

1 COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP
 2 MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127) (rhodesmg@cooley.com)
 3 MATTHEW D. BROWN (196972) (brownmd@cooley.com)
 101 California Street, 5th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111-5800
 Telephone: (415) 693-2000
 4 Fax: (415) 693-2222

5 Attorneys for Defendant
 6 FACEBOOK, INC.

7
 8
 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 11 SAN JOSE DIVISION

13 DONALD SILVERSTRI, DAWN KEER,
 14 KIMBERLY MANCELLA, JILL
 SILVERMAN STRELZIN, and
 15 CHRISTOPHER LEMOLE, on behalf of
 themselves and others similarly situated,

16 Plaintiff,

17 v.

18 FACEBOOK, INC.,

19 Defendant.

Case No. C10-cv-00429 (JF)

20 ERIC MARKOWITZ, FRANK
 21 BLUEMENTHAL, LAUREN REESE, and
 BILLY STERN, on behalf of themselves and
 all others similarly situated,

22 Plaintiff,

23 v.

24 FACEBOOK, INC.,

25 Defendant.

Case No. C10-cv-00430 (JF)

**DEFENDANT FACEBOOK'S OPPOSITION
 TO PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES
 SHOULD BE RELATED**

26
 27
 28

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Defendant Facebook, Inc. opposes the administrative motion filed by Plaintiffs in the
3 above-captioned cases (*Donald Silverstri, et al. v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. C10-cv-00429 (JF), and
4 *Eric Markowitz, et al. v. Facebook, Inc.*, No. C10-cv-00430 (JF)) (“Plaintiffs”) to relate those
5 cases to the case captioned *Sean Lane, et al. v. Facebook, Inc., et al.*, No. C08-cv-3845. Under
6 the criteria set forth in Civil Local Rule 3-12, the *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* cases are not related to
7 the *Lane* case. The cases involve different issues and arise from wholly distinct events separated
8 by two years. *Lane* arises from certain interactions between Facebook, the popular social
9 networking website, and third-party websites that participated in Facebook’s Beacon program.
10 The key events in *Lane* took place between November 2007 and December 2007, which was also
11 the putative class period. In contrast, the *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* complaints concern specific
12 changes to users’ privacy settings made on November 19, 2009 and December 9, 2009, two years
13 later. Indeed, Plaintiffs appear to recognize this when they concede that “[t]he Lane matter
14 involves discrete privacy issues from an earlier time.” (Motion 2.) In addition to a lack of factual
15 commonality, there is only limited overlap in the legal theories alleged in the cases. Because of
16 the substantial differences between the two actions, the criteria of Civil Local Rule 3-12 are not
17 met, and coordination of Plaintiffs’ newly filed cases with *Lane* is unwarranted. Moreover, the
18 *Lane* case may soon be resolved, with the motion for final approval of the proposed class action
19 settlement scheduled to be heard before Judge Seeborg on February 26, 2010. (Note that
20 although Plaintiffs’ motion states that *Lane* is pending before District Judge James Ware, the case
21 actually is assigned to District Judge Richard Seeborg, with discovery matters referred to
22 Magistrate Judge Patricia Trumbull.)

23 **II. BACKGROUND**

24 The *Lane* complaint was filed on August 12, 2008 against Facebook and several other
25 defendants—Blockbuster, Inc., Fandango, Inc., Hotwire, Inc., STA Travel, Inc., Overstock.com,
26 Inc., Zappos.com, Inc., Gamefly, Inc., and John Does 1-40 (who are referred to as the “Facebook
27 Beacon Activated Affiliates” or “FBAAAs”). In *Lane*, the plaintiffs alleged that Facebook and the
28 FBAAAs engaged in a program to solicit, advertise, and market business transactions to Facebook

