

CCPA LITIGATION – ONE YEAR LATER (AND WHAT WILL CHANGE UNDER THE CPRA)



Ann Staggs
Lead Privacy Counsel
Airbnb
www.linkedin.com/in/ans415



Ian Ballon, JD, LLM, CIPP/US
Co-Chair, Global IP & Technology Practice Group
Greenberg Traurig LLP
(650) 289-7881 (310) 586-6575
Ballon@GTLaw.com
Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn: Ian Ballon
www.IanBallon.net

IAN C. BALLON

HOME

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

ABOUT THE TREATISE

MORE...

E-Commerce & Internet Law: Treatise with Forms - 2d Edition



2020 UPDATES NOW AVAILABLE!!

The revised and updated edition of this comprehensive work provides you with a complete legal authority on e-commerce and Internet law, covering business-to-business and business-to-customer issues, regulatory issues, and emerging trends. It includes practice tips and forms and its unique organization facilitates finding quick answers to your questions. This valuable resource on Internet and e-commerce issues contains nearly 10,000 detailed footnotes, plus references to hundreds of unpublished court decisions, many of which are not available anywhere else.

[BUY NOW](#)

Agenda

- Anatomy of a security breach case
- The CCPA and CPRA
- Contract formation/ arbitration

Planning for security incidents

What is reasonable security?

Mitigating risks

**CYBERSECURITY
BREACH AND DATA
PRIVACY PUTATIVE
CLASS ACTION
LITIGATION**

Cybersecurity and Data Privacy Class Action Litigation

▣ Cybersecurity claims

- Breach of contract (if there is a contract)
- Breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing (if the contract claim isn't on point)
- Breach of implied contract (if there is no express contract)
- Breach of fiduciary duty, Negligence, Fraud, unfair competition
- State cybersecurity statutes (especially those that provide for statutory damages and attorneys' fees)
- California (and potentially Oregon) IoT Law, CCPA

▣ Securities fraud

▣ Data privacy claims

- Electronic Communications Privacy Act
 - Wiretap Act (Title I); Stored Communications Act (Title II)
 - Campbell v. Facebook, Inc., 951 F.3d 1106 (9th Cir. 2020) (finding Article III standing)
 - In re Google Assistant Privacy Litig., 457 F. Supp. 3d 797 (N.D. Cal. 2020) (dismissing Wiretap Act claim)
- Computer Fraud and Abuse Act - 18 U.S.C. § 1030
 - \$5,000 minimum injury
 - United States v. Van Buren, 940 F.3d 1192 (11th Cir. 2019), cert. granted, 140 S. Ct. 2667 (2020) (holding that Van Buren exceeded authorized access by accessing the Georgia Crime Information Center database (which he was otherwise authorized to access) to run a license plate check for a third party for money)
- Video Privacy Protection Act - 18 U.S.C. § 2710
- State laws
 - Illinois Biometric Information Privacy Act (recently adopted in other states)
 - Michigan's Preservation of Personal Privacy Act
 - California laws including the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA)
- Breach of contract/ privacy policies
 - In re Equifax, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litigation, 362 F. Supp. 3d 1295, 1331-32 (N.D. Ga. 2019) (granting defendant's motion to dismiss breach of contract claims premised on Equifax's Privacy Policy)
 - Bass v. Facebook, Inc., 394 F. Supp. 3d 1024, 1037-38 (N.D. Cal. 2019) (dismissing claims for breach of contract, breach of implied contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, quasi contract, and breach of confidence in a putative data security breach class action suit, where Facebook's Terms of Service included a limitation-of-liability clause)
- Regulatory enforcement - FTC and potentially state Attorneys General, including in California (under the CCPA)
 - Coordinate litigation and regulatory enforcement (usually confidential)

