Amazon Joins Big Tech's Dive Into the Legal Market With Amazon Quick for Legal

Amazon has joined the ranks of Big Tech companies releasing new legal tech products. The company recently debuted Amazon Quick for Legal, built on Amazon Quick, a generative artificial intelligence platform that offers features for users that primarily deal with information management.

Amazon Quick for Legal has agentic AI capabilities for workflows related to contract monitoring, e-discovery, legal research, compliance and document analysis, according to the product's landing page.

Users can ask the AI assistant to provide an agent for contracting that reviews contracts and provide answers to legal questions and explanations for regulatory requirements. Amazon Quick can also provide an agent for tracking and renewing compliance documents, which might involve organizing compliance documents in one folder, tracking expirations, automating renewal reminders and allowing collaboration across teams.

Amazon Quick integrates with a number of applications, including Box, Slack and Zoom.

In launching Quick for Legal, Amazon joins the influx of Big Tech companies developing AI tools for the legal market.

Last month, AI platform Perplexity announced Computer for Counsel, which provides agentic AI legal capabilities and legal tech integrations available to Perplexity Enterprise and Max users. Earlier this summer, AI developer OpenAI hired Ironclad co-founder and former CEO Jason Boehmig as the product leader for its new legal vertical. In April, Microsoft announced its Legal Agent for document analysis, drafting and contracts review. Anthropic developed a legal plugin that it announced in January and has since added several model context protocol integrations with over 20 legal tech companies.

Judge likely to advance class action over hacked Facebook accounts

courthousenews.com/judge-likely-to-advance-class-action-over-hacked-facebook-accounts

SAN FRANCISCO (CN) — A proposed class of Facebook users who say Meta failed to protect their accounts from hackers and denied users access to their own accounts after they'd been compromised will likely be able to advance their claims against the tech giant, a federal judge ruled Wednesday.

Senior U.S. District Judge William H. Orrick said in a tentative ruling from the bench that he was inclined to allow the plaintiffs' claims of breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing and unfair competition to move forward as they had addressed his concerns with their prior complaint.

"It seems to me that 'you can delete the individual content you share, post and upload at any time' is a promise to begin the process whenever the customer wants, and the deletion is to take place within 90 days," the Barack Obama appointee said.

He continued: "It seems to me there is a breach of implied covenant theory: Meta is intentionally using the plaintiffs' information and has gotten rid of people who were there to protect the information; that seems like a plausible theory to me."

Lead plaintiffs Sara Isgur, Eddie Edwards and Richard Repp sued Meta in 2024, claiming the company breached its terms of service by allowing hackers to take over users' Facebook accounts while denying users access to their own accounts.

Orrick dismissed the plaintiffs' second amended complaint in January for failure to state claims but allowed them leave to amend. At Wednesday's hearing, the judge said he was inclined to find the plaintiffs had addressed his concerns with their prior complaint.

"I think this ought to start maneuvering its way through the process," he said.

In their most recent complaint, the plaintiffs say they allowed Meta to license their information in exchange for access to Facebook. However, they say Meta violated its terms of service by intentionally not restoring access to their hacked accounts or providing a way for them to rescind the company's license to their personal information to keep profiting from it.

They additionally claim Meta intentionally fired customer service employees who typically assist users who have been locked out of their accounts, further increasing its profits.

Melissa Zappala of Dunn Isaacson Rhee, representing Meta, argued the plaintiffs are using their licensing theory to attempt to hold the company responsible for being locked out of their Facebook accounts due to the hackers, despite Meta's terms of service stating that the company is not liable for hackers' conduct.

Zappala additionally argued that while the platform's terms of service do state users can delete content at any time, the process does not work perfectly and the terms of service must be read as a whole.

"Yes, there is a statement that a user can delete content, but there is no guarantee that a user can delete content at any time, which is precisely what plaintiffs are attempting to impose," she said.

Additionally, Zappala said the terms of service do not give users the right to terminate Meta's license. Licenses can only be terminated, she said, when Meta deletes the content from the system, which is distinct from user deletion of content.

