INTERNET

TRACKI**D**IGCLI

l n

R

е

ACEBOOK

1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
2	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
3	SAN JOSE DIVISION				
4					
5					
6	IN RE FACEBOOK INTERNET) 5:12-MD-02314-EJD TRACKING LITIGATION)				
7) SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA				
8) NOVEMBER 16, 2017				
9) PAGES 1-55				
10)				
11)				
12					
13	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DAVILA				
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE				
15	APPEARANCES:				
16	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: BY: STEPHEN G. GRYGIEL SILVERMAN THOMPSON SLUTKIN WHITE				
17	26TH FLOOR, 201 NORTH CHARLES ST. BALTIMORE, MD 21201				
18					
19	FOR THE PLAINTIFF: BY: DAVID A. STRAITE KAPLAN FOX & KILSHEIMER LLP				
20	850 THIRD AVENUE, 14TH FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10022				
21					
22	APPEARANCES CONTINUED ON THE NEXT PAGE				
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER: SUMMER FISHER, CSR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 13185				
24	CERTIFICATE NOMBER 13103				
25	PROCEEDINGS RECORDED BY MECHANICAL STENOGRAPHY TRANSCRIPT PRODUCED WITH COMPUTER				

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED:	
2	FOR THE DEFENDANT:	BY: MATTHEW DEAN BROWN
3		LAUREN POMEROY COOLEY LLP
4		101 CALIFORNIA ST. FLR 5 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

	1	SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA NOVEMBER 16, 2017
	2	PROCEEDINGS
	3	(COURT CONVENED AT 9:02 A.M.)
09:02:42	4	THE COURT: AND WE WILL CALL OUR MORNING CALENDAR.
09:02:45	5	THIS IS 12-MD-2314. FACEBOOK INTERNET TRACKING CASE.
09:02:53	6	MAY I HAVE APPEARANCES, PLEASE.
09:02:55	7	MR. GRYGIEL: GOOD MORNING, YOUR HONOR.
09:02:57	8	STEVE GRYGIEL FOR THE PLAINTIFFS. WITH ME IS MY
09:02:59	9	COLLEAGUE, DAVID STRAITE, WHOM I'M SURE YOU REMEMBER.
09:03:03	10	THE COURT: YES, THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
09:03:04	11	MR. GRYGIEL: YOUR HONOR, BEFORE I SIT DOWN, I WOULD
09:03:06	12	LIKE TO MENTION IN THIS CASE, AS YOUR HONOR IS AWARE, WE HAVE
09:03:09	13	SOME DOCUMENTS THAT HAVE BEEN PROVIDED TO THE COURT UNDER SEAL.
09:03:11	14	THEY WILL ALMOST CERTAINLY BE REFERRED TO TODAY DURING THE
09:03:13	15	COURSE OF THE ARGUMENT, BY ONE SIDE OR THE OTHER, PERHAPS
09:03:16	16	GENERALLY, PERHAPS MORE SPECIFICALLY. AND I THOUGHT WITH THAT,
09:03:19	17	THIS MIGHT BE A CASE WHERE WE ARE KEEPING THE COURTROOM CLOSED
09:03:22	18	UNTIL WE ARE DONE.
09:03:23	19	THE COURT: WELL, I RECOGNIZE THAT, I JUST WANT TO
09:03:26	20	IT MAY BE POSSIBLE FOR YOU TO MAKE YOUR ARGUMENT WITHOUT
09:03:28	21	EXPOSING THE CONTENT.
09:03:30	22	MR. GRYGIEL: IT MAY BE BUT, I DIDN'T WANT TO ATTRACT
09:03:33	23	ANY DIFFICULTY WITH THE OTHER SIDE ABOUT MENTIONING A DOCUMENT
09:03:35	24	THEY THOUGHT I SHOULDN'T MENTION.
09:03:37	25	THE COURT: WELL, THANK YOU.

09:03:38	1	MR. BROWN, DO YOU INTEND TO REVEAL SECRETS HERE?
09:03:40	2	MR. BROWN: I DO NOT INTEND TO DO THAT.
09:03:42	3	I THOUGHT THAT THERE HAD BEEN A PROVISION OF THE
09:03:44	4	PROTECTIVE ORDER THAT THE GOVERNS THIS. AND THIS IS THE FIRST
09:03:49	5	TIME HEARING OF THIS. I THOUGHT I TOOK PRIOR NOTICE OF THAT.
09:03:52	6	SO I WOULD OBJECT TO, OBVIOUSLY, DISCUSSING ANY
09:03:55	7	CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION IN OPEN COURT.
09:03:56	8	THE COURT: AND DO YOU THINK IT'S POSSIBLE TO
09:03:58	9	ACCOMPLISH YOUR ARGUMENT WITHOUT DOING THAT?
09:04:00	10	MR. BROWN: I DO.
09:04:01	11	THE COURT: OKAY.
09:04:02	12	MR. GRYGIEL: WELL, YOUR HONOR, IN MY CASE FRANKLY,
09:04:04	13	THERE ARE SOME PORT PARTS OF THESE DOCUMENTS I DO WANT TO REFER
09:04:07	14	TO. THEY ARE QUITE TELLING. THEY ARE IMPORTANT TO OUR CASE.
09:04:10	15	I CAN CERTAINLY DESCRIBE THEM IN A WAY THAT DOESN'T
09:04:13	16	PARTICULARLY IDENTIFY A SPEAKER AND DOESN'T PARTICULARLY
09:04:15	17	IDENTIFY A TIME.
09:04:15	18	YOUR HONOR HAS THEM AS EXHIBITS, AND THAT MAY BE VERY WELL
09:04:18	19	SUFFICIENT TO DIRECT THE COURT'S ATTENTION TO THEM.
09:04:19	20	THE COURT: I THINK THAT WOULD SUFFICE, YEAH.
09:04:22	21	MR. GRYGIEL: WELL, IF WE GET INTO A PROBLEM AREA,
09:04:25	22	MR. BROWN CAN LET ME KNOW.
09:04:27	23	THE COURT: SURE.
09:04:27	24	MR. BROWN: WELL, YEAH, TO BE CLEAR, IT SHOULDN'T BE
09:04:29	25	MY BURDEN TO LET HIM KNOW AFTER HE'S DISCUSSED CONTENTS OF A

09:04:33	1	CONFIDENTIAL DOCUMENT. AND IT'S NOT JUST ABOUT WITHHOLDING
09:04:36	2	PEOPLE'S NAMES OR THE AUTHORS OF THE DOCUMENTS, IT'S THE
09:04:39	3	CONTENTS.
09:04:40	4	THE COURT: UNDERSTOOD.
09:04:40	5	WELL, I THINK WE CAN I'VE READ YOUR PLEADINGS AND I'VE
09:04:44	6	LOOKED AT THIS, AND I HAVE AN INCLINATION OF WHAT YOU ARE
09:04:46	7	SPEAKING ABOUT, BUT I DO THINK WE CAN ACCOMPLISH THE
09:04:49	8	CONVERSATION THIS MORNING WITHOUT SPECIFIC REFERENCE.
09:04:51	9	MR. GRYGIEL: I THINK WE CAN MANAGE IT, YOUR HONOR.
09:04:54	10	THE COURT: MR. BROWN, THERE'S SOMEONE ELSE AT YOUR
09:04:56	11	TABLE.
09:04:56	12	MR. BROWN: SO MATT BROWN FOR FACEBOOK, AND JOINED BY
09:05:01	13	LAUREN POMEROY.
09:05:01	14	THE COURT: THANK YOU. GOOD MORNING.
09:05:02	15	PLEASE BE SEATED. THANK YOU.
09:05:05	16	WELL, THIS IS FACEBOOK'S MOTION. SO MR. BROWN, WOULD YOU
09:05:10	17	OR MS. POMEROY BE MAKING ANY ARGUMENT? OR PERHAPS MR. WONG
09:05:14	18	WILL MAKE THE ARGUMENT WHEN HE ARRIVES.
09:05:18	19	MR. BROWN: YES.
09:05:19	20	THE COURT: WE COULD WAIT FOR HIM IF YOU WOULD LIKE.
09:05:21	21	MR. BROWN: THAT'S OKAY. I UNDERSTAND THERE WAS A
09:05:23	22	BAD ACCIDENT ON 280 THIS MORNING, IT WAS HOLDING A BUNCH OF
09:05:27	23	PEOPLE UP.
09:05:29	24	THE COURT: SO WHY SHOULD THIS MOTION BE GRANTED? I
09:05:32	25	GUESS THAT'S MY QUESTION.

09:05:34 1 2 09:05:36 09:05:37 09:05:40 4 09:05:44 5 09:05:48 6 09:05:49 7 09:05:52 8 09:05:56 9 09:06:01 10 09:06:04 11 09:06:08 12 09:06:14 13 09:06:18 14 09:06:18 15 09:06:19 16 09:06:22 17 09:06:25 18 09:06:30 19 09:06:34 20 09:06:37 21 09:06:40 22 09:06:44 23 09:06:48 24

09:06:50 25

MR. BROWN: AND THAT GOES TO THE HEART OF WHY WE ARE HERE TODAY.

SO YOUR HONOR WILL RECALL IN THE PREVIOUS ORDER DISMISSING
THE SECOND AMENDED COMPLAINT, AND THAT ORDER DEALT WITH A WHOLE
ARRAY OF CLAIMS, ONLY TWO OF WHICH ARE THE ONES THAT WE ARE
DEALING WITH STILL HERE.

FOR THE BREACH OF CONTRACT CLAIM AND THE BREACH OF IMPLIED COVENANT CLAIM, YOUR HONOR DISMISSED THOSE WITH LEAVE TO AMEND.

AND IN DOING SO, SAID A COUPLE DIFFERENT THINGS THAT ARE IMPORTANT HERE. IN A SENSE, DIRECTIONS TO THE PLAINTIFFS ON THINGS THEY SHOULD KEEP IN MIND AS THEY AMEND.

AND THAT IS, THE FIRST THING WAS, POINT TO WHAT TERMS IN THE STATEMENTS OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES YOU CONTEND WERE BREACHED.

THE STATEMENTS OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES IS THE CONTRACT BETWEEN FACEBOOK AND ITS USERS.

SECONDLY, IF YOU ARE CONTENDING THAT THERE'S SOME DOCUMENT OUTSIDE OF THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES THAT IS SOMEHOW INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE, THEN EXPLAIN HOW, WITH SPECIFICITY, THAT DOCUMENT IS INCORPORATED.

AND FOR EXAMPLE, ONE WAY IN WHICH YOU MIGHT SHOW THAT IS

TO SHOW WHAT TRAIL OF LINKS YOU WOULD NEED TO FOLLOW TO GET

FROM THE SRR, TO THE PARTICULAR, LET'S SAY, HELP CENTER PAGE

THAT YOU MIGHT BE RELYING ON.

SO THAT WAS SORT OF THE DIRECTIVE GIVEN IN THE LAST ORDER.

09:06:55	1
09:06:58	2
09:07:04	3
09:07:07	4
09:07:09	5
09:07:13	6
09:07:14	7
09:07:18	8
09:07:21	9
09:07:29	10
09:07:33	11
09:07:37	12
09:07:39	13
09:07:42	14
09:07:46	15
09:07:49	16
09:07:55	17
09:07:58	18
09:08:01	19
09:08:02	20
09:08:07	21
09:08:10	22
09:08:14	23
09:08:15	24
09:08:21	25

AND THAT'S, OF COURSE, CONSISTENT WITH A WHOLE LONG LINE OF
CASE LAW BEARING ON THE DOCTRINE OF INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE
WHICH HOLDS THAT THE REFERENCE MUST BE CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL,
THE REFERENCE MUST BE CALLED TO THE ATTENTION OF THE OTHER
PARTY, AND THE TERMS OF ANY INCORPORATED DOCUMENT MUST BE KNOWN
TO THE PARTIES.

AND WHY IS THAT? IT GOES RIGHT TO THE HEART OF CONTRACT

LAW. WE ARE TRYING TO EFFECTUATE THE INTENT OF THE PARTIES.

AND WE NEED TO MAKE SURE THAT WHAT -- ONE OF THE PARTIES IN THE

CASE IS INTENDING A CONTRACT IS, IS ACTUALLY THE CONTRACT THAT

WAS AGREED TO AND WAS KNOWN AND CONSENTED TO BY BOTH PARTIES.

SO YOU WILL RECALL THAT WE CAME BEFORE YOUR HONOR LAST AT THE END OF JULY, PLAINTIFFS HAD REQUESTED A CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE WHICH YOUR HONOR GRANTED, AND YOU WILL RECALL WE HAD A LONG CONVERSATION ABOUT HELP CENTER PAGES.

AND PLAINTIFFS SAID THAT THEY HAD IDENTIFIED ALL THE STATEMENTS IN THE HELP CENTER, AT LEAST WHAT THEY BELIEVED WAS THE HELP CENTER, IN THE CLASS PERIOD THAT THEY WERE GOING TO RELY ON.

AND THEY ASKED THE COURT TO ORDER FACEBOOK TO PRODUCE
HISTORICAL VERSIONS OF THOSE HELP CENTER PAGES. NOW THEY HAD
APPARENTLY IDENTIFIED THESE USING THE WAY BACK MACHINE OR
SOMETHING LIKE THAT.

SO WE LEFT THE COURTHOUSE THAT DAY, AND A WEEK PASSED, TWO WEEKS PASSED, NO WORD FROM THE PLAINTIFFS.

09	:	0	8	:	2	6	1
09	:	0	8	:	2	9	2
09	:	0	8	:	3	2	3
09	:	0	8	:	3	6	4
09	:	0	8	:	4	0	5
09	:	0	8	:	4	3	6
09	:	0	8	:	4	8	7
09	:	0	8	:	5	6	8
09	:	0	8	:	5	8	9
09	:	0	9	:	0	1	10
09	:	0	9	:	0	7	11
09	:	0	9	:	1	0	12
09	:	0	9	:	1	1	13
09	:	0	9	:	1	5	14
09	:	0	9	:	2	1	15
09	:	0	9	:	2	5	16
09	:	0	9	:	3	0	17
09	:	0	9	:	3	8	18
09	:	0	9	:	4	1	19
09	:	0	9	:	4	3	20
09	:	0	9	:	4	7	21
09	:	0	9	:	5	0	22
09	:	0	9	:	5	4	23
09	:	0	9	:	5	7	24
09	:	1	0	:	0	3	25

SOME 17 DAYS LATER, WE GOT THE REQUEST, WHICH WAS A LITTLE SURPRISING TO ME, GIVEN THAT WE HAD HEARD THAT THEY HAD ALREADY IDENTIFIED THE LANGUAGE THAT WAS SUPPOSEDLY PART OF THE CONTRACT THAT THEY ARE SUING OVER HERE.

SO WE GOT THE LETTER AND THEY SAID, HERE ARE THE FOUR PAGES THAT WE ARE GOING TO RELY ON. SO WE DID OUR DILIGENCE AND SEARCHED FOR HISTORICAL VERSIONS OF THOSE PAGES.

AND WE REPORTED BACK TO THEM. IN ONE INSTANCE, THE LANGUAGE WAS NOT EVER FOUND IN THE HELP CENTER. AND THEN WITH RESPECT TO THE OTHER THREE, WE CAME TO LEARN THAT ALL OF THOSE PAGES HAD ALREADY BEEN PRODUCED TO THE PLAINTIFFS EARLIER IN DISCOVERY IN THE CASE.

SO WE POINTED THAT OUT AND GAVE THEM THE BATES NUMBERS TO MAKE IT REALLY EASY. AND WE NOTED IN GETTING BACK TO THEM,

THAT THE MAJORITY OF THOSE PAGES WERE ACTUALLY DATED AFTER THE

CLASS PERIOD, AND THEREFORE, WERE NOT RELEVANT.

I THEN GOT AN E-MAIL BACK, WHICH I THINK IS TELLING AND IMPORTANT CONTEXT FOR THE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT THAT WAS LATER FILED.

AND IT SAYS, AS YOU NOTE, SEVERAL OF THE PRODUCED PAGES
POSTDATE THE CLASS PERIOD PROPOSED IN THE SECOND AMENDED
COMPLAINT. AND PERHAPS INARTFULLY, THAT WAS THE POINT OF OUR
INQUIRY. WE NEED TO CONFIRM WHETHER OLDER HISTORICAL VERSIONS
OF HELP CENTER PAGES MIGHT EXIST, OTHER THAN THE ONES ALREADY
PRODUCED.

09:	:10:	04	1
09:	:10:	06	2
09:	:10:	09	3
09:	:10:	13	4
09:	:10:	18	5
09:	:10:	22	6
09:	:10:	25	7
09:	:10:	28	8
09:	:10:	32	9
09:	:10:	35	10
09:	:10:	39	11
09:	:10:	43	12
09:	:10:	48	13
09:	:10:	52	14
09:	:10:	58	15
09:	:11:	01	16
09:	:11:	05	17
09:	:11:	06	18
09:	:11:	10	19
09:	:11:	17	20
09:	:11:	20	21
09:	:11:	24	22
09:	11:	25	23
09:	:11:	30	24
09:	:11:	34	25

IN OTHER WORDS, WE ARE LOOKING FOR PAGES WITHIN THE CLASS PERIOD. IN PARTICULAR, IF THEY EXIST, WE NEED PRODUCTION OF ANY HELP CENTER PAGES THAT CONTAIN THE LANGUAGE FROM THE FIRST SENTENCE OF THE FIRST PARAGRAPH IN EXHIBIT A TO MY LETTER.