Defense Strategies for Data Privacy & Cybersecurity litigation

- Can you compel arbitration?
- If there are multiple suits – is MDL consolidation possible or desirable?
 - Security breach cases are often consolidated in the district where the defendant is located
- Motions to Dismiss
 - Rule 12(b)(1) standing – circuit split - 6th, 7th, 9th, DC vs. high threshold: 2d, 4th, 8th (3d)
 - Rule 12(b)(6) motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim
 - In re: Marriott Int'l, Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litig., 440 F. Supp. 3d 447 (D. Md. 2020)
 - In re: Solara Medical Supplies, LLC Customer Data Security Breach Litig., _ F. Supp. 3d _, 2020 WL 2214152 (S.D. Cal. 2020)
- Summary judgment
- Class Certification
- Work Product Privilege
 - In re: Capital One Consumer Data Security Breach Litig., MDL No. 1:19md2915, 2020 WL 3470261 (E.D. Va. June 25, 2020) (Ordering production of the Mandiant Report)
 - Applied the 4th Circuit's "driving force" test – (1) was the report prepared when the litigation was a real likelihood (yes); (2) would it have been created anyway in the absence of litigation (yes)
 - Capital One had a preexisting contractual relationship with Mandiant for similar reports and could not show that, absent the breach, the report would have been any different in addressing business critical issues (and the report was widely distributed to 50 employees, 4 different regulators and an accountant)
 - Footnote 8: use different vendors, scopes of work and/or different investigation teams
 - In re: Capital One Consumer Data Security Breach Litig., MDL No. 1:19md2915, 2020 WL 5016930 (E.D. Va. Aug. 21, 2020) (Price Waterhouse – not produced)
 - The Ninth Circuit does not weigh motivations where documents may be used both for business purposes and litigation: In re Grand Jury Subpoena, 357 F.3d 900, 908 (9th Cir. 2004)
- Settlement

Cybersecurity Breach Class Action Litigation - Standing

- Circuit split on Article III standing: Low threshold: 6th, 7th, 9th, DC vs. higher: 2d, 4th, 8th, 11th (3d)
- Remijas v. Neiman Marcus Group, 794 F.3d 688 (7th Cir. 2015)
- Lewert v. P.F. Chang's China Bistro Inc., 819 F.3d 963 (7th Cir. 2016)
- Galaria v. Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co., 663 F. App'x 384 (6th Cir. 2016) (2-1)
- Reilly v. Ceridian Corp., 664 F.3d 38 (3d Cir. 2011), cert. denied, 566 U.S. 989 (2012)
- Beck v. McDonald, 848 F.3d 262 (4th Cir. 2017)
 - Allegation that data breaches created an enhanced risk of future identity theft was too speculative
 - Rejected evidence that 33% of health related data breaches result in identity theft
 - Rejected the argument that offering credit monitoring services evidenced a substantial risk of harm (rejecting *Remijas*)
 - Mitigation costs in response to a speculative harm do not qualify as injury in fact
- Whalen v. Michael's Stores, Inc., 689 F. App'x. 89 (2d Cir. 2017)
 - The theft of plaintiff's credit card numbers was not sufficiently concrete or particularized to satisfy *Spokeo* (name, address, PIN not exposed)
 - credit card was presented for unauthorized charges in Ecuador, but no allegation that fraudulent charges actually were incurred
- McMorris v. Carlos Lopez & Associates, LLC, 995 F.3d 295 (2d Cir. 2021)
 - Plaintiffs may establish Article III standing based on an increased risk of identity theft or fraud following the unauthorized disclosure of their data, but employee was not at substantial risk of future identity theft
- Attias v. Carefirst, Inc., 865 F.3d 620 (D.C. Cir. 2017), cert. denied, 138 S. Ct. 981 (2018)
 - following *Remijas v. Neiman Marcus Group, LLC* in holding that plaintiffs, whose information had been exposed but who were not victims of identity theft, had plausibly alleged a heightened risk of future injury because it was plausible to infer that a party accessing plaintiffs' personal information did so with "both the intent and ability to use the data for ill."
- In re U.S. Office of Personnel Management Data Security Breach Litig., 928 F.3d 42 (D.C. Cir. 2019) (21M records)
- In re SuperValu, Inc., Customer Data Security Breach Litig., 870 F.3d 763 (8th Cir. 2017)
 - Affirming dismissal for lack of standing of the claims of 15 of the 16 plaintiffs but holding that the one plaintiff who alleged he suffered a fraudulent charge on his credit card had standing
 - Rejected cost of mitigation (*Clapper*) (*Cf. P.F. Chang's*)
- In re Zappos.com, Inc., 888 F.3d 1020 (9th Cir. 2018), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 1373 (2019)
 - Merely having personal information exposed in a security breach constitutes sufficient harm to justify Article III standing in federal court, regardless of whether the information in fact is used for identity theft or other improper purposes
 - **Bootstrapping** - Because other plaintiffs alleged that their accounts or identities had been commandeered by hackers, the court concluded that the appellants in *Zappos* - who did not allege any such harm - could be subject to fraud or identity theft
- Tsao v. Captiva MVP Restaurant Partners, LLC, 986 F.3d 1332 (11th Cir. 2021)
 - No Article III standing for mitigation injuries (lost time, lost reward points, lost access to accounts) or potential future injury, where plaintiff's credit card was exposed when a restaurant's point of sale system was breached