"Even if a user were to initiate a deletion process, Meta may still need to retain that content and the license to that content," she said. "Because plaintiffs claim that users have the right to delete content and terminate Meta's license, and that is not a promise in the terms of service, the breach of contract claim should be dismissed."

Zappala further argued that because the terms of service do not promise users can delete their content and terminate Meta's license, the implied covenant claim should also be dismissed.

In rebuttal, plaintiffs' attorney Annick Persinger of Tycko & Zavareei argued the plaintiffs have a right to revoke the contract they have with Meta at any time.

"We did our very best to read your order and follow your instructions," she told the judge. "We are very glad to hear that you have found our efforts sufficient, at least tentatively."

Orrick said he would issue an order as soon as he could.

Neither party responded to requests for comment by press time.

Judge greenlights $35 million settlement in Hain Celestial investor suit | Secondary Sources | National

(July 15, 2026) - The Hain Celestial Group Inc. has agreed to pay $35 million to settle a long-running securities fraud lawsuit alleging it concealed a "channel stuffing" scheme to inflate revenue more than a decade ago.

In re the Hain Celestial Group Inc. Securities Litigation, No. 16-cv-4581, *motion for preliminary settlement approval granted* (E.D.N.Y. July 13, 2026).

The proposed settlement, which received preliminary approval from U.S. Magistrate Judge Lee G. Dunst of the Eastern District of New York on July 13, resolves class-action allegations related to the company's financial results from 2014 to 2016.

Hain makes natural and organic food and personal care products under brand names including Celestial Seasonings and Alba Botanica.

The consolidated suit alleges that Hain and top executives falsely attributed the company's results to "strong demand" while concealing that it gave sales concessions and incentives to distributors for purchasing excess products.

The channel stuffing scheme inflated Hain's results and obscured a significant decline in demand until the company revised several years' worth of financial results in 2017, the suit says.

Hain settled related Securities and Exchange Commission allegations in 2018 related to its use of incentives.

The investor suit's history included two dismissals by the District Court, both of which the 2nd U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals vacated.

Lead plaintiffs Rosewood Funeral Home and Salamon Gimpel notified the District Court on May 14 that the parties had reached an agreement to settle the suit.

In a June 26 memo supporting their motion for preliminary settlement approval, the plaintiffs called the $35 million deal a "very good result" for class members after a decade of litigation.

There was a "very strong possibility" of a lesser recovery or none at all, given that Hain recently disclosed doubt about its ability to continue as a going concern, the memo said.

Judge Dunst granted the unopposed motion and scheduled a final settlement hearing for Oct. 28.

What Law Firms Can Learn from AI Deployment

law.com/legaltechnews/2026/07/16/what-law-firms-can-learn-from-ai-deployment

Legal and business professionals who develop an understanding of AI and its capabilities and limitations will be better equipped to navigate technological change.

Editor's note: Hanson Bridgett recently announced the firmwide deployment of Anthropic's Claude across its attorneys and professional staff. The legal industry spent years asking whether artificial intelligence belonged in law firms.
In 2026, that question is largely settled. The new question, "How do you implement AI successfully?" is harder. The firms that answer it thoughtfully will help set the standard for the profession. The ones that don't will spend years catching up.

One lesson learned from AI deployment projects is that implementation and adoption rarely happen at the same pace. As with any new tool or process introduced within an organization, questions arise, and adoption rates vary across practice groups and business teams. Litigation professionals had different use cases and priorities than members of the marketing, HR, finance, and IT departments. The variation was significant enough to shape how training, governance, and support needed to be approached across the organization.

The experience reiterated something we are already seeing in other organizations implementing AI. Change management, governance, and training are often the most critical components of an AI deployment plan. This hard work, governance, data security, training, oversight, and professional responsibility, needs to happen well in advance of putting these tools to work for clients and client matters.

It is incumbent on firms to create policies, set usage scenarios, and implement training and support so that all members within the firm understand the strengths and weaknesses of these technologies. People don’t always embrace AI technology in the same manner.

