

**No. 21-16281**

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

---

Cara Jones, *et al.*,

*Plaintiffs-Appellants,*

v.

Google LLC, *et al.*,

*Defendants-Appellees.*

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California

No. 5:19-cv-07016

Hon. Beth Labson Freeman

---

**APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF**

---

Jonathan K. Levine (No. 220289)  
Elizabeth C. Pritzker (No. 146267)  
Caroline C. Corbitt (No. 305492)  
PRITZKER LEVINE LLP  
1900 Powell Street, Suite 450  
Emeryville, CA 94608  
Telephone: (415) 692-0772  
Facsimile: (415) 366-6110  
[jkl@pritzkerlevine.com](mailto:jkl@pritzkerlevine.com)  
[ecp@pritzkerlevine.com](mailto:ecp@pritzkerlevine.com)  
[ccc@pritzkerlevine.com](mailto:ccc@pritzkerlevine.com)

David S. Golub  
Steven L. Bloch  
Ian W. Sloss  
SILVER GOLUB & TEITELL LLP  
Four Landmark Square, 3d Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901  
Telephone: (203) 325-4491  
Facsimile: (203) 325-3769  
[dgolub@sgtlaw.com](mailto:dgolub@sgtlaw.com)  
[sbloch@sgtlaw.com](mailto:sbloch@sgtlaw.com)  
[isloss@sgtlaw.com](mailto:isloss@sgtlaw.com)

*Attorneys for Appellants*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
INTRODUCTION .....	1
ARGUMENT.....	2
I.    COPPA Does Not Preempt Plaintiffs’ Claims .....	2
A.    Plaintiffs’ State Law Damages Claims Are Not “Inconsistent” With Either COPPA’s Substantive Requirements or Its Remedial Scheme.....	2
1.    COPPA’s Remedial Scheme Does Not “Exclude” Remedies Based on Traditional State Law Claims ..	3
2.    Google’s Contention that Congress Intended for FTC Enforcement to be “Exclusive” is Unsupported, Erroneous, and Inconsistent with the Text of § 6502(d) .....	6
3.    Plaintiffs’ Claims Would Not Result in “Inconsistent” COPPA Enforcement.....	11
4.    Preemption of Plaintiffs’ Claims Is Not Supported by COPPA’s Failure to Provide a Private Right of Action or its Lack of a “Savings Clause” .....	18
a.    The Absence of a Private Right of Action Does Not Enlarge the Scope of Preemption .....	18
b.    The Absence of a “Savings Clause” Does Not Limit Ordinary Preemption Principles.....	21
B.    Plaintiffs’ Claims Are Not Impliedly Preempted by COPPA .....	21
C.    The Chamber’s Amicus Brief Does Not Support Google’s Arguments.....	23

..

II.	Plaintiffs' Claims Against the Channel Defendants Were Improperly Dismissed .....	25
A.	Plaintiffs' Claims Against the Channel Defendants Are Not Preempted .....	25
B.	Plaintiffs Have Sufficiently Alleged the Channel Defendants' Wrongdoing .....	25
III.	Plaintiffs Are Entitled to Equitable Relief .....	29
IV.	Plaintiffs Lack Adequate Remedies at Law .....	31
V.	Plaintiffs' Privacy, Consumer Protection, and Unjust Enrichment Claims Should Be Allowed to Go Forward .....	33
A.	Privacy .....	33
B.	Unjust Enrichment .....	36
C.	State Consumer Protection Statutes .....	37
VI.	The Court Should Have Granted Plaintiffs Leave to Add Parties and Claims. ....	38
	CONCLUSION .....	39

...

