

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

STATE OF LOUISIANA, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, JR., in his official
capacity as President of the United States of
America, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. 22-cv-1213

**DEFENDANTS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND AND PROPOSED FINDINGS OF FACT	5
I. For years, in response to public sentiment, social media companies have sought to identify and contain misinformation on their platforms.	5
A. Since their emergence, social media companies have been economically incentivized to moderate content on their platforms.....	5
B. After the 2016 U.S. presidential election, social media companies took significant steps to combat election-related influence campaigns and misinformation on their platforms.	9
C. As the COVID-19 pandemic emerged, social media companies sought to address health misinformation on their platforms.	13
D. Social media companies have long taken actions short of removal against “borderline content” that is not expressly prohibited by their content moderation removal policies.	15
E. Bipartisan calls to revise or revoke Section 230 have repeatedly arisen over the years.....	19
II. Since 2017, Executive Branch agencies and officials have promoted authoritative information or expressed concerns with the spread of misinformation.....	22
A. The White House	23
1. White House Public Statements	25
a. White House Press Briefings (Jennifer Psaki).....	25
b. President Biden’s Comments	28
c. White House Communications Director Kate Bedingfield’s Comments.....	29
2. White House Private Statements.....	30
a. White House Requests for More Data about Misinformation on Facebook	31
b. No White House Demands for Changes to the Companies’ Content Moderation Policies or Practices Regarding COVID-19	36

c.	White House Requests for Action on Fake and Doctored Posts and Accounts	37
B.	The Surgeon General	40
1.	The Advisory, the RFI, and Other Public Statements	42
2.	Direct Communications with Social Media Companies.....	45
3.	The Virality Project.....	49
C.	The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).....	51
1.	CDC’s Pandemic-Era Meetings with Social Media Companies.....	53
2.	CDC’s Responses to Social Media Companies’ Requests for Scientific Information Relating to Claims About COVID-19 or Vaccines.....	56
3.	CDC Emails Alerting Social Media Companies to Misinformation Themes Observed on Platforms and Providing Relevant Scientific Information	59
4.	CDC’s Two “Be on the Lookout Meetings” in May 2021	60
5.	A CDC Official’s One-Time Use of a Facebook Reporting Channel in 2021	62
6.	CDC’s Receipt of Bi-weekly Facebook COVID-19 Content Reports in 2021	62
D.	The Census Bureau	63
E.	Dr. Fauci, Former Director of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID)	64
F.	The Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency (CISA)	69
1.	CISA’s Mission and General Overview	69
2.	The Election Infrastructure Subsector	70
3.	The Center for Internet Security.....	72
4.	CISA’s Efforts to Build Resilience to Misinformation	74
a.	CISA’s Mis-, Dis-, and Malinformation (“MDM”) Team.....	74

b.	CISA’s Switchboarding Work During the 2020 Election Cycle	74
c.	CISA’s Meetings with Social Media Companies	80
d.	CISA’s Limited Involvement with the Election Integrity Partnership.....	84
G.	The State Department’s Global Engagement Center (GEC).....	86
H.	The Federal Bureau of Investigation.....	91
1.	FBI Efforts as to Foreign Influence and Election Misinformation	91
2.	The “Hunter Biden Laptop Story”.....	97
	LEGAL STANDARD.....	101
	ARGUMENT.....	102
I.	Plaintiffs fail to satisfy their burden of demonstrating that irreparable harm would result in the absence of a preliminary injunction.	104
A.	Plaintiffs cannot establish imminent, irreparable harm based on social media companies’ past content moderation decisions.	106
1.	The Individual Plaintiffs’ alleged harms stem from long-past content moderation decisions.....	107
2.	Plaintiff States’ alleged harms likewise stem from long-past content moderation decisions.....	112
B.	Plaintiffs cannot establish imminent, irreparable harm based on alleged past actions of federal officials.	113
1.	Plaintiffs have not made the requisite showing of ongoing or imminent irreparable harm as to the White House Defendants.	115
2.	Plaintiffs have not made the requisite showing of ongoing or imminent irreparable harm as to CISA Defendants.	116
3.	Plaintiffs have not made the requisite showing of ongoing or imminent irreparable harm as to the CDC Defendants.....	118
4.	Plaintiffs have not made the requisite showing of ongoing or imminent irreparable harm as to the Census Defendants.	120

5.	Plaintiffs have not made the requisite showing of ongoing or imminent irreparable harm as to Dr. Fauci, in his former capacity as NIAID Director.	121
6.	Plaintiffs have not made the requisite showing of ongoing or imminent irreparable harm as to the GEC Defendants.	121
C.	Plaintiffs’ delay in seeking relief shows there is no immediate need for an injunction.	126
II.	Plaintiffs fail to show a likelihood of success on the merits.	128
A.	Plaintiffs lack Article III standing to bring any of their claims.	128
1.	Plaintiffs fail to establish any injury-in-fact.	130
2.	Plaintiffs fail to establish traceability and redressability.	131
B.	Plaintiffs are not likely to prevail on their First Amendment claims.	136
1.	Plaintiffs are not likely to prevail on their theory that any Defendant provided “such significant encouragement” as to convert private conduct into government conduct.	141
a.	Plaintiffs’ “significant encouragement” theory rests on a misunderstanding of Blum and its progeny.	141
b.	Plaintiffs fail to show that the White House has provided “such significant encouragement” as to render the White House legally responsible for social media companies’ independent decisions.	148
c.	Plaintiffs fail to show that OSG has provided “such significant encouragement” as to render OSG legally responsible for social media companies’ independent decisions.	160
i.	Surgeon General’s Public Statements	165
ii.	OSG’s Private Communications	167
iii.	The RFI.	168
2.	Plaintiffs fail to show “coercion” under <i>Bantam Books</i>	169
a.	Plaintiffs fail to connect purported coercion to specific acts harming them.	170
b.	Defendants made no threats and instead sought to persuade.	171

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.