

THE HONORABLE JOHN H. CHUN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

JACINDA DORIAN, individually, and  
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiff,

v.

AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.,

Defendant.

No. 2:22-cv-00269-JHC

AMAZON WEB SERVICES, INC.'S  
RULE 12(b)(6) MOTION TO  
DISMISS AND RULE 12(f) MOTION  
TO STRIKE CLASS ALLEGATIONS

NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:  
June 10, 2022

ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED

MOTION TO DISMISS AND  
MOTION TO STRIKE CLASS ALLEGATIONS

Perkins Coie LLP  
1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

|   | <b>Page</b> |
|---|-------------|
| 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  |             |
| INTRODUCTION .....  | 1           |
| BACKGROUND .....  | 3           |
| A.    The Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act (“BIPA”).....          | 3           |
| B.    Amazon Web Services (“AWS”), Rekognition, and ProctorU.....           | 4           |
| C.    Plaintiff’s Claims Against AWS.....                                   | 5           |
| MOTION TO DISMISS UNDER RULE 12(b)(6).....                                  | 6           |
| A.    AWS Did Not “Possess” or “Collect” Plaintiff’s Data.....              | 6           |
| 1.    Plaintiff alleges no facts showing that AWS “possessed”               |             |
| her data.....   | 7           |
| 2.    Plaintiff alleges no facts showing that AWS “collected” her           |             |
| data.....   | 11          |
| B.    Plaintiff’s Claims Should Be Dismissed Under the Illinois             |             |
| Extraterritoriality Doctrine and the U.S. Constitution’s Dormant            |             |
| Commerce Clause .....   | 15          |
| 1.    Plaintiff’s claims violate the extraterritoriality doctrine.....      | 15          |
| 2.    Adopting Plaintiff’s sweeping interpretation of BIPA                  |             |
| would violate the U.S. Constitution’s Dormant Commerce                      |             |
| Clause.....   | 18          |
| C.    BIPA’s Financial Institutions Exemption Bars Plaintiff’s Claims ..... | 18          |
| 1.    BIPA may not be applied to “financial institutions,” which            |             |
| includes colleges and universities that administer financial                |             |
| aid.....  | 19          |
| 2.    Allowing Plaintiff’s claims to proceed would                          |             |
| impermissibly apply BIPA’s requirements to the Colleges,                    |             |
| which are financial institutions. ....                                      | 19          |
| D.    Plaintiff Cannot Be “Aggrieved” by AWS’s Alleged Violation of         |             |
| Section 15(a).....  | 21          |
| MOTION TO STRIKE CLASS ALLEGATIONS UNDER RULE 12(f).....                    | 22          |
| CONCLUSION.....   | 24          |

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES****Page(s)****CASES**

|    |   |        |
|----|---|--------|
| 1  |   |        |
| 2  |   |        |
| 3  | <b>CASES</b>  |        |
| 4  | <i>Abdelfattah v. Carrington Mortg. Servs. LLC,</i>                       |        |
| 5  | No. C-12-04656-RMW, 2013 WL 5718463 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 21, 2013).....        | 22     |
| 6  | <i>Am. Sur. Co. v. Jones,</i>   |        |
| 7  | 51 N.E.2d 122 (Ill. 1943).....  | 21     |
| 8  | <i>Amchem Prod., Inc. v. Windsor,</i>                                     |        |
| 9  | 521 U.S. 591 (1997).....  | 24     |
| 10 | <i>Ashcroft v. Iqbal,</i>   |        |
| 11 | 556 U.S. 662 (2009).....  | 6      |
| 12 | <i>Avery v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.,</i>                           |        |
| 13 | 216 Ill. 2d 100 (2005) .....  | 2, 15  |
| 14 | <i>Balistreri v. Pacifica Police Dep't,</i>                               |        |
| 15 | 901 F.2d 696 (9th Cir. 1988) .....  | 6      |
| 16 | <i>Bernal v. ADP, LLC,</i>  |        |
| 17 | No. 2017-CH-12364, 2019 WL 5028609 (Ill. Cir. Ct. Aug. 23, 2019) .....    | 13     |
| 18 | <i>Bryant v. Compass Grp. USA, Inc.,</i>                                  |        |
| 19 | 503 F. Supp. 3d 597 (N.D. Ill. 2020) .....                                | 19     |
| 20 | <i>Bryant v. Compass Grp. USA, Inc.,</i>                                  |        |
| 21 | 958 F.3d 617 (7th Cir. 2020) .....  | 22     |
| 22 | <i>Cashatt v. Ford Motor Co.,</i>   |        |
| 23 | No. 3:19-CV-05886-RBL, 2020 WL 1987077 (W.D. Wash. Apr. 27, 2020) .....   | 24     |
| 24 | <i>Chestnut Corp. v. Pestine, Brinati, Gamer, Ltd.,</i>                   |        |
| 25 | 667 N.E.2d 543 (Ill. App. Ct. 1996) .....                                 | 21     |
| 26 | <i>Doe v. Northwestern Univ.,</i>   |        |
|    | No. 21 C 1579, 2022 WL 1485905 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 22, 2022).....             | 19, 20 |
|    | <i>Duerr v. Bradley Univ.,</i>  |        |
|    | No. 1:21-CV-01096-SLD-JEH, 2022 WL 1487747 (C.D. Ill. Mar. 10, 2022)..... | 19, 20 |
|    | <i>Figueroa v. Kronos Inc.,</i>   |        |
|    | 454 F. Supp. 3d 772 (N.D. Ill. 2020) .....                                | 13     |

