

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

STATE OF NEW MEXICO, *ex rel.*  
HECTOR BALDERAS, Attorney General for the  
State of New Mexico,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

GOOGLE, LLC, a Delaware limited liability  
company,

*Defendant.*

Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-00143-NF-KHR  
Hon. Nancy Freudenthal

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

**GOOGLE'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE COMPLAINT  
AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

MOTION TO DISMISS..... 1

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT..... 1

INTRODUCTION ..... 1

BACKGROUND ..... 2

    A. Google Provides G Suite For Education To Schools For Free..... 2

    B. Google’s Privacy Commitments For GSFE ..... 3

    C. Google Relies On Schools To Provide Or Obtain Parental Consent For Students Using The Core And Additional Services..... 4

    D. The Attorney General Files Suit ..... 5

LEGAL STANDARD..... 5

ARGUMENT..... 6

I. THE COMPLAINT FAILS TO PLEAD A COPPA VIOLATION..... 6

    A. COPPA Requires “Reasonable Efforts” To Obtain Consent ..... 7

    B. FTC Guidance: Operators May Rely On Schools To Provide Or Obtain Consent..... 7

    C. Google Follows The FTC’s Guidance ..... 10

    D. Following FTC Guidance Is Reasonable ..... 11

    E. The Attorney General’s Remaining COPPA Theories Fail ..... 14

II. THE COMPLAINT IDENTIFIES NO UPA VIOLATION..... 15

    A. The Attorney General Has Not Alleged Any Sale, Lease, Rental, or Loan In Connection with GSFE ..... 15

    B. The Complaint Identifies No Fraudulent Or Misleading Statement Or Omission That Violates The UPA ..... 16

        1. Most alleged misrepresentations in the Complaint are insufficiently pled ..... 17

        2. The Complaint does not plausibly allege that Google fails to comply with the identified privacy commitments ..... 18

        3. Google’s publication of its Privacy Notice defeats any omissions claim.. 20

    C. The Attorney General’s COPPA-Based UPA Claims Fail On The Merits And Are Preempted..... 21

    D. The Complaint’s “Unconscionable” Practices Claim Also Fails Because Nothing Alleged In The Complaint Is Unconscionable ..... 23

III. THERE IS NO INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION ..... 24

CONCLUSION..... 27

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Federal Cases</b>	
<i>Alvarado v. KOB-TV, LLC</i> , 493 F.3d 1210 (10th Cir. 2007).....	4, 20, 25
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009) .....	5
<i>Auer v. Robbins</i> , 519 U.S. 452 (1997) .....	12, 13
<i>New Mexico ex rel. Balderas v. Tiny Lab Productions</i> , No. 18-854 MV/JFR, 2020 WL 2065275 (D.N.M. Apr. 29, 2020) .....	11, 16, 23, 26
<i>Barreras v. Travelers Home &amp; Marine Ins. Co.</i> , No. 12-CV-0354 RB/RHS, 2012 WL 12870348 (D.N.M. Oct. 17, 2012).....	17
<i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i> , 550 U.S. 544 (2007) .....	5, 15
<i>Choate v. Champion Home Builders Co.</i> , 222 F.3d 788 (10th Cir. 2000) .....	22
<i>Dahlberg v. Avis Rent A Car Sys., Inc.</i> , 92 F. Supp. 2d 1091 (D. Colo. 2000) .....	12
<i>Dine Citizens Against Ruining Our Env't v. Jewell</i> , No. CIV 15-0209 JB/SCY, 2015 WL 4997207 (D.N.M. Aug. 14, 2015).....	12
<i>Dubbs v. Head Start, Inc.</i> , 336 F.3d 1194 (10th Cir. 2003).....	26, 27
<i>English v. Gen. Elec. Co.</i> , 496 U.S. 72 (1990) .....	21, 22
<i>Gade v. Nat'l Solid Wastes Mgmt. Ass'n</i> , 505 U.S. 88 (1992) .....	22, 23
<i>Kelly v. Advanta Corp.</i> , No. CV 02-250 LH/RHS, 2003 WL 27385023 (D.N.M. July 1, 2003).....	25
<i>Kisor v. Wilkie</i> , 139 S. Ct. 2400 (2019) .....	12, 13