"CAN YOU CONFIRM WHETHER OR NOT THAT LANGUAGE OR LANGUAGE
MATERIALLY SIMILAR APPEARED IN THE HELP CENTER PRIOR TO
SEPTEMBER 27, 2011."

BECAUSE YOU WILL REMEMBER THAT THE CLASS PERIOD ENDED ON SEPTEMBER 26, 2011.

AND WE DID OUR DILIGENCE, AND I RESPONDED THAT WE HAD DONE

A REASONABLE SEARCH AND WE DID NOT FIND ANY HISTORICAL PAGES

THAT PREDATED WHAT WE HAD ALREADY PRODUCED.

SO WHAT WE HAVE HERE IS PLAINTIFFS LOOKING FOR LANGUAGE WITHIN THE CLASS PERIOD AND MAKING SPECIFIC FOLLOW-UP REQUESTS WITH RESPECT TO, APPARENTLY, THE ONE THAT THEY WERE REALLY INTERESTED IN, AND WE TOLD THEM THAT THERE WAS NOTHING MORE THERE.

SO I THOUGHT THAT WAS THE END OF IT, BUT THEN THREE DAYS BEFORE THE COMPLAINT WAS DUE, I GOT ANOTHER REQUEST SAYING,

JUST TODAY, WE LEARNED OF YET ANOTHER STATEMENT WHICH WE ARE

APPARENTLY GOING TO CONTEND IS PART OF THIS CONTRACT THAT WE

ARE SUING OVER.

AND I SAID THAT THIS IS COMING QUITE LATE, WITH ONLY THREE DAYS LEFT, BUT WE KICKED IT INTO HIGH GEAR AND DID OUR DILIGENCE AND GOT BACK TO THEM WITH THAT.

09:11:38 1 2 09:11:42 09:11:45 09:11:46 4 09:11:52 09:11:55 6 09:11:59 7 09:12:02 8 09:12:05 9 09:12:12 10 09:12:17 11 09:12:20 12 09:12:24 13 09:12:28 14 09:12:31 15 09:12:38 16 09:12:40 17 09:12:42 18 09:12:45 19 09:12:50 20 09:12:57 21 09:12:59 22 09:13:02 23 09:13:06 24 09:13:11 25

SO I LAY ALL THAT FOUNDATION JUST AS, A SOMEWHAT TABLE SETTING, BUT I THINK IMPORTANT CONTEXT FOR THEN WHAT YOU SEE IN THE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT.

WE HAVE THE PLAINTIFFS SEARCHING FOR A STATEMENT WITHIN

THE CLASS PERIOD THAT THEY CAN HANG THEIR HAT ON, AND EVEN

COMING BACK THREE DAYS BEFORE THE COMPLAINT IS DUE, YET LOOKING

STILL MORE FOR SUCH A STATEMENT.

THEN COMES THE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT. AND IF YOU LOOK
AT COUNT 1, THE BREACH OF CONTRACT COUNT, THERE ARE NO SPECIFIC
REFERENCES TO THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, NO
CITATION OF A PARTICULAR PARAGRAPH OR SECTION NUMBER OF THE
STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, NO QUOTATION FROM
LANGUAGE OF THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.
THERE ARE NO SPECIFIC HELP CENTER TERMS, SPECIFICALLY
IDENTIFIED IN COUNT 1, OR EVEN CITED. THIS IS ALL VERY
GENERAL, THERE'S KIND OF A CHARACTERIZATION OF WHAT THE SUPPOSE
ED PROMISE WAS.

EARLIER IN THE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT, THERE ARE A NUMBER OF HELP CENTER PAGES THAT ARE CITED OR QUOTED FROM, AS SORT OF A JUMBLE OF THEM. BUT INTERESTINGLY, THERE WERE NO DATES ASSOCIATED WITH ANY OF THEM, AT LEAST WITHIN THE BODY OF THE COMPLAINT.

SO THAT ALONE, I WOULD CONTEND IS CERTAINLY NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE COURT'S EARLIER ORDER, OBVIOUSLY THIS COMPLAINT HAS TO BE ASSESSED ON ITS OWN. BUT ONE WOULD HAVE THOUGHT GIVEN THE

09:13:15	1
09:13:17	2
09:13:20	3
09:13:24	4
09:13:29	5
09:13:32	6
09:13:35	7
09:13:39	8
09:13:43	9
09:13:45	10
09:13:48	11
09:13:57	12
09:14:02	13
09:14:03	14
09:14:09	15
09:14:19	16
09:14:21	17
09:14:25	18
09:14:27	19
09:14:29	20
09:14:34	21
09:14:41	22
09:14:46	23
09:14:50	24

09:14:51 25

INSTRUCTION GIVEN IN THE EARLIER ORDER, THAT YOU WOULD HAVE
SEEN SPECIFIC DATES ASSOCIATED WITH EACH OF THOSE SUPPOSED
PROMISES THAT SUPPOSEDLY MADE UP THE CONTRACT. BUT WE DIDN'T
HAVE THE THAT.

AS BECAME CLEAR THROUGHOUT BRIEFING, AS YOUR HONOR HAS SEEN, THE FACT THAT THE DATES ARE ALL OVER THE PLACE.

I THINK THE FIRST HELP CENTER PAGE THAT'S CITED IN THE COMPLAINT, AND I CAN BE CORRECTED IF I'M WRONG ABOUT THIS, BUT I BELIEVE IT'S DATED IN MAY OF 2011.

NOW YOU WILL RECALL THAT THE BEGINNING DATE OF THE CLASS PERIOD WAS APRIL 22ND, I BELIEVE, OF 2010.

YES. SO THE CLASS PERIOD HAD BEEN APRIL 22ND, 2010, TO SEPTEMBER 26, 2011.

THE VERY FIRST HELP CENTER PAGE THAT I'M AWARE OF IN THE NEW COMPLAINT IS DATED MAY 24TH, 2011. AND WE DON'T KNOW THAT FROM THE FOUR CORNERS OF THE COMPLAINT, WE KNOW THAT LOOKING AT A TINY LITTLE DATE THAT'S ON THE DOCUMENT THAT'S ATTACHED AS AN EXHIBIT TO THE COMPLAINT.

SO JUST AS SORT OF A SIDE NOTE, I MEAN, LITERALLY THE FIRST HELP CENTER PAGE IS DATED OVER A YEAR AFTER THE CLASS PERIOD SUPPOSEDLY STARTED. WHICH HELP CENTER PAGE SUPPOSEDLY WAS AGREED TO BY THE PUTATIVE CLASS MEMBERS BEFORE MAY 22ND, 2011, BETWEEN APRIL 22ND, 2010 AND MAY 24TH, 2011, WE ARE NOT SURE.

BUT IN ANY EVENT, MY MAIN POINT WAS THAT THE DATES WERE

09:	14:53	1
09:	14:59	2
09:	15:06	3
09:	15 : 07	4
09:	15:16	5
09:	15:20	6
09:	15:25	7
09:	15:29	8
09:	15:34	9
09:	15:38	10
09:	15:41	11
09:	15 : 47	12
09:	15:56	13
09:	15 : 57	14
09:	16:01	15
09:	16:03	16
09:	16:07	17
09:	16:09	18
09:	16:13	19
09:	16:17	20
09:	16:23	21
09:	16:31	22
09:	16:34	23
09:	16:39	24
09:	16:43	25

ALL OVER THE PLACE. AND SEVERAL OF THE HELP CENTER PAGES ARE,

IN FACT, DATED AFTER THE CLASS PERIOD, AND WITH QUITE DIFFERENT

LANGUAGE.

AND SO AFTER PLAINTIFFS SEARCHED MIGHTILY FOR LANGUAGE WITHIN THE CLASS PERIOD, AND AFTER YOUR HONOR HAD EXPLAINED THAT THEY NEEDED TO IDENTIFY WITH SPECIFICITY AND WITH DATES, THE CONTRACT TERMS THAT THEY WERE RELYING ON, WE END UP WITH A THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT THAT HAS SORT OF A JUMBLE OF HELP CENTER PROVISIONS CITED OR QUOTED. NO DATES ASSOCIATED WITH THEM. AND IN FACT, DATES THAT ARE ALL OVER THE PLACE, INCLUDING DATES THAT POSTDATE THE CLASS PERIOD.

AND SO PLAINTIFFS DECIDED TO JUST ELIMINATE THE LAST DAY OF THE CLASS PERIOD.

SO WE NOW NO LONGER HAVE A COMPLAINT THAT HAS

SEPTEMBER 26, 2011 AS THE END OF THE CLASS PERIOD. PLAINTIFFS

ARE NOW SAYING WELL, GOSH, NOW THERE ACTUALLY IS NO END DATE,

AND THAT'S TO BE DETERMINED LATER.

SO IN ORDER TO RELY ON THE SUPPOSED CONTRACTURAL PROVISIONS, WHICH ARE REALLY HELP CENTER PAGES, THEY HAVE NOW JUST DONE AWAY WITH THE LAST DATE OF THE CLASS PERIOD.

SO THAT NOW LEADS US TO INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE. AND THE SITUATION WE HAVE HERE IS A STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES THAT DOES NOT MAKE REFERENCE TO THE HELP CENTER WHATSOEVER. I THINK PLAINTIFFS WOULD JUST SIMPLY HAVE TO CONCEDE THAT AS A FACT.

09	:16:	:46	1
09	:16:	: 49	2
09	:16:	:51	3
09	:16:	:56	4
09	:17:	:01	5
09	:17:	:02	6
09	:17:	:05	7
09	:17:	:07	8
09	:17:	:12	9
09	:17:	:16	10
09	:17:	:21	11
09	:17:	:25	12
09	:17:	:27	13
09	:17:	:28	14
09	:17:	:30	15
09	:17:	:31	16
09	:17:	:33	17
09	:17:	:34	18
09	:17:	:35	19
09	:17:	:38	20
09	:17:	: 42	21
09	:17:	: 44	22
09	:17:	: 45	23
09	:17:	:51	24
09	:17:	:56	25

SO THERE'S CERTAINLY NO INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE INTO THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, WHICH IS IN FACT THE CONTRACT BETWEEN FACEBOOK AND ITS USERS. SO WHAT WE HAVE IS REALLY SORT OF A DAISY CHAIN OF INCORPORATION THEORY, AS I WOULD CALL IT.

AND THEY ARGUE THAT WELL, FIRST, THE PRIVACY POLICY IS
INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND
RESPONSIBILITIES, AND THEN THESE PARTICULAR HELP CENTER PAGES
ARE INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO THE PRIVACY POLICY. SO
THROUGH SORT OF A TRANSITIVE SORT OF PROPERTY HERE, OR A DAISY
CHAIN OF INCORPORATION TYPE THEORY, THESE HELP CENTER PAGES ARE
SOMEHOW INCORPORATED INTO THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND
RESPONSIBILITIES.

THE COURT: COULD THAT EVER WORK? IS THAT EVER POSSIBLE?

MR. BROWN: ONLY IN THE MOST EXTREME CIRCUMSTANCES.

I MEAN --

THE COURT: HOW WOULD THAT BE POSSIBLE?

MR. BROWN: WELL, YOU KNOW, THE STANDARD IS THAT IT'S GOT TO BE CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL AND IT'S GOT TO BE BROUGHT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE OTHER PARTY. AND THEY HAVE TO ASSENT TO THAT, RIGHT.

SO YOU COULD IMAGINE AN EXTREME SITUATION WHERE THE SRR -- WELL, LET'S SPEAK HYPOTHETICALLY. YOU COULD HAVE A CONTRACT, I SUPPOSE, THAT SAID DOCUMENT NUMBER 2 IS HEREBY INCORPORATED BY

09:18:01 1 2 09:18:06 3 09:18:08 09:18:12 4 09:18:19 09:18:22 6 09:18:28 7 09:18:31 8 09:18:35 09:18:39 10 09:18:42 11 09:18:44 12 09:18:49 13 09:18:53 14 09:18:57 15 09:19:00 16 09:19:03 17 09:19:04 18 09:19:06 19 09:19:10 20 09:19:15 21 09:19:16 22 09:19:20 23 09:19:23 24 09:19:29 25

REFERENCE INTO THIS CONTRACT, BOTH PARTIES SIGN THE CONTRACT OR ASSENT TO IT IN WHATEVER WAY.

YOU COULD THEN, IN A VERY CLEAR, CONSPICUOUS PLACE IN

DOCUMENT NUMBER 2 SAY, BY THE WAY, IN THIS DOCUMENT, TERMS OF

DOCUMENT NUMBER 3 ARE HEREBY INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE AND

INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE INTO THE CONTRACT.

I WOULD ARGUE THAT YOU MIGHT EVEN NEED THAT LEVEL OF

CLARITY, OTHERWISE IT'S NOT COMPLETELY CLEAR WHETHER THE INTENT

IS REALLY JUST TO INCORPORATE INTO THE STAND-ALONE DOCUMENT

NUMBER 2, OR WHETHER IT'S TRULY INTENDED TO RELATE BACK TO KIND

OF THE ASSENTED TO CONTRACT.

YOU COULD IMAGINE SOME SITUATION LIKE THAT, AND I'M NOT GOING TO SORT OF SAY IN THE ABSTRACT THAT WHATEVER SET OF FACTS MIGHT COME BEFORE THE COURT, THAT THAT WOULD IN FACT SATISFY IT, BUT I'M TRYING TO GIVE YOU A STRAIGHT ANSWER TO YOUR QUESTION. BUT IT'S NOT WHAT WE HAVE, IT'S NOT EVEN CLOSE TO WHAT WE HAVE HERE.

THE COURT: SO WHAT I HEAR YOU SAYING IS THAT THE REASON THE LAW REQUIRES CLARITY AND UNEQUIVOCAL LANGUAGE IS BECAUSE WE AVOID THIS TYPE OF POSSIBLE CONFUSION WITH TERMS.

MR. BROWN: SURE.

AND HERE IT'S THE PLAINTIFF THAT'S TRYING TO ENGAGE IN THE DAISY CHAIN THEORY OF INCORPORATION. BUT YOU COULD IMAGINE INSTANCES WHERE A DEFENDANT MIGHT FOR ITS OWN ADVANTAGE, AND THE PLAINTIFF MIGHT THINK IT'S QUITE UNFAIR.

09:19:32 1 2 09:19:34 09:19:36 3 09:19:39 4 09:19:45 09:19:52 6 09:19:57 7 09:20:02 8 09:20:06 9 09:20:09 10 09:20:12 11 09:20:15 12 09:20:18 13 09:20:23 14 09:20:26 15 09:20:28 16 09:20:33 17 09:20:38 18 09:20:41 19 09:20:45 20 09:20:49 21 09:20:50 22 09:20:52 23 09:20:54 24 09:20:55 25

THE COURT: WHAT HAPPENS IN THE -- I'M SORRY TO INTERRUPT YOU, MR. BROWN.

BUT I'M JUST CURIOUS IN THE CONTEXT OF, I DON'T KNOW HOW

TO DESCRIBE IT, IN THE CONTEXT OF ELECTRONIC -- THIS BUSINESS

WHERE THESE TERMS CHANGE FREQUENTLY, THE SRR SOMETIMES CHANGE,

THERE ARE UPGRADES TO SOFTWARE, UPGRADES TO WHATEVER THE

PROGRAM IS OR WHATEVER THE FUNCTION IS, AND I THINK THAT'S

PRETTY COMMON KNOWLEDGE THAT THAT HAPPENS, PEOPLE RECEIVE, OH,

HERE'S YOUR NEW TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

AND YOU KNOW, AS WE KNOW, PEOPLE TYPICALLY DO, THEY SCROLL TO THE BOTTOM WITHOUT READING ALL THAT GOOD WORK THAT PEOPLE LIKE YOU AND YOUR FIRMS PUT IN AND ALL OF THAT, AND THEN CLICK THE BUTTON.

DOES THAT CHANGE HOW WE LOOK AT THINGS THEN?

MR. BROWN: WELL, YOU KNOW, IN A SITUATION LIKE THAT,

I MEAN, WHAT YOU'RE BASICALLY HAVING IS YOU ARE HAVING A NEW -
YOU ARE HAVING A MECHANISM FOR A NEW ASSENT TO A NEW CONTRACT

OR AT LEAST AN AMENDMENT TO A CONTRACT, RIGHT.

SO ALL THE PRINCIPLES OF CONTRACT LAW WOULD APPLY. AND THERE EITHER NEEDS TO BE SOME SHOWING THAT THERE WAS ACTUALLY ASSENT BETWEEN THE TWO PARTIES.

