

No. 21-1496

IN THE
Supreme Court of the United States

TWITTER, INC.,

Petitioner,

v.

MEHIER TAAMNEH, *et al.*,

Respondents.

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

BRIEF FOR PETITIONER

ALEX W. MILLER
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
7 World Trade Center
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007

SETH P. WAXMAN
Counsel of Record
PATRICK J. CAROME
ARI HOLTZBLATT
CLAIRE H. CHUNG
AMY LISHINSKI
ANDRES C. SALINAS
NATHANIEL W. REISINGER
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING
HALE AND DORR LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 663-6000
seth.waxman@wilmerhale.com

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

Under Section 2333 of the Anti-Terrorism Act, as amended by the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act, U.S. nationals injured by “an act of international terrorism” that is “committed, planned, or authorized by” a designated foreign terrorist organization may sue any person who “aids and abets, by knowingly providing substantial assistance, or who conspires with the person who committed such an act of international terrorism,” and recover treble damages. 18 U.S.C. §2333(a), (d)(2). The questions presented are:

1. Whether a defendant that provides generic, widely available services to all its numerous users and “regularly” works to detect and prevent terrorists from using those services “knowingly” provided substantial assistance under Section 2333 merely because it allegedly could have taken more “meaningful” or “aggressive” action to prevent such use.

2. Whether a defendant whose generic, widely available services were not used in connection with the specific “act of international terrorism” that injured the plaintiff may be liable for aiding and abetting under Section 2333.

(i)

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING

Petitioner Twitter, Inc. was a defendant in the district court and an appellee in the court of appeals.

Respondents Facebook, Inc. (now known as Meta Platforms, Inc.) and Google LLC were also defendants in the district court and appellees in the court of appeals. Pursuant to this Court's Rule 12.6, Google LLC and Facebook, Inc. filed letters at the certiorari stage indicating that they support Petitioner.

Respondents Mehier Taamneh, Lawrence Taamneh, Sara Taamneh, and Dimana Taamneh were plaintiffs in the district court and appellants in the court of appeals.

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Twitter, Inc. is a privately held company, and its parent corporation is X Holdings I, Inc. No publicly held corporation owns 10 percent or more of Twitter, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDING	ii
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	vi
INTRODUCTION	1
OPINIONS BELOW	4
JURISDICTION	5
STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED	5
STATEMENT	5
A. Twitter And Its Policy Against Harmful Content	5
B. Statutory Background.....	7
C. This Case	10
1. Plaintiffs’ Theory Of Liability.....	10
2. District Court Proceeding	14
3. Court Of Appeals Proceeding	17
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	19
ARGUMENT.....	21
I. SECTION 2333(d) REQUIRES A DEFENDANT TO SUBSTANTIALLY ASSIST A SPECIFIC “ACT OF INTERNATIONAL TERRORISM,” NOT A GENERAL TERRORISM CAMPAIGN	22

TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued

	Page
A. Section 2333(d) Requires That A Defendant Substantially Assist The “Act Of International Terrorism” That Gave Rise To The Claim	22
B. Common Law Principles Confirm That Aiding And Abetting Requires Assisting The Principal Tort	26
C. The Ninth Circuit Erroneously Construed Section 2333(d)	32
II. SECTION 2333(d) REQUIRES, AT A MINIMUM, THAT DEFENDANTS KNEW OF SPECIFIC ACCOUNTS THAT SUBSTANTIALLY ASSISTED THE REINA ATTACK AND THAT NOT BLOCKING THOSE ACCOUNTS WOULD SUBSTANTIALLY ASSIST SUCH AN ATTACK.....	36
A. Statutory Text, <i>Halberstam</i> , And Common Law Principles Require Specific Knowledge Of The Alleged Substantial Assistance	37
B. The Ninth Circuit Misconstrued The Statutory Knowledge Requirement.....	43
C. Decisions From Other Courts Of Appeals Confirm The Ninth Circuit’s Error	45
III. REVERSAL IS NECESSARY TO PREVENT FAR-REACHING HARMFUL CONSEQUENCES.....	47
CONCLUSION	52

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.