Plaintiffs fail to plead the elements of negligence. 15
	E. Plaintiffs Cannot State a Claim for Breach of an Implied Contract (Count 3). 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

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page(s)
F. Plaintiffs’ Claim for Breach of the Implied Covenant Fails (Count 4).	18
G. Plaintiffs Cannot State a Claim for Violation of the CDAFA (Count 8).	19
H. Plaintiffs’ Fraud-Based Claims Should Be Dismissed (UCL, CLRA, Fraudulent Concealment; Counts 6, 7, 9)Counts 6, 7, 9).	20
1. Plaintiffs fail to plead with Rule 9(b) particularity.	20
2. Most of the Plaintiffs cannot bring claims under the CLRA or UCL.	22
3. The four remaining Plaintiffs’ CLRA damages claims fail.	23
4. Plaintiffs otherwise fail to state a claim under the UCL.	24
a. Plaintiffs fail to state a claim under the UCL’s “unlawful” prong.	24
b. Plaintiffs fail to state a claim under the UCL’s “unfair” prong.	24
I. Plaintiffs’ Unjust Enrichment and Quasi-Contract Claims Fail (Count 5).	25
V. CONCLUSION	25

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Aas v. Super. Ct.</i> , 24 Cal. 4th 627 (2000)	16
<i>In re Apple & AT&T iPad Unlimited Data Plan Litig.</i> , 802 F. Supp. 2d 1070 (N.D. Cal. 2011)	25
<i>In re Apple & ATTM Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. C 07-05152, 2010 WL 3521965 (N.D. Cal. July 8, 2010)	20
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009)	4, 19
<i>Baba v. Hewlett-Packard Co.</i> , No. C 09-05946, 2010 WL 2486353 (N.D. Cal. June 16, 2010)	24
<i>Banga v. Equifax Info. Servs. LLC</i> , No. 14-CV-03038, 2015 WL 3799546 (N.D. Cal. June 18, 2015)	11
<i>Barnes v. Yahoo!, Inc.</i> , 570 F.3d 1096 (9th Cir. 2009).....	5, 6, 7
<i>Batzel v. Smith</i> , 333 F.3d 1018 (9th Cir. 2003).....	6
<i>Be In, Inc. v. Google Inc.</i> , No. 12-CV-03373, 2013 WL 5568706 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 9, 2013).....	18
<i>Bell Atl. Corp v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....	4
<i>Belluomini v. Citigroup, Inc.</i> , No. CV 13-01743, 2013 WL 3855589 (N.D. Cal. July 24, 2013)	12
<i>Bem v. Stryker Corp.</i> , No. C 15-2485, 2015 WL 4573204 (N.D. Cal. July 29, 2015).....	16
<i>Brodsky v. Apple Inc.</i> , No. 19-CV-00712, 2019 WL 4141936 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 30, 2019)	19
<i>Burnell v. Marin Humane Soc’y</i> , No. CV 14-5635, 2015 WL 6746818 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 5, 2015).....	16
<i>Cal. Grocers Ass’n, Inc. v. Bank of Am.</i> , 22 Cal. App. 4th 205 (1994).....	23

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
(continued)

		Page(s)
1		
2		
3	<i>Carafano v. Metrosplash.com, Inc.</i> ,	
4	339 F.3d 1119 (9th Cir. 2003).....	5
5	<i>Careau & Co. v. Sec. Pac. Bus. Credit, Inc.</i> ,	
6	222 Cal. App. 3d 1371 (1990).....	19
7	<i>Castillo v. Seagate Tech., LLC</i> ,	
8	No. 16-cv-01958, 2016 WL 9280242 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 14, 2016).....	14
9	<i>Cattie v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.</i> ,	
10	504 F. Supp. 2d 939 (S.D. Cal. 2007).....	23
11	<i>Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. L.A. Cellular Tel. Co.</i> ,	
12	20 Cal. 4th 163 (1999).....	24
13	<i>Davidson v. Apple, Inc.</i> ,	
14	No. 16-cv-04942, 2017 WL 976048 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 14, 2017).....	21
15	<i>Dent v. Nat'l Football League</i> ,	
16	902 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2018).....	15
17	<i>Doe v. Internet Brands, Inc.</i> ,	
18	824 F.3d 846 (9th Cir. 2016).....	7
19	<i>Doe v. Internet Brands, Inc.</i> ,	
20	No. CV 12-3626, 2016 U.S. Dist. Lexis 192144 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2016).....	15
21	<i>Doe v. Kik Interactive, Inc.</i> ,	
22	No. 20-60702, 2020 WL 5156641 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 31, 2020).....	8
23	<i>Doe v. MySpace, Inc.</i> ,	
24	528 F.3d 413 (5th Cir. 2008).....	7
25	<i>Dohrmann v. Intuit, Inc.</i> ,	
26	823 F. App'x 482 (9th Cir. 2020).....	17
27	<i>Dual Diagnosis Treatment Ctr., Inc. v. Blue Cross of Cal.</i> ,	
28	SA CV 15-0736, 2016 WL 6892140 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 22, 2016).....	18
	<i>Dyroff v. Ultimate Software Grp., Inc.</i> ,	
	No. 17-cv-05359, 2017 WL 5665670 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 26, 2017), <i>aff'd</i> , 934 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. 2010).....	15
	<i>Dyroff v. Ultimate Software Grp., Inc.</i> ,	
	934 F.3d 1093 (9th Cir. 2019).....	5

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.