

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND..... 2

 A. The DiF Dataset and Microsoft’s Download 2

 B. Plaintiffs’ Lawsuit..... 3

 C. Microsoft’s Summary Judgment Motion 5

III. ARGUMENT 6

 A. Plaintiffs Have Not Exercised Diligence in Discovery..... 7

 B. Plaintiffs Do Not Identify the Specific Facts Relevant to Summary
 Judgment That Their Far-Reaching Requests Would “Likely” Reveal..... 8

 1. BIPA and Extraterritoriality 8

 2. Dormant Commerce Clause 10

 3. Unjust Enrichment 10

IV. CONCLUSION..... 12

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

Federal Cases

Burke v. Pro. Transp., Inc.,
2018 WL 6107217 (W.D. Wash. 2018) *passim*

Conkle v. Jeong,
73 F.3d 909 (9th Cir. 1995)7

Dodge v. Evergreen Sch. Dist.,
513 F. Supp. 3d 1286 (W.D. Wash. 2021).....8, 11

Landmark Dev. Corp. v. Chambers Corp.,
752 F.2d 369 (9th Cir. 1985)6, 7

Margolis v. Ryan,
140 F.3d 850 (9th Cir. 1998)6

Robertson v. Cath. Cmty. Servs. of W. Wash.,
2021 WL 2376610 (W.D. Wash. 2021)8

SEC v. Stein,
906 F.3d 823 (9th Cir. 2018)6, 8, 10

Shannon v. Albertelli Firm, P.C.,
2014 WL 11309798 (N.D. Ga. Jan. 6, 2014), *aff'd*, 610 F. App'x 866 (11th
Cir. 2015)12

State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Adams,
2021 WL 5810664 (W.D. Wash. 2021)8

State Statutes

740 ILCS 14/15(b)3, 8, 9, 10

Rules

Rule 56(d) *passim*

Other Authorities

M. Merler, et al., DIVERSITY IN FACES, IBM Research AI at 2 (Feb. 22, 2019)
(Dkt. 70-6).....2

I. INTRODUCTION

1
2 The Court should deny Plaintiffs' Rule 56(d) Motion because Plaintiffs (a) have not
3 exercised due diligence in discovery, and (b) do not identify the specific facts relevant to
4 Microsoft's Motion for Summary Judgment that their wide-ranging requests would "likely"
5 reveal. Microsoft has no objection, however, to allowing Plaintiffs until March 18 to file their
6 opposition brief, which will afford ample time to take depositions of Microsoft's seven
7 declarants (as well as the six declarants Amazon has offered for deposition in its case).
8 Microsoft proposes to re-note its motion for April 1, when its reply brief would be due.

9 This case boils down to a simple set of facts that can be addressed on this schedule,
10 without the disproportionate discovery Plaintiffs' Motion demands. In 2019, two individuals
11 associated with Microsoft—one a contractor, the other an intern—downloaded IBM's Diversity
12 in Faces ("DiF") Dataset. In short order, they decided the DiF Dataset was useless for their
13 research projects, and they moved on. The contractor and the intern were in Washington and
14 New York, respectively, and neither they nor their work had any connection with Illinois.
15 Microsoft has provided discovery responses, documents, and declarations corroborating these
16 facts. And these straightforward facts form the basis for its Motion for Summary Judgment.

17 Now, after their own inexcusable delays, Plaintiffs invoke Rule 56(d) in hopes of getting
18 at least six more months to engage in wide-ranging discovery before responding to Microsoft's
19 Motion. But Plaintiffs' request relies on pure conjecture, and they fail to carry their Rule 56(d)
20 burden. Plaintiffs filed this case on July 14, 2020, and discovery has been ongoing since
21 November 2020. Microsoft told Plaintiffs the facts on which it relies in its Motion for Summary
22 Judgment in December 2020. Plaintiffs have had more than a year to take depositions to explore
23 those facts. Despite that, they now seek a delay of briefing for "not less than" six months so they
24 can pursue thirteen broad categories of additional discovery, which they speculate *might* turn up
25 something they can use to oppose Microsoft's Motion. But Rule 56(d) requires that a party
26 seeking to defer a summary judgment motion must identify *specific* facts discovery is *likely* to
27 unearth and are *essential* to oppose the motion. Plaintiffs' Motion falls far short of this standard.

1 Microsoft does not object to Plaintiffs deposing witnesses who submitted declarations in
2 support of its Motion, all but one of whom Plaintiffs have known about for at least six months.
3 Further, Microsoft will produce any previously unproduced documents on which its witnesses
4 relied in preparing their declarations. But for the other categories of discovery Plaintiffs
5 demand, they fail to demonstrate: (1) the facts they expect to elicit from their proposed
6 discovery; (2) that these facts *exist*; and (3) that the facts are essential to opposing Microsoft’s
7 Motion. The Court should deny Plaintiffs’ Motion and adopt Microsoft’s proposed schedule.

8 II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

9 A. The DiF Dataset and Microsoft’s Download

10 The essential facts are undisputed. In 2018, IBM created its DiF Dataset to “advance the
11 study of fairness and accuracy in face recognition technology.” M. Merler, et al., DIVERSITY IN
12 FACES, IBM Research AI at 2 (Feb. 22, 2019) (Dkt. 70-6). IBM did not create the Dataset with
13 an eye toward commercial applications, and it did not annotate the faces appearing in photos
14 linked in the DiF Dataset for the purpose of identifying any individuals. *Id.* Rather, IBM created
15 a facial coding scheme to provide a baseline for measuring diversity in datasets, and its data
16 likely cannot be used for identification at all. *See* Dkt. 85 (Merler Decl.) ¶ 7. IBM made the DiF
17 Dataset available to researchers only, and its DiF Dataset Terms of Use “made clear that the DiF
18 Dataset could only be used for non-commercial, research purposes.” *Id.* ¶ 9.

19 Reports indicate IBM received over 250 requests for the DiF Dataset. *See* Dkt. 80 at 18
20 (Vance Dep. 100:18-19). Only two came from people who stated their research was related to
21 Microsoft. One of those requests came from an outside contractor for Microsoft working in
22 Redmond, Washington, Ben Skrainka, who told IBM he would “use the DiF Dataset to evaluate
23 the bias of different facial recognition algorithms.” Dkt. 85 Ex. C at 2-3. The other came from a
24 post-graduate intern at Microsoft Research in New York City, Samira Samadi, who told IBM she
25 “need[ed] a diverse image data set to be able to study the effect of different factors” that affect
26 “how well people can evaluate the output of a facial recognition system.” *Id.* Ex. D at 2-3. Both
27 downloaded the DiF Dataset in February 2019.

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.