

Nos. 22-15103 and 22-15104

IN THE
United States Court of Appeals
For the Ninth Circuit

JOHN DOE #1 AND JOHN DOE #2,

Plaintiffs-Appellees-Cross-Appellants,

v.

TWITTER, INC.,

Defendant-Appellant-Cross-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court

for the Northern District of California Case No. 21-CV-0485

BRIEF OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES
(SECOND BRIEF ON CROSS-APPEAL)

Lisa D. Haba
Adam A. Haba
The Haba Law Firm, P.A.
1220 Commerce Park Dr., Suite 207
Longwood, FL 32779
Telephone: (844) 422-2529

Paul A. Matiasic (SBN 226448)
The Matiasic Firm, P.C.
4 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1400
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 675-1089

Benjamin W. Bull
Peter A. Gentala
Danielle Bianculli Pinter
Christen M. Price
NATIONAL CENTER
ON SEXUAL EXPLOITATION
1201 F ST NW, Suite 200
Washington, D.C., 20004
Telephone: (202) 393-7245

Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellees-Cross-Appellants

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	i
INTRODUCTION.....	1
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT.....	4
ISSUES PRESENTED (TWITTER’S APPEAL).....	5
ISSUES PRESENTED (PLAINTIFFS’ CROSS-APPEAL)	5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	6
I. Statutory Background	6
A. Congress Authorizes Civil Claims for Child Victims of CSAM6	
B. Congress Enacts CDA 230 amid concerns about materials that are inappropriate for children on the internet	7
C. Congress Criminalizes Trafficking.....	8
D. Congress Authorizes Civil Claims Against Traffickers	9
E. Congress Confirms Internet Companies Do Not Have Section 230 Immunity from Civil Sex-Trafficking Claims.....	10
II. Factual Background	12
A. The Twitter Platform and Sexual Exploitation.....	12
B. The Sex Trafficking of John Doe # 1 and John Doe # 2	14
III. Procedural Background.....	18
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT.....	19
STANDARD OF REVIEW	24
ARGUMENT IN RESPONSE TO TWITTER’S PRINCIPAL BRIEF	24
I. Plaintiffs sufficiently alleged beneficiary trafficking violations against Twitter, and the District Court’s ruling should be affirmed.	25
A. Plaintiffs sufficiently alleged that Twitter knowingly received a benefit.....	26
B. Plaintiffs plausibly alleged that Twitter participated in a venture	30

C.	Twitter knew or should have known that Plaintiffs were victims of sex trafficking.....	33
D.	The distribution of CSAM for value is a “commercial sex act”	35
II.	The District Court correctly interpreted the FOSTA amendment to CDA 230.....	44
ARGUMENT ON CROSS-APPEAL.....		49
I.	Plaintiffs’ CSAM claims against Twitter are not barred by CDA 230 immunity and should not have been dismissed.....	49
A.	Twitter knew the video of Plaintiffs was CSAM	50
B.	Twitter received, transported, advertised, presented, distributed, and possessed the CSAM	51
C.	CDA 230 does not give civil immunity for personal injuries sustained through violations of involving CSAM.....	53
D.	Plaintiffs’ 18 U.S.C. §§ 2252A and 2255 claims do not treat Twitter as a publisher or speaker	54
E.	CSAM is not “information” or speech and therefore publisher/speaker status does not apply.....	55
F.	The District Court’s dismissal of Plaintiffs § 2252A claim lacks persuasive authority	57
II.	Plaintiffs sufficiently alleged a direct sex-trafficking violation against Twitter, and the claim should not have been dismissed with prejudice.	63
A.	Plaintiffs have sufficiently alleged that Twitter knowingly obtained, provided, maintained, and advertised them.	63
CONCLUSION		68
ADDENDUM:.....		72
TEXT OF STATUTORY AUTHORITIES.....		72