1 *Healy v. Beer Inst., Inc.*,  
 2 491 U.S. 324 (1989).....18

3 *Heard v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.*,  
 4 524 F. Supp. 3d 831 (N.D. Ill. 2021) .....9

5 *Heard v. Becton, Dickinson & Company*,  
 6 440 F. Supp. 3d 960 (N.D. Ill. 2020) .....9, 12

7 *In re Coinstar Inc. S’holder Derivative Litig.*,  
 8 No. C11-133 MJP, 2011 WL 5553778 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 14, 2011).....16

9 *In re Facebook Biometric Info. Priv. Litig.*,  
 10 326 F.R.D. 535 (N.D. Cal. 2018).....21

11 *Jacobs v. Hanwha Techwin America, Inc.*,  
 12 No. 21 C 866, 2021 WL 3172967 (N.D. Ill. July 27, 2021) .....9, 12, 13

13 *Knieval v. ESPN*,  
 14 393 F.3d 1068 (9th Cir. 2005) .....7

15 *Lapekas v. Kaiser Found. Health Plan, Inc.*,  
 16 No. 10-CV-5984-VBF-FMOx, 2011 WL 13217477 (C.D. Cal. May 25, 2011) .....24

17 *Linehan v. AllianceOne Receivables Mgmt., Inc.*,  
 18 No. C15-1012-JCC, 2016 WL 9526500 (W.D. Wash. Nov. 22, 2016).....22

19 *Loomis v. Slendertone Distrib., Inc.*,  
 20 420 F. Supp. 3d 1046 (S.D. Cal. 2019).....7

21 *McGoveran v. Amazon Web Servs., Inc.*,  
 22 No. 20-cv-1399-LPS, 2021 WL 4502089 (D. Del. Sept. 30, 2021) .....15, 16, 17, 18

23 *Miller v. Dollar Tree Stores, Inc.*,  
 24 No. CV-06-019-RHW, 2006 WL 8438078 (E.D. Wash. Oct. 13, 2006).....23

25 *Namuwonge v. Kronos, Inc.*,  
 26 418 F. Supp. 3d 279 (N.D. Ill. 2019) .....12, 13

*Parsons v. Ryan*,  
 754 F.3d 657 (9th Cir. 2014) .....22

*People v. Ward*,  
 830 N.E.2d 556 (Ill. 2005) .....7, 8

*Poshville, Inc. v. Pawnee Leasing*,  
 No. 2:21-CV-01465-SVW-AGR, 2021 WL 4776708 (C.D. Cal. July 15, 2021).....24

|    |  |        |
|----|--|--------|
| 1  | <i>Rosenbach v. Six Flags Ent. Corp.</i> ,                           |        |
| 2  | 129 N.E.3d 1197 (Ill. 2019) .....                                    | 7, 21  |
| 3  | <i>Sam Francis Foundation v. Christies, Inc.</i> ,                   |        |
| 4  | 784 F.3d 1320 (9th Cir. 2015) .....                                  | 18     |
| 5  | <i>Solon v. Midwest Med. Recs. Ass’n, Inc.</i> ,                     |        |
| 6  | 236 Ill. 2d 433 (2010) .....   | 9, 13  |
| 7  | <i>Stevenson v. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc.</i> ,                |        |
| 8  | 69 F. Supp. 3d 792 (N.D. Ill. 2014) .....                            | 21     |
| 9  | <i>Thakkar v. ProctorU, Inc.</i> ,                                   |        |
| 10 | No. 21-CV-2051, 2021 WL 5507041 (C.D. Ill. Nov. 23, 2021).....       | 1      |
| 11 | <i>United States v. Cotterman</i> ,                                  |        |
| 12 | 709 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 2013) .....                                   | 4      |
| 13 | <i>United States v. Kuchinski</i> ,                                  |        |
| 14 | 469 F.3d 853 (9th Cir. 2006) .....                                   | 7, 8   |
| 15 | <i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes</i> ,                              |        |
| 16 | 564 U.S. 338 (2011).....   | 23     |
| 17 | <i>Williams v. Nat’l Football League</i> ,                           |        |
| 18 | No. C14-1089 MJP, 2014 WL 5514378 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 31, 2014).....    | 6      |
| 19 | <i>Zellmer v. Facebook, Inc.</i> ,                                   |        |
| 20 | No. 3:18-cv-01880-JD, 2022 WL 976981 (N.D. Cal. Mar. 31, 2022) ..... | 14, 15 |
| 21 | <b>STATUTES</b>  |        |
| 22 | 740 ILCS 14/5(a) .....   | 3      |
| 23 | 740 ILCS 14/5(d) .....   | 3      |
| 24 | 740 ILCS 14/10.....  | 3, 23  |
| 25 | 740 ILCS 14/15(a) .....  | passim |
| 26 | 740 ILCS 14/15(b) .....  | passim |
|    | 740 ILCS 14/20.....  | 21     |
|    | 740 ILCS 14/20(1) .....  | 4      |
|    | 740 ILCS 14/20(2) .....  | 4      |

# 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.