15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	RICT OF CALIFORNIA ND DIVISON Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ) <u>PUTATIVE CLASS ACTION</u> DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION
23 24 25 26 27	
28 Gibson, Dunn &	DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS'

2	1. I have been employed as a software engineer at Facebook since May 2010, and my
3	current title is Engineering Manager. I am over the age of 18. I have worked on the Facebook
4	Messages product to build anti-abuse, security, and anti-phishing systems for the Facebook Messages
5	product. My responsibilities generally involve ensuring the integrity of messages passing through
6	Facebook's system to ensure that they are not malicious, fraudulent, or spam. My work thus
7	encompasses one of Facebook's suite of anti-abuse systems (also referred to as "Security"
8	systems). Unless otherwise stated, the following facts are within my personal knowledge and, if
9	called and sworn as a witness, I could and would testify competently to these facts.
10	2. I provide this Declaration to explain certain facts regarding Facebook's software code

11 as it relates to Facebook's and other Security-related systems, particularly as they relate to uniform resource locators ("URLs") in messages sent and received through the Facebook platform, in 12 support of Facebook's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification. 13

As explained in further detail below, Facebook source code is configured to run

. Accordingly, there are many instances when a URL or URL attachment generated in connection with a message will not lead to 18 the creation of a share object. Specifically, in those instances when a URL attachment is blocked by 19 no share object will be created. Further, contrary to assertions I understand Plaintiffs have 20 made in this case, uses share objects generated from URL attachments to messages for its security and anti-abuse functions. 22

Overview of 23

3.

14

15

16

17

21

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP

24	4. to determine whether a
25	message or post, or information included with it – such as a URL – is malicious, fraudulent, or
26	otherwise harmful. For example, if a person using Facebook posts or sends a message with the URI
27	http://clickmonkeys.com, would analyze the URL to determine
28	1

DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

1	whether it is a harmful link containing spam, malware, a virus, or the like, and whether it is likely that
2	the sender's account has been hijacked (given that it sent a malicious or spammy URL or URLs).
3	can likewise run things like
4	
5	
6	5. One general purpose of Facebook's Security systems (including , among others)
7	is to protect people and their data when they use Facebook. For instance, Facebook encrypts user
8	activity (whether that involves posting a status update or sending a message) so that third parties
9	cannot access it in transit, and if an individual clicks on a spam post accidentally, Facebook's
10	detection tools determine whether a virus has infected the individual's browser or computer and helps
11	to remove it. , among other Security tools, was built to ward off attacks from cyber criminals,
12	hackers, and other such individuals or entities, so that all people legitimately using Facebook can
13	enjoy the site safely and confidently.
14	6. runs a series of various filters and other mechanisms by which to detect abuse
15	or other fraudulent activity on Facebook; these include functions called and and
16	"Sigma." the URL typed
17	in the text of the message
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	. Sigma, in turn, is a rules engine that runs a series of policies
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	2
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

1	and URLs in Messages
2	7. As noted above in paragraph 3, Facebook code is configured such that
3	
4	8. <i>First</i> , during the period covered by discovery in this case (2010-2013), if JavaScript
5	code was running in the sender's browser and it detected the existence of a typed URL, and sent a
6	request to 'scrape' information about that URL from either a Facebook server or the third-party
7	website, Facebook would assess
8	. This functionality can be seen in the code file for
9	which specifically states that
10	
11	9. Specifically, if the sender typed a URL into the message and
12	, which would in turn,
13	(which is contained in a
14	system called , it would tell
15	. Accordingly, no URL preview would be generated. So instead,
16	. This was true whether the person using
17	Facebook was attempting to share the URL through a message or through a public post to their
18	profile, a status message on their NewsFeed, a post to a friend's profile, or the like;
19	to generate a URL
20	preview. If
21	
22	
23	10. <u>Second</u> , if a URL preview was successfully generated (and not deleted by the sender),
24	the URL attachment would have been sent with the message when the sender pressed "Send."
25	
26	
27	
28	3
son, Dunn & tcher LLP	DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

1	to determine and help resolve any abuse- or security-related issues.
2	intended to detect large-
3	scale automated abuse (e.g., spam, malware, phishing, and other abuse). For example, Sigma
4	
5	
6	. Likewise, the
7	. Further,
8	could be run through Facebook's
9	
10	11.
11	, and that the sender was
12	allowed to send messages to that recipient (i.e. the recipient had not blocked that sender). This would
13	also include
14	qualify for delivery to the Inbox or
15	whether it should be directed to the" Other" folder, based on the sender-recipient(s) relationship and
16	the recipient's configured settings. The code file (and other related files) provides
17	the context in which
18	. If
19	such an error occurred, the second second . If such an error occurred with respect to a
20	URL attachment to a message, no share object would have been generated from that attachment.
21	12. Further, the code file creates an object for the
22	check containing data called a The is a
23	
24	. These features are extracted from the message and include data such as the
25	identity of the "target" (i.e. the intended recipient), whether or not the message is a reply to an
26	existing message or creates a new thread, the body of the message, and the data from any share object
27	associated with the message. Accordingly, may use
28	4
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

