

No. 21-1333

---

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

REYNOLDO GONZALES, *ET AL.*, PETITIONERS,

*v.*

GOOGLE LLC, RESPONDENT.

*ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT*

**BRIEF FOR THE CENTER FOR GROWTH AND  
OPPORTUNITY, AMERICANS FOR  
PROSPERITY FOUNDATION, BEACON  
CENTER OF TENNESSEE, FREEDOM  
FOUNDATION OF MINNESOTA, ILLINOIS  
POLICY, INDEPENDENCE INSTITUTE, JAMES  
MADISON INSTITUTE, LIBERTAS INSTITUTE,  
MOUNTAIN STATES POLICY CENTER,  
OKLAHOMA COUNCIL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS,  
PELICAN INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY,  
AND RIO GRANDE FOUNDATION AS *AMICI  
CURIAE* IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT**

ANDREW C. NICHOLS  
*Counsel of Record*  
Charis Lex P.C.  
11921 Freedom Dr., Ste. 550  
Reston, VA 20190  
(571) 549-2645  
*anichols@charislex.com*

*Counsel for Amici Curiae*

---

## QUESTION PRESENTED

Does 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1) immunize interactive computer services when they make targeted recommendations of information provided by another information content provider?

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED .....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iv
INTEREST OF <i>AMICI CURIAE</i> .....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	6
I. This case is readily resolved under the plain text of Section 230. ....	6
A. Section 230 distinguishes between “enabling tools” that “choose,” “organize,” and “display” or “forward” “content”—which describes YouTube’s automated recommendation system—and “content” itself.....	6
B. Holding that YouTube’s automated recommendation system is protected as an “enabling tool” fits with the law’s express purpose statements. ....	12
1. This Court relies on express statutory purpose statements to clarify the proper interpretation of operative text.....	12
2. Section 230’s express purpose statements favor distinguishing YouTube’s automated recommendation system from content. ....	14
II. Reading Section 230 as its plain text requires will best foster speech and expand the marketplace of ideas. ....	21

- A. Under the law’s current interpretation, the marketplace of ideas has grown and heterodox speech has flourished. .... 21
  - 1. Since Section 230 was enacted, internet platforms have added billions of users, each a unique content creator..... 21
  - 2. Many of the leading voices on the internet are conservative or heterodox. .... 24
- B. Assuming that Section 230 must be constricted to stop censorship by “Big Tech” ignores that no one has ever ruled Big Tech for long. .... 27
- C. By exposing upstarts to liability that only established firms can bear, constricting Section 230 would chill heterodox speech and shrink the marketplace of ideas. .... 29
- CONCLUSION ..... 32

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Atl. Marine Constr. Co. v. United States Dist. Court</i> , 571 U.S. 49 (2013) .....	11–12
<i>Fair Housing Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommates.com, LLC</i> , 521 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	31
<i>FDA v. Brown &amp; Williamson Tobacco Corp.</i> , 529 U.S. 120 (2000) .....	10
<i>Force v. Facebook, Inc.</i> , 934 F.3d 53 (2d Cir. 2019) .....	8
<i>Mia. Herald Publ’g Co. v. Tornillo</i> , 418 U.S. 241 (1974) .....	9
<i>Nat’l Cable &amp; Telecoms. Ass’n v. Gulf Power Co.</i> , 534 U.S. 327 (2002) .....	12–13
<i>R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v. Cigarettes Cheaper!</i> , 462 F.3d 690 (7th Cir. 2006) .....	29
<i>Reynolds v. United States</i> , 565 U.S. 432 (2012) .....	13
<i>Samantar v. Yousuf</i> , 560 U.S. 305 (2010) .....	12
<i>Sorrell v. IMS Health Inc.</i> , 564 U.S. 552 (2011) .....	12
<i>Sw. Airlines Co. v. Saxon</i> , 142 S. Ct. 1783 (2022) .....	10
<i>Toyota Motor Mfg., Ky. v. Williams</i> , 534 U.S. 184 (2002) .....	12

# 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.