Practice groups and business functions require different guidance and training, and proactively addressing these differences increases adoption and usefulness. As firms begin to embrace broad implementation, governance and change management become increasingly important.

Firms are already using gen AI in summary reports of depositions and client documents, for drafting routine communications, identifying document discrepancies, and identifying similar cases.

Members at all levels of firms use it for a variety of day-to-day business functions. Today, these applications are increasingly widespread. If used thoughtfully, gen AI will enable professionals to focus on tasks that require expertise, judgment, client relationships, and accountability.

That distinction is important because the value of these tools depends on a clear understanding of where technology ends, and professional responsibility begins.

Gen AI remains a tool. It is not the decision maker. It owes no duties to clients. It does not practice law. It does not exercise professional judgment. It does not bear responsibility for legal advice ultimately delivered to clients.

That responsibility rests with lawyers and other professionals.

That, in turn, makes governance imperative before any significant deployment.

Responsible deployment of gen AI includes policies, restrictions on client and confidential data, review processes, human oversight, collaboration among operations, IT, and risk management teams, and ongoing evaluation as technology evolves.

Training, a concern for many organizations today, requires significant attention. Users must be trained not only on specific use cases but also on how these tools fit into existing workflows. They need opportunities to ask questions, share experiences, and learn from others as adoption progresses. Without robust ongoing training, any technology's impact will be diminished.

Organizations should also be prepared to communicate clearly with clients about how these tools are being used and what safeguards are in place. Transparency helps reinforce trust and demonstrates a continued commitment to professional standards.

The legal industry also has a broader opportunity. AI literacy will become as important a professional skill as legal research, writing, and negotiation. Legal and business professionals who develop an understanding of AI and its capabilities and limitations will be better equipped to navigate technological change.

The firms that derive the greatest value from AI will not necessarily be those that move first. They will be the firms that invest in governance, training, and change management from the outset.

AI will become a feature of legal practice. Ensuring that adoption is responsible, reliable, ethical, and sustainable is one of the defining challenges facing the profession.

David and Larry Ellison Sued by Paramount Investor Alleging 'Illegal' Side Deal With Donald Trump to Secure U.S. Approval for Warner Bros. Takeover

Paramount Skydance chief David Ellison and his tech billionaire dad Larry Ellison have been sued by a Paramount shareholder who alleged they cut an "illegal" deal with President Donald Trump to secure U.S. governmental approval for the takeover of Warner Bros. Discovery.

The shareholder lawsuit, filed Tuesday in Delaware Chancery Court, seeks to block Paramount's $111 billion merger with WBD and also seeks unspecified monetary damages. According to the suit, the Ellisons allegedly promised "illegal private benefits to President Trump in order to remove federal regulatory barriers."

Per the lawsuit, the Ellisons' side deal with Trump included "the opportunity to improperly funnel cash" to to the president by settling his legal claims against CNN, as well as promises that CNN anchors whom Trump does not like would be fired after the WBD takeover. "The Ellisons' actions not only harm the reputations of the news outlets they currently own, which are hemorrhaging viewers, but they are latent liabilities waiting to be triggered by a future administration," the suit says.

The complaint was filed a day after 12 Democratic state attorneys general filed a federal lawsuit seeking to block the Paramount-WBD merger on antitrust grounds, alleging it would give the combined company undue control in theatrical and cable TV markets. The WGA also sued to stop the merger, claiming it would hurt writers' pay and job opportunities.

In a statement, a Paramount spokesperson said: "This lawsuit recycles allegations that have already been reported and already addressed. As we've said consistently: no commitments from either David or Larry Ellison have been made to any government body, State AG, or federal agency regarding the future of CNN or any other news property, other than the goal to deliver truth-based journalism." The company also said, "The Warner Bros. Discovery transaction stands on its own merits. Combining these two libraries and platforms gives consumers more choice, not less — greater investment in original programming, a stronger competitor to streaming rivals, and a more durable footing for journalism and storytelling alike. We remain confident in the merger's fundamentals and will continue toward closing."

