```
1
       online business, and because they are large.
 2
          Your Honor, case after case has said, online businesses,
 3
       in fact owe duties to their customers. We see that in the two
 4
      Facebook decisions from this -- from this district, again, as
 5
      well as cases like Maynard, Lemmon, Brooks, online businesses
 6
      owe duties of care.
 7
          And in fact, the fact --
 8
                THE COURT: Well, let me ask this.
 9
               MS. SCULLION: Go ahead.
10
                THE COURT: -- to Mr. --
11
               MS. SCULLION: Drake.
12
                THE COURT: So is that the position that you're
13
      attempting to take, that you owe no duty?
               MR. DRAKE: No. That's not the --
14
15
                THE COURT: All right. So what --
16
                         (Simultaneous colloquy.)
17
               MR. DRAKE: -- wouldn't articulate it that way, Your
18
      Honor.
19
                THE COURT: So what duty do you owe? What duty do
20
      you owe to these children?
21
               MR. DRAKE: Well, I think that's a -- an amorphous
22
      question that's hard to answer --
23
                          (Simultaneous colloquy.)
24
                THE COURT: -- best you can.
25
                MR. DRAKE: Well --
```

```
1
                THE COURT:
                            Do the best you can. You're a --
 2
                MR. DRAKE:
                           I think --
 3
                THE COURT: -- collectively represent billion-dollar
 4
      companies.
 5
          What duty do owe to these adolescents?
 6
               MR. DRAKE: Well, I'm not sure that I know what duty
 7
      the companies would owe based on any case that I been able to
 8
       find to be able to articulate a duty for Your Honor today and
 9
       I think that's part of the problem that we're struggling
10
      with --
11
                THE COURT: That is part of the problem. That is
12
      part of the problem, that you seem to suggest you have no
13
      duty.
14
               MR. DRAKE: Well, we're suggesting that we have no
15
      cognizable, recognized duty under the laws of the 49 states
16
      that -- that are mostly at issue here -- I guess could we
17
       could say all 50 states if -- if we want -- that has looked at
18
      this exact set of allegations. The plaintiffs had the burden
19
      to plead that duty under Rule 88 --
20
                THE COURT: And you had a duty bringing a motion to
21
       dismiss to say that nothing is there and -- and you get to be
22
      scot-free.
23
               MR. DRAKE: Well, we -- what we've articulated in our
24
      motion, Your Honor, is that a general duty to design a
```

platform in a safe way is no --

25

```
1
                THE COURT:
                            So you don't -- you don't have a duty
 2
      to --
 3
                MR. DRAKE: Not as articulated.
                THE COURT: -- to design a platform in a safe way.
 4
 5
      That's what you want -- that's what you want to arque.
                           Well, what I'm arguing --
 6
                MR. DRAKE:
 7
                THE COURT: Yes or no? Yes or no?
 8
               MR. DRAKE: Well, yes, I do want to argue that, Your
 9
      Honor.
10
                THE COURT: That you have -- let me write it down.
      No duty to design a platform in a safe way. That's what you
11
12
       said.
13
               MR. DRAKE: That duty does not exist under the law.
      It has not been articulated by any of the cases that we've
14
15
       looked at, that we've cited at length in our brief.
16
      courts have repeatedly looked at this issue in a whole host of
17
      different contexts, whether traditional media or modern media
18
      or social media.
19
          And the courts have found that pleading a one-sentence
20
      duty that says you have a duty to design your platform in a
21
       safe way is not a cognizable duty. It does not satisfy the
22
      burden to plead a duty under Rule 8.
23
          And it has been repeatedly rejected by numerous courts in
      the context specifically of online platforms and for reasons,
24
```

many of which Mr. Willen articulated earlier, which is that to

25

1 recognize such a duty as articulated would stifle free 2 expression. And that is a significant policy objective that 3 courts have repeatedly recognized. And that allegations like 4 those in the complaint here do not satisfy the foreseeability 5 standard that courts have also articulated --6 **THE COURT:** Any response? 7 (Simultaneous colloquy.) 8 MR. DRAKE: -- recognizes it underpinning --9 MS. SCULLION: Yes, Your Honor. As Your Honor's 10 picked up on, they -- they do, in fact, allege -- and this is motion to dismiss at page 28. They say, "no state has 11 recognized any duty of an online service to its customers." 12 13 It's flat. It's extreme. It's not supported by the law. 14 And -- and I've already talked about the various cases, 15 including in this district, that have found duties of care owed to the customers of online service -- online --16 17 (Simultaneous colloquy.) 18 THE COURT: Could I have my state AG reps --19 Well, actually, I will get to you. 20 I'm curious to know whether the 40 state attorney generals 21 are going to agree with you, that your clients have no duty to 22 design a platform in a safe way. 23 MR. DRAKE: Well, if I could just -- just to add one more point to that, Your Honor. I was speaking in the context 24

of tort and negligence liability and duty.

25

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	MR. DRAKE: Not in the context of perhaps federal
3	statutes whether COPPA or Protect or other statutes that might
4	exist, but in the context of common law
5	THE COURT: In the context of the law that we
6	generally deal with in these kinds of things.
7	All right. We're moving on. Causation.
8	MS. SCULLION: Thank you, Your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Okay. So my notes with respect to
10	causation, I have Ms. Hazam back and Mr. Blavin.
11	MR. BLAVIN: Correct. Mr. Blavin.
12	THE COURT: Blavin?
13	MR. BLAVIN: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Well, at least I didn't call you
15	"Mr. Jonathan."
16	MR. BLAVIN: That would have been fine, too.
17	THE COURT: I had a classmate in college, and we
18	called him "the guy with two last names." Sorry about that.
19	Okay. Causation. Everybody has agreed I think we've
20	heard repeatedly today that we aren't dealing with but-for
21	causation, right?
22	MS. HAZAM: Correct, Your Honor.
23	THE COURT: Correct?
24	MR. BLAVIN: Correct, Your Honor.
25	THE COURT: Okay.