No. 21-16210

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CHILDREN'S HEALTH DEFENSE, a Georgia non-profit organization,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

FACEBOOK, INC., a Delaware corporation; MARK ZUCKERBERG, a California resident; SCIENCE FEEDBACK, a French corporation; THE POYNTER INSTITUTE FOR MEDIA STUDIES, INC., a Florida corporation; and DOES 1-20,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the Judgment of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Case No. 3:20-cv-05787-SI Honorable Susan Illston, United States District Judge

APPELLANT'S OPENING BRIEF

ROGER I. TEICH Cal. State Bar No. 147076 290 Nevada Street San Francisco, CA 94110 Telephone: (415) 948-0045

rteich@juno.com

JED RUBENFELD (pro hac vice) 1031 Forest Road New Haven, CT 06515 Telephone: (203) 387-2505

rubenfeldjed@gmail.com

ROBERT F. KENNEDY, JR. (pro hac vice)

MARY HOLLAND (pro hac vice)

Children's Health Defense 1227 North Peachtree Parkway

Suite 202

Peachtree City, GA 30269 Telephone: (917) 743-3868

mary.holland@childrenshealthdefense.org

Counsel for Appellant



Case: 21-16210, 10/28/2021, ID: 12272238, DktEntry: 19, Page 2 of 80

CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Appellant submits the following statement of corporate interests and affiliations for the use of the judges of this Court: Appellant has no corporate interests. Appellant is not a publicly-held corporation or other publicly-held entity. Appellant has no stock, so no publicly-held corporation or entity owns any stock in Appellant.

Dated: October 28, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT F. KENNEDY, JR. Founder and Chairman

Children's Health Defense

MARY S. HOLLAND

General Counsel

Children's Health Defense

6.

ROGER I. TEICH

Counsel for Appellant Children's Health Defense



TABLE OF CONTENTS

			<u>r</u>	age #	
CORPORA	TE DI	ISCLO	SURE STATEMENT	i	
TABLE OF	FAUT	HORIT	TIES	v	
INTRODU	CTION	٠		1	
JURISDIC	ΓΙΟΝΑ	AL STA	ATEMENT	3	
ISSUES PR	RESEN	ITED		3	
STATEME	NT OI	FTHE	CASE	4	
SUMMAR	Y OF	ARGU	MENT	6	
ARGUME	NT	•••••		6	
I.			RICT COURT VIOLATED THE WELL-KNOWN (b)(6) STANDARD OF REVIEW	8	
II.	THE DISTRICT COURT ERRED IN DISMISSING CHD'S CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS. 10				
	A.	Legal	Standards Governing a State Action Determination	10	
	B.	CHD	Has Adequately Pleaded Joint Action.	12	
		1.	Applicable Legal Standards	12	
		2.	Direct Evidence of Public-Private Agreement to "Curb Misinformation."	13	
		3.	Circumstantial Evidence of Joint Action	16	
		4.	Substantial Benefits Given by Facebook to the Federal Government.	18	
		5.	The District Court's Further Requirement that Federal Actors Be Shown To Be Involved in the Specific Censorship Directed at CHD Is Legally Baseless.	19	



C.	CHE	CHD Has Adequately Pleaded Coercion22						
	1.	Applicable Standards						
	2.	Federal Officials Repeatedly Threatened Defendants with Adverse Regulatory and Legal Action If They Refused to Censor So-Called "Vaccine Misinformation."	26					
	3.	These Repeated Warnings Are More Than Adequate To Raise a Plausible Inference of Coercion Under Long-Established Case Law.	30					
	4.	The District Court's Further Requirement—that CHD Allege that Facebook was Directed to Take the "Specific" Acts of Censorship At Issue Here—Is Untenable and Contradicts Ninth Circuit Case Law	34					
	5.	CHD <i>Has</i> Alleged that Federal Actors Directed Defendants to Take Specific Censorship Action with Regard to CHD	37					
D.	CHE	D Has Adequately Pleaded Significant Encouragement						
E.	and]	The Unique Convergence Here of Joint Action, Pressure, and Immunity-by-Statute Compels a Finding that State Action Has Been Adequately Pleaded41						
F.		CHD Has Otherwise Adequately Pleaded Its Constitutional Claims						
	1.	This Circuit Permits First Amendment <i>Bivens</i> Actions Where, as Here, the First Amendment Right Is Well Established and No Alternative Remedies Exist.	43					
	2.	CHD Has Adequately Pleaded Zuckerberg's Personal Involvement.	44					
	3.	CHD's Constitutional Claims Against Facebook Are Not Foreclosed by <i>Malesko</i>	49					



III.		DISTRICT COURT ERRONEOUSLY DISMISSED O'S LANHAM ACT CLAIMS	51	
IV.		DISTRICT COURT CLEARLY ERRED IN DISMISSING O'S RICO CLAIM.	53	
V.	DISMISSAL OF SCIENCE FEEDBACK WAS AN ABUSE OF DISCRETION.			
	A.	Statement of Facts.	57	
	B.	Legal Analysis	59	
CONCLUSION			62	
CERTIFICA	ATE (OF COMPLIANCE	63	
CERTIFICA	ATE C	OF SERVICE	64	

DOCKET

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.

