

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

TIKTOK INC., et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity
as President of the United States, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 20-cv-02658 (CJN)

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
RENEWED MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
AGAINST COMMERCE DEPARTMENT PROHIBITIONS 2-5**

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

STATEMENT OF FACTS 2

 A. TikTok Is a Massively Popular Forum for Creative Expression and Political Speech, Akin to a Virtual Town Square for More Than 100 Million Americans. 2

 B. TikTok Has Safeguards to Protect the Security of U.S. User Data. 3

 C. TikTok Has Effective and Fair Content Moderation Policies and Practices. 4

 D. For Almost a Year Before the Ban, TikTok Provided Information to CFIUS and Made Extensive Efforts to Fully Address Any National Security Concerns. 5

 E. The Administration’s Political Focus Moved to China and TikTok..... 6

 F. President Trump Issued His August 6 Order Premised on a Purported National Security Need to Ban TikTok, but Subsequent Administration Actions Immediately Undercut That Justification. 6

 G. The Commerce Department Issued Prohibitions That Will Ban TikTok in the United States. 8

 H. Plaintiffs Filed this Action and the Court Preliminarily Enjoined the First Prohibition..... 10

 I. The Government Provided An Administrative Record That Relies on Inaccurate, Outdated, And Irrelevant Materials, And Includes Recommendations for Restrictions Far Short of a Ban. 10

 J. The Remaining Prohibitions Will Cause Plaintiffs Irreparable Harm. 12

ARGUMENT 13

 I. Plaintiffs Are Likely to Succeed on the Merits of Their Claims That the Remaining Prohibitions Are Unlawful and Unconstitutional..... 13

 A. The Remaining Prohibitions Violate IEEPA Because They Regulate and Prohibit “Personal Communication” and “Informational Materials,” Thereby Exceeding Express Limitations Imposed by Congress..... 13

 1. IEEPA Forbids Government Regulation of “Personal Communication” or “Informational Materials” 14

 2. The Remaining Prohibitions Unlawfully Regulate Personal Communication..... 15

 3. The Remaining Prohibitions Unlawfully Regulate Informational Materials. 17

- B. The Remaining Prohibitions Are Arbitrary and Capricious in Violation of the APA Because the Agency Provided an Inadequate Explanation Based on Inaccurate, Outdated, and Irrelevant Materials, Failed to Consider Reasonable Alternatives, and Offered a Pretextual Justification for Its Action..... 21
 - 1. The Remaining Prohibitions are Reviewable Under the APA..... 21
 - 2. The Commerce Department Provided an Inadequate Explanation That Is Not Supported by the Record, And Which Relies on Inaccurate, Outdated, and Irrelevant Materials..... 23
 - 3. The Agency Failed to Consider or Explain Why Reasonable Alternatives That Are Set Forth in the AR Itself Were Not Adequate. 28
 - 4. The Commerce Department’s Stated Justification for the Prohibitions Is Pretextual..... 30
- C. The Remaining Prohibitions Violate Plaintiffs’ Constitutional Rights. 33
 - 1. The Remaining Prohibitions Infringe on Plaintiffs’ First Amendment Right to Speech. 33
 - 2. The Remaining Prohibitions Violate Plaintiffs’ Due Process Rights..... 38
- D. The Remaining Prohibitions Violate IEEPA in Other Respects..... 41
- II. All of the Other Elements Required for Injunctive Relief Are Easily Established. 42
 - A. The Remaining Prohibitions Are Inflicting, and Will Continue to Inflict, Irreparable Harm..... 42
 - B. The Balance of Equities and Public Interest Require Injunctive Relief. 44
- CONCLUSION..... 45

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
<i>Abbott Labs. v. Gardner</i> , 387 U.S. 136 (1967).....	22
* <i>Al Haramain Islamic Found., Inc. v. Dep't of Treasury</i> , 686 F.3d 965 (9th Cir. 2012)	39
<i>Allied Local & Reg'l Mfrs. Caucus v. EPA</i> , 215 F.3d 61 (D.C. Cir. 2000).....	28
<i>Bayer HealthCare, LLC v. FDA</i> , 942 F. Supp. 2d 17 (D.D.C. 2013).....	43
<i>Billups v. Charleston</i> , 961 F.3d 673 (4th Cir. 2020)	35
<i>Boswell v. Heckler</i> , 749 F.2d 788 (D.C. Cir. 1984).....	30
<i>Brodie v. HHS</i> , 715 F. Supp. 2d 74 (D.D.C. 2010).....	44
<i>CAIR v. DOJ</i> , 264 F. Supp. 2d 14 (D.D.C. 2003).....	23
<i>Cernuda v. Heavey</i> , 720 F. Supp. 1544 (S.D. Fla. 1989)	14
<i>Citizens to Preserve Overton Park, Inc. v. Volpe</i> , 401 U.S. 402 (1971).....	22
<i>Clark Cty. v. FAA</i> , 522 F.3d 437 (D.C. Cir. 2008).....	23
<i>Corp. of Presiding Bishop of Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints v. Hodel</i> , 637 F. Supp. 1398 (D.D.C. 1986).....	32
<i>DeJonge v. Oregon</i> , 299 U.S. 353 (1937).....	38
* <i>Dep't of Commerce v. New York</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2551 (2019).....	23, 30, 33

<i>Edwards v. District of Columbia</i> , 755 F.3d 996 (D.C. Cir. 2014).....	38
<i>Elrod v. Burns</i> , 427 U.S. 347 (1976).....	44
<i>Gordon v. Holder</i> , 721 F.3d 638 (D.C. Cir. 2013).....	45
<i>Grace v. District of Columbia</i> , 187 F. Supp. 3d 124 (D.D.C. 2016).....	44
<i>Hawaii Housing Auth. v. Midkiff</i> , 467 U.S. 229 (1984).....	32
<i>Healy v. James</i> , 408 U.S. 169 (1972).....	35
<i>*Holy Land Found. for Relief and Dev. v. Ashcroft</i> , 333 F.3d 156 (D.C. Cir. 2003).....	22, 23, 38, 39
<i>Home Box Office, Inc. v. FCC</i> , 567 F.2d 9 (D.C. Cir. 1977).....	31, 33
<i>INS v. St. Cyr</i> , 533 U.S. 289 (2001).....	42
<i>Judulang v. Holder</i> , 565 U.S. 42 (2011).....	23
<i>*Kalantari v. NITV, Inc.</i> , 352 F.3d 1202 (9th Cir. 2003)	14, 15
<i>League of Women Voters v. Newby</i> , 838 F.3d 1 (D.C. Cir. 2016).....	45
<i>Lovell v. Griffin</i> , 303 U.S. 444 (1938).....	35
<i>Mach Mining, LLC v. EEOC</i> , 135 S. Ct. 1645 (2015).....	21, 22
<i>*Mathews v. Eldridge</i> , 424 U.S. 319 (1976).....	38, 40
<i>McCullen v. Coakley</i> , 573 U.S. 464 (2014).....	36, 37

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.