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Cases

<i>A.B. v. Marriott Int’l, Inc.</i> , 455 F.Supp.3d 171 (E.D. Pa. 2020)	27, 33
<i>Ardolf v. Weber</i> , 332 F.R.D. 467 (S.D.N.Y. 2019)	38
<i>B.M. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 4368214 (N.D. Cal. 2020)...	26
<i>Carafano v. Metrosplash.com, Inc.</i> , 339 F.3d 1119 (9th Cir. 2003)	8
<i>Dep’t of Hous. & Urb. Dev. v. Rucker</i> , 535 U.S. 125 (2002)	64
<i>Doe #1 v. MG Freesites, LTD</i> , No. 7:21-CV-00220-LSC, 2022 WL 407147, at *19 (N.D. Ala. Feb. 9, 2022).....	41, 62
<i>Doe #1 v. Red Roof Inns, Inc.</i> , 21 F.4th 714 (11th Cir. 2021).....	34
<i>Doe No. 1 v. Backpage.com, LLC</i> , 817 F. 3d 12 (1st Cir. 2016)	11
<i>Doe S.W. v. Lorain-Elyria Motel, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 1244192 (S.D. Ohio Mar. 16, 2020)	27
<i>Doe v. Bates</i> , 2006 WL 3813758 (E.D. Tex. 2006)	61, 62
<i>Doe v. Kik</i> , 482 F. Supp. 3d 1242 (S.D. Fl. 2020).....	31, 32
<i>Doe v. Mindgeek USA Inc.</i> , 558 F. Supp. 3d 828 (C.D. Cal. 2021)	41
<i>Doe v. Twitter, Inc.</i> , 555 F. Supp. 3d 889 (N.D. Cal. 2021).....	passim
<i>Edward J. DeBartolo Corp. v. Fla. Gulf Coast Bldg. & Const. Trades Council</i> , 485 U.S. 568 (1988)	48
<i>Enigma Software Grp. USA, LLC v. Malwarebytes, Inc.</i> , 946 F.3d 1040 (9th Cir. 2019)	55
<i>Ernst & Haas Mgmt. Co., Inc. v. Hiscox, Inc.</i> , 23 F.4th 1195 (9th Cir. 2022).....	24
<i>Fair Hous. Council of San Fernando Valley v. Roommates.c.om, LLC</i> , 521 F.3d 1157 (9th Cir. 2008).....	54
<i>Fields v. Twitter, Inc.</i> , 881 F.3d 739 (9th Cir. 2018).....	24
<i>Garnett By & Through Smith v. Renton Sch. Dist. No. 403</i> , 987 F.2d 641 (9th Cir. 1993)	48
<i>Geiss v. Weinstein Co. Holdings LLC</i> , 383 F. Supp. 3d 156 (S.D. N.Y. 2019)	27, 31
<i>Gonzalez v. Google LLC, et al.</i> , 2 F.4th 871 , 886 (9th Cir. 2021)	59, 60, 61

<i>J.C. v. Choice Hotels Int’l, Inc.</i> , 2020 WL 6318707 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2020)	27
<i>Khachatryan v. Blinken</i> , 4 F.4th 841 (9th Cir. 2021)	24, 30
<i>Lopez v. Smith</i> , 203 F.3d 1122 (9th Cir. 2000).....	67
<i>M.A. v. Wyndham Hotels & Resorts, Inc.</i> , 425 F. Supp. 3d 959 (S.D. Ohio 2019)	passim
<i>Morton v. Mancari</i> , 417 U.S. 535 (1974).....	59
<i>Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius</i> , 567 U.S. 519 (2012).....	47
<i>New York Times v. Sullivan</i> , 376 U.S. 254 (1964)	62
<i>New York v. Ferber</i> , 458 U.S. 747 (1982).....	43, 55, 56
<i>Noble v. Weinstein</i> , 335 F. Supp. 3d 504 (S.D. N.Y. 2018).....	27, 31, 38
<i>Obsidian Financial Group, LLC v. Cox</i> , 740 F.3d 1284 (9th Cir. 2014).....	62
<i>Olympic Forest Coal. v. Coast Seafoods Co.</i> , 884 F.3d 901 (9th Cir. 2018).....	24
<i>Osborne v. Ohio</i> , 495 U.S. 103 (1990).....	56
<i>Owner-Operators Indep. Drivers Ass’n of Am., Inc. v. Skinner</i> , 931 F.2d 582 (9th Cir. 1991)	23, 59
<i>Paroline v. United States</i> , 572 U.S. 434 (2014)	43, 56
<i>Ratha v. Phatthana Seafood Co.</i> , 35 F.4th 1159 (9th Cir. 2022)	47
<i>S. Y. v. Naples Hotel Co.</i> , 476 F.Supp.3d 1251 (M.D. Fla. Aug. 5, 2020).....	27
<i>Scarborough v. Atl. Coast Line R. Co.</i> , 178 F.2d 253 (4th Cir. 1949).....	44
<i>Sharkey v. O’Neal</i> , 778 F.3d 767 (9th Cir. 2015)	67
<i>Tanzin v. Tanvir</i> , ___ U.S. ___, 141 S.Ct. 486 (2020).....	64
<i>U.S. v. Afyare</i> , 632 F. App’x 272 (6th Cir. 2016)	31, 32
<i>U.S. v. Bazar</i> , 747 Fed. Appx. 454 (9th Cir. 2018).....	37
<i>U.S. v. Brooks</i> , 610 F.3d 1186 (9th Cir. 2010).....	39
<i>U.S. v. Carroll</i> , 105 F.3d 740 (1st Cir. 1997).....	51
<i>U.S. v. Cook</i> , 782 F.3d 983 (8th Cir. 2015).....	36
<i>U.S. v. Cox</i> , 963 F.3d 915 (9th Cir. 2020).....	64
<i>U.S. v. Croghan</i> , 973 F.3d 809 (8th Cir. 2020).....	52
<i>U.S. v. Flanders</i> , 752 F.3d 1317 (11th Cir. 2014).....	42
<i>U.S. v. Haas</i> , 986 F.3d 467 (4th Cir. 2021).....	24, 39

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.