1 users and the users' friends without sufficient consent. According to the *Lane* complaint, under
2 agreements between Facebook and the FBAs, when a user accessed one or more of the FBAs'
3 websites and a certain type of triggering event occurred (for example, making a travel reservation
4 or online purchase), the website relayed information about the user's activity to Facebook. In
5 certain circumstances, the user's activity was shared with the Facebook user's network of friends
6 on the Facebook website. The *Lane* plaintiffs alleged that by doing so, Facebook and the FBAs
7 violated their rights. The key events in *Lane* took place between November 2007 and December
8 2007, the putative class period. The *Lane* complaint alleged that the actions of the defendants
9 under the Beacon program gave rise to claims under the Electronic Communications Privacy Act,
10 the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, the Video Privacy Protection Act, the California Consumer
11 Legal Remedies Act, the California Computer Crime Law, civil conspiracy, and unjust
12 enrichment. The *Lane* case has resulted in a proposed class action settlement, final approval of
13 which will be sought at a hearing before Judge Seeborg on February 26, 2010.
14 ([http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/CAND/Calendar.nsf/572d47d88520f842882566a2007f2b59/cd0a](http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/CAND/Calendar.nsf/572d47d88520f842882566a2007f2b59/cd0a5c0f181b8b5988256a01005e0eeb?OpenDocument)
15 [5c0f181b8b5988256a01005e0eeb?OpenDocument](http://www.cand.uscourts.gov/CAND/Calendar.nsf/572d47d88520f842882566a2007f2b59/cd0a5c0f181b8b5988256a01005e0eeb?OpenDocument).)

16 In contrast, the *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* complaints were filed against Facebook on
17 January 29, 2010, and arise from events in late 2009 that have no relationship to the Beacon
18 program. These complaints assert that two changes made by Facebook to its privacy settings
19 system decreased user privacy and resulted in wider access to personal information that users had
20 included in their profiles and had previously been accessible to a more limited number of other
21 Facebook users. The *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* complaints allege that Facebook's privacy
22 announcement accompanying these changes was misleading and confusing. Plaintiffs'
23 complaints do not allege two of the legal theories alleged in *Lane*—namely, the Computer Fraud
24 and Abuse Act and the Video Privacy Protection Act—and, moreover, allege four causes of
25 action which are not in the *Lane* complaint: violation of the statutory right of publicity, violation
26 of California Business and Professions Code section 17200, the common law tort of
27 appropriation, and injunctive relief.

28

1 Although the parties agree that *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* are related to each other and
2 should be consolidated, Facebook does not agree that *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* are related to
3 *Lane*.

4 **III. ARGUMENT: PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION SHOULD BE DENIED BECAUSE**
5 ***SILVERSTRI* AND *MARKOWITZ* ARE NOT RELATED TO *LANE*.**

6 This Court should deny Plaintiffs' administrative motion because the recently filed
7 *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* cases are not related to *Lane*. Under Civil Local Rule 3-12(a), "[a]n
8 action is related to another when (1) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property,
9 transaction or event; and (2) It appears likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication
10 of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different Judges."
11 Under these criteria, Plaintiffs' cases are not related to *Lane* and should not be transferred.

12 **A. Plaintiffs' Cases do not Substantially Concern the Same Parties, Property,**
13 **Transaction, or Event as *Lane*.**

14 Plaintiffs' cases and *Lane* do not concern the same transaction or event as required by
15 Rule 3-12(a)(1). The facts upon which Plaintiffs base their claims bear no relationship to the
16 facts upon which the *Lane* complaint is based. *Lane* arises from aspects of the Facebook Beacon
17 program and, specifically, events which occurred over two years ago. *See supra* part II.
18 Plaintiffs' claims in *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* are not connected to the Beacon program, and
19 instead arise from unrelated changes that Facebook made to its privacy settings in late 2009. *See*
20 *id.* Although Plaintiffs make the generalized contention that that their cases relate to *Lane*
21 because they "concern common legal issues of privacy" (Motion 2), Plaintiffs fail to point to any
22 substantially similar transaction or event. In fact, Plaintiffs undermine their conclusion by
23 conceding that "[t]he Lane matter involves discrete privacy issues from an earlier time." (*Id.*)

24 Further, the *Silverstri* and *Markowitz* cases do not substantially concern the same parties
25 as *Lane*. Facebook is the only party common to the three cases. While Facebook is the sole
26 defendant in Plaintiffs' cases, *Lane* names several additional parties as defendants, none of whom
27 are named or mentioned in the *Silverstri* or *Markowitz* complaints.

28

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
28

B. Keeping Plaintiffs' Cases Before This Court Will Not Cause Unduly Burdensome Duplication of Labor and Expense or Conflicting Results.

Plaintiffs suggest that there might be duplication of labor and expense if this Court were to relate their cases to *Lane*. But in addition to an absence of common transactions, events, and parties, there is only minimal overlap of the legal theories alleged in the cases. *See supra* part II. Thus, keeping the case before this Court would not cause an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense. For the same reasons, there is no risk of conflicting results. Moreover, the *Lane* case is at a more advanced stage and may soon be resolved. The motion for final approval of the proposed class action settlement is scheduled to be heard before Judge Seeborg on February 26, 2010.

