

1 Michelle A. Kisloff
E. Desmond Hogan
2 Allison M. Holt
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP
3 555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20004
4 Tel: (202) 637-5600
Fax: (202) 637-5910
5 michelle.kisloff@hoganlovells.com
desmond.hogan@hoganlovells.com
6 allison.holt@hoganlovells.com

7 Michael M. Maddigan (SBN 163450)
Vassi Iliadis (SBN 296382)
8 **HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP**
9 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, CA 90067
10 Tel: (310) 785-4600
Fax: (310) 785-4601
11 michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com
vassi.iliadis@hoganlovells.com
12

13 *Attorneys for Defendants Uber USA, LLC,
Uber Technologies, Inc., and Rasier, LLC*

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
16 **WESTERN DIVISION – LOS ANGELES**

17 IN RE: UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,
DATA SECURITY BREACH
18 LITIGATION

MDL No. 2:18-ml-02826-PSG(GJSx)

Case No. 2:18-cv-3001-PSG(GJSx)

19 This Document Relates To:

20 BRADLEY WEST, individually and on
behalf of all others similarly situated,

The Honorable Philip S. Gutierrez

21 Plaintiffs,

**DEFENDANTS’ RESPONSE
TO PLAINTIFF’S NOTICE OF
SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORITY IN SUPPORT OF
PLAINTIFF BRADLEY
WEST’S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANTS’ MOTION TO
COMPEL ARBITRATION
AND STAY ACTION**

22 v.

23 UBER USA, LLC, UBER
24 TECHNOLOGIES, INC., RASIER, LLC

25 Defendants.
26
27
28

1 Defendants Uber USA, LLC, Uber Technologies, Inc., and Rasier, LLC
2 (collectively, “Uber”) hereby submit this Response to Plaintiff’s Notice of
3 Supplemental Authority in Support of Plaintiff Bradley West’s Opposition to
4 Defendants’ Motion to Compel Arbitration, addressing the First Circuit’s recent
5 decision in *Cullinane v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 893 F.3d 53 (1st Cir. 2018).

6 The First Circuit’s decision in *Cullinane* was wrongly decided and conflicts
7 with the current legal landscape regarding assent to online agreements. It also
8 inexplicably departs from the reasoning applied by other courts that have reviewed
9 the registration processes for Uber riders. *See Meyer v. Uber Techs., Inc.* 868 F. 3d
10 66 (2d Cir. 2017) (applying California law); *Cordas v. Uber Techs., Inc.*, 228 F.
11 Supp. 3d 985 (N.D. Cal. 2017) (applying California law); *Cubria v. Uber Techs.,*
12 *Inc.*, 242 F. Supp. 3d 541 (W.D. Tex. 2017).

13 Applying Massachusetts law, the *Cullinane* court concluded that the riders did
14 not receive reasonable notice of Uber’s Terms sufficient to show assent to those
15 Terms and the arbitration agreement therein. *See Cullinane*, 893 F.3d at 64.
16 Ignoring the modern realities of website and mobile application design, the court
17 opined that the notice presented on plaintiffs’ iPhones during registration that said
18 “By creating an Uber account, you agree to the Terms of Service & Privacy Policy”
19 with “The Terms of Service & Privacy Policy” in a clickable button indicated by
20 bold white text enclosed in a rectangle was not sufficiently conspicuous, because it
21 was not blue and underlined and thus “did not have the common appearance of a
22 hyperlink.” *Id.* at 63. But this disregards that clickable buttons are both common
23 practice and a recognized format for hyperlinks, *see* HTML Style Sheet,
24 https://www.w3schools.com/css/css_link.asp (last visited August 6, 2018) (“Links
25 can be styled with any CSS property (e.g. color, font-family, background, etc.).”).
26 Indeed, the First Circuit’s own website demonstrates that hyperlinks come in a
27 variety of colors, fonts, icons, and shapes. *See* U.S. Court of Appeals for the First
28 Circuit, <http://www.ca1.uscourts.gov> (last visited August 6, 2018) (displaying a link

1 to the privacy policy in plain gray text at the bottom of the webpage). The court also
2 made the unprecedented finding that the handful of other items on the screen—
3 amounting to just ten additional words—diminished the ability of consumers to
4 identify a notice and hyperlink that otherwise has “characteristics that make a term
5 conspicuous.” *Id.* at 64.

6 The *Cullinane* analysis is further flawed in failing to evaluate Uber’s
7 registration process from the perspective of a “reasonably prudent smartphone user,”
8 who recognizes that a button labeled “Terms of Service & Privacy Policy” leads to
9 another page displaying the terms to which they will be bound. *Meyer*, 868 F.3d at
10 79. This is why courts that have properly applied the perspective of a reasonably
11 prudent smartphone user to identical or nearly identical Uber registration processes
12 for riders have uniformly concluded that the notice of Uber’s Terms is sufficiently
13 conspicuous to conclude that riders assented to them. *See, e.g., id.* at 78 (“[A]
14 reasonably prudent smartphone user would understand that the terms were
15 connected to the creation of a user account.”); *Cordas*, 228 F. Supp. 3d at 990 (Uber
16 “clearly display[ed] the notice” and the plaintiff “was on notice of Uber’s terms and
17 conditions” under California law); *Cubria*, 242 F. Supp. 3d at 548 (Uber’s notice
18 was “prominent enough to put a reasonable user on notice of the terms of the
19 Agreement”). *Cullinane* provides no grounds for departing from the well-reasoned
20 analyses in those cases.

21 Finally, *Cullinane* is at odds with the reasoning of the Ninth Circuit Court of
22 Appeals, which has noted that courts find the requisite notice for assent to terms of
23 service where, as here “the user is required to affirmatively acknowledge the
24 agreement before proceeding with use of the website” or app. *Nguyen v. Barnes &*
25 *Noble Inc.*, 763 F.3d 1171, 1176 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing *Fteja v. Facebook, Inc.*, 841
26 F. Supp. 2d 829, 835–40 (S.D.N.Y. 2012) (finding assent where the user clicked a
27 button labeled “Sign Up” in response to a notice stating: “By Clicking Sign Up, you
28

1 are indicating that you have read and agreed to the Terms of Service”). That is the
2 case with Plaintiff West.

3 The *Cullinane* opinion is not binding here, and is not persuasive. Uber’s
4 Motion to Compel Arbitration should be granted.

5
6 **HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP**

7 Dated: August 6, 2018

By: /s/ Michelle A. Kisloff

8 Michelle A. Kisloff
9 E. Desmond Hogan
10 Allison M. Holt
11 **HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP**
12 555 Thirteenth Street, NW
13 Washington, D.C. 20004
14 Tel: (202) 637-5600
15 Fax: (202) 637-5910
16 michelle.kisloff@hoganlovells.com
17 desmond.hogan@hoganlovells.com
18 allison.holt@hoganlovells.com

19 Michael M. Maddigan (SBN 163450)
20 Vassi Iliadis (SBN 296382)
21 **HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP**
22 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400
23 Los Angeles, CA 90067
24 Tel: (310) 785-4600
25 Fax: (310) 785-4601
26 michael.maddigan@hoganlovells.com
27 vassi.iliadis@hoganlovells.com

28 *Attorneys for Defendants Uber USA,
LLC, Uber Technologies, Inc., and
Rasier, LLC*