THE COURT: THAT'S THE CLICK OF THE BUTTON.

MR. BROWN: EXACTLY. IT'S USUALLY THE CLICK OF A BUTTON.

BUT HERE WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT IS LITERALLY, IT'S A

09:20:57	1
09:21:02	2
09:21:07	3
09:21:13	4
09:21:14	5
09:21:21	6
09:21:22	7
09:21:26	8
09:21:28	9
09:21:33	10
09:21:37	11
09:21:39	12
09:21:42	13
09:21:43	14
09:21:46	15
09:21:46	16
09:21:51	17
09:21:58	18
09:22:01	19
09:22:04	20
09:22:09	21
09:22:15	22
09:22:20	23
09:22:22	24
09:22:26	25

HELP CENTER BY ITS NAME, IT IS A HELP CENTER ON A WEBSITE. AND
THESE HELP CENTER PAGES ARE CONSTANTLY CHANGING AND EVOLVING,
PROBABLY ON A MONTHLY OR MAYBE EVEN WEEKLY BASIS IN SOME
INSTANCES.

AND WHAT THEY ARE ASKING YOU TO DO IS ACTUALLY FIND THAT
THE ENTIRETY OF THE HELP CENTER IS SOMEHOW INCORPORATED BY
REFERENCE, FIRST IN THE PRIVACY POLICY, AND THEN SOMEHOW FROM
THERE, INTO THE STATEMENTS OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

SO IMAGINE THE QUAGMIRE WE WOULD GET INTO IN TERMS OF FIGURING OUT WHAT THE CONTRACT IS AT ANY GIVEN TIME.

THE COURT: AND YOU SUGGEST THEY DO THAT BECAUSE THEY SAY THERE'S REFERENCE TO THE HELP CENTER IN SOME OF THE LANGUAGE.

MR. BROWN: AND SO LET ME LAY THAT OUT EVEN MORE CLEARLY.

SO THERE ARE THREE VERSIONS OF THE PRIVACY POLICY THAT ARE REFERRED TO IN THE COMPLAINT. NONE OF THOSE VERSIONS OF THE PRIVACY POLICY REFER SPECIFICALLY TO THE HELP CENTER, AS WE UNDERSTAND IT, AS WE WOULD CONSIDER THE HELP CENTER.

THERE ARE SOME REFERENCES TO THINGS CALLED HELP PAGES,

LOWER CASE H, LOWER CASE P, THAT REFER USERS TO DIFFERENT TOOLS

THEY CAN USE TO CUSTOMIZE FACEBOOK OR PROVIDE ADVICE ON HOW TO

CHANGE PASSWORDS AND THINGS LIKE THAT.

BUT FIRST OF ALL, WE WOULDN'T -- WE WOULD SAY THAT THOSE

ARE NOT ACTUALLY REFERENCES TO THE HELP CENTER. BUT EVEN IF

0	9	:	2	2	:	2	9	1
0	9	:	2	2	:	3	3	2
0	9	:	2	2	:	3	7	3
0	9	:	2	2	:	4	3	4
0	9	:	2	2	:	4	6	5
0	9	:	2	2	:	4	9	6
0	9	:	2	2	:	5	2	7
0	9	:	2	2	:	5	5	8
0	9	:	2	2	:	5	6	9
0	9	:	2	3	:	0	0	10
0	9	:	2	3	:	0	4	11
0	9	:	2	3	:	0	9	12
0	9	:	2	3	:	1	3	13
0	9	:	2	3	:	1	8	14
0	9	:	2	3	:	2	2	15
0	9	:	2	3	:	2	6	16
0	9	:	2	3	:	2	9	17
0	9	:	2	3	:	3	3	18
0	9	:	2	3	:	3	6	19
0	9	:	2	3	:	4	1	20
0	9	:	2	3	:	4	6	21
0	9	:	2	3	:	5	0	22
0	9	:	2	3	:	5	3	23
0	9	:	2	3	:	5	8	24

09:24:01 25

YOU THOUGHT THEY WERE, NONE OF THOSE PAGES ARE AT ISSUE, RIGHT.

SO EVEN IF YOU FOUND THAT TO BE A CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL INCORPORATION OF THOSE PAGES INTO THE PRIVACY POLICY, THEY CERTAINLY DON'T INCORPORATE CLEARLY, THE ACTUAL PAGES OF THE HELP CENTER THAT THEY ARE TRYING TO RELY ON FOR THE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT, PUTTING ASIDE WHETHER YOU CAN THEN TAKE THE PRIVACY POLICY AND INCORPORATE THAT INTO THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

SO THERE ARE PROBLEMS WITH EVERY STEP OF THE DAISY CHAIN.

SO THOSE ARE THE THREE PRIVACY POLICIES. AND THEN THEY ALSO

POINT TO A DATA USE POLICY LATER IN THEIR CLASS PERIOD, I THINK

LITERALLY WITHIN THE LAST MONTH OF THE CLASS PERIOD.

AND THAT DOCUMENT HAS REFERENCE TO THREE HELP CENTER

PAGES, ONLY THREE, IT DOESN'T PURPORT, I DON'T EVEN THINK

PLAINTIFFS WOULD ARGUE THAT IT PURPORTS TO PULL IN THE ENTIRETY

OF THE HELP CENTER. IT'S THREE HELP CENTER PAGES, NONE OF

WHICH THEY ARE RELYING ON, NONE OF WHICH THEY ARE RELYING ON.

SO LITERALLY, THE THEORY HERE, IN ADDITION TO THIS KIND OF ATTENUATED DAISY CHAIN, WHICH I THINK JUST FAILS PERIOD, I DON'T THINK YOU CAN TAKE ALL THOSE STEPS, EVEN PUTTING THAT ASIDE FOR A MOMENT, THEY ARE TRYING TO PULL IN HELP CENTER PAGES THAT AREN'T REFERRED TO ANYWHERE.

AND THAT CLEARLY WASN'T THE INTENT OF THE PARTIES AND WOULD RESULT IN ALL SORTS OF SORT OF CONTRACTURAL INTERPRETATION PROBLEMS AND ALL SORTS -- INVITE MISCHIEF,

09:24:04	1	FRANKLY, IN LITIGATION.
09:24:07	2	THE COURT: SO FOR PLAINTIFF'S CASE TO THRIVE ON THE
09:24:10	3	BREACH OF CONTRACT THEORY, WHAT I HEAR YOU SAYING IS THEY NEED
09:24:19	4	THIS INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE.
09:24:20	5	MR. BROWN: THEY ABSOLUTELY DO. BECAUSE THE CONTRACT
09:24:22	6	ITSELF, WHICH IS THE STATEMENTS OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES,
09:24:24	7	HAS NO PROVISION THAT THEY ARE RELYING ON, PERIOD.
09:24:28	8	THE COURT: STANDING ALONE.
09:24:28	9	MR. BROWN: STANDING ALONE. THEY ABSOLUTELY HAVE TO
09:24:32	10	INCORPORATE THESE HELP CENTER PAGES. AND THAT'S THE THEORY
09:24:35	11	THAT THEY'VE THAT THEY ARE RELYING ON.
09:24:39	12	SO, YOU KNOW, I DON'T THINK IT WORKS, AND I THINK THAT IT,
09:24:42	13	FRANKLY, SHOULD JUST BE DISMISSED AT THIS POINT, AND DISMISSED
09:24:45	14	WITH PREJUDICE.
09:24:47	15	AND I DID WANT TO POINT OUT, THERE ARE OTHER ISSUES WE CAN
09:24:51	16	TALK ABOUT, BUT THIS IS SORT OF A THRESHOLD ISSUE.
09:24:53	17	THE COURT: WELL, THIS IS THE ONE, CANDIDLY, I'M MOST
09:24:56	18	INTERESTED IN. I THINK IT IS A THRESHOLD ISSUE AND THE
09:25:01	19	REMAINING COUNT FLOWS FROM THIS AS WELL.
09:25:04	20	MY SENSE OF IT IS, IF THE CONTRACT EXISTS, THEN THE SECOND
09:25:08	21	COUNT EXISTS AS WELL. BUT IF THERE'S NO CONTRACT, THEN
09:25:12	22	MR. BROWN: THAT'S RIGHT.
09:25:12	23	AND, I MEAN, I THINK THERE ARE PROBLEMS WITH THE DAMAGES
09:25:15	24	ELEMENT, I THINK THERE'S THIS WHOLE ISSUE ABOUT THESE
09:25:18	25	PURPORTEDLY, THROUGH ALLEGATIONS FROM SEPTEMBER 27, 2011 AND ON

09:25:24	1
09:25:27	2
09:25:32	3
09:25:38	4
09:25:41	5
09:25:44	6
09:25:47	7
09:25:50	8
09:25:51	9
09:25:54	10
09:25:58	11
09:25:59	12
09:26:02	13
09:26:06	14
09:26:08	15
09:26:10	16
09:26:14	17
09:26:17	18
09:26:21	19
09:26:26	20
09:26:29	21
09:26:31	22
09:26:35	23
09:26:38	24
09.26.42	25

AND NEW KIND OF CLASS MEMBERS WHICH, UNDER THE LAW, ARE TREATED

AS NEW PLAINTIFFS. NEITHER OF THOSE RELATE BACK TO THE EARLIER

COMPLAINT IN THE CASE. AND SO THERE'S AN ENTIRE PROBLEM THERE.

SO THERE'S SORT OF A STACK OF PROBLEMS HERE, AND I DON'T
THINK YOU'VE GOT THE TERMS THAT THEY CONTEND WERE PART OF THE
CONTRACT AND CONTEND WERE BREACHED, WEREN'T ACTUALLY PART OF
THE CONTRACT, BECAUSE THE INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE DOCTRINE
IS NOT SATISFIED.

BUT THEN THERE ARE PROBLEMS WITH THE DAMAGES ELEMENT AND THERE ARE ALSO PROBLEMS WITH THE NEW ALLEGATIONS NOT RELATING BACK.

THE COURT: IS THERE A PROBLEM WITH INCORPORATING BY REFERENCE, A DOCUMENT THAT DID NOT EXIST AT THE TIME OF THE ORIGINAL CONTRACT?

MR. BROWN: WELL, THAT COULD BE A PROBLEM.

WE HAVE A SITUATION HERE WHERE THIS STATEMENT OF RIGHTS

AND RESPONSIBILITIES, I THINK THE LAST ONE IN TIME, REFERENCED

IN THE COMPLAINT, ACTUALLY PREDATED SOME OF THE HELP CENTER

PAGES THAT THEY ARE TRYING TO RELY ON.

AND SO THAT COULD POTENTIALLY BE A PROBLEM AS WELL. I
MEAN, I DON'T KNOW THAT YOU NECESSARILY EVEN NEED TO GET TO
THAT ISSUE, BECAUSE OF THE MORE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEMS, BUT
CERTAINLY THE TIMING COULD BE AN ISSUE.

IT GETS BACK TO THIS, IN SOME WAYS, A LARGER ISSUE, WHEN YOU ARE TRYING TO INCORPORATE IN SOMETHING LIKE A HELP CENTER

0	9	:	2	6	:	4	6	1
0	9	:	2	6	:	4	9	2
0	9	:	2	6	:	5	4	3
0	9	:	2	6	:	5	8	4
0	9	:	2	7	:	0	2	5
0	9	:	2	7	:	0	5	6
0	9	:	2	7	:	1	3	7
0	9	:	2	7	:	1	7	8
0	9	:	2	7	:	2	0	9
0	9	:	2	7	:	2	9	10
0	9	:	2	7	:	3	4	11
0	9	:	2	7	:	3	7	12
0	9	:	2	7	:	3	9	13
0	9	:	2	7	:	4	3	14
0	9	:	2	7	:	4	5	15
0	9	:	2	7	:	4	8	16
0	9	:	2	7	:	5	1	17
0	9	:	2	7	:	5	5	18
0	9	:	2	7	:	5	6	19
0	9	:	2	7	:	5	9	20
0	9	:	2	8	:	0	6	21
0	9	:	2	8	:	0	9	22
0	9	:	2	8	:	1	2	23
0	9	:	2	8	:	1	8	24
Λ	a		2	Q		2	2	25

WHERE YOU'VE GOT KIND OF DYNAMIC AND CONSTANTLY SHIFTING AND EVOLVING PAGES, IT BECOMES A REAL LEGAL PROBLEM TRYING TO FIGURE OUT HOW THOSE SHIFTING PAGES BECOME PART OF A CONTRACT THAT MAY HAVE ALREADY BEEN ASSENTED TO EARLIER IN TIME.

UNLESS THERE'S SOME VERY SPECIFIC PROVISION, YOU CAN IMAGINE PEOPLE CONTRACTING IN A WAY WHERE THERE'S SOME SORT OF AGREEMENT AND UNDERSTANDING THAT AN INCORPORATED DOCUMENT MAY CHANGE IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES, AND THE PARTIES IN A VERY CLEAR, KNOWING WAY, ASSENT TO KIND OF THOSE CHANGED TERMS, CHANGES IN THE INCORPORATED DOCUMENTS IN THE FUTURE.

BUT I'M SPEAKING KIND OF HYPOTHETICALLY, I'M TRYING TO

COVER THE WATERFRONT HERE. SO I THINK IT'S POSSIBLE YOU COULD

HAVE THAT SITUATION BUT WE ARE NOWHERE CLOSE TO THAT HERE.

THERE'S NO REFERENCE TO THE HELP CENTER AT ALL IN THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, LET ALONE SOME UNDERSTANDING REFLECTED THAT ANY CHANGE THAT AN ENGINEER MIGHT PUSH OUT TO THE HELP CENTER MIGHT BECOME A CONTRACTURAL OBLIGATION BETWEEN THE PARTIES.

THE COURT: WELL, I'M GOING TO OBVIOUSLY ASK YOUR

COLLEAGUE OPPOSITE ABOUT THIS, BECAUSE I THOUGHT IN ADVANCING

THIS QUESTION, HE WILL RESPOND TO, I'M CERTAIN, I THOUGHT THAT

PLAINTIFFS ARGUE THAT THE DATA USE POLICY PROMISED THAT YOU

WOULD NOT, FACEBOOK WOULD NOT LOG -- TRACK LOGGED OUT USERS.

AND IT SEEMS THAT THAT VERSION WAS PUBLISHED

SEPTEMBER 2011 SOME TIME, SEPTEMBER 7TH I THINK IT WAS, WHICH

0	9	:	2	8	:	2	7	1
0	9	:	2	8	:	2	8	2
0	9	:	2	8	:	3	1	3
0	9	:	2	8	:	3	4	4
0	9	:	2	8	:	3	6	5
0	9	:	2	8	:	3	8	6
0	9	:	2	8	:	4	2	7
0	9	:	2	8	:	4	4	8
0	9	:	2	8	:	4	7	9
0	9	:	2	8	:	5	2	10
0	9	:	2	8	:	5	8	11
0	9	:	2	8	:	5	9	12
0	9	:	2	9	:	0	5	13
0	9	:	2	9	:	0	9	14
0	9	:	2	9	:	1	2	15
0	9	:	2	9	:	1	7	16
0	9	:	2	9	:	1	9	17
0	9	:	2	9	:	2	1	18
0	9	:	2	9	:	2	4	19
0	9	:	2	9	:	2	9	20
0	9	:	2	9	:	3	3	21
0	9	:	2	9	:	3	8	22
0	9	:	2	9	:	4	1	23
0	9	:	2	9	:	4	2	24
0 :	9	:	2	9	:	4	5	25

WOULD HAVE BEEN AFTER.

AND I THINK THAT'S WHERE THERE'S INCORPORATION PROBLEM THAT I'M SURE I WILL GET SOME HELP FROM YOUR FRIENDS ON THE OTHER SIDE.

MR. BROWN: YEAH. AND THANKS FOR REMINDING ME OF THAT. THAT WAS ONE ISSUE I SORT OF NEGLECTED TO TOUCH ON.

SO THERE IS A TIMING ISSUE THERE BETWEEN THE DATE OF THE SRR AND THE DATE OF THE DATA USE POLICY.

THERE'S A DISTINCT PROBLEM IN INCORPORATING THAT POLICY BY REFERENCE BECAUSE THE SRR DOESN'T MENTION THE DATA USE POLICY ANYWHERE.

AND SO THE STANDARD IS THERE'S GOT TO BE A CLEAR,

UNEQUIVOCAL PULLING IN BY REFERENCE OF AN EXTERNAL DOCUMENT,

AND IT NEEDS TO BE BROUGHT TO THE OTHER PARTY'S ATTENTION SO

THEY CAN ASSENT TO IT, AND THE DATA USE POLICY IS SIMPLY NOT

MENTIONED ANYWHERE IN THAT, IN EVEN THE LATEST-IN-TIME

STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

WE ALSO HAVE AN ARGUMENT, IT'S IN THE PAPERS, FOR WHY EVEN
IF YOU WERE TO FIND THAT POLICY TO BE INCORPORATED BY
REFERENCE, WHY THAT CONTRACTURAL PROVISION ON ITS FACE CAN'T
CONSTITUTE A BREACH. IN OTHER WORDS, THE ALLEGED CONDUCT DOES
NOT CONSTITUTE A BREACH OF THAT LANGUAGE WHATSOEVER, BUT I
DON'T THINK YOU EVEN NEED TO GET THERE.