**THE CALIFORNIA CONSUMER
PRIVACY ACT (CCPA) &
CALIFORNIA PRIVACY RIGHTS
AND ENFORCEMENT ACT OF
2020 (CPRA)**

CCPA Putative Class Action Litigation

- The CCPA applies to businesses (1) with annual gross revenue > \$25 M; (2) that buy, sell or receive for commercial purposes personal information of 50,000 or more consumers, households or devices, or (3) that derive 50% or more of their annual revenue from selling consumers' personal information (excludes entities subject to federal regulation)
- The private right of action narrowly applies only to security breaches and the failure to implement reasonable measures, not other CCPA provisions
- But plaintiffs may recover statutory damages of between \$100 and \$750
- The CCPA creates a private right of action for [1] consumers [2] “whose **nonencrypted or nonredacted** [3] personal information [within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1798.150(a)(1) and 1798.81.5] . . . [4] is subject to an **unauthorized access and exfiltration, theft, or disclosure** [5] as a result of the business's [6] violation of the duty to **implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices**”
- What is *reasonable* will be defined by case law
- \$100 - \$750 “per consumer per incident or actual damages, whichever is greater, injunctive or declaratory relief, and any other relief that a court deems proper.”
- 30 day notice and right to cure as a precondition to seeking statutory damages (modeled on the Consumer Legal Remedies Act)
 - If cured, a business must provide “an express written statement” (which could later be actionable)
- In assessing the amount of statutory damages, the court shall consider “any one or more of the relevant circumstances presented by any of the parties to the case, including, but not limited to, the nature and seriousness of the misconduct, the number of violations, the persistence of the misconduct, the length of time over which the misconduct occurred, the willfulness of the defendant's misconduct, and the defendant's assets, liabilities, and net worth”
- CCPA claims typically are joined with other cybersecurity breach or data privacy claims

Defense Strategies for CCPA & Other Cybersecurity Litigation

- ▣ Many “CCPA claims” aren’t actually actionable under the CCPA
- ▣ The CCPA creates a private right of action for
 - [1] consumers
 - [2] “whose **nonencrypted or nonredacted**
 - [3] personal information [within the meaning of Cal. Civ. Code §§ 1798.150(a)(1) and 1798.81.5] . . .
 - [4] is subject to an **unauthorized access and exfiltration, theft, or disclosure**
 - [5] as a result of the business’s
 - [6] violation of the duty to **implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices”**
- ▣ Should you respond to a CCPA 30 day cure notice and if so how?
- ▣ Consider the same issues discussed earlier:
 - Arbitration?
 - MDL?
 - Motions to Dismiss
 - Summary judgment
 - Settlement
- ▣ How to avoid or anticipate CCPA claims?
 - Encrypt your data and comply with the CCPA (or make sure to avoid its application)....
 - Implement and maintain reasonable security procedures and practices
 - Craft a binding and enforceable arbitration provision and include it in every contract with consumers under the FAA (not state law), avoiding or complying with AAA requirements
 - Make sure your online and mobile consumer contract formation process conforms to the law in the worst jurisdictions
 - Where you don’t have privity of contract, make sure you are an intended beneficiary of an arbitration clause in a contract with a business partner who does have privity (because you will be sued!)
 - Explore insurance coverage

How will litigation change under the CPRA?