IV. CONCLUSION

Silverstri and *Markowitz* are not related to *Lane* under the criteria of Civil Local Rule 3-12, and therefore Plaintiffs' administrative motion should be denied.

Dated: February 9, 2010

COOLEY GODWARD KRONISH LLP
MICHAEL G. RHODES (116127)
MATTHEW D. BROWN (196972)

/s/ Matthew D. Brown
Matthew D. Brown
Attorneys for Defendant FACEBOOK, INC.

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
28

PROOF OF SERVICE
(FRCP 5)

I am a citizen of the United States and a resident of the State of California. I am employed in San Francisco County, State of California, in the office of a member of the bar of this Court, at whose direction the service was made. I am over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is Cooley Godward Kronish LLP, 101 California Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California 94111-5800. On the date set forth below I served the documents described below in the manner described below:

DEFENDANT FACEBOOK’S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS’ ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED; [PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’ ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED

(BY ELECTRONIC MAIL) I am personally and readily familiar with the business practice of Cooley Godward Kronish LLP for the preparation and processing of documents in portable document format (PDF) for e-mailing, and I caused said documents to be prepared in PDF and then served by electronic mail to the parties listed below.

on the following part(ies) in this action:

Michael James Aschenbrener
Edelson McGuire, LLC
350 N. LaSalle Street, Suite 1300
Chicago, IL 60654
312-589-6379
312-589-6378 (fax)
maschenbrener@edelson.com

Michael Graham Rhodes
Michael Lambert
Emily Fawne Burns
Maria Ostrovsky
Cooley Godward LLP
Five Palo Alto Square
3000 El Camino Real
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2155
650-843-5000
650-857-0663 (fax)
mrhodes@cooley.com
mlambert@cooley.com
burnsef@cooley.com
mostrovsky@cooley.com

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
28

Mark Andrew Chavez
Chavez & Gertler LLP
42 Miller Avenue
Mill Valley, CA 93941
415-381-5599
415-381-5572 (fax)
mark@chavezgertler.com

Thomas Mathew Corea
Jeremy Reade Wilson
Corea Firm
1201 Elm Street
Suite 4150
Dallas, TX 75270
214-953-3900
tcorea@corealaw.com
jwilson@corealaw.com

John William Davis
Law Office of John W. Davis
4445 Eastgate Mall
Second Floor
San Diego, CA 92121
858-812-2976
858-658-0072 (fax)
john@johnwdavis.com

Marc A. Fuller
Frank C. Brame
Michael L Raiff
Vinson & Elkins L.L.P.
2001 Ross Ave.
Suite 3700
Dallas, TX 75201
214-220-7881
214-999-7881 (fax)
mfuller@velaw.com

Shawn Hanson
Jones Day
555 California Street
26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94104
415 626 3939
415 875 5700 (fax)
shanson@jonesday.com

David Christopher Parisi
Suzanne L. Havens Beckman
Parisi & Havens, LLP
15233 Valleyheart Drive
Sherman Oaks, CA 91403
818-990-1299
818-501-7852 (fax)
dparisi@parisihavens.com
shavens@parisihavens.com

Alan Himmelfarb
Edelson McGuire LLC
2757 Leonis Blvd
Vernon, CA 90058
323- 585-8696
323-585-8696 (fax)
Consumerlaw1@earthlink.net

Scott A Kamber
David A. Stampley
KamberLaw, LLC
11 Broadway
22nd Floor
New York, NY 10004
646-964-9600
212-920-3081 (fax)
skamber@kamberlaw.com
dstampley@kamberlaw.com

Joseph H Malley
Law Office of Joseph H. Malley, PC
1045 North Zang Boulevard
Dallas, TX 75208
214-943-6100
malleylaw@gmail.com

Thomas J. Moses
Brydon Hugo & Parker
135 Main Street, 20th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105
(415) 808-0300
(415) 808-0333 (fax)
tmoses@bhplaw.com

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
28

George A. Otstott, Jr.
Ericksen, Arbuthnot, et al.
111 Sutter Street
Suite 575
San Francisco, CA 94104
415-362-7126
415-362-6401 (fax)
gotstott@eakdl.com

Executed on February 9, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ Linda A. Nafey
Linda A. Nafey