THE COURT: SO FOR THE REASONS YOU'VE ARTICULATED IN
YOUR PAPERS AND ADVANCED THIS MORNING, YOU ARE REQUESTING THIS

09:29:49	1
09:29:51	2
09:29:52	3
09:29:57	4
09:30:04	5
09:30:07	6
09:30:08	7
09:30:11	8
09:30:19	9
09:30:23	10
09:30:26	11
09:30:28	12
09:30:31	13
09:30:36	14
09:30:39	15
09:30:43	16
09:30:45	17
09:30:48	18
09:30:50	19
09:30:54	20
09:31:00	21
09:31:01	22
09:31:03	23
09:31:05	24
09:31:08	25

COURT DISMISS THIS ACTION WITH PREJUDICE.

MR. BROWN: THAT'S RIGHT.

THE COURT: SO MY SENSE IS THAT THERE'S SOME
RECOGNITION THAT YOUR CLIENT MAY HAVE MADE SOME STATEMENTS,
MISREPRESENTATIONS ABOUT ITS POLICY AT SOME POINT IN TIME ABOUT
THIS TRACKING BUSINESS.

I'M NOT ASKING YOU TO CONCEDE THAT YOUR CLIENTS DID THAT,
BUT IT SEEMS THAT THERE WAS A CONVERSATION OUT THERE AT A TIME
WHEN FACEBOOK SAID THEY DIDN'T AND THEN CHANGED THEIR POLICY
SUBSEQUENT.

PERHAPS TO THE HARM OF CONSUMERS, THAT'S ANOTHER ISSUE,
WHAT'S THE DAMAGES, I UNDERSTAND THAT. BUT SHOULDN'T THERE BE
SOME KIND OF REMEDY FOR A COMPANY DOING THAT? MAYBE MR. WONG
WANTS TO SPEAK TO THAT IN DEFENSE OF HIS CLIENT. I SEE HE'S
ARRIVED.

MR. BROWN: WELL, I THINK WHAT YOU ARE REFERRING TO,
AND I'M GOING TO SPEAK SOMEWHAT GENERICALLY BECAUSE THE
DOCUMENTS, I THINK YOU ARE REFERRING TO, ARE SUBJECT TO A
PROTECTIVE ORDER, AND AS I MENTIONED EARLIER, WE HADN'T
RECEIVED ANY NOTICE THAT THESE WOULD BE COMING UP DURING THE
HEARING TODAY.

THE COURT: DON'T ANSWER MY QUESTION IF YOU NEED TO SPEAK ABOUT THOSE, BUT THIS IS VERY GENERAL.

AND AS I SAID, I'M CERTAINLY NOT REFERRING TO ANYTHING

THAT I THINK IS PROTECTED, I THINK THIS IS PUBLIC CONVERSATION

09:31:12 1 2 09:31:13

3 09:31:14

09:31:19

09:31:24

09:31:30

09:31:32

09:31:34 8 09:31:37 9

09:31:42 10

09:31:47 11

09:31:53 12

09:31:56 13 09:32:00 14

09:32:05 15

09:32:08 16

09:32:12 17

09:32:17 18

09:32:20 19

09:32:22 20

09:32:26 21

09:32:30 22

09:32:35 23

09:32:38 24

09:32:43 25

ABOUT THIS SITUATION.

MR. BROWN: SURE.

THERE WERE CERTAIN STEPS TAKEN TO SORT OF THE SHIFT THE COMPANY'S PRACTICES. AND THAT HAPPENS ALL THE TIME IN THE WORLD. BUT THE QUESTION IS WHETHER THERE WAS ANY WRONGFUL CONDUCT ASSOCIATED WITH THE PRACTICES BEFORE.

AND WE'VE NOW BEEN THROUGH IT, I SHOULD HAVE COUNTED BEFORE I CAME HERE TODAY, BUT WE HAVE GONE THROUGH, I WOULD THINK A DOZEN OR MORE CAUSES OF ACTION IN THIS CASE SO FAR.

AND SO IT'S SORT OF NOT FOR LACK OF TRYING, BUT, YOU KNOW, WE SHOULDN'T JUST BE SORT OF IN SOME GESTALT OR LOOSE FASHION, SAYING WELL, GOSH, IT SEEMS LIKE MAYBE THERE WAS SOMETHING A LITTLE OFF HERE, LET'S LOOK FOR A WAY TO MAKE IT INTO A FEDERAL MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION. THAT SHOULDN'T BE THE POINT.

AND IT'S REALLY UP TO THE PLAINTIFFS TO COME FORWARD AND ALLEGE FACTS AND TIE THEM TO LEGAL THEORIES. THEY HAVE TRIED TO DO THAT, THEY SPENT A LOT OF TIME TRYING TO CONVINCE THE COURT THAT THIS WAS A WIRE TAP ACT VIOLATION.

I REMEMBER LOTS AND LOTS OF BRIEFING AND ARGUMENT OVER THAT. AND, YOU KNOW, NOT SURPRISINGLY SO, BECAUSE THE AVAILABILITY OF STATUTORY DAMAGES, AND YOU KNOW, THAT WAS FOUND NOT TO BE A SATISFACTORY CLAIM TO BRING, AND WE ARE WHERE WE ARE NOW, WHICH IS BREACH OF CONTRACT CLAIM AND A BREACH OF IMPLIED COVENANT CLAIM. AND THEY SIMPLY HAVEN'T ALLEGED IT.

THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

09:32:53	1
09:32:54	2
09:32:57	3
09:32:58	4
09:33:02	5
09:33:07	6
09:33:10	7
09:33:11	8
09:33:14	9
09:33:18	10
09:33:22	11
09:33:25	12
09:33:28	13
09:33:31	14
09:33:33	15
09:33:37	16
09:33:42	17
09:33:46	18
09:33:48	19
09:33:52	20
09:33:53	21
09:33:55	22
09:33:59	23
09:34:03	24
09:34:05	25

YOU RISE TO CONCEDE THE MOTION.

MR. GRYGIEL: YOUR HONOR, ANYTHING BUT. ANYTHING BUT.

IN FACT, AFTER LISTENING TO MR. BROWN'S ARGUMENT, TWO
MAJOR POINTS STRUCK ME. THE FIRST ONE IS HE TALKED AN AWFUL
LOT ABOUT JUMBLING AND TIMING AND THE DIFFICULTY OF SORTING
THINGS OUT.

WE ARE HERE ON A 12(B)(6) MOTION, RULE 8(A) IS THE TEST.

ARE THEY NOT ON NOTICE OF THAT WHICH WE CLAIM? I LOOK AT THEIR BRIEFING AND THEY ARE FULLY ON NOTICE OF THAT WHICH WE CLAIM.

THE ISSUES HE'S RAISING ARE FACTUAL ISSUES THAT REQUIRE DISCOVERY. IN FACT, THEY CITE NO FEWER THAN 19 SUMMARY JUDGEMENT OR TRIAL COURT CASES DEALING WITH THE VERY ISSUES IN THIS CASE. I ADMIT THAT, POINT NUMBER ONE.

NUMBER TWO, I COULDN'T HELP IT, AS I HEAR HIM SPEAK, ALL I CAN THINK OF IS, THEY TAKE THE POSITION THAT IS ARTICULATED SO WONDERFUL IN LOSE CARROLL'S THROUGH THE LOOKING GLASS, HUMPTY DUMPTY. "A WORD MEANS WHAT I SAY IT MEANS, NOTHING MORE AND NOTHING LESS. THE QUESTION IS WHO IS TO BE MASTER. THAT IS ALL."

WELL, THE MASTER ISN'T FACEBOOK. THE MASTER IS THE GOVERNING LAW, THIS COURT AND THE CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE, ALL OF WHICH SHOW THAT BOTH OF THESE CLAIMS SHOULD BE SUSTAINED.

LET'S START WITH SOMETHING I'VE HEARD NOTHING ABOUT FROM MR. BROWN, SOMETHING WE'VE TALKED ABOUT MANY TIMES IN THIS CASE

1 09:34:08 09:34:11 2 3 09:34:13 09:34:19 4 5 09:34:24 09:34:27 09:34:32 7 09:34:35 09:34:39 09:34:40 10 09:34:44 11 09:34:45 12 09:34:47 13 09:34:52 14 09:34:55 15 09:34:58 16 09:35:03 17 09:35:03 18 09:35:06 19 09:35:10 20 09:35:14 21 09:35:14 22 09:35:16 23 09:35:19 24 09:35:24 25

AND IT'S IN FRONT OF YOUR HONOR IN ALL OF THE EXHIBITS. IT'S A CRUCIALLY IMPORTANT POINT.

WHEN FACEBOOK'S TRACKING OF ITS LOGGED OUT USERS, WHICH HAD NEVER BEEN DISCLOSED IN ANY OF THE SRR'S IN THE PRIVACY POLICY OR IN THE DATA USE POLICY OR IN ANY OF THE HELP CENTER PAGES, WHEN IT WAS DISCLOSED, FACEBOOK DID NOT RESPOND WITH, WELL, WAIT A MINUTE, WHAT'S THE UPROAR, WE ARE ENTITLED TO DO THIS, WE HAVE GOTTEN CONTRACTURAL UNDERTAKING THAT PERMITS US TO DO THIS.

NO, WHAT WE HAD WAS, WE HAVE A PROBLEM AND WE ARE GOING TO FIX IT.

NOW WHY WOULD YOU SAY YOU HAD A PROBLEM AND YOU WERE GOING TO FIX IT UNLESS ONE, YOU HADN'T PREVIOUSLY DISCLOSED IT; AND TWO, YOU THOUGHT IT WAS MATERIAL TO FIX.

THERE IS AN ABUNDANCE OF QUOTES IN THE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT THAT SHOW TWO VERY IMPORTANT THINGS -- THREE VERY IMPORTANT THINGS.

ONE, THAT FACEBOOK WAS DOING THIS BECAUSE THEY WERE UNDER PRESSURE TO KEEP USERS LOGGED IN BECAUSE THAT'S WHERE THE MONEY COMES FROM.

MR. BROWN: EXCUSE ME, EXCUSE ME. THAT'S NOT

APPROPRIATE. THAT'S A DOCUMENT THAT'S UNDER SEAL, AND WE

ALREADY HAD THIS CONVERSATION ON THE RECORD BEFORE MR. GRYGIEL

GOT UP TO SPEAK.

09:35:25	1
09:35:26	2
09:35:29	3
09:35:31	4
09:35:32	5
09:35:35	6
09:35:39	7
09:35:43	8
09:35:49	9
09:35:52	10
09:35:55	11
09:35:58	12
09:36:02	13
09:36:06	14
09:36:10	15
09:36:14	16
09:36:17	17
09:36:20	18
09:36:21	19
09:36:22	20
09:36:24	21
09:36:27	22
09:36:28	23
09:36:30	24
09.36.35	25

AND I'M SORRY, THAT'S NOT APPROPRIATE.

THE COURT: SO IF YOU CAN MAKE YOUR ARGUMENTS WITHOUT REFERENCING, I THINK WE ARE IN AGREEMENT THAT WE DO THAT.

MR. GRYGIEL: FAIR ENOUGH.

AND THEN WE HAVE, TO GENERALIZE, A NUMBER OF ITERATIONS OF ENGINEERS GOING TO BACK AND FORTH WITH, THIS NEEDS TO BE FIXED IMMEDIATELY. THE PRIVACY PEOPLE ARE ON THIS. WE HAVE BEEN TOLD WE SAID WE DON'T DO THIS AND WE CAN'T DO THIS.

AND WE QUOTE, AND IT'S AT PARAGRAPH 91 IN THE THIRD

AMENDED COMPLAINT, "FACEBOOK DIDN'T SAY WE ARE ENTITLED TO DO

THIS, OUR CONTRACT PERMITS US TO DO THIS. FACEBOOK SAID, WE'VE

SAID WE DON'T DO IT," AND THIS IS A PUBLIC STATEMENT, "AND WE

COULDN'T DO IT WITHOUT SOME FORM OF DISCLOSURE AND CONSENT."

YOUR HONOR, THE CONTRACT CASE AND THE IMPLIED COVENANT

CASE COULD STOP RIGHT THERE BECAUSE WE HAVE INTERNAL ADMISSIONS

DEMONSTRATING THAT A CONTRACT EXISTED OR THEY WOULDN'T HAVE

SAID THE THINGS THEY SAID, THAT THEY UNDERSTOOD THE CONTRACT

WAS MATERIAL.

THE COURT: LET ME STOP YOU THERE.

HOW DOES THAT CREATE CONTRACT?

MR. GRYGIEL: BECAUSE THAT SHOWS -- EXACTLY THE RIGHT OUESTION, YOUR HONOR.

BECAUSE THAT SHOWS THAT OUR THEORY OF THE CONTRACT, THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, INCORPORATED IN THE PRIVACY POLICY, AND THEN THE HELP CENTER PAGES, IS CORRECT.

1 09:36:38 09:36:39 2 3 09:36:43 09:36:46 4 09:36:49 09:36:51 09:36:51 7 09:36:54 09:36:58 9 09:37:01 10 09:37:05 11 09:37:08 12 09:37:10 13 09:37:11 14 09:37:13 15 09:37:13 16 09:37:17 17 09:37:19 18 09:37:23 19 09:37:27 20 09:37:31 21 09:37:38 22 09:37:41 23 09:37:46 24 09:37:49 25

THE COURT: EXCUSE ME.

I GUESS THE PIECE I'M MISSING, AND I'M SORRY, IT'S 9:30
IN THE MORNING HERE, BUT THE PIECE I'M MISSING IS THE
STATEMENTS OF OTHER ENGINEERS, WOULD THOSE BE INCORPORATED BY
REFERENCE TO THIS --

MR. GRYGIEL: NO, YOUR HONOR.

THOSE STATEMENTS AREN'T INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE, THOSE

STATEMENTS ARE THE INTERPRETATIVE GLOSS THAT CONSTITUTED

ADMISSIONS -- I CAN'T HELP IT, I'M AN OLD TRIAL LAWYER -- THAT

CONSTITUTE ADMISSIONS BY THE OTHER PARTY THAT THEIR OWN PEOPLE

UNDERSTOOD THAT THEY HAD SAID THEY WOULDN'T DO THIS.

THE COURT: SO FIT THAT INTO THE CONTRACT ANALYSIS.

MR. GRYGIEL: SURE.

LET'S START WITH THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

WE CITED AT PARAGRAPH 24 AND 57, MR. BROWN SAYS WE DON'T SEE ANYTHING ABOUT WHAT THE STATEMENTS OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES SAY. IT SAYS, AMONG OTHER THINGS, "YOUR PRIVACY," THIS IS A QUOTE, "YOUR PRIVACY IS VERY IMPORTANT TO US. WE HAVE DESIGNED OUR PRIVACY POLICY SO THAT YOU CAN UNDERSTAND HOW WE COLLECT AND HOW WE USE YOUR DATA."

WE ENCOURAGE YOU TO READ THE PRIVACY POLICY, BECAUSE IT WILL ALLOW YOU TO MAKE INFORMED DECISIONS CONCERNING THESE ISSUES OF PRIVACY THAT ARE SO CENTRAL TO THE SRR.

IT'S IN PARAGRAPH 1 OF EVERY ONE OF THE STATEMENTS OF

09:37:52	1
09:37:56	2
09:37:59	3
09:38:03	4
09:38:07	5
09:38:09	6
09:38:13	7
09:38:16	8
09:38:30	9
09:38:32	10
09:38:34	11
09:38:38	12
09:38:40	13
09:38:43	14
09:38:45	15
09:38:47	16
09:38:50	17
09:38:54	18
09:38:58	19
09:39:01	20
09:39:03	21
09:39:05	22
09:39:10	23
09:39:14	24
09:39:21	25

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. SO TO TIE BACK WHAT I WAS SAYING ABOUT THE INTERNAL ADMISSIONS, IT SHOWS THAT THEIR UNDERSTANDING, AND IF IT DOESN'T, IT'S A FACT QUESTION, TIES BACK TO THAT PARAGRAPH IN THE SRR SAYING WE CAN'T DO THIS. WE HAVE SAID WE WON'T DO IT.

LET ME MAKE THE CHAIN FOR YOUR HONOR. SO WE'VE GOT THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES BEGINS WITH THAT CENTRAL PARAGRAPH.

THE COURT: THE GENERAL PRIVACY POLICY.

MR. GRYGIEL: THE PRIVACY POLICY. WHICH FACEBOOK SAYS, ITSELF, IN ITS RESPONSE TO CONGRESS, THE PRIVACY POLICY THEN BECOMES, ITSELF, A LAYERED DOCUMENT.