- The CPRA was adopted as a ballot initiative in November 2020 and will amend the CCPA litigation section effective January 1, 2023
- The litigation remedies are largely the same except:
 - New thresholds for CPRA applicability for a business (and covers sharing)
 - Expanded to cover anyone whose email address in combination with a password or security question and answer that would permit access to the account was subject to an unauthorized access and exfiltration, theft, or disclosure
 - The CPRA will apply to businesses engaged in consumer credit collection and reporting
 - New caveat on what constitutes a cure
 - Online contract formation
 - Representative action nonwaiver
- **New threshold:** The CPRA applies to businesses with (1) annual gross revenue > \$25 M; (2) that buy, sell or receive for commercial purposes personal information of (50,000) **100,00** or more consumers, households or devices, and (3) businesses that derive 50% or more of their annual revenue from selling (**buying** or **sharing**) consumers' personal information (excludes entities subject to federal regulation)
- New Civil Code § 1798.150 - implementation and maintenance of reasonable security procedures and practices does not amount to a cure (in response to a 30 day letter)
- New Civil Code § 1798.140(h) - Consent does not include "acceptance of a general or broad terms of use" that describes "personal information processing along with other, unrelated information"
- New Civil Code § 1798.192 – prohibits and renders void “a representative action waiver”

The California Privacy Rights and Enforcement Act of 2020 (CPREA)

CPREA

Overview:

- Amends + strengthens 2018 CCPA
- Clarifies/defines key concepts under the CCPA
- Increased compliance resourcing and obligations



Privileged & Confidential - Internal Use Only



CPRA

Changes



Aligns w/ GDPR

Minimize activities re PI, protect PI, limited retention, limit use of SPI, opt out of sharing PI



Establishes Privacy Regulator

CA Privacy Protection Agency established.



Privacy & Security Impact Assessments

CA AG to adopt regs requiring annual privacy and security audits when “processing.. Significant risk to consumer”



“Business” in scope expanded

Includes those w/ 50% of more annual revenue from *storing PI*



Employee + B2B Exceptions Extended

Extend’s CCPA exceptions to 1/2023



No right for PI for political purposes

Consumer right to request business collection of PI for political purposes eliminated.



Recovery

Personal Info Security Breaches



Monetary

Greater of actual damages or \$100 - \$750 per incident



Injunction or Declaratory Relief

Order that company must stop a certain practice, declare certain activity as illegal



Any Other Relief Proper

Court can require additional action such as requiring credit monitoring or change in activity. (e.g. audits, privacy oversight committee w/ member)



“

non-encrypted and non-redacted
email + pw, or security question
+ answer providing access to the
account

Personal Information Security Breach





First Name/ First Initial + Last Name



Driver's license number, California identification card number, tax identification number, passport number, military identification number, or other unique identification number issued on a government document commonly used to verify the identity of a specific individual.



Account number or credit or debit card number, in combination with any required security code, access code, or password that would permit access to an individual's financial account.



medical info



Health insurance info



Unique biometric data generated from measurements or technical analysis of human body characteristics, such as a fingerprint, retina, or iris image, used to authenticate a specific individual. Unique biometric data does not include a physical or digital photograph, unless used or stored for facial recognition purposes.

Do not re-distribute.