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Am. Airlines, Inc. v. Wolens</i> , 513 U.S. 219 (1995) .....	17
<i>Am. Life Ins. Co. v. Stewart</i> , 300 U.S. 203 (1937) .....	32
<i>Arizona v. United States</i> , 567 U.S. 387 (2012) .....	8
<i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i> , 556 U.S. 662 (2009) .....	26
<i>Bates v. Dow Agrosiences, LLC</i> , 544 U.S. 431 (2005) .....	passim
<i>Bly-Magee v. California</i> , 236 F.3d 1014 (9th Cir. 2001) .....	38
<i>Buckman Co. v. Plaintiffs' Legal Comm.</i> , 531 U.S. 341 (2001) .....	13, 14, 15
<i>Cel-Tech Commc'ns, Inc. v. Los Angeles Cellular Tel. Co.</i> , 973 P.2d 527 (Cal. 1999) .....	38
<i>Chapman v. Pier 1 Imports (U.S.) Inc.</i> , 631 F.3d 939 (9th Cir. 2011) .....	30
<i>Circuit City Stores v. Adams</i> , 532 U.S. 105 (2001) .....	21, 23
<i>City of L.A. v. Lyons</i> , 461 U.S. 95 (1983) .....	29
<i>Coleman v. Mondelez Int'l Inc.</i> , No. CV208100FMOAFMX, 2021 WL 6618557 (C.D. Cal. July 26, 2021) .....	32
<i>Gilstrap v. United Air Lines, Inc.</i> , 709 F.3d 995 (9th Cir. 2013) .....	passim
<i>Gordon v. Virtumundo, Inc.</i> , 575 F.3d 1040 (9th Cir. 2009) .....	9
<i>Haas v. Travelex Ins. Servs. Inc.</i> , No. 220-CV-06171ODWPLAX, 2021 WL 3682309 (C.D. Cal. Aug. 19, 2021) .....	32
<i>Hodsdon v. Mars, Inc.</i> , 891 F.3d 857 (9th Cir. 2018) .....	38
<i>Howard Hess Dental Labs. Inc. v. Dentsply Int'l, Inc.</i> 602 F.3d 237 (3d Cir. 2010) .....	29
<i>In re California Gasoline Spot Mkt. Antitrust Litig.</i> , No. 20-CV-03131-JSC, 2021 WL 1176645 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 29, 2021) .....	31
<i>In re Facebook, Inc. Internet Tracking Litig.</i> , 956 F.3d 589 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	33, 35, 36, 37

<i>In re First All. Mortg. Co.</i> , 471 F.3d 977 (9th Cir. 2006) .....	27
<i>In re Google Inc. Cookie Placement Consumer Privacy Litig.</i> , 806 F.3d 125 (3d Cir. 2015) .....	36
<i>In re Nickelodeon Cons. Privacy Litig.</i> , 827 F.3d 262 (3d Cir. 2015).....	14, 36, 37
<i>In re Nifedipine Antitrust Litig.</i> , 335 F.Supp.2d 6 (D.D.C. 2004).....	29
<i>In re Zoom Video Communications Inc. Privacy Litigation</i> , 525 F. Supp.3d 1017 (N.D. Cal. 2021). .....	38
<i>Ishikawa v. Delta Airlines, Inc.</i> , 343 F.3d 1129 (9th Cir. 2003).....	passim
<i>Lozano v. AT &amp; T Wireless Servs., Inc.</i> , 504 F.3d 718 (9th Cir. 2007) .....	38
<i>Manzarek v. St. Paul Fire &amp; Marine Ins. Co.</i> , 519 F.3d 1025 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	39
<i>McDonald v. Killoo ApS</i> , 385 F. Supp.3d 1022 (N.D. Cal. 2019).....	36
<i>Medtronic, Inc. v. Lohr</i> , 518 U.S. 470 (1996).....	passim
<i>Metrophones Telecomms., Inc. v. Global Crossing Telecomms., Inc.</i> , 423 F.3d 1056 (9th Cir 2005) .....	passim
<i>Milliken v. Bradley</i> , 433 U.S. 267 (1977) .....	32
<i>Munns v. Kerry</i> , 782 F.3d 402 (9th Cir. 2015) .....	30
<i>Nacarino v. Chobani, LLC</i> , No. 20-CV-07437-EMC, 2022 WL 344966 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 4, 2022) .....	33
<i>New Mexico ex rel. Balderas v. Tiny Lab Prods.</i> , 457 F. Supp.3d 1103 (D. N.M. 2020) .....	11
<i>Perez v. Nidek Co., Ltd.</i> , 711 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir 2013) .....	13, 15
<i>Sagastume v. Psychemedics Corp.</i> , 2020 WL 8175597 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 30, 2020) .....	33
<i>Sindell v. Abbot Labs</i> , 26 Cal. 3d 588 (1980).....	28
<i>Sonner v. Premier Nutrition Corp.</i> , 971 F.3d 834 (9th Cir. 2020) .....	31, 32
<i>Souter v. Edgewell Pers. Care Co.</i> , No. 20-CV-1486 TWR (BLM), 2022 WL 485000 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 16, 2022).....	32

# 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.