ESSENTIALLY, WHAT FACEBOOK SAYS IS WHEN YOU LOOK AT

STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, HERE IS THE STATEMENT

OF RIGHTS SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES, WE HYPERLINK TO IN TELLING

YOU TO READ THE PRIVACY POLICY.

THINK OF THE WOLSCHLAGER CASE WHERE THE COURT SAID GHEE,

IT'S PRETTY IMPORTANT WHEN ONE DOCUMENT SAYS YOU SHOULD READ

ANOTHER, IT'S VERY STRONG INDICIA THAT THIS IS A DOCUMENT

THAT'S INCORPORATED. NO MAGICAL BUZZ WORDS ARE REQUIRED.

SECOND POINT THERE, YOUR HONOR, THIS IS FACEBOOK'S

CONTRACT. FACEBOOK DESIGNED THE COMPONENTS OF, CONSTRUCTED

THIS CONTRACT, AND DECIDED WHAT WENT IN IT. THIS ISN'T A CASE

LIKE THE MANY THEY CITED, LIKE CHAN COMES TO MIND, WHERE A POOR

PERSON SIGNS AN AGREEMENT AND DOESN'T HAVE ANY WAY OF

09:39:23	1
09:39:26	2
09:39:30	3
09:39:32	4
09:39:35	5
09:39:38	6
09:39:41	7
09:39:45	8
09:39:45	9
09:39:48	10
09:39:51	11
09:39:52	12
09:39:55	13
09:39:57	14
09:40:01	15
09:40:04	16
09:40:07	17
09:40:11	18
09:40:15	19
09:40:17	20
09:40:21	21
09:40:25	22
09:40:28	23
09:40:31	24
09:40:32	25

UNDERSTANDING SHE HAS SIGNED UP FOR ARBITRATION AND FORFEITS
HER JURY TRIAL RIGHTS UNDER THE 7TH AMENDMENT BECAUSE SHE'S A
BROKER NOW SUBJECT TO A BROKER ARBITRATION AGREEMENT.

THIS ISN'T LIKE <u>ST. PAUL MERCURY</u> WHERE THE DOCUMENT ALLEGED TO BE INCORPORATED IS FULL OF BLANKS.

OUR CASE IS VERY DIFFERENT. THE DOCUMENTS WERE A,

READILY ACCESSIBLE TO FACEBOOK. THEY ARE THEIR DOCUMENTS, THEY

DESIGNED THE CONTRACTS, THAT CLAUSE IS DINE. THEY WERE KNOWN

TO THE OTHER PARTY AND CALLED IT TO THEIR ATTENTION, THEY ARE

THE VERY ONES WHO CALLED THESE DOCUMENTS TO THE PLAINTIFF'S

ATTENTION.

HOW DO THEY DO THAT? LOOK AT EXHIBIT T, YOUR HONOR.

EXHIBIT T SAYS A COUPLE OF THINGS THAT ARE IMPORTANT ENOUGH

THAT I WOULD LIKE TO MAKE SURE THAT I GET THEM EXACTLY RIGHT.

EXHIBIT T, PUBLIC LETTER TO THE CONGRESS PEOPLE WHO WOULD CHALLENGE WHAT FACEBOOK WAS DOING. IT SAYS, "OUR DATA USE POLICY ALSO PROVIDES A LINK TO OUR HELP CENTER WHERE WE ANSWER FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT A VARIETY OF TOPICS, INCLUDING QUESTIONS AROUND SOCIAL PLUG-INS."

PRECISELY WHAT WE ARE DEALING WITH HERE, THE FACEBOOK
"LIKE" BUTTON FOR THE MOST PART. SOCIAL PLUG-INS. THIS ISN'T
AMORPHOUS, THIS ISN'T VAPOROUS, THIS IS THE DATA USE POLICY
SAYING, OUR HELP CENTER POLICY IS INCORPORATED HERE, THAT'S
EXACTLY WHAT IT SAYS.

THE COURT: IS THAT WHAT IT SAYS?

0	9	:	4	0	:	3	3	1
0	9	:	4	0	:	3	5	2
0	9	:	4	0	:	3	8	3
0	9	:	4	0	:	4	3	4
0	9	:	4	0	:	4	6	5
0	9	:	4	0	:	4	7	6
0	9	:	4	0	:	5	2	7
0	9	:	4	0	:	5	5	8
0	9	:	4	0	:	5	8	9
0	9	:	4	1	:	0	1	10
0	9	:	4	1	:	0	4	11
0	9	:	4	1	:	0	8	12
0	9	:	4	1	:	1	1	13
0	9	:	4	1	:	1	3	14
0	9	:	4	1	:	1	5	15
0	9	:	4	1	:	1	7	16
0	9	:	4	1	:	1	9	17
0	9	:	4	1	:	2	1	18
0	9	:	4	1	:	2	5	19
0	9	:	4	1	:	2	9	20
0	9	:	4	1	:	3	4	21
0	9	:	4	1	:	3	6	22
0	9	:	4	1	:	4	0	23
0	9	:	4	1	:	4	7	24
0	9	:	4	1	:	5	0	25

MR. GRYGIEL: WELL, REALLY, YOUR HONOR, YES,
ABSOLUTELY. BECAUSE IT'S ATTENTION IN THE LANGUAGE IN THE
CASES. THE CASES SAY, AND MR. BROWN SAYS YES, THE LANGUAGE OF
THE CASES SAY THE STANDARD NUMBER ONE IS YOU HAVE TO HAVE A
CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL REFERENCE.

BUT THEN IT SAYS NO BUZZ WORDS ARE REQUIRED, AND IT IS

SUFFICIENT, SEE WOLSCHLAGER, SEE SHAW, SEE VIRTUALLY EVERY CASE

THAT RECITES THE DOCTRINE. AS LONG AS IT GUIDES THE USER.

"GUIDES," THAT'S THE OPERATIVE TERM FOR CONTRACTURAL

INTERPRETATION HERE. AS LONG AS IT GUIDES THE USER TO THE NEXT

DOCUMENT, THAT'S SUFFICE FOR CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL.

THE COURT: SO WHAT ARE THE SPECIFIC PAGES AND STATEMENTS IN THE HELP PAGES THAT FORM THIS CONTRACT?

MR. GRYGIEL: IF I COULD, YOUR HONOR, I'M GOING TO ANSWER THAT QUESTION. BUT JUST TO GIVE IT --

THE COURT: YOU JUST DON'T WANT TO ANSWER IT NOW.

MR. GRYGIEL: NO, I WAS GOING TO PUT CONTEXT IN IT.

BECAUSE UNDERNEATH WHAT I WAS SAYING, AND YOU CAN ASK ME
AGAIN BECAUSE I HAVE AN ANSWER FOR IT, BUT I JUST WANTED TO
POINT OUT THAT NOT ONLY DOES EXHIBIT T TALK ABOUT THE DATA USE
POLICY INCORPORATING A LINK TO THE HELP CENTER, IT SAYS
SOMETHING FURTHER, "WE PROVIDE LINKS TO OUR HELP CENTER PAGES
IN THE DROP DOWN MENU OF EVERY PAGE OF OUR SITE TO SEARCH FOR
ANSWERS TO PRIVACY-RELATED QUESTIONS."

COULD FACEBOOK REALLY BE SURPRISED THAT THIS IS

09:41:52	1
09:41:55	2
09:41:58	3
09:42:02	4
09:42:05	5
09:42:05	6
09:42:07	7
09:42:11	8
09:42:14	9
09:42:17	10
09:42:19	11
09:42:22	12
09:42:25	13
09:42:27	14
09:42:35	15
09:42:39	16
09:42:43	17
09:42:47	18
09:42:48	19
09:42:52	20
09:42:55	21
09:42:57	22
09:43:00	23
09:43:04	24
09:43:09	25

CONSIDERED, THE PRIVACY-RELATED PAGES ARE PART OF THE CONTRACT?

WHEN GOING RIGHT BACK TO THE FUNDAMENTAL FOUNDATIONAL DOCUMENT,

THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, IT STARTS WITH

PARAGRAPH 1 IN BOLD FACE, "YOUR PRIVACY IS VERY IMPORTANT TO

US."

IN FACT, I THINK IT'S PARAGRAPH 18 OF ALL THE STATEMENTS
OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. AT THE BOTTOM IT SAYS, "OTHER
DOCUMENTS YOU SHOULD READ, THE PRIVACY POLICY," AFTER THEY HAVE
ALREADY TOLD YOU IN THE BODY OF IT TO READ IT.

NOW TO COME BACK TO YOUR QUESTION, YOUR HONOR, WHICH HELP CENTER PAGES ARE INCORPORATED.

WE CITE THEM -- IN FACT, WE CITE THEM IN SERIAL FASHION IN OUR EXHIBITS. BUT WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO IS POINT, FOR EXAMPLE TO, IT IS EXHIBIT J. "WHAT INFORMATION DOES FACEBOOK RECEIVE ABOUT ME WHEN I VISIT A WEBSITE WITH A SOCIAL PLUG-IN?"

AND HERE IS WHERE THE ESSENTIAL FAILURE TO DISCLOSE WHERE THE BREACH OF CONTRACT COMES IN. TECHNICAL INFORMATION.

CERTAIN LIMITED INFORMATION.

THE REST OF THE EXHIBITS, TO SUMMARIZE, IT WOULD TAKE A LONG TIME TO GO THROUGH ALL OF THEM, THE REST OF THE EXHIBITS SAY THIS, YOUR HONOR, FACEBOOK IS SAYING TO ITS USERS, WHEN YOU GO TO THESE HELP CENTER PAGES, WHEN YOU ARE LOGGED OUT OF FACEBOOK, WE RECEIVE CERTAIN INFORMATION, BUT THAT INFORMATION IS TECHNICAL AND IT IS LIMITED. IF YOU ARE LOGGED INTO FACEBOOK, WE GET ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.

09:	43:14	1
09:	43:17	2
09:	43:21	3
09:	43:24	4
09:	43:26	5
09:	43:29	6
09:	43:33	7
09:	43:35	8
09:	43:40	9
09:	43:43	10
09:	43:45	11
09:	43:48	12
09:	43:51	13
09:	43:54	14
09:	43:58	15
09:	44:00	16
09:	44:05	17
09:	44:09	18
09:	44:12	19
09:	44:16	20
09:	44:22	21
09:	44:23	22
09:	44:24	23
09:	44:28	24
09:	44:33	25

IN OTHER WORDS, THE SORT OF INFORMATION THAT CAN LINK A USER AND A USER'S ACTIVITIES ON A SITE TO A USER ID.

THAT'S A VERY IMPORTANT DISTINCTION. NO REASONABLE USER IN THE REASONABLENESS OF -- A REASONABLE USER'S UNDERSTANDING IS WHAT'S AT ISSUE HERE. NO REASONABLE USER COULD READ THAT POLICY AND UNDERSTAND FACEBOOK TO HAVE DISCLOSED THAT WHICH IT SHOULD HAVE DISCLOSED.

THAT LOOK, WHEN YOU GO TO THIRD-PARTY SITES AND YOU ARE LOGGED OUT, WE ARE STILL GETTING THE SAME INFORMATION THAT WE WOULD GET WHEN YOU ARE LOGGED IT IN.

AND AS A MATTER OF COMMON SENSE, YOUR HONOR, I ASK WOULD ANY REASONABLE USER LOOKING AT THEIR FACEBOOK CONTRACT, UNDERSTAND THAT WHEN THEY LOG OUT OF FACEBOOK, THAT FACEBOOK IS STILL TRACKING THEM ACROSS THIRD-PARTY SITES, JUST THE WAY IT WAS DOING WHEN THEY WERE LOGGED IN?

I DON'T THINK, YOUR HONOR, BY ANY STRETCH OF EVEN PEOPLE,

TO QUOTE THE <u>LA QUINTA</u> CASE, WHO ARE INFLICTED WITH LAW

DEGREES, COULD CONJURE UP AND HAVE IT BE REALISTIC.

SO TO SUMMARIZE THERE, WHAT WE HAVE IS A PRIVACY POLICY
THAT ESSENTIALLY, CLEARLY, GOES RIGHT TO THE PRIVACY POLICY.
THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES GOES RIGHT TO THE
PRIVACY POLICY.

THE PRIVACY POLICY, ACCORDING TO EXHIBIT T, ITSELF APPEARS
ON ALMOST EVERY PAGE OF FACEBOOK'S WEBSITE. THIS IS SIMPLY NOT
A CASE WHERE A COUNTER PARTY IN THE CONTRACT CAN SAY THE

09:44:	37	1
09:44:	41	2
09:44:	44	3
09:44:	47	4
09:44:	50	5
09:44:	53	6
09:44:	55	7
09:44:	58	8
09:45:	05	9
09:45:	09	10
09:45:	12	11
09:45:	15	12
09:45:	19	13
09:45:	25	14
09:45:	27	15
09:45:	32	16
09:45:	33	17
09:45:	36	18
09:45:	39	19
09:45:	43	20
09:45:	47	21
09:45:	54	22
09:45:	56	23
09:45:	56	24
09:45:	58	25

INFORMATION, THE CONTRACTURAL PROVISIONS WERE NOT CLEARLY ACCESSIBLE TO ME, THEY WEREN'T DRAWN TO MY ATTENTION, THEY CREATED THEM, AND THAT THE USER WASN'T GUIDED TO THEM.

IN FACT, THE EXHIBITS WE ATTACHED SHOW THAT NOT ONLY WAS THE USER GUIDED TO THEM, FACEBOOK SAID YOU SHOULD READ THESE THINGS. THIS IS IMPORTANT.

THE COURT: SO IN DOCUMENT 148, WHICH WAS THE ORDER,
THE COURT'S ORDER, ON PAGE 13 AT LINE 16, THERE WAS -- I
INDICATED THE CLAIMANTS DIDN'T IDENTIFY THE TRAIL OF LINKS
LEADING TO THE SRR AND THE STATEMENTS THAT IT IDENTIFIED.

AND I THINK MR. BROWN WAS REFERENCING, PERHAPS THIS,

EARLIER, BUT THERE WERE SPECIFIC CONTRACTURAL PROVISIONS, I

THINK, THAT I KNOW THAT WAS A DEFICIENCY. AND I GUESS RELATED

TO MY EARLIER QUESTION, WHAT PART OF THE THIRD AMENDED

COMPLAINT ANSWERS THE QUESTION THAT I LEFT?

MR. GRYGIEL: PARAGRAPH 44, YOUR HONOR.

I BELIEVE IT'S PARAGRAPH 44 OF THE THIRD AMENDED

COMPLAINT, SAYS THAT THE HELP CENTER PAGES, THE PRIVACY POLICY

REFERS TO THE HELP CENTER PAGES. I DON'T KNOW THAT THIS WAS IN

THE BRIEFING, BUT WHEN ONE LOOKS AT THAT, IT'S TO THE FIRST

PAGE OF THE HELP CENTER PAGES, AND THAT TENDS TO DEMONSTRATE

THAT THE HELP CENTER FOR PARTICULAR REQUESTS IS INCORPORATED BY

REFERENCE.

THE COURT: IS THIS WHERE THE INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE ANALYSIS BEGINS THEN?

1 09:46:00 09:46:01 09:46:03 3 09:46:04 4 09:46:05 09:46:09 6 09:46:14 7 09:46:16 8 09:46:20 9 09:46:23 10 09:46:25 11 09:46:29 12 09:46:33 13 09:46:36 14 09:46:39 15 09:46:42 16 09:46:46 17 09:46:50 18 09:46:53 19 09:46:54 20 09:46:58 21 09:47:01 22 09:47:02 23 09:47:05 24

09:47:08 25

MR. GRYGIEL: IT REALLY DOES, YOUR HONOR.

THE COURT: TO GO BEYOND, WE NEED TO INCORPORATE BY REFERENCE, THAT DOCUMENT.

MR. GRYGIEL: RIGHT.

IT'S -- I THINK IT'S VERY IMPORTANT TO STEP BACK THOUGH,

AND KEEP IN MIND A POINT I MADE BEFORE, BUT I DO THINK IT BEARS

EMPHASIS, THIS IS FACEBOOK'S CONTRACT.

AND WHAT WE HAVE HERE IS LAWYER CONJURING SAYING, WELL, WE COULDN'T POSSIBLY KNOW THAT OUR HELP CENTER PAGES, WHICH CHANGED ALL THE TIME, THAT HAD DIFFERENT DATES ON THEM -- AND BY THE WAY, ALL OF OUR EXHIBITS HAVE DATES AT THE VERY TOP, AS I THINK YOU GATHERED WHEN MR. BROWN READ FROM THEM, IT'S VERY ODD TO THINK THAT WHEN THE DOCTRINE OF INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE IS ESSENTIALLY INTERPRETED TO PREVENT UNFAIR SURPRISE TO SOMEBODY, THAT FACEBOOK COULD SAY WE ARE UNFAIRLY SURPRISED BY BEING HELD TO THE SPECIFIC STATEMENTS WE MADE ABOUT HOW WE USE COOKIES, HOW WE COLLECT INFORMATION, HOW WE USE INFORMATION AND WHAT THE DIFFERENCES ARE BETWEEN LOGGED IN AND LOGGED OUT USERS.