Encryption and Redaction



ONLINE AND MOBILE CONTRACT FORMATION

Online and Mobile Contract Formation

▫ Trend: Continued hostility to implied contracts

- Emmanuel v. Handy Technologies, Inc., 992 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2021) (enforcing ToS and arbitration provision under Mass law where plaintiff selected 'Accept' in a mobile app)
- Nguyen v. Barnes & Noble Inc., 763 F.3d 1171, 1175-79 (9th Cir. 2014)
 - declining to enforce an arbitration clause
 - "where a website makes its terms of use available via a conspicuous hyperlink on every page of the website but otherwise provides no notice to users nor prompts them to take any affirmative action to demonstrate assent, even close proximity of the hyperlink to relevant buttons users must click on – without more – is insufficient to give rise to constructive notice"
- Wilson v. Huuuge, Inc., 944 F.3d 1212 (9th Cir. 2019)
 - declining to enforce an arbitration clause in a mobile Terms of Service agreement
 - Benson v. Double Down Interactive, LLC, 798 F. App'x 117 (9th Cir. 2020) (no constructive notice)
- Dohrmann v. Intuit, Inc., 823 F. App'x 482 (9th Cir. 2020)
 - Reversing the denial of a motion to compel arbitration
 - Holding the arbitration provision in Intuit's Terms of Use enforceable where a user, to access a TurboTax account, was required, after entering a user ID and password, to click a "Sign In" button, directly above the following language: "By clicking Sign In, you agree to the Turbo Terms of Use, TurboTax Terms of Use, and have read and acknowledged our Privacy Statement," where each of those documents was highlighted in blue hyperlinks which, if clicked, directed the user to a new webpage containing the agreement
- Lee v. Ticketmaster L.L.C., 817 F. App'x 393 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Nicosia v. Amazon.com, Inc., 834 F.3d 220 (2d Cir. 2016)
 - Reversing the lower court's order dismissing plaintiff's complaint, holding that whether the plaintiff was on inquiry notice of contract terms, including an arbitration clause, presented a question of fact where the user was not required to specifically manifest assent to the additional terms by clicking "I agree" and where the hyperlink to contract terms was not "conspicuous in light of the whole webpage."
- Meyer v. Uber Technologies, Inc., 868 F.3d 66 (2d Cir. 2017)
 - (1) Uber's presentation of its Terms of Service provided reasonably conspicuous notice as a matter of California law and (2) consumers' manifestation of assent was unambiguous
 - "when considering the perspective of a reasonable smartphone user, we need not presume that the user has never before encountered an app or entered into a contract using a smartphone. Moreover, a reasonably prudent smartphone user knows that text that is highlighted in blue and underlined is hyperlinked to another webpage where additional information will be found."
 - "[T]here are infinite ways to design a website or smartphone application, and not all interfaces fit neatly into the clickwrap or browserwrap categories."
- Cullinane v. Uber Technologies, Inc., 893 F.3d 53 (1st Cir. 2018)
 - Displaying a notice of deemed acquiescence and a link to the terms is insufficient to provide reasonable notice to consumers
- Stover v. Experian Holdings, Inc., 978 F.3d 1082 (9th Cir. 2020)
 - Visiting a website four years after agreeing to Terms of Use that permitted changes did not bind the plaintiff to the terms in effect on later visit
 - Ways to make future amendments enforceable

amazon.com

SIGN IN SHIPPING & PAYMENT GIFT OPTIONS PLACE ORDER

Review your order

By placing your order, you agree to Amazon.com's [privacy notice](#) and [conditions of use](#).

Shipping address Change	Payment method Change	Gift cards & promotional codes
[Redacted]	VISA [Redacted] Gift Card	<input type="text" value="Enter Code"/> <input type="button" value="Apply"/>
Or try Amazon Locker 20 locations near this address	Billing address Change Same as shipping address	

Order Summary

Items:	[Redacted]
Shipping & handling:	[Redacted]
<hr/>	
Total before tax:	[Redacted]
Estimated tax to be collected:	[Redacted]
Total:	[Redacted]
Gift Card:	[Redacted]

Order total:

[Redacted]

[How are shipping costs calculated?](#)**FREE** TWO-DAY SHIPPING

FREE Two-Day Shipping on this Order: [Redacted] you can save \$5.48 on this order by selecting "FREE Two-Day Shipping with a free trial of Amazon Prime" below.

