

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

THE HONORABLE JOHN C. COUGHENOUR

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

STEVEN VANCE, <i>et al.</i> ,	Plaintiffs,
v.	
MICROSOFT CORPORATION,	Defendant.

No. 2:20-cv-01082-JCC-MAT

DEFENDANT MICROSOFT
CORPORATION'S MOTION TO
DISMISS

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
OCTOBER 9, 2020

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	3
A. The Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act.....	3
B. The IBM DiF Dataset.....	4
C. Microsoft’s Alleged Conduct.....	5
ARGUMENT	6
I. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS PLAINTIFFS’ BIPA CLAIMS.	6
A. BIPA Does Not Apply Extraterritorially to Microsoft’s Alleged Conduct.	6
B. Plaintiffs’ BIPA Claims Violate the Dormant Commerce Clause.....	9
1. Plaintiffs’ Claims Impermissibly Attempt to Regulate Conduct Occurring Entirely Outside Illinois’s Borders.	9
2. Plaintiffs’ BIPA Claims Impermissibly Displace the Legislation and Policy Decisions Made by States Other Than Illinois.	12
C. Plaintiffs Fail to State a Claim Under BIPA Sections 15(b) or 15(c).....	16
1. BIPA Does Not Apply to the Use of Photographs.....	16
2. Section 15(b) Does Not Apply to the Passive Possession of Data by Third Parties Like Microsoft.....	19
3. Plaintiffs Fail to Plausibly Allege That Microsoft “Profited” From Their Biometrics and Thus Fail to Plead a Section 15(c) Claim.	21
II. THE COURT SHOULD DISMISS PLAINTIFFS’ UNJUST ENRICHMENT CLAIM.....	22
III. PLAINTIFFS HAVE NO SEPARATE INJUNCTIVE RELIEF CLAIM.	24
CONCLUSION.....	24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
Cases	
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	<p><i>ACLU v. Johnson</i>, 194 F.3d 1149 (10th Cir. 1999)15</p> <p><i>Am. Libraries Ass’n v. Pataki</i>, 969 F. Supp. 160 (S.D.N.Y. 1997)15</p> <p><i>Archdiocese of St. Louis v. Internet Entm’t Grp., Inc.</i>, 1999 WL 66022 (E.D. Mo. Feb. 12, 1999).....16</p> <p><i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal</i>, 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....6</p> <p><i>Avery v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i>, 835 N.E.2d 801 (Ill. 2005).....7, 9</p> <p><i>Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly</i>, 550 U.S. 544 (2007).....6</p> <p><i>Bernal v. ADP, LLC</i>, No. 2017-CH-12364, Order (Cook Cty. Ill. Cir. Ct. Aug. 23, 2019).....21, 22</p> <p><i>Cameron v. Polar Tech Indus., Inc. & ADP, LLC</i>, No. 2019-CH-000013, Tr. (DeKalb Cty. Ill. Cir. Ct. Aug. 23, 2019)21</p> <p><i>Chinatown Neighborhood Ass’n v. Harris</i>, 794 F.3d 1136 (9th Cir. 2015)10</p> <p><i>Cleary v. Philip Morris Inc.</i>, 656 F.3d 511 (7th Cir. 2011)23</p> <p><i>Cousineau v. Microsoft Corp.</i>, 992 F. Supp. 2d 1116 (W.D. Wash. 2012).....8, 23, 24</p> <p><i>In re D.W.</i>, 827 N.E.2d 466 (Ill. 2005)21</p> <p><i>Dana Tank Container, Inc. v. Human Rights Comm’n</i>, 687 N.E.2d 102 (Ill. App. Ct. 1997)21</p> <p><i>Daniels Sharpsmart, Inc. v. Smith</i>, 889 F.3d 608 (9th Cir. 2018)10</p>