THIS JUST DOES NOT FIT THAT PARADIGM. THAT, YOUR HONOR, WITH RESPECT, IS A LAWYER'S ARGUMENT. THAT IS NOT AN ARGUMENT THAT ANY REASONABLE USER WOULD NOT.

AND THEY CITED THIS CASE, KASHMIRI V. UNIVERSITY OF

CALIFORNIA REGENTS, AND I WAS GLAD THEY DID, THEY CITED IT FOR

A LIMITED POINT, BUT NATURALLY I READ THE WHOLE THING.

09:	47:	12	1
09:	47:	14	2
09:	47:	17	3
09:	47:	20	4
09:	47:	25	5
09:	47:	28	6
09:	47:	30	7
09:	47:	37	8
09:	47:	41	9
09:	47:	46	10
09:	47:	48	11
09:	47:	53	12
09:	47:	56	13
09:	47:	58	14
09:	48:	01	15
09:	48:	04	16
09:	48:	05	17
09:	48:	08	18
09:	48:	12	19
09:	48:	15	20
09:	48:	18	21
09:	48:	20	22
09:	48:	24	23
09:	48:	28	24
09:	48:	31	25

AND WHAT THE COURT BASICALLY SAID THERE WAS LOOK, YOU'VE GOT TO INTERPRET CONTRACTS IN A WAY THAT A REASONABLE PERSON WOULD DO THEM. AND SOMETIMES THE RULES REQUIRE SOME MOVEMENT IN ORDER TO RECOGNIZE THAT REASONABLENESS IS THE TOUCHSTONE.

NOW I'M SUMMARIZING, BUT THAT'S WHAT IT SAID. IT IS NOT REASONABLE TO SAY THAT THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, WHICH EXPRESSLY REFERS TO THE PRIVACY POLICY, WHICH EXPRESSLY INCLUDES THE HELP CENTER PAGES, WHERE THE HELP CENTER PAGES ARE ON EVERY PAGE OF THE WEBSITE, AND THE PRIVACY POLICY IS, BY FACEBOOK'S ADMISSION, IT JUST DOESN'T DO TO SAY WHEN YOU'VE GOT PRIVACY POLICY PAGES ON VIRTUALLY EVERY PAGE OF THE FACEBOOK'S WEBSITE, WHICH WOULD INCLUDE THE SRR, WHEN YOU'VE GOT HELP CENTER PAGES ON EVERY PAGE OF THE WEBSITE, WHICH CERTAINLY INCLUDES THE SRR, THAT FACEBOOK IS SOMEHOW UNFAIRLY SURPRISED TO BEING HELD TO ITS CONTRACTUAL UNDERTAKING.

THE COURT: IS IT REASONABLE TO ASSUME, I THINK THE
WORDS MR. BROWN USE WAS A DAISY CHAIN, BUT I WILL JUST SAY IT
SOUNDS LIKE THERE'S A MULTIPLE CHAIN OF INCORPORATION BY
REFERENCE THAT'S REQUIRED TO FIND CONTRACT UNDER YOUR ANALYSIS.

MR. GRYGIEL: WELL, TO FIND CONTRACT HERE,

YOUR HONOR, I WOULD SUBMIT THAT WE CAN SIMPLY SUE ON STATEMENT

OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES. THAT WHEN YOU SAY YOUR PRIVACY

IS VERY IMPORTANT TO US AND YOU DO AN AWFUL LOT OF THINGS THAT

ARE DESIGNED, AS THEY'VE ALREADY ADMITTED, TO CIRCUMVENT

9:48:32	1	PRECISELY THAT PROMISE, THAT THAT BY ITSELF SUFFICES FOR A
9:48:34	2	BREACH OF CONTRACT, PARTICULARLY UNDER RULE 8(A).
9:48:37	3	THE COURT: THAT'S NOT THE ALLEGATION THAT'S BEFORE
9:48:38	4	THE COURT NOW.
9:48:39	5	MR. GRYGIEL: RIGHT.
9:48:39	6	THE COURT: BUT, I GUESS, IS IT REASONABLE TO GO
9:48:42	7	THROUGH THAT SERIATUM INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE BY CONTRACT?
9:48:48	8	MR. GRYGIEL: I THINK IT IS, YOUR HONOR.
9:48:49	9	AND ONE OF THE REASONS I THINK IT IS, IS NOT JUST BECAUSE
9:48:51	10	IT HELPS MY CASE, BUT BECAUSE FACEBOOK, ITSELF, SAID THAT.
9:48:55	11	WHEN FACEBOOK WAS RESPONDING TO CONGRESS AND THEY WERE
9:48:57	12	REFERRING SPECIFICALLY HERE TO THEIR PRIVACY POLICY, FACEBOOK
9:49:01	13	DESCRIBED THE WAY IT WAS STRUCTURED IN PRECISELY THE WAY WE ARE
9:49:06	14	MAKING THE INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE ARGUMENT. THEY TOLD
9:49:09	15	CONGRESS WE USE A LAYERED APPROACH.
9:49:11	16	WHAT THEY SAID WAS WE ESSENTIALLY, I'M PARAPHRASING, WE
9:49:17	17	GIVE BULLET POINTS, BROAD CATEGORICAL POINTS, IN THE PRIVACY
9:49:21	18	POLICY. AND IF SOMEONE WANTS TO READ ON FURTHER AND UNDERSTAND
9:49:25	19	THE SPECIFICS OF HOW THAT OPERATES, IN OTHER WORDS TO
9:49:27	20	UNDERSTAND HOW THE PRIVACY POLICY ACTUALLY WORKS, AND WHAT IT
9:49:30	21	REALLY MEANS IN TERMS OF WHEN YOU GO TO THE THIRD-PARTY CITE,
9:49:33	22	THEN YOU GO TO THE HELP CENTER.
9:49:34	23	THE COURT: IS THAT THE SAME THING AS AN OWNERS
9:49:36	24	MANUAL IN YOUR TESLA THAT YOU MIGHT DRIVE? IS IT IN THE
9:49:41	25	OWNER'S MANUAL?

09:49:42	1	MR. GRYGIEL: YOU KNOW, YOUR HONOR, I AM GLAD YOU
09:49:44	2	BROUGHT THAT UP BECAUSE YESTERDAY IN OUR MOOT COURT, I USED
09:49:47	3	THAT EXAMPLE. AND IT WAS SLIGHTLY DIFFERENT, I SAID, LET'S
09:49:48	4	SAY
09:49:49	5	THE COURT: IT WASN'T A TESLA, IT WAS PROBABLY A FORD
09:49:51	6	OR SOMETHING.
09:49:51	7	MR. GRYGIEL: IN MY CASE, YOUR HONOR, IT WAS A BEAT
09:49:53	8	UP FORD F150.
09:49:55	9	AND MY ARGUMENT WOULD BE LIKE THIS, IF I GO TO AN
09:49:58	10	AUTOMOBILE DEALERSHIP AND I SIGN MY PURCHASE CONTRACT, AND
09:50:00	11	UNDERNEATH THAT THEY STICK A BUNCH OF DOCUMENTS THAT HAVE TO
09:50:04	12	DEAL WITH WARRANTIES AND REVISITS IN THE CASE OF RECALLS, AND
09:50:06	13	THAT SORT OF THING, AND IT REFERS TO THEM, YOU'VE GOT
09:50:09	14	INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE.
09:50:10	15	YOU DON'T HAVE IT IF THEY ALSO GAVE ME A COUPLE OF
09:50:14	16	BROCHURES TO BUY A NEW CAR IN TEN YEARS.
09:50:16	17	OUR CASE IS NOT LIKE THAT. WHAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HERE
09:50:17	18	IS
09:50:17	19	THE COURT: WELL, I'M TALKING ABOUT AN OWNER'S
09:50:19	20	MANUAL.
09:50:19	21	YOU ARE SAYING, GEE, IF YOU NEED MORE HELP WITH THIS HELP
09:50:22	22	CENTER, PERHAPS HOW DO I DO THIS, HOW DO I MOVE THIS, HOW DO I
09:50:26	23	CHANGE PROFILE, WHATEVER IT IS, ISN'T THE HELP CENTER AN
09:50:29	24	OWNER'S MANUAL?
09:50:30	25	MR. GRYGIEL: I SUPPOSE, YOUR HONOR, TO SOME EXTENT

09:50:32	1
09:50:36	2
09:50:39	3
09:50:42	4
09:50:45	5
09:50:48	6
09:50:49	7
09:50:52	8
09:50:57	9
09:51:02	10
09:51:06	11
09:51:10	12
09:51:13	13
09:51:17	14
09:51:18	15
09:51:21	16
09:51:24	17
09:51:27	18
09:51:32	19
09:51:35	20
09:51:38	21
09:51:41	22
09:51:42	23
09:51:43	24
00.51.46	25

IT IS, BUT IT CONTAINS PROMISES, IT CONTAINS COMMITMENTS.

WHAT YOU HAVE THERE WHEN YOU READ THE EXHIBITS, WHAT DOES FACEBOOK DO WITH THE INFORMATION IT GETS FROM ME? AND THEN FACEBOOK COMES BACK AND TELLS YOU, THAT IS A CONTRACTURAL REPRESENTATION IN RESPONSE TO A FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTION ABOUT WHAT WE DO WITH YOUR INFORMATION.

THE COURT: SO THAT'S -- I HEAR WHAT YOU ARE SAYING,

AND I'M TRYING TO FASHION A SITUATION WHERE IT ALMOST SOUNDS

LIKE WHATEVER FACEBOOK SAYS THEN, THEY WOULD CONTRACT, WHATEVER

THEY SAY IN WHATEVER PAGE, WHEREVER IT IS, A CONSUMER COULD

SAY, WELL, YOU SAID THIS AND THEREFORE WE ARE IN CONTRACT.

MR. GRYGIEL: AS IT DEALS WITH WHAT WE ARE HERE BEFORE THE COURT TODAY, ON SOCIAL PLUG-INS, I THINK THE ANSWER IS UNEQUIVOCALLY, YES.

YOU CAN'T POSSIBLY -- IT SEEMS TO ME YOU CAN'T CONSTRUCT A RATIONAL CONTRACTURAL UNIVERSE WHERE PEOPLE CAN PREDICT

BEHAVIOR AND UNDERSTAND THE ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF BEHAVIOR,
A PURELY CONTRACTURAL REGIME, WHERE ONE PARTY CAN SAY HERE IS

WHAT WE GET WHEN YOU ARE LOGGED OUT. VERY DIFFERENTLY, HERE IS

WHAT WE GET WHEN YOU ARE LOGGED IN. AND THEN HAVE THEM BE ABLE

TO SAY, WE DIDN'T MEAN ANY OF IT. THE CONTRACT MEANS WHAT I

SAY.

THE COURT: I UNDERSTAND THAT PART.

BUT THE FLIP SIDE OF THAT IS A CONSUMER SAYING GHEE, MY INTERPRETATION OF THE HELP PAGES, THE OWNER'S MANUAL IS THIS,

0	9	:	5	1	:	5	2	1
0	9	:	5	1	:	5	7	2
0	9	:	5	1	:	5	9	3
0	9	:	5	2	:	0	2	4
0	9	:	5	2	:	0	6	5
0	9	:	5	2	:	0	9	6
0	9	:	5	2	:	1	5	7
0	9	:	5	2	:	1	6	8
0	9	:	5	2	:	1	9	9
0	9	:	5	2	:	2	2	10
0	9	:	5	2	:	2	7	11
0	9	:	5	2	:	3	2	12
0	9	:	5	2	:	3	5	13
0	9	:	5	2	:	3	8	14
0	9	:	5	2	:	4	0	15
0	9	:	5	2	:	4	5	16
0	9	:	5	2	:	4	8	17
0	9	:	5	2	:	5	2	18
0	9	:	5	2	:	5	5	19
0	9	:	5	2	:	5	8	20
0	9	:	5	3	:	0	0	21
0	9	:	5	3	:	0	3	22
0	9	:	5	3	:	0	6	23
0	9	:	5	3	:	0	9	24
0	9	:	5	3	:	1	1	25

AND IF I GO BACK TO THE SRR, WHATEVER IT IS, THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITIES, I THINK I'M IN CONTRACT WITH THEM AND I CAN HOLD THEM TO CONTRACT.

DOES THAT OPEN UP A WHOLE DIFFERENT LAYER, THEN, OF INTERPRETATION THAT WE HAVE TO WORRY ABOUT?

MR. GRYGIEL: YOUR HONOR IS MAKING THE ARGUMENT OF REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM. MR. GRYGIEL, DOESN'T YOUR ARGUMENT GO TOO FAR? AND I THINK THE ANSWER IS NO, IT DOESN'T.

HERE WE HAVE A LEVIATHAN OF A COMPANY, SAYING THINGS

CAREFULLY TO ITS USERS ABOUT HOW IT USES ITS DATA. THERE IS

NOTHING TO ME THAT STRIKES ME AS, GHEE WHIZ, THAT'S A REAL

PROBLEM TO HOLD FACEBOOK TO THAT, IF THEY SAY IT AND IT IS IN

THE HELP CENTER, WHICH IS IN THE PRIVACY POLICY, WHICH IS IN

THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, THEN IT'S IN.

THE COURT: THAT GETS BACK TO THAT TRAIL.

BUT LET'S ANALYZE THAT. I THINK THAT'S WHAT I'M REALLY
INTERESTED IN IS THAT TRAIL. HOW DO YOU HACK THROUGH THAT
TRAIL, OR DO YOU HAVE TO HACK? IS IT PAVED, OR DO YOU HAVE TO
CUT YOUR WAY THROUGH BRUSH TO MAKE THAT CONNECTION?

MR. GRYGIEL: THAT'S A GOOD ANALOGY.

I THINK IT'S NOT ONLY PAVED, BUT LIGHTED AND GUIDED.

BECAUSE HERE WE HAVE FACEBOOK, ITSELF, SAYING NO QUESTION, SRR

GOES RIGHT TO THE PRIVACY POLICY; READ IT, IT'S IMPORTANT, IT

DEALS WITH HOW WE COLLECT THE DATA.

SO THAT PART OF THE "DAISY CHAIN" IS EASY. THERE'S NO

09:53:15	1	QUESTION ABOUT THAT. LOADS OF CASES CAN SAY YOU CAN
09:53:16	2	INCORPORATE ANOTHER DOCUMENT BY REFERENCE.
09:53:18	3	THE PROBLEM COMES WITH THE HELP CENTER PAGES. BUT THE
09:53:21	4	PRIVACY POLICY ITSELF SAYS, WE INCORPORATE, IN SO MANY WORDS,
09:53:24	5	WE ARE INCORPORATING
09:53:26	6	THE COURT: WAIT, WAIT. IN SO MANY WORDS? DOES IT
09:53:29	7	SAY "WE INCORPORATE."
09:53:29	8	MR. GRYGIEL: LET ME GET THE LANGUAGE FOR YOUR HONOR.
09:53:32	9	"OUR DATA USE POLICY ALSO PROVIDES A LINK." THAT SOUNDS
09:53:42	10	LIKE IT SATISFIES THE TEST FOR ME
09:53:44	11	MR. BROWN: WHICH EXHIBIT ARE WE LOOKING AT?
09:53:47	12	MR. GRYGIEL: THIS IS EXHIBIT T.
09:53:48	13	"OUR DATA USE POLICY ALSO PROVIDES A LINK TO OUR HELP
09:53:51	14	CENTER WHERE WE ANSWER FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT A
09:53:54	15	VARIETY OF TOPICS, INCLUDING QUESTIONS AROUND SOCIAL PLUG-INS."
09:53:57	16	THE COURT: IS THE WORD "INCORPORATE" IN ANY OF THAT?
09:54:00	17	MR. GRYGIEL: NO, YOUR HONOR. BUT IT IS ABSOLUTELY
09:54:02	18	BEYOND PER ADVENTURE THAT YOU DON'T NEED TO USE ANY BUZZ WORDS
09:54:07	19	OF INCORPORATION.
09:54:07	20	THE COURT: WELL, WE START WITH INCORPORATION AND
09:54:09	21	WORK OUR WAY DOWN. SO THERE'S NO INCORPORATION.
09:54:12	22	WHAT IS IT IN THAT LANGUAGE, THEN, THAT WOULD SUGGEST THAT
09:54:15	23	INCORPORATION IS APPROPRIATE?
09:54:16	24	MR. GRYGIEL: TWO THINGS.
09:54:17	25	ONE, THE EXACT WORDS FACEBOOK CHOSE TO USE. "LINK."