Ш

1	
2	
3	. Based on the
4	
5	, the sender might have seen the
6 7	following security prompt:
7 8	Message Failed
8 9 10	This message contains blocked content that has previously been flagged as abusive or spammy. Let us know if you think this is an error.
10 11 12	Okay
13	13. , including
14	to perform their anti-abuse- and security-related
15	functions. For instance, the "tracking information" about a URL contained in the global share object
16	for that URL – such as the number of times it was shared, and in what form (post, message, "Like"
17	Button click, comment, etc.), and the date the URL was first shared on Facebook – was available to
18	·
19	14. <i>Third</i> , when a sender or a recipient tried to view the sent message,
20	
21	
22	. It would once again run a
23 24	discussed in paragraphs 10-13 and if any of these threw an error, the message, part of the
24 25	message, or its URL attachment may not have been rendered to the recipient. Of course, this set of checks would not occur if
23 26	
20	
28	
on, Dunn & cher LLP	5 DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

Ш

detect that a	URL attachment to the message was potentially dangerous when the recipient (or
	v it in their inbox, it could have shown the following security protocol to the recip
	en they tried to view the message and its attachment:
	uth Putnam 🖓 1
	This message is no longer available because it was
	identified as abusive or marked as spam.
15.	Note that, if in this process, a
	it could not render its URL
attachment	to the recipient (or sender) trying to view that message. Facebook would
	·
<u>Variability</u>	Among Class Members and Over Time in Connection with
<u>Variability</u> 16.	Among Class Members and Over Time in Connection with There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether
	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether
	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme
16. associated v	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme with it.
16.	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme
16. associated v	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme with it.
16. associated v	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme with it.
16. associated v	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme with it.
16. associated v	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme with it.
16. associated v	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme with it.
16. associated v	There was considerable variability in a given instance with respect to whether on a message and any URL attachme with it.

1	. Thus,
2	presented by each message. It is impossible to know precisely what will do given the
3	variability of the input and other data at a given time.
4	18. Further, each individual , Sigma, and ,
5	among others) could determine whether or not to
6	. For instance, if a sender
7	attempted to upload a malicious file,
8	
9	19. Further, Facebook's
10	
11	
12	20. Similarly, as described earlier above, if a sender sent a message to a recipient
13	recognized as their Facebook friend, but the message contained a URL known to be a spammy link,
14	
15	
16	
17	21. Alternatively, if a share object had been created, but was later determined by
18	
19 20	, so that it would not have rendered the URL preview
20	attachment to the sender or recipient if they later reopened that message in their Inbox or Sent
21	Messages folder.
22 23	22. Taking all of this variation together, at a minimum, determining whether a putative
23 24	class member's share of a URL in a message actually resulted in the transmission of a URL attachment or creation of a share object depended, among other things, on whether the
24	attachment of creation of a share object depended, among other timigs, on whether the
23 26	. Such a determination
27	would require the following individualized inquiries for each message:
28	
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	7 DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

Ш

1	a. Was the message sent from the Facebook website, or was it sent using the Share
2	Plugin on a third party website?
3	b. Did the sender either copy and paste a URL into the draft message text field, or type a
4	URL into the draft text and press the space bar?
5	c. Was the URL to a third-party webpage (as opposed to a Facebook webpage)?
6	d. Was the sender using a browser that is JavaScript capable?
7	e. Did the sender have JavaScript enabled in her browser?
8	f. Did any of the
9	
10	
11	g. When the message was sent,
12	
13	, or Sigma
14	
15	, among other things?
16	h. After the message had been sent, and the sender or recipient attempted to view it, was
17	the URL attachment, or part of the message, or the whole message,
18	
19	
20	
21	?
22	23. To my knowledge, neither Facebook nor any other entity possesses the data that would
23	be required to ascertain the answers to the inquiries in paragraph 22(a)-(g), either on an individual or
24	bulk basis, for putative class members.
25	
26	
27	
28	8
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

1	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
2	foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on January 14, 2016, in Menlo
3	Park, California.
4	
5	/s/ Michael Adkins Michael Adkins
6	Michael Adkins
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
26	
20 27	
28	9
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP	DECLARATION OF MICHAEL ADKINS IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT FACEBOOK, INC.'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION Case No. C 13-05996 PJH (MEJ)

ATTORNEY ATTESTATION

I, Christopher Chorba, attest that concurrence in the filing of this Declaration of Michael Adkins has been obtained from the signatory. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 15th day of January, 2016, in Los Angeles, California.

Dated: January 15, 2016

/s/ Christopher Chorba Christopher Chorba