<i>Koch v. Koch Indus.</i> , 203 F.3d 1202 (10th Cir. 2000).....	5, 17
<i>Manigault-Johnson v. Google, LLC</i> , No. 2:18-CV-1032-BHH, 2019 WL 3006646 (D. S.C. Mar. 31, 2019).....	22, 26
<i>Michelson v. Merrill, Lynch, Pierce, Fenner &amp; Smith, Inc.</i> , 669 F. Supp. 1244 (S.D.N.Y. 1987).....	17
<i>Mitchell v. Comm’r</i> , 775 F.3d 1243 (10th Cir. 2015).....	12
<i>SEC v. Nacchio</i> , 438 F. Supp. 2d 1266 (D. Colo. 2006) .....	18
<i>Nanodetex Corp. v. Sandia Corp.</i> , No. 05-cv-1041, 2007 WL 4356154 (D.N.M. July 26, 2007) .....	16
<i>In re Nickelodeon Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , 827 F.3d 262 (3d Cir. 2016) .....	25, 26
<i>Safe Streets All. v. Hickenlooper</i> , 859 F.3d 865 (10th Cir. 2017) .....	5
<i>Schwartz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , No. 1:18-CV-00328-WJ-SCY, 2018 WL 4148434 (D.N.M. Aug. 30, 2018) .....	24
<i>Sedillos v. United Collection Bureau, Inc.</i> , No. 10-CV-1063 WJ/WDS, 2011 WL 13289655 (D.N.M. Aug. 17, 2011).....	23
<i>Sprietsma v. Mercury Marine</i> , 537 U.S. 51 (2002) .....	22
<i>Summit Elec. Supply Co. v. Int’l Bus. Machs. Corp.</i> , No. 1:07-CV-0431 MCA/DJS, 2009 WL 9087259 (D.N.M. Sept. 30, 2009).....	17
<i>Two Old Hippies, LLC v. Catch the Bus, LLC</i> , 784 F. Supp. 2d 1200 (D.N.M. 2011).....	17, 18
<i>Van Woudenberg v. Gibson</i> , 211 F.3d 560 (10th Cir. 2000), <i>abrogated on other grounds by McGregor v. Gibson</i> , 248 F.3d 946 (10th Cir. 2001) .....	6
<i>Williams v. Foremost Ins. Co.</i> , 102 F. Supp. 3d 1230 (D.N.M. 2015).....	15
<i>Yunker v. Pandora Media, Inc.</i> , No. 11–CV–3113 JSW, 2013 WL 1282980 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 26, 2013).....	25

**State Cases**

*Dollens v. Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.*,  
356 P.3d 531 (N.M. Ct. App. 2015)..... 18

*Hicks v. Eller*,  
280 P.3d 304 (N.M. Ct. App. 2012)..... 16

*State ex rel. King v. B&B Inv. Grp., Inc.*,  
329 P.3d 658 (N.M. 2014)..... 23, 24

*Moore v. Sun Publ’g Corp.*,  
881 P.2d 735 (N.M. Ct. App. 1994)..... 24, 25

*Portales Nat’l Bank v. Ribble*,  
75 P.3d 838 (N.M. Ct. App. 2003)..... 24

**Federal Statutes**

Children’s Online Privacy Protection Act, 15 U.S.C. § 6501, *et. seq* .....*passim*

15 U.S.C. § 6502(b) ..... 6, 12

15 U.S.C. § 6502(d) ..... 12, 21

15 U.S.C. § 6505..... 22

**State Statutes**

N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-2(D)..... 15,18

N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-2(E)..... 23

N.M. Stat. Ann. § 57-12-3 ..... 15

**Regulations**

16 C.F.R. § 312.2..... 7

16 C.F.R. § 312.3..... 7

16 C.F.R. § 312.7 ..... 15

64 Fed. Reg. 59,888 (Nov. 3, 1999)..... 7, 8, 9, 11, 13

84 Fed. Reg. 35,842 (July 25, 2019)..... 8, 9

# 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.