

Megan E. Jones (Cal. Bar No. 296274)
 Seth R. Gassman (Cal. Bar No. 311702)
 HAUSFELD LLP
 600 Montgomery Street, Suite 3200
 San Francisco, CA 94111
 Telephone: (415) 633-1908
 mjones@hausfeld.com
 sgassman@hausfeld.com

Will Thompson (CA Bar No. 289012)
 BURNS CHAREST LLP
 900 Jackson Street, Suite 500
 Dallas, Texas 75202
 Telephone: (469) 904-4550
 wthompson@burnscharest.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and the Proposed Class

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

P. S., a minor, by and through her Guardian,
 Cherise Slate, and M. T. W., a minor, by and
 through her Guardian, Brenda Washington,
 individually and on behalf of all others
 similarly situated,

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

TIKTOK, INC., a corporation, and
 BYTEDANCE, INC., a corporation,

Defendant(s).

CASE NO.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT:

**(1) Violation of Illinois Biometric
 Information Privacy Act, 740 ILCS
 14/1 et seq., § 15**

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2		
3	PARTIES	2
4	JURISDICTION AND VENUE	2
5	FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS	3
6	A. Biometric Information and BIPA.....	3
7	B. The Evolution of TikTok.	4
8	C. Defendants have collected, captured, received, obtained, stored and/or	
9	used biometric identifiers and/or information in violation of Section 15(b)	
10	of BIPA.	6
11	D. Defendants' failure to provide a written, publicly available policy regarding	
12	the retention and destruction of biometric information violated Section 15(a)	
13	of BIPA.	9
14	E. Plaintiffs' Personal Experiences.	9
15	CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS	10
16	CAUSES OF ACTION	13
17	First Cause of Action	13
18	PRAYER FOR RELIEF	14
19	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL	15
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 Plaintiffs P. S., a minor, by and through her guardian Cherise Slate, and M. T. W., a minor,
2 by and through her guardian Brenda Washington, on behalf of themselves and other similarly
3 situated individuals, bring this Class Action Complaint against Defendants TikTok, Inc.,
4 (“TikTok”) both individually and as a successor-in-interest to Musical.ly, Inc. (“musical.ly”) and
5 ByteDance, Inc., (“ByteDance”) (collectively referred to herein as “Defendants”) and allege as
6 follows:

7 **INTRODUCTION**

8 1. TikTok, Inc. has created one of the most popular social media networking apps in
9 the United States (“TikTok App” or the “App”). The App allows users to create, view, and share
10 three to fifteen-second videos of dancing, lip-syncing, and other forms of self-expression, as well
11 as short looping videos of three to sixty seconds.

12 2. The App’s playful features belie Defendants’ reliance on users’ private, biometric
13 information. The App scans a user’s facial geometry before running an algorithm to determine the
14 user’s age. The App also uses facial scans to allow users to superimpose animated facial filters
15 onto the moving faces of video subjects.

16 3. Defendants do not inform the App’s users that their biometric data is being
17 collected, captured, received, obtained, stored, and/or used by the App. Nor do Defendants disclose
18 what they do with that data, who has access to that data, and whether, where, and for how long
19 that data is stored.

20 4. By collecting, capturing, receiving, obtaining, storing and/or using facial scans
21 without obtaining informed consent and by failing to make public their data use and retention
22 policy, Defendants violate the Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act (“BIPA”), 740 ILCS
23 14/1 *et seq.*

24 5. Plaintiffs bring this action individually and on behalf of proposed classes in order
25 to enjoin Defendants’ continued violation of BIPA and to recover statutory damages for
26 Defendants’ unauthorized collection, capture, receipt, storage, and/or use of biometric information
27 belonging to TikTok App users in Illinois.

1 **PARTIES**

2 6. Plaintiff P. S., a minor, is and has been at all relevant times, a resident and citizen
3 of the state of Illinois. P. S. brings this case by and through her guardian, Cherise Slate, a resident
4 and citizen of the state of Illinois. P. S. began using TikTok in 2019.

5 7. Plaintiff M. T. W., a minor, is and has been at all relevant times, a resident and
6 citizen of the state of Illinois. M. T. W. brings this case by and through her guardian, Brenda
7 Washington, a resident and citizen of the state of Illinois. M. T. W. began using TikTok in 2018.

8 8. Defendant TikTok, Inc. is, and at all relevant times was, a California corporation
9 with its principal place of business in Culver City, California. Defendant also maintains offices in
10 Palo Alto and Mountain View, California.

11 9. TikTok, Inc. is sued in its individual capacity and as the successor-in-interest to
12 Musical.ly, Inc., a California Corporation formerly headquartered in Palo Alto, California.

13 10. Defendant ByteDance, Inc. is, and at all relevant times was, a Delaware corporation
14 with its principal place of business in Palo Alto, California.

15 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 11. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to the Class Action Fairness
17 Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1332(d) (“CAFA”) because (i) the proposed class consists of well over 100
18 members; (ii) the parties are minimally diverse as all members of the proposed class, including
19 Plaintiffs, are citizens of Illinois—a state different from Defendants’ home states of California and
20 Delaware; and (iii) the aggregate amount in controversy exceeds \$5,000,000, exclusive of interest
21 and costs. The estimated number of Illinois TikTok users impacted by Defendants’ conduct
22 multiplied by BIPA’s statutory liquidated damages figure (\$5,000 for each intentional or reckless
23 violation and \$1,000 for each negligent violation) exceeds CAFA’s \$5,000,000 threshold.

24 12. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because (i) both Defendants’
25 principal places of business are in the State of California, and Defendant TikTok, Inc. is
26 incorporated in the State of California; and (ii) because the allegations in this Complaint arise from
27 Defendants’ misconduct occurring within this State.

13. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 1391, venue is proper in this District because: (i) Defendant ByteDance, Inc.’s principal place of business is in this District; and (ii) a substantial part of the conduct giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims occurred in or emanated from this District.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

A. Biometric Information and BIPA.

14. In 2008, Illinois enacted BIPA in light of the “very serious need [for] protections for the citizens of Illinois when it comes to [their] biometric information.”¹

15. Biometrics are unlike other unique identifiers used to access finances or other sensitive information. “For example, social security numbers, when compromised, can be changed. Biometrics, however, are biologically unique to the individual; therefore, once compromised, the individual has no recourse, is at heightened risk for identity theft, and is likely to withdraw from biometric-facilitated transactions.”²

16. To address this legitimate concern, Section 15(b) of BIPA provides that:

No private entity may collect, capture, purchase, receive through trade, or otherwise obtain a person’s or a customer’s biometric identifier or biometric information, unless it first:

- (1) informs the subject or the subject’s legally authorized representative in writing that a biometric identifier or biometric information is being collected or stored;
- (2) informs the subject or the subject’s legally authorized representative in writing of the specific purpose and length of term for which a biometric identifier or biometric information is being collected, stored, and used; and
- (3) receives a written release executed by the subject of the biometric identifier or biometric information or the subject’s legally authorized representative.³

¹ 95th Ill. Gen. Assem. House Proceedings, May 30, 2008, at 249 (statement of Representative Ryg), available at <http://www.ilga.gov/house/transcripts/htrans95/09500276.pdf>.

² 740 ILCS 14/5(c).

³ 740 ILCS 14/15(b).

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.