The rep also cited Skydance's statement in the summer of 2025 regarding the Skydance-Paramount Global merger: "As with any transaction that requires regulatory approval, Skydance executives and its representatives have had routine and customary interactions with government officials, including with the Administration, Congress, and federal regulators… throughout its history and during the review of the proposed acquisition of

Paramount, Skydance has fully complied with all applicable laws, including our nation's anti-bribery laws."

Since the Paramount-Skydance deal closed in August 2025, "the Ellisons proceeded to remake CBS in the president's image, bought properties he enjoyed, and even hosted events to honor him," the suit said. "This helped the Ellisons, but it appears to have hurt Paramount." Larry Ellison was a primary financial backer of the Paramount Global deal and is personally backstopping the Warner Bros. takeover as well.

Paramount's proposed WBD acquisition was given a green light from the U.S. Justice Department in mid-June, which did not impose any requirements for divestitures or other concessions on the part of Paramount Skydance. Top DOJ officials cleared Paramount-WBD over the objections of lower-ranking lawyers at the department, who were inclined to challenge the deal, the Wall Street Journal reported.

After Trump indicated his preference for Paramount to acquire WBD — over Netflix's deal to buy Warner Bros.'s streaming and studio businesses — federal regulators took a conspicuously hands-off approach to the reviewing the Paramount-WBD merger, according to the suit. Per the complaint, there has been no indication that the deal is under review by the U.S. Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (CFIUS), despite Paramount lining up $24 billion from the sovereign wealth funds of Saudi Arabia, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates. According to Paramount, the three Middle Eastern funds would own 38.5% of the combined Paramount-Warner Bros. Paramount has previously said foreign investors backing the WBD bid will not have board seats or voting shares, and thus CFIUS review is not warranted.

According to the shareholder lawsuit, the lack of scrutiny of the Paramount-WBD deal introduces risk for Paramount investors. The suit said that "future presidential administrations are likely to subject such an ownership structure to intense and persistent scrutiny, creating significant long-term exposure for Paramount. The court should use its equitable power to stop defendants from reaping personal benefits based on illegal activity."

The Paramount investor named as lead plaintiff in the lawsuit is Paul Robbins, who is being represented by Thomas Law, Public Integrity Project and Freedom of the Press Foundation. A copy of the complaint is available at this link.

Seth Stern, chief of advocacy at the Freedom of the Press Foundation, said in a statement about the lawsuit: "The economic terms of this merger, on their own, make no sense for Paramount shareholders. They make even less sense given reports of the Ellisons' commitments to Trump to tank CNN's reputation and viewership just like they did at CBS.

CNN and CBS viewers want real journalism. If Paramount's news networks are watered down to appease the administration, they'll stop tuning in, and the public will be less informed."

Brendan Ballou, CEO of the Public Integrity Project, commented: "America's richest people want to turn America's most important media outlets into propaganda machines for the president. This is bad for Paramount's shareholders. This is bad for democracy. And this is deeply corrupt. This case is about exposing and stopping that corruption."

In addition to David and Larry Ellison, the suit names as defendants Paramount Skydance board members: Gerry Cardinale, Safra Catz, Andrew Brandon-Gordon, Paul Marinelli, John Thornton, Barbara Byrne, Andrew Campion, Justin Hamill and Sherry Lansing.

According to the lawsuit, the stockholder derivative action brought by Robbins is against "Lawrence and David Ellison, Paramount's father-son controlling stockholders, to prevent them from profiting from breaches of their fiduciary duty of loyalty as Paramount's controllers," as well as David Ellison in his capacity as CEO and chairman of Paramount Skydance "to prevent David Ellison from profiting from breaches of his fiduciary duty of loyalty as a Paramount director"; and "the entire Paramount Board, to prevent them from closing a merger transaction with Warner Bros. Discovery (the 'Merger') that, as currently configured, would allow Paramount fiduciaries to profit from an illegal bribery scheme in breach of their fiduciary duties of loyalty to Paramount and otherwise in violation of bedrock Delaware corporate law."