» [Sign up for a free trial](#)

Estimated delivery: Sept. 25, 2014 - Sept. 26, 2014**Choose a delivery option:**

- FREE Two-Day Shipping with a free trial of [Redacted] --get it Wednesday, Sept. 24
- One-Day Shipping --get it tomorrow, Sept. 23
- Two-Day Shipping --get it Wednesday, Sept. 24
- Standard Shipping --get it Sept 25 - 26
- FREE Shipping --get it Sept. 28 - Oct. 2

*Why has sales tax been applied? [See tax and seller information](#)Do you need help? Explore our [Help pages](#) or [contact us](#)

For an item sold by Amazon.com: When you click the "Place your order" button, we'll send you an email message acknowledging receipt of your order. Your contract to purchase an item will not be complete until we send you an email notifying you that the item has been shipped.

Colorado, Oklahoma, South Dakota and Vermont Purchasers: [Important information regarding sales tax you may owe in your State](#)Within 30 days of delivery, you may return new, unopened merchandise in its original condition. Exceptions and restrictions apply. See [Amazon.com's Returns Policy](#)[Go to the Amazon.com homepage](#) without completing your order.

6:00

Register

GOOGLE+ **FACEBOOK**

OR

First Name Last Name

Password

NEXT

6:00

Payment

PROMO CODE



MM YY CVV

U.S. ZIP

REGISTER

OR

By creating an Uber account, you agree to the [TERMS OF SERVICE & PRIVACY POLICY](#)



Online and Mobile Contract Formation

- **Trend: Continued hostility to implied contracts**
- Emmanuel v. Handy Technologies, Inc., 992 F.3d 1 (1st Cir. 2021) (enforcing ToS and arbitration provision under Mass law where plaintiff selected 'Accept' in a mobile app)
- Nguyen v. Barnes & Noble Inc., 763 F.3d 1171, 1175-79 (9th Cir. 2014)
 - declining to enforce an arbitration clause
 - "where a website makes its terms of use available via a conspicuous hyperlink on every page of the website but otherwise provides no notice to users nor prompts them to take any affirmative action to demonstrate assent, even close proximity of the hyperlink to relevant buttons users must click on – without more – is insufficient to give rise to constructive notice"
- Wilson v. Huuuge, Inc., 944 F.3d 1212 (9th Cir. 2019)
 - declining to enforce an arbitration clause in a mobile Terms of Service agreement
 - Benson v. Double Down Interactive, LLC, 798 F. App'x 117 (9th Cir. 2020) (no constructive notice)
- Dohrmann v. Intuit, Inc., 823 F. App'x 482 (9th Cir. 2020)
 - Reversing the denial of a motion to compel arbitration
 - Holding the arbitration provision in Intuit's Terms of Use enforceable where a user, to access a TurboTax account, was required, after entering a user ID and password, to click a "Sign In" button, directly above the following language: "By clicking Sign In, you agree to the Turbo Terms of Use, TurboTax Terms of Use, and have read and acknowledged our Privacy Statement," where each of those documents was highlighted in blue hyperlinks which, if clicked, directed the user to a new webpage containing the agreement
- Lee v. Ticketmaster L.L.C., 817 F. App'x 393 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Nicosia v. Amazon.com, Inc., 834 F.3d 220 (2d Cir. 2016)
 - Reversing the lower court's order dismissing plaintiff's complaint, holding that whether the plaintiff was on inquiry notice of contract terms, including an arbitration clause, presented a question of fact where the user was not required to specifically manifest assent to the additional terms by clicking "I agree" and where the hyperlink to contract terms was not "conspicuous in light of the whole webpage."
- Meyer v. Uber Technologies, Inc., 868 F.3d 66 (2d Cir. 2017)
 - (1) Uber's presentation of its Terms of Service provided reasonably conspicuous notice as a matter of California law and (2) consumers' manifestation of assent was unambiguous
 - "when considering the perspective of a reasonable smartphone user, we need not presume that the user has never before encountered an app or entered into a contract using a smartphone. Moreover, a reasonably prudent smartphone user knows that text that is highlighted in blue and underlined is hyperlinked to another webpage where additional information will be found."
 - "[T]here are infinite ways to design a website or smartphone application, and not all interfaces fit neatly into the clickwrap or browserwrap categories."
- Cullinane v. Uber Technologies, Inc., 893 F.3d 53 (1st Cir. 2018)
 - Displaying a notice of deemed acquiescence and a link to the terms is insufficient to provide reasonable notice to consumers
- Stover v. Experian Holdings, Inc., 978 F.3d 1082 (9th Cir. 2020)
 - Visiting a website four years after agreeing to Terms of Use that permitted changes did not bind the plaintiff to the terms in effect on later visit
 - Ways to make future amendments enforceable