TWO, THE WORDS FACEBOOK NOWHERE, IN ANY OF THESE 09:54:23 1 DOCUMENTS, CHOSE TO USE. 09:54:26 2 THE COURT: LINK IS A PATH. 3 09:54:29 09:54:30 4 MR. GRYGIEL: YES, YES. AND DEALING WITH THE VERY ISSUE, PRIVACY POLICY, DATA USE 09:54:32 POLICY, AND THAT'S HOW YOU GO TO THE HELP CENTER BECAUSE THAT 09:54:36 09:54:39 7 TALKS ABOUT IT. THAT IS NOT AT ALL A DAISY CHAIN, THAT IS A DIRECT LINK. 09:54:44 8 AND YOUR HONOR, IT BEARS MENTION HERE, NOWHERE DID 09:54:45 FACEBOOK EVER, IN ANY OF THESE UNDERTAKINGS, TELL ITS USERS, BY 09:54:48 10 09:54:52 11 THE WAY, THIS STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, IT 09:54:55 12 DOESN'T INCLUDE THE PRIVACY POLICY OR DATA USE POLICY, AND IT DOES NOT INCLUDE THE HELP CENTER PAGES. 09:55:00 13 THE COURT: DO THEY NEED TO DO THAT? 09:55:03 14 09:55:04 15 MR. GRYGIEL: I DON'T THINK THEY NEED TO DO THAT, YOUR HONOR. THEY HAVE AN INTEGRATION CLAUSE IN THOSE 09:55:06 16 09:55:09 17 AGREEMENTS, SOMETHING I'VE LOOKED AT. BUT THEN IT BEGS THE 09:55:12 18 QUESTION WHAT ARE YOU INTEGRATING, SO THAT DOESN'T GET YOU VERY 09:55:15 19 FAR. 09:55:16 20 BUT FACEBOOK COULD HAVE SIMPLY CHOSEN AS A SIMPLE DECLARATIVE SENTENCE TO PROTECT ITSELF FROM ANY CLAIMS IT MADE 09:55:20 21 09:55:23 22 IN THE HELP CENTER BEING CONTRACTURAL, OR THE PRIVACY POLICY 09:55:24 23 BEING CONTRACTURAL, BY DISCLAIMING THOSE AS PART OF ANY 09:55:24 24 CONTRACT. 09:55:24 25 THE COURT: WELL, ISN'T THAT A STATEMENT THAT THEY

1 09:55:30 2 09:55:30 3 09:55:31 09:55:34 4 09:55:37 09:55:39 09:55:41 7 09:55:44 8 09:55:51 9 09:55:55 10 09:55:59 11 09:55:59 12 09:56:02 13 09:56:05 14 09:56:09 15 09:56:11 16 09:56:15 17 09:56:17 18 09:56:17 19 09:56:21 20 09:56:24 21 09:56:27 22 09:56:32 23 09:56:36 24

09:56:38 25

DIDN'T BELIEVE THEY WERE IN CONTRACT?

MR. GRYGIEL: WELL, YOUR HONOR, THAT MIGHT BE.

ON THE OTHER HAND, WHEN, AS I'VE MENTIONED BEFORE, WHEN YOU'VE GOT THE PEOPLE INSIDE THE COMPANY SAYING EXACTLY THE OPPOSITE, THAT WOULD BE AN AWFULLY EASY QUESTION FOR A JURY TO RESOLVE IN MY FAVOR.

AND THE THIRD WAY I THINK WE GET TO THIS LINK FROM THE DATA USE POLICY, IS THE VERY PRESENCE OF EVERY ONE OF THE -- ON EVERY FACEBOOK WEB PAGE, OF THE HELP CENTER PAGES, AND ON VIRTUALLY EVERY PAGE OF FACEBOOK'S WEBSITE OF THE PRIVACY POLICY.

THOSE ARE THEIR WORDS TO CONGRESS. THOSE AREN'T MY WORDS.

SO WHAT THEY ARE SAYING IN THE PRIVACY POLICY IS THAT WE

USE A LAYERED APPROACH, WE GIVE YOU SOME GENERAL INFORMATION IN

THE PRIVACY POLICY, AND WHEN YOU REALLY WANT TO KNOW WHAT WE

ARE DOING WITH YOUR DATA THAT WE ARE COLLECTING UP ACROSS THE

INTERNET, THEN YOU GO TO THE HELP CENTER AND THAT WILL TELL

YOU.

AND IT'S FAIR ENOUGH TO SAY THAT FACEBOOK IS ON NOTICE OF WHAT THE CLAIM IS, THE KINDS OF ALLEGATIONS AND PROOF THEY WOULD NEED TO DEFEND IT. AND I THINK WE MORE THAN SATISFIED THE QUESTION OF "BORROWED" FROM TWOMBLY, HAVE WE GENERATED A REASONABLE INFERENCE THAT DISCOVERY WOULD YIELD EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE ELEMENTS OF THE CLAIM.

AND A COUPLE OF OTHER POINTS THERE, YOUR HONOR, THAT I

09:56:	40	1
09:56:	44	2
09:56:	49	3
09:56:	52	4
09:56:	55	5
09:56:	56	6
09:56:	58	7
09:56:	59	8
09:57:	03	9
09:57:	08	10
09:57:	11	11
09:57:	14	12
09:57:	17	13
09:57:	20	14
09:57:	23	15
09:57:	27	16
09:57:	30	17
09:57:	32	18
09:57:	35	19
09:57:	39	20
09:57:	41	21
09:57:	46	22
09:57:	49	23
09:57:	52	24

09:57:54 25

THINK ARE IMPORTANT. TO THE EXTENT THERE'S ANY AMBIGUITY ABOUT THIS, AS NUMEROUS CASES SAY, IT'S BLACK LETTER LAW, WE CITED SANDQUIST, YOU CONSTRUE THAT AMBIGUITY AGAINST THE PARTY THAT CREATED IT. IN FACT, THE CALIFORNIA CIVIL CODE SAYS PRECISELY THE SAME THING.

THE COURT: WELL, WHAT'S YOUR POSITION ON THE DATA USE POLICY?

AND I ASK THE TIMING QUESTION, THE SEPTEMBER 7TH DATE AND THE APRIL 26TH DATE. DO YOU HAVE A THOUGHT ABOUT THAT?

MR. GRYGIEL: CERTAINLY WITHIN THE ORIGINAL PLEADED CLASS PERIOD, LARGELY CONSISTENT WITH THE REPRESENTATIONS, IN TERMS OF THEIR THEME, THE STRUCTURE IS A LITTLE DIFFERENT AND THE WORDS ARE DIFFERENT, BUT THE THEME IS THE SAME AS THE PREVIOUS PRIVACY POLICIES; ESSENTIALLY, A DISCLOSURE TO THE USERS, HERE IS WHAT WE COLLECT, HERE IS HOW WE USE IT, HERE IS WHAT WE DO WITH IT, HERE'S HOW WE PROTECT IT OR DO NOT PROTECT IT, WITH ALL KINDS OF DISCLOSURES.

MY VIEW IS IT IS ONE OF A PIECE. THIS ENTIRE PRIVACY
ISSUE IS ESSENTIALLY ONE OF A PIECE. YOU'VE GOT FACEBOOK
MAKING A NUMBER OF ITERATIONS, WHICH ISN'T A DEFENSE TO
CONTRACT, THAT'S SIMPLY SOMETHING FOR DISCOVERY, I'M SUPPOSED
TO UNDERSTAND WHAT EXACTLY PEOPLE ARE RELYING ON. YOU DON'T
NEED RELIANCE, IT'S CONTRACT. WHAT EXACTLY WAS THE CONTRACT AT
THE RELEVANT TIME FOR A PARTICULAR USER.

BUT THAT'S SOMETHING YOU DO IN DISCOVERY. AND AS

09:57:56 1 2 09:57:59 3 09:57:59 09:58:03 4 09:58:04 09:58:07 6 09:58:11 7 09:58:15 09:58:18 9 09:58:21 10 09:58:24 11 09:58:27 12 09:58:31 13 09:58:33 14 09:58:36 15 09:58:40 16 09:58:42 17 09:58:45 18 09:58:45 19 09:58:47 20 09:58:52 21 09:58:55 22 09:58:58 23 09:58:58 24 09:59:01 25

MR. BROWN WAS UNKIND ENOUGH TO POINT OUT, WE ARE DOWN TO TWO CLAIMS.

SO WE'VE GOT A CONTRACT CLAIM AND IMPLIED COVENANT CLAIM.

THAT WOULD NOT BE TERRIBLY DIFFICULT TO SORT OUT.

AND WE CITED SOME CASES, YOUR HONOR, I THINK WEBER

MANUFACTURING WAS ONE, GUIDOTTI WAS ONE OF THE OTHERS THAT SAY,

LOOK, TYPICALLY INCORPORATE BY REFERENCE IS A QUESTION OF LAW

FOR THE COURT, BUT THERE ARE CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE IT'S DIFFICULT

ENOUGH THAT THIS IS A QUESTION OF FACT.

I THINK WE ABSOLUTELY PASS MUSTER HERE. BUT IF WE DON'T,
IT'S CERTAINLY A QUESTION FOR FACT. IT WOULD BE SIMPLE ENOUGH
MATTER TO GO TO FACEBOOK, GET SOME FURTHER DISCOVERY, TAKE A
COUPLE OF DEPOSITIONS AND SAY, WHY DIDN'T YOU INCLUDE, FOR
EXAMPLE, A DISCLAIMER? DIDN'T YOU UNDERSTAND WHEN YOU SAID WE
CAN'T DO THIS AND WE DON'T DO THIS WITHOUT DISCLOSURE AND
CONSENT, DIDN'T YOU UNDERSTAND YOU WERE ALREADY PROMISED
ELSEWHERE YOU WERE NOT TO DO THIS? AND DIDN'T YOU UNDERSTAND
THAT PROMISE WAS MATERIAL?

I SEE THAT AS A VERY FINITE MATTER.

THE POINT FOR TODAY, YOUR HONOR, IS THAT THAT IS A FACTUAL QUESTION, NOT SOMETHING THAT CAN BE RESOLVED ON LAWYERS

CHARACTERIZING DOCUMENTS, PARTICULARLY WHEN YOU HAVE AS CLEAR A

CHAIN AS YOU DO HERE.

THE FACT THIS INCLUDES THREE DOCUMENTS IS, FRANKLY, A
MATTER OF SUPREME INDIFFERENCE. AS LONG AS THE ROAD, TO USE

09:59:04	1	YOUR HONOR'S ANALOGY, IS PAVED, AND WE THINK IT'S LIGHTED,
09:59:06	2	THAT'S GOOD ENOUGH, YOU GET THERE.
09:59:08	3	THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
09:59:10	4	MR. GRYGIEL: ANYTHING ELSE? BECAUSE I'VE GOT PLENTY
09:59:13	5	OF OTHER THINGS I WOULD LIKE TO SAY, YOUR HONOR.
09:59:14	6	THE COURT: OH, I'M SURE YOU DO, BUT I'VE READ THE
09:59:17	7	PLEADINGS. THIS WAS THE ISSUE I WAS CURIOUS ABOUT.
09:59:20	8	MR. GRYGIEL: EXCUSE ME, YOUR HONOR.
09:59:21	9	THE COURT: YES.
09:59:22	10	MR. STRAITE: IS IT OKAY YOU ASKED A QUESTION, AND
09:59:24	11	IT'S IMPORTANT TO SUPPLEMENT THE RESPONSE, IF I MAY, WITH ONE
09:59:27	12	SENTENCE HERE.
09:59:28	13	THE COURT: OF COURSE.
09:59:28	14	MR. STRAITE: YOU ASKED WHETHER IT'S PERMISSIBLE TO
09:59:31	15	INCORPORATE THE SEPTEMBER 7TH, 2011 DATA USE POLICY, WHICH IS
09:59:35	16	THE NEW NAME FOR THE PRIVACY POLICY, IT'S THE SAME DOCUMENT,
09:59:38	17	BUT NEW NAME, WHETHER IT'S PERMISSIBLE TO INCORPORATE THAT INTO
09:59:41	18	THE EARLIER DATE OF SRR. KIND OF GO BACKWARDS IN TIME.
09:59:45	19	THAT'S ACTUALLY PROBABLY NOT THE RIGHT QUESTION. THE
09:59:47	20	QUESTION IS WHEN IS THE DATE OF THE CONTRACT? IT'S NOT THE
09:59:49	21	DATE IT WAS ISSUED, IT'S THE DATE THAT WAS AGREED TO BY THE
09:59:52	22	USER.
09:59:53	23	THE CONTRACT SAYS, THIS IS THE SRR, "BY USING OR ACCESSING
09:59:55	24	FACEBOOK, YOU AGREE TO THIS STATEMENT."
09:59:59	25	SO EVERY TIME THE USER ACCESSES THE FACEBOOK WEBSITE, THEY

10:00:02	1	AGREE TO THE SRR.
10:00:04	2	SO SAY
10:00:05	3	THE COURT: EVERY TIME YOU ACCESS, YOU ARE IN A NEW
10:00:09	4	CONTRACT?
10:00:10	5	MR. STRAITE: THAT'S FACEBOOK'S POSITION, YES, YOUR
10:00:12	6	HONOR.
10:00:12	7	THAT'S WHAT THE CONTRACT SAYS. I WOULD BE HAPPY
10:00:18	8	INDUSTRY-WIDE IF THAT WEREN'T THE CASE, BUT UNFORTUNATELY THE
10:00:18	9	LAW SAYS OTHERWISE.
10:00:18	10	I HAVE MANY, MANY CASES WHERE I WOULD BE MUCH HAPPIER IF
10:00:21	11	THE CONTRACT IS NOT RE-AGREED TO EVERY TIME WHEN USERS USE THAT
10:00:25	12	SERVICE, BUT THAT'S THE LANGUAGE HERE OF THE CONTRACT.
10:00:27	13	SO IF A SUBSCRIBER OF PLAINTIFF ACCESSES THE SERVICE ON
10:00:31	14	SEPTEMBER 7TH, SEPTEMBER 8TH, 9TH OF 2011, AT THAT POINT THEY
10:00:34	15	ARE RE-AGREEING, ACCORDING TO THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT, AND
10:00:38	16	THEREFORE WE DON'T HAVE TO GO BACK IN TIME, AND THE DATA USE
10:00:40	17	POLICY
10:00:40	18	THE COURT: IT'S A CONTINUOUS CONTRACT THEN, ISN'T
10:00:43	19	IT?
10:00:43	20	MR. STRAITE: NO, IT'S ONLY EACH TIME SOMEONE
10:00:46	21	ACCESSES FACEBOOK.
10:00:47	22	IF SOMEONE ACCESSES THE SERVICE EVERY MONTH, ONCE A MONTH,
10:00:50	23	THEN THEY AGREE TO THE CONTRACT EACH TIME.
10:00:52	24	THE COURT: EVERY DAY.
10:00:53	25	MR. STRAITE: MANY PEOPLE ACCESS IT MORE THAN ONCE

10:00:56	1	PER DAY, YES.
10:00:57	2	THE COURT: AND SO THERE'S CONTINUAL CONTRACT GOING
10:00:59	3	ON.
10:00:59	4	MR. STRAITE: IT'S AGREED TO EVERY SINGLE TIME
10:01:01	5	SOMEONE ACCESSES, ACCORDING TO THE TERMS OF THE CONTRACT.
10:01:04	6	THAT'S IN PARAGRAPH 23 OF THE COMPLAINT. SO THAT'S THE
10:01:08	7	TERMS OF THE CONTRACT, AND SO IF THERE'S A PROBLEM WITH THE
10:01:11	8	TIMING, THIS SOLVES THAT TIMING.
10:01:13	9	THE COURT: OKAY.
10:01:13	10	MR. STRAITE: I JUST WANTED TO POINT THAT OUT.
10:01:15	11	THE COURT: OKAY. GREAT. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
10:01:18	12	MR. GRYGIEL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:01:21	13	THE COURT: MR. BROWN.
10:01:22	14	MR. BROWN: WELL, THE DAILY CONTRACTING POINT JUST
10:01:25	15	MAKES THE MIND RACE WHEN THINKING ABOUT CLASS CERTIFICATION,
10:01:27	16	BUT WE WILL PUT THAT ASIDE FOR TODAY.
10:01:33	17	SO PLAINTIFF'S COUNSEL SPOKE OF A "RATIONAL CONTRACTURAL
10:01:39	18	UNIVERSE," AND I WOULD SUBMIT THAT THE POSITIONS THAT THEY'VE
10:01:44	19	TAKEN HERE ARE FAR FROM RATIONAL.
10:01:48	20	PLAINTIFFS HAVE LITERALLY TAKEN THE POSITION, IF I HEARD
10:01:52	21	IT CORRECTLY, THAT EVERY STATEMENT ON THE WEBSITE, THE FACEBOOK
10:01:57	22	WEBSITE, IS PART OF THE CONTRACT, UNLESS FACEBOOK SPECIFICALLY
10:02:02	23	DISCLAIMS IT WITHIN THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND
10:02:04	24	RESPONSIBILITIES.
10:02:05	25	I HAVE NEVER EVER HEARD ANYBODY TAKE THAT POSITION ABOUT

10:02:11	1
10:02:15	2
10:02:18	3
10:02:22	4
10:02:29	5
10:02:34	6
10:02:37	7
10:02:41	8
10:02:42	9
10:02:49	10
10:02:58	11
10:03:00	12
10:03:02	13
10:03:05	14
10:03:08	15
10:03:11	16
10:03:15	17
10:03:23	18
10:03:27	19
10:03:33	20
10:03:38	21
10:03:40	22
10:03:45	23
10:03:49	24
10:03:53	25

HOW WHEN TWO PARTIES DECIDE AND WHAT TERMS ARE GOING TO BE INCLUDED IN A CONTRACT. THAT'S AN ABSURD PROPOSITION.