The plaintiff, Paul Robbins, is currently a Paramount stockholder and has "continuously been a Paramount stockholder since before the August 7, 2025 combination of Paramount Global and Skydance" that created Paramount Skydance, per the lawsuit.

Securities

PwC and UK Partner Hit With £3 Million Fine Over Babcock Audit

July 16, 2026, 1:55 AM PDT

PwC and one of its partners was hit with more than £3 million ($4.1 million) of fines by a UK regulator over its audits of Babcock International Group Plc.

The Financial Reporting Council said PwC and the audit engagement partner, John Waters, "admitted serious and numerous breaches," according to a statement on Thursday. The firm and Waters didn't obtain appropriate audit evidence in some circumstances and failed to challenge Babcock's management to determine whether its accounting approach was compliant.

The sanctions were tied to audits of Babcock's financial statements for the 2019 and 2020 fiscal years. UK-headquartered Babcock, which is listed, provides engineering services, with a number of its contracts with the UK government, according to the FRC.

"We're sorry that some aspects of these audits were not of the standard expected," PwC said in a statement. "Audit quality is a constant focus for the firm and the impact of our commitment to continuous improvement has been underlined by recent inspection results."

Babcock shares plummeted in 2021 after the firm reported more than £2 billion of impairments and made certain accounting changes after a broad business review. The company said it had to restate earlier profits that it had reported in error.

The fine was reduced from £5 million to mitigate for cooperation and admissions, the UK regulator said. PwC was fined £3.2 million, while Waters' sanction came to about £59,000. Waters has retired from PwC and is no longer a registered auditor.

To contact the reporter on this story:
Isabella Farr in London at ifarr2@bloomberg.net

To contact the editors responsible for this story:
Tom Metcalf at tmetcalf7@bloomberg.net

Class Action

Manage Newsletters

Starbucks, Ex-Execs Shed Investor Lawsuit Over Sales Decline

July 16, 2026, 8:27 AM PDT

Starbucks Corp. and former top executives convinced a federal judge to toss investor allegations that the coffee giant and former executives overhyped its reinvention plan while store traffic and sales were declining in key markets.

Judge John H. Chun agreed that the investors didn't adequately allege former CEO Laxman Narasimhan believed rosy statements he made in a January 2024 earnings call related to Starbucks' operations at that time rather than past performance. The investors leading the case can replead the allegations dismissed in the US District Court for the Western District of Washington's Wednesday order by the end of the month.

A recent US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit ruling made it tougher for investors to plead scienter — intent or deliberate recklessness to defraud. The Ninth Circuit clarified that inferring scienter is harder where the statement at hand isn't flagrantly false and the complaint doesn't allege facts to counter more innocent explanations, Chun said.

The district court's prior analysis finding the investors did adequately plead Narasimhan's scienter focused just on knowledge, falsity, and particularity, Chun said, rather than whether the inference was at least as compelling as an alternative reason for his conduct.

Starbucks bolstered the alternative explanation for Narasimhan's conduct by arguing the alleged misstatements were made on an earnings call for the already-completed first fiscal quarter of 2024, and the investors' complaint lacked a plausible motive for misleading investors or indications that the executive believed he was discussing current store conditions, the judge said.

"Plaintiffs' failure to demonstrate that the statements are 'flagrantly false' also makes Defendants' alternative explanation—that Defendant Narasimhan genuinely believed that he was referring to the past quarter's results—much more likely," Chun said.

Given he no longer found scienter allegations sufficient, Chun tossed the remaining securities fraud claims against the former CEO and Starbucks. And because he tossed those allegations, controlling person claims against both former executives, Narasimhan and Chief Financial Officer Rachel Ruggeri, must also be dismissed, Chun said.

Fallen Traffic

Investors alleged that Starbucks touted its reinvention plan as working while hiding that it was seeing fallen store traffic in the US and China.