Arbitration, Contract Formation & Mass Arbitration

- ▣ Arbitration and Class Action Waivers
 - AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, 131 S. Ct. 1740 (2011)
 - Henry Schein, Inc. v. Archer & White Sales, Inc., 139 S. Ct. 524 (2019)
 - American Express Co. v. Italian Colors Restaurant, 133 S. Ct. 2304 (2013)
 - Tompkins v. 23andMe.com, Inc., 840 F.3d 1016 (9th Cir. 2016)
 - Abrogating or limiting earlier Ninth Circuit cases that applied pre-*Concepcion* California unconscionability case law, which had treated arbitration clauses differently from other contracts
 - Venue selection, bilateral attorneys' fee and IP carve out provisions not unconscionable
 - Enforcing delegation clause
 - Baltazar v. Forever 21, Inc., 62 Cal. 4th 1237, 200 Cal. Rptr. 3d 7 (2016) (abrogating earlier precedent that held certain provisions to be unconscionable when included in arbitration agreements)
 - Larsen v. Citibank FSB, 871 F.3d 1295 (11th Cir. 2017) (compelling arbitration; unilateral amendment provision modified by the duty of good faith and fair dealing under either Ohio or Washington law)
 - National Federation of the Blind v. Container Store, 904 F.3d 70 (1st Cir. 2018)
 - Holding T&Cs illusory under TX law, and declining to enforce the included arbitration clause
 - Rejecting the argument that a unilateral amendment clause was not illusory because modified by the duty of good faith and fair dealing or based on the severability clause
- ▣ Mass Arbitration
 - Postmates Inc. v. 10,356 Individuals, CV 20-2783 PSG, 2020 WL 1908302 (C.D. Cal. 2020) (denying injunctive relief)
- ▣ Drafting Tips
 - Rent-A-Center, West, Inc. v. Jackson, 130 S. Ct. 2772 (2010)
 - Challenge to the enforceability of an agreement (arbitrable) vs. challenge to the agreement to arbitrate
 - Clause: arbitrator, not a court, must resolve disputes over interpretation, applicability, enforceability or formation, including any claim that the agreement or any part of it is void or voidable
 - Rahimi v. Nintendo of America, Inc., 936 F. Supp. 2d 1141 (N.D. Cal. 2013)
 - Henry Schein, Inc. v. Archer & White Sales, Inc., 139 S. Ct. 524 (2019)
 - Revitch v. DIRECTV, LLC, 977 F.3d 713 (9th Cir. 2020) ("affiliates" didn't extend to later affiliates; declining to enforce an arbitration agreement in a TCPA case)
 - Lamps Plus, Inc. v. Varela, 139 S. Ct. 1407 (2019) (holding that ambiguity in an arbitration agreement does not provide sufficient grounds for compelling classwide arbitration)
 - AAA – registration requirement
 - Address “mass arbitration” – JAMS vs AAA
 - Review and update frequently

PRACTICAL TIPS

CCPA LITIGATION – ONE YEAR LATER (AND WHAT WILL CHANGE UNDER THE CPRA)



Ann Staggs
Lead Privacy Counsel
Airbnb
www.linkedin.com/in/ans415



Ian Ballon, JD, LLM, CIPP/US
Co-Chair, Global IP & Technology Practice Group
Greenberg Traurig LLP
(650) 289-7881 (310) 586-6575
Ballon@GTLaw.com
Facebook, Twitter, LinkedIn: Ian Ballon
www.IanBallon.net