OBVIOUSLY, IT CAN'T BE THE CASE.

THE PLAINTIFFS HAVE TOLD YOU THAT, HAVE TAKEN THE POSITION
THAT THE SRR INCORPORATES BY REFERENCE THE PRIVACY POLICY,
BECAUSE ESSENTIALLY THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND
RESPONSIBILITIES SAYS READ THE PRIVACY POLICY. THAT'S
ESSENTIALLY THEIR POSITION.

WHAT I WANTED TO POINT OUT IS, YOU KNOW, THERE ARE
DIFFERENT WAYS THAT PARTIES CAN DO THIS. AND AT THE TIME, AT
THE TIME THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HERE, THE PRIVACY POLICY WAS
NOT INCORPORATED INTO THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND
RESPONSIBILITIES, WHICH IS THE POSITION THAT I TOOK EARLIER.

AND THE MERE SORT OF REFERENCES AND ENCOURAGEMENT TO READ IT DOESN'T SOMEHOW MAKE IT A CONTRACTURAL TERM.

BUT I ALSO WANTED TO JUST PROVIDE BY WAY OF EXAMPLE, AND THIS WAS ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT 6 TO MY DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF THE MOTION, THIS IS A STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

IT'S DATED JANUARY 30TH, 2015, SO QUITE A BIT LATER THAN THE TIME PERIOD THAT WE ARE TALKING ABOUT HERE.

AND AT THE END OF THAT STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND

RESPONSIBILITIES IN BOLD FACE FONT, IT SAYS, "BY USING OR

ACCESSING FACEBOOK SERVICES, YOU AGREE THAT WE CAN COLLECT AND

USE SUCH CONTENT AND INFORMATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE DATA

POLICY, AS AMENDED FROM TIME TO TIME."

10:03:57 1 2 10:04:04 3 10:04:10 10:04:15 4 10:04:18 10:04:22 6 10:04:31 7 10:04:38 8 10:04:44 9 10:04:48 10 10:04:52 11 10:04:53 12 10:04:59 13 10:05:02 14 10:05:05 15 10:05:10 16 10:05:18 17 10:05:23 18 10:05:28 19 10:05:33 20 10:05:35 21 10:05:38 22 10:05:41 23 10:05:45 24 10:05:48 25

SO HERE WE HAVE A VERY SPECIFIC STATEMENT WITHIN THE SRR WHEREBY USERS ARE VERY CLEARLY AND UNEQUIVOCALLY AGREEING THAT THE TERMS OF THE DATA POLICY NEED TO BE COMPLIED WITH.

AND THAT IS DIFFERENT FROM WHAT WE HAVE IN ANY OF THE
THREE PRIVACY POLICIES THAT ARE ATTACHED TO THE COMPLAINT, OR
THE DATA USE POLICY ATTACHED TO THE COMPLAINT.

LET'S SEE, THE NEXT POINT IS THAT YOU ASK A NUMBER OF REALLY POINTED QUESTIONS ABOUT WHAT LANGUAGE IN THE DATA USE POLICY THEY WERE RELYING ON FOR THEIR PROPOSITION THAT THESE PARTICULAR HELP PAGES THAT THEY ARE RELYING ON ARE INCORPORATED.

AND I FOUND IT VERY STRIKING BECAUSE THE ANSWER WAS NOT TO PULL UP THE DATA USE POLICY AND POINT YOUR HONOR TO ANY LANGUAGE IN THE DATA USE POLICY, WHICH IS WHAT ONE WOULD EXPECT IN RESPONSE TO A QUESTION LIKE THAT, BUT RATHER TO GO TO THIS LETTER DATED JANUARY 6, 2012 A LITTLE BIT LATER, BY THE WAY, THAN THE CLASS PERIOD HERE, AND THIS IS ATTACHED AS EXHIBIT T, AS IN TOM, TO THE COMPLAINT. YOU RECALL I ASKED FOR CLARIFICATION WHAT HE WAS READING FROM BECAUSE IT DIDN'T SOUND LIKE THE DATA USE POLICY.

AND ESSENTIALLY, WHAT THEY ARE DOING IS THEY ARE TRYING TO USE THIS LETTER TO SOMEHOW ESTABLISH THAT THE HELP CENTER WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE DATA USE POLICY, RATHER THAN POINTING TO THE LANGUAGE IN THE DATA USE POLICY ITSELF, WHICH I THINK IS VERY, VERY TELLING.

10:05:53 1 10:05:56 2 10:05:58 10:06:03 4 10:06:08 10:06:13 6 10:06:16 7 10:06:22 8 10:06:23 9 10:06:27 10 10:06:32 11 10:06:39 12 10:06:41 13 10:06:46 14 10:06:51 15 10:06:54 16 10:06:55 17 10:06:59 18 10:07:03 19 10:07:07 20 10:07:10 21 10:07:14 22 10:07:20 23 10:07:25 24 10:07:28 25

AND I MIGHT JUST MAKE ONE ADDITIONAL POINT WHILE WE ARE TALKING ABOUT EXHIBIT T, AS IN TOM.

THEY MAKE A LOT OUT OF THIS LANGUAGE IN THE LETTER ABOUT A LAYERED APPROACH. AND WHAT THEY ARE TRYING TO SUGGEST, AND I WOULD SUGGEST MISREPRESENT, IS THAT FACEBOOK IS SOMEHOW BOUGHT INTO THIS CHAIN OF INCORPORATION THEORY THAT THEY ARE PUSHING HERE IN THIS THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT. AND IT HAS ABSOLUTELY NOTHING TO DO WITH THAT.

WHAT IT SAYS HERE IS THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT THE DATA USE POLICY. THIS IS ON PAGE 9 OF THE LETTER. SO THIS IS DOCUMENT ECF NUMBER 157-20, AND PAGE 9 OF THE LETTER, BATES NUMBER ENDING 248.

AND IT SAYS IN IT, MEANING IN THE DATA USE POLICY, WE USE

A LAYERED APPROACH. SUMMARIZING OUR PRACTICES ON THE FRONT

PAGE, AND THEN ALLOWING PEOPLE TO CLICK THROUGH THE POLICY FOR

MORE DETAILS.

THEY ARE TALKING ABOUT A LAYERED APPROACH WITHIN THE DATA USE POLICY, SIMPLY THAT YOU'VE GOT A SUMMARY OF THE DATA USE PRACTICES ON THE FIRST PAGE, AND THEN YOU CAN HYPERLINK TO MORE THOROUGH DESCRIPTIONS OF THOSE GENERAL PRACTICES.

IT'S A LAYERED APPROACH WITHIN THE DATA USE POLICY ITSELF.

THERE IS NO SORT OF ADMISSION IN THIS LETTER OF JANUARY 2012

THAT FACEBOOK WAS SOMEHOW ENDORSING THIS DAISY CHAIN THEORY OF INCORPORATION WITH RESPECT TO ITS STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

1	0	:	0	7	:	3	3	1
1	0	:	0	7	:	3	8	2
1	0	:	0	7	:	4	1	3
1	0	:	0	7	:	4	5	4
1	0	:	0	7	:	4	7	5
1	0	:	0	7	:	5	0	6
1	0	:	0	7	:	5	1	7
1	0	:	0	7	:	5	7	8
1	0	:	0	8	:	0	0	9
1	0	:	0	8	:	0	4	10
1	0	:	0	8	:	0	9	11
1	0	:	0	8	:	1	3	12
1	0	:	0	8	:	1	5	13
1	0	:	0	8	:	2	2	14
1	0	:	0	8	:	2	6	15
1	0	:	0	8	:	3	0	16
1	0	:	0	8	:	3	3	17
1	0	:	0	8	:	3	6	18
1	0	:	0	8	:	4	0	19
1	0	:	0	8	:	4	5	20
1	0	:	0	8	:	4	9	21
1	0	:	0	8	:	4	9	22
1	0	:	0	8	:	5	3	23
1	0	:	0	8	:	5	7	24
1	0	:	0	9	:	0	1	25

MIGHT I ALSO POINT OUT IN TERMS OF INCORPORATION OF THE HELP CENTER, THERE WAS A LOT OF TIME SPENT TRYING TO CONVINCE YOUR HONOR THAT THE PRIVACY POLICY WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES, BUT OF COURSE ULTIMATELY, THEY NEED ONE MORE LINK IN THE CHAIN AS WELL IN ORDER TO GET TO THE HELP CENTER PAGES.

AND WE DON'T NEED TO TALK ABOUT THESE IN TOO MUCH DETAIL,

BUT I WANTED TO GUIDE THE COURT'S ATTENTION TO THE WOODS V.

GOOGLE CASE WHICH WE CITE IN OUR BRIEF, THAT WAS A DECISION BY

JUDGE FOGEL IN 2011. AND THAT WAS A CASE THAT -- IT WAS A

CLASS ACTION, AND IT WAS A CLASS OF ADVERTISERS SUING GOOGLE

OVER THE AD WORDS IN THE PRODUCT.

AND THE AGREEMENT THERE NOTED, "PROGRAM USE IS SUBJECT TO
ALL APPLICABLE GOOGLE AND PARTNER POLICIES, INCLUDING THE
EDITORIAL GUIDELINES."

AND JUDGE FOGEL HELD THERE THAT, "WHILE THE REFERENCE IN THE AGREEMENT TO INCORPORATION OF ALL APPLICABLE GOOGLE POLICIES IS CLEAR AND UNEQUIVOCAL, IT IS NOT APPARENT THAT THE TERMS OF GOOGLE'S INVALID CLICKS POLICY IN THE AD WORDS HELP CENTER ARE KNOWN OR EASILY AVAILABLE TO THE CONTRACTING PARTIES.

THE COMPLAINT REFERS TO MORE THAN A DOZEN PAGES IN BOTH
THE AD WORDS HELP CENTER AND AD SENSE HELP CENTER, THAT
ALLEGEDLY IDENTIFIED GOOGLE'S OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE INVALID
CLICKS POLICY.

10:09:03	1
10:09:10	2
10:09:13	3
10:09:17	4
10:09:19	5
10:09:24	6
10:09:29	7
10:09:35	8
10:09:40	9
10:09:44	10
10:09:46	11
10:09:51	12
10:09:54	13
10:09:58	14
10:10:04	15
10:10:07	16
10:10:12	17
10:10:15	18
10:10:19	19
10:10:23	20
10:10:26	21
10:10:31	22
10:10:34	23
10:10:37	24
10:10:42	25

THE FACT THAT STATEMENTS ABOUT INVALID CLICKS ARE SPREAD ACROSS A VARIETY OF PAGES IN A VARIETY OF FORMATS, MAKE IT DIFFICULT TO IDENTIFY THE TERMS OF ANY ACTUAL AND UNAMBIGUOUS CONTRACTURAL OBLIGATIONS."

STRIKINGLY SIMILAR TO THE SITUATION THAT WE HAVE HERE.

AND FURTHER, THERE WAS THE <u>DUNKEL V. EBAY</u> CASE WHICH WAS A DECISION BY YOUR HONOR IN 2014, WHICH CITED WOODS V. GOOGLE.

AND THERE, THERE WAS A CAUSE OF ACTION AGAINST EBAY

RELATING TO THE SUSPENSION OF THE PLAINTIFF'S ACCOUNTS. AND

PLAINTIFFS ARGUED THAT THE HELP CENTER PAGES THAT THEY ATTACHED

TO THE COMPLAINT WERE INCORPORATED INTO THE USER AGREEMENT.

BUT THE COURT HELD THAT THE PLAINTIFFS HAD STILL FAILED TO

PROPERLY ALLEGE THE EXISTENCE OF AN AGREEMENT, PARTICULARLY IN

HOW THE HELP PAGES ARE INCORPORATED INTO THE USER AGREEMENT.

AND THAT CLAIM WAS DISMISSED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND.

NOT ONLY DID THAT CASE FAVORABLY CITE WOODS V. GOOGLE, BUT I WOULD JUST NOTE THAT THAT WAS ALSO A CONTRACT OF ADHESION AND THAT WAS NOT REALLY RELEVANT TO THE ANALYSIS IN ANY WAY, AND WAS ALSO DECIDED ON THE PLEADINGS.

SO THIS IDEA THAT THERE ARE ALL THESE FACTUAL ISSUES,

REALLY, I DON'T THINK HOLDS ANY WATER. THIS IS AN ISSUE THAT

CAN CERTAINLY BE DECIDED AS A MATTER OF LAW AT THE PLEADINGS

STAGE.

I MIGHT JUST MAKE ONE OTHER POINT TOO, IF I COULD. AND THAT IS, YOU KNOW, IF THE ENTIRETY OF THE HELP CENTER IS

10:10:44 1 2 10:10:50 10:10:54 3 10:10:57 4 10:11:01 5 10:11:04 6 10:11:07 7 10:11:12 8 10:11:16 9 10:11:22 10 10:11:23 11 10:11:27 12 10:11:30 13 10:11:31 14 10:11:35 15 10:11:39 16 10:11:45 17 10:11:48 18 10:11:53 19 10:11:57 20 10:12:00 21 10:12:02 22 10:12:03 23 10:12:04 24

10:12:06 25

INCORPORATED, YOU KNOW, I DON'T THINK THAT WE'VE EVEN EXTENDED
THE LOGIC AS FAR AS IT CAN GO.

I ALREADY THINK THAT THAT IS, FRANKLY, AN ABSURD PROPOSITION THAT YOU COULD DO THAT. BUT WHY STOP THERE? THERE ARE LINKS IN THE HELP CENTER, FOR INSTANCE, TO A HELP COMMUNITY, AND THE HELP COMMUNITY, THERE ARE ALL SORTS OF USER-GENERATED COMMENTS ABOUT VARIOUS THINGS ON FACEBOOK, USERS HELPING EACH OTHER. AND THEN FACEBOOK REPRESENTATIVES CHIMING IN WITH HELPFUL COMMENTS, YOU KNOW, FACEBOOK TOOLS AND PRACTICES AND THE LIKE.

SO WHY SHOULD WE STOP AT THE HELP CENTER? DOES THE ENTIRETY OF THE HELP COMMUNITY, WHICH IS LINKED TO IN THE HELP CENTER, BECOME PART OF THE CONTRACT?

YOU CAN SEE WHERE IT JUST CREATES A WHOLE HOST OF MESSY
PROBLEMS, AND THAT'S WHY WE HAVE THE STANDARD OF CLEAR AND
UNEQUIVOCAL AND NEEDING THE INCORPORATED DOCUMENT TO BE BROUGHT
CLEARLY TO THE REFERENCE OF BOTH CONTRACTING PARTIES AND FOR
THERE TO BE CLEAR ASSENT TO IT. IT REINFORCES THE FUNDAMENTAL
PRINCIPLE UNDERLYING CONTRACT WHICH IS THAT WE NEED TO ENFORCE
THE CONTRACTURAL INTENT OF THE PARTIES.

THE COURT: THANK YOU. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

MR. BROWN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.

MR. GRYGIEL: MAY I HAVE JUST --

THE COURT: OH, I THINK I'VE GOT ENOUGH. THANK YOU.

I'M REMINDED OF THE MALTESE FALCON, I THINK IT WAS, WHEN

10:12:11	1	SIDNEY GREENSTREET SPOKE TO SAM SPADE AND SAID, "HERE'S TO
10:12:17	2	PLAIN SPEAKING AND CLEAR UNDERSTANDING." AND I SUPPOSE THEY
10:12:19	3	WERE TALKING WITH CONTRACTS, WEREN'T THEY. I'M SURE THEY WERE.
10:12:23	4	THE MATTER IS UNDER SUBMISSION.
10:12:24	5	THANK YOU VERY MUCH. I APPRECIATE YOUR HELP THIS MORNING.
10:12:27	6	MR. GRYGIEL: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:12:30	7	MR. BROWN: THANK YOU, YOUR HONOR.
10:12:31	8	(THE PROCEEDINGS WERE CONCLUDED AT 10:12 A.M.)
	9	
	10	
	11	
	12	
	13	
	14	
	15	
	16	
	17	
	18	
	19	
	20	
	21	
	22	
	23	
	24	
	25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I, THE UNDERSIGNED OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, 280 SOUTH FIRST STREET, SAN JOSE, CALIFORNIA, DO HEREBY CERTIFY: THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT, CERTIFICATE INCLUSIVE, CONSTITUTES A TRUE, FULL AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPT OF MY SHORTHAND NOTES TAKEN AS SUCH OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER OF THE PROCEEDINGS HEREINBEFORE ENTITLED AND REDUCED BY COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION TO THE BEST OF MY ABILITY.

SUMMER A. FISHER, CSR, CRR CERTIFICATE NUMBER 13185

DATED: 11/21/17