

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;
THE POYNTER INSTITUTE FOR MEDIA STUDIES, INC.,
a Florida corporation; SCIENCE FEEDBACK, a French corporation,

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

**AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF
CHILDREN'S HEALTH DEFENSE AND REVERSAL**

JOHN W. WHITEHEAD
THE RUTHERFORD INSTITUTE
109 Deerwood Road
Charlottesville, VA 22911
Telephone: (434) 978-3888
legal@rutherford.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page #</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE.....	1
SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT.....	2
ARGUMENT: THE DISTRICT COURT’S DISMISSAL OF CHD’S SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT UNDER RULE 12(b)(6) MUST BE REVERSED BECAUSE CHD HAS PLED SUFFICIENT FACTS THAT DEFENDANTS VIOLATED CHD’S FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS IN THEIR ROLE AS GOVERNMENT ACTORS.....	4
A. Whether state action exists is a fact-bound inquiry, and CHD has met the threshold pleading requirements precluding a dismissal of its claims under Rule 12(b)(6).....	5
B. CHD alleged sufficient facts to state a claim of government action by Defendants, making this case distinguishable from <i>Prager</i> and <i>Divino</i>	7
C. The district court’s judgment must be reversed to enable CHD to proceed with this lawsuit so as to avoid grave injustice and lack of a remedy where the government acts through private companies to violate constitutionally protected rights.....	11
CONCLUSION.....	16
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE (FORM 8).....	17

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....	7, 11
<i>Biden v. Knight First Amendment Institute</i> , 141 S.Ct. 1220 (2021).....	2
<i>Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Fed. Bureau of Narcotics</i> , 403 U.S. 388 (1971).....	2, 6, 10, 11
<i>Blum v. Yaretsky</i> , 457 U.S. 991 (1982).....	10
<i>Brentwood Acad. v. Tenn. Secondary Sch. Athletic Ass’n</i> , 531 U.S. 288 (2001).....	5, 6, 7, 11
<i>Brunette v. Humane Soc’y of Ventura Cty.</i> , 294 F.3d 1205 (9th Cir. 2002).....	8
<i>Divino Group, LLC v. Google, LLC, et.al.</i> , 2021 WL 5175 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 6, 2021).....	3, 4, 9, 10
<i>Dobyns v. E-Systems, Inc.</i> , 667 F.2d 1219 (5th Cir. 1982).....	8
<i>Johnson v. Knowles</i> , 113 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 1997).....	5
<i>Lugar v. Edmondson Oil Co.</i> , 457 U.S. 922 (1982).....	6
<i>Marsh v. Alabama</i> , 326 U.S. 501 (1946).....	8
<i>Packingham v. North Carolina</i> , 137 S.Ct. 1730 (2017).....	2, 3, 11

Prager University v. Google LLC, YouTube LLC,
951 F.3d 991 (9th Cir. 2020).....3, 4, 7, 8, 9

Other Authorities

Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.....15

Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(2).....1

Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6).....4, *passim*

Hatmaker, Taylor, “White House asks tech leaders for help with coronavirus response,” *TechCrunch.com* (March 11, 2020),
<https://techcrunch.com/2020/03/11/white-house-cto-kratsios-tech-facebook-google-meeting/>.....12

Johnstone, Caitlin, “Why You Should Oppose the Censorship of David Icke (Hint: It Has Nothing to Do With Icke),” *Medium.com* (May 2, 2020),
<https://medium.com/@caityjohnstone/why-you-should-oppose-the-censorshipofIcke>14

Kean, Sean, and Sherr, Ian, “White House asks tech companies for help battling coronavirus,” *C/NET* (March 12, 2020), <https://www.cnet.com/news/white-house-asks-tech-companies-for-help-battling-coronavirus/>13

Romm, Tony, “White House asks Silicon Valley for help to combat coronavirus, track its spread and stop misinformation,” *The Washington Post* (March 11, 2020)
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/2020/03/11/white-house-tech-meeting-coronavirus>12

Shu, Catherine, and Shieber, Jonathan, “Facebook, Reddit, Google, LinkedIn, Microsoft, Twitter and YouTube issue joint statement on misinformation,” *TechCrunch.com* (March 16, 2020), <https://techcrunch.com/2020/03/16/facebook-reddit-google-linkedin-microsoft-twitter-and-youtube-issue-joint-statement-on-misinformation>13

VanLandingham, Rachel *Incitement at 100--And 50--And Today: Words We Fear: Burning Tweets & the Politics of Incitement*, 85 Brook. L. Rev. 37 (2019).....14

IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE¹

The Rutherford Institute is an international nonprofit organization headquartered in Charlottesville, Virginia. Founded in 1982 by its President, John W. Whitehead, the Institute provides legal representation at no charge to individuals whose constitutional rights have been threatened or violated, and educates the public about constitutional and human rights issues affecting their freedoms. The Rutherford Institute is interested in this case because it touches upon core questions of the right to freedom of expression which is the bedrock for preservation of individual liberty that both the federal elements of our constitutional structure and the Bill of Rights were created to protect and preserve.

The Rutherford Institute writes in support of the appeal filed by Children’s Health Defense (“CHD”) from the judgment rendered in the district court on June 30, 2021 dismissing CHD’s claims against Facebook, Zuckerberg, and Poynter (“Defendants”). The purpose of this Brief is to support CHD’s first cause

¹ *Amicus* certifies that counsel of record for Children’s Health Defense, Facebook, Inc., Mark Zuckerberg, and The Poynter Institute for Media Studies, Inc. have consented to *Amicus* filing a brief in support of CHD. *Amicus* thus files this brief pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 29(a)(2). Although Science Feedback is named in the title of this case, the claims against Science Feedback were dismissed without prejudice by the district court due to lack of service, and Science Feedback has not appeared in this matter; thus, no consent was obtained or needed from Science Feedback. No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, and no party or counsel for a party contributed money that was intended to fund preparing or submitting this brief.

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.