1 *Daniels-Hall v. Nat’l Educ. Ass’n*,
629 F.3d 629 F.3d 992 (9th Cir. 2010)8

2 *Edifecs Inc., v. TIBCO Software Inc.*,
3 2011 WL 1045645 (W.D. Wash. Mar. 23, 2011)25

4 *Edwards v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.*,
5 2011 WL 3516155 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 11, 2011)25

6 *In re Facebook Biometric Information Privacy Litigation*,
185 F. Supp. 3d 1155 (N.D. Cal. 2016)18

7 *Griffin v. Oceanic Contractors, Inc.*,
8 458 U.S. 564 (1982).....19

9 *Harbers v. Eddie Bauer, LLC*,
10 415 F. Supp. 3d 999 (W.D. Wash. 2019)17

11 *Healy v. Beer Inst., Inc.*,
1491 U.S. 324 (1989).....2, 10, 12

12 *Kelley v. Microsoft Corp.*,
13 251 F.R.D. 544 (W.D. Wash. 2008)23

14 *L’Garde, Inc. v. Raytheon Space & Airborne Sys.*,
15 805 F. Supp. 2d 932 (C.D. Cal. 2011)4

16 *Landau v. CNA Fin. Corp.*,
886 N.E.2d 405 (Ill. App. 2008)7

17 *Monroy v. Shutterfly, Inc.*,
18 2017 WL 4099846 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 15, 2017) *passim*

19 *Mount v. PulsePoint, Inc.*,
20 684 Fed. App’x 32 (2d Cir. 2017).....24

21 *Namuwonge v. Kronos, Inc.*,
418 F. Supp. 3d 279 (N.D. Ill. 2019)21

22 *Nat’l Collegiate Athletic Ass’n v. Miller*,
23 10 F.3d 633 (9th Cir. 1993)14, 15

24

25 *Nat’l Solid Wastes Mgmt. Ass’n v. Meyer*,
63 F.3d 652 (7th Cir. 1995)14

26

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
LAW OFFICES
920 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300
Seattle, WA 98104-1610

1 *Neals v. PAR Tech. Corp.*,
 419 F. Supp. 3d 1088 (N.D. Ill. 2019)9

2 *Patel v. Facebook, Inc.*,
 3 932 F.3d 1264 (9th Cir. 2019)7, 9, 19, 20

4 *People v. Hanna*,
 5 800 N.E.2d 1201 (Ill. 2003)19

6 *Pooh-Bah Enter., Inc. v. Cnty. of Cook*,
 905 N.E.2d 781 (Ill. 2009)23

7 *Reyn’s Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc.*,
 8 442 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2006)4

9 *Rivera v. Google, Inc.*,
 10 238 F. Supp. 3d 1088 (N.D. Ill. 2017)7, 9, 19, 20

11 *Rosenbach v. Six Flags Entm’t Corp.*,
 129 N.E.3d 1197 (Ill. 2019)19

12 *Sam Francis Found. v. Christies, Inc.*,
 13 784 F.3d 1320 (9th Cir. 2015)11

14 *Seattle Prof’l Eng’g Employees Ass’n v. Boeing Co.*,
 139 Wn.2d 824 (2000)24

15 *Sonoma Cty. Ass’n of Retired Employees v. Sonoma Cty.*,
 16 708 F.3d 1109 (9th Cir. 2013)17

17 *Tarzian v. Kraft Heinz Foods Co.*,
 18 2019 WL 5064732 (N.D. Ill. Oct. 9, 2019).....9

19 *Vance et al. v. Amazon.com, Inc.*,
 20 W.D. Wash. No. 2:20-cv-01084-RAJ1

21 *Welborn v. Internal Revenue Serv.*,
 218 F. Supp. 3d 64, 78 (D.D.C. 2016)24

22

23 **Statutes**

24 740 ILCS 14/53, 19

25 740 ILCS 14/103, 17

26

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
 LAW OFFICES
 920 Fifth Avenue, Suite 3300
 Seattle, WA 98104-1610

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.