The proposed class includes those who acquired Starbucks stock from Nov. 2, 2023, to April 30, 2024. That day, Starbucks reported second-quarter results with weak store traffic performance. Its stock price plummeted almost 16% the next day.

Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP is lead counsel for the investors. Latham & Watkins LLP and K&L Gates LLP represent Starbucks and the ex-executives. Robbins Geller, Latham, and Starbucks didn't immediately respond to emails seeking comment.

The case is Garbaccio v. Starbucks Corp. , W.D. Wash., No. 2:24-cv-01362, 7/15/26 .

To contact the reporter on this story: Gillian R. Brassil in Washington at gbrassil@bloombergindustry.com

To contact the editor responsible for this story: Brian Flood at bflood@bloombergindustry.com

'Stunning Turn of Events': Johnson & Johnson Asks Judge to Order Potential Dismissal of All 67,000 Talc Lawsuits

Johnson & Johnson, in a motion for order to show cause, insisted that lead plaintiffs’ counsel in the talc multidistrict litigation withdrew their two "marquee" specific causation experts after they acknowledged other risk factors impacting women in six bellwether cases—and that most ovarian cancers are idiopathic.

- Plaintiffs' attorneys Michelle Parfitt and Christopher Placitella said of Johnson & Johnson's motion: "Defendants’ claim is as breathtaking as it is meritless."
- U.S. District Judge Michael Shipp, who is overseeing the talc multidistrict litigation in the District of New Jersey, ordered the plaintiffs’ steering committee to indicate how it plans to move forward with bellwether trials and has set an Aug. 3 hearing.
- Johnson & Johnson has insisted that the two experts, Dr. Daniel Clarke-Pearson and Dr. Judith Wolf, came up with new theories and flip-flopped on the significance of talc as to the cause of ovarian cancer during testimony on May 7 and May 8.

Johnson & Johnson has asked a federal judge for an order that could potentially dismiss all the 67,000 lawsuits alleging its baby powder caused ovarian cancer.

In the motion, filed last month, Johnson & Johnson insisted that lead plaintiffs’ counsel in the talc multidistrict litigation withdrew their two “marquee” specific causation experts after they acknowledged other risk factors impacting women in six bellwether cases—and that most ovarian cancers are idiopathic.

Such a “stunning turn of events,” Johnson & Johnson attorney Jessica Brennan, of Barnes & Thornburg in Morristown, New Jersey, wrote in the motion, are “litigation dispositive” and require an order to show cause why all the talc cases should be dismissed—not just the bellwethers.

“The scientific record in this MDL shows that no qualified expert could reliably opine that perineal talc use was more probably than not a substantial contributing factor to any plaintiff’s ovarian cancer, the baseline burden of proof on causation,” she wrote. “Given this reality, now laid unavoidably bare by the testimony of the withdrawn experts, the court should not only dismiss the six bellwether cases, it should dismiss all claims in the MDL with prejudice.”

Lead plaintiffs’ counsel Michelle Parfitt, of Ashcraft & Gerel in Washington, D.C., and liaison counsel Christopher Placitella, of Cohen, Placitella & Roth in Red Bank, New Jersey, responded in a June 29 filing that Johnson & Johnson’s motion “swung for the fences” in an attempt to avoid remand orders that could set the stage for talc trials across the country. They also insisted they could later reinstate the two experts, Dr. Daniel Clarke-Pearson and Dr. Judith Wolf.

“Defendants’ claim is as breathtaking as it is meritless,” they wrote.

Judges in state court talc cases, including in California, Florida, Georgia and Pennsylvania, have allowed the same experts into trials, they wrote.

“J&J wants this court to dismiss an entire MDL on the flawed theory that the existence of competing risk factors makes specific causation scientifically impossible,” they wrote. “The science, the law and the record all foreclose that result.”

U.S. District Judge Michael Shipp, who is overseeing the talc multidistrict litigation in the District of New Jersey, ordered the plaintiffs’ steering committee to indicate by today whether it planned to reinstate the experts and, if not, how it plans to move forward with bellwether trials. He also set an Aug. 3 hearing. On Tuesday, the plaintiffs’ steering committee asked the judge to give them until July 22 to respond to his order.

Johnson & Johnson’s motion is its latest attack on plaintiffs’ experts in the talcum powder litigation, having lodged lawsuits, subpoenas and public accusations of “junk science.” Earlier this year, retired U.S. District Judge Freda Wolfson, now serving as special master, had recommended that all 39 experts in the talc multidistrict litigation, including three general causation experts for the plaintiffs, as well as Johnson & Johnson's experts, could testify. But on July 10, she recommended striking some of the methods used by one of the plaintiffs’ general causation experts who has testified about asbestos in Johnson & Johnson’s talc products.

In an emailed statement, Johnson & Johnson’s worldwide vice president of litigation Erik Haas praised Wolfson’s “decisive rejection of plaintiffs’ latest attempt to put litigation-driven asbestos testing before a jury.”

“This is exactly why courts serve as gatekeepers: mass-tort claims must be proven with reliable science, not manufactured through expert theories developed for litigation,” the statement says. “The company will continue its efforts to expose the plaintiffs’ bar’s effort to weaponize junk science in pursuit of meritless talc claims.”

'Radically Changed Their Specific Cause Opinions'

Johnson & Johnson’s dismissal motion follows a hearing on May 7 and May 8 before Wolfson involving specific causation experts—or those planning to testify that talc was a contributing factor in the ovarian cancer of the individual women in the six bellwether trials.

During that testimony, wrote Johnson & Johnson attorney Kristen Fournier, a New York partner at Kirkland & Ellis, in a letter after that hearing, plaintiffs' experts "radically changed their specific cause opinions," coming up with new theories and flip-flopping on the significance of talc as to the cause of ovarian cancer. They also disagreed with each other on whether talc, by itself, could be enough to cause ovarian cancer.

"In other words," she wrote, "the hearing confirmed that plaintiffs' experts have no scientific basis to say that talc is a cause, let alone a 'significant contributing case,' of any woman's cancer, revealing the speculative, baseless, and unreliable nature of their specific causation opinions."

She sought the opportunity to file supplemental briefs, which both sides did.

On June 8, Parfitt withdrew both experts.

In a statement released on June 11, the date of its motion, Johnson & Johnson said, "Plaintiffs' withdrawal of their only specific causation experts leaves them unable to satisfy an essential element of their claims, which mandates the dismissal of the claims, with prejudice. More broadly, the experts' concessions elicited during the hearing regarding their opinions affirm that, as decades of science establishes, no plaintiff can make the requisite showing that talc caused their harm, and that this litigation should be put to rest."

Big Tech Docket: New York Times says OpenAI lied to court | Secondary Sources | Federal

(July 15, 2026) - A group of newspapers has accused OpenAI of lying and destroying evidence in a copyright case, and four states seek $1.4 trillion in penalties from Meta.

Here's a roundup of recent events in the world of Big Tech.

Artificial intelligence

The New York Times and other newspapers have asked a Manhattan federal court to sanction OpenAI, alleging the artificial intelligence company lied about its ability to search its systems for copyrighted material and destroyed evidence in the copyright dispute. The news publishers claim that OpenAI falsely told the court it could not search its large language models for their articles while hiding that it had already done so. *New York Times Co. v. Microsoft Corp. et al.*, No. 23-cv-11195, *motion for sanctions filed* (S.D.N.Y. July 9, 2026).

A federal judge has dismissed without prejudice a proposed class action accusing Google LLC of using its Gemini AI platform to track users' communications without their consent, Reuters reports. The lawsuit claimed that Google violated user privacy by enabling Gemini's tracking features by default, rather than as an opt-in choice. U.S. District Judge Noel Wise of the Northern District of California ruled that the plaintiffs failed to show that Google had used their data for any specific purpose. *Thele et al. v. Google LLC*, No. 25-cv-9704, *order issued* (N.D. Cal. July 7, 2026).

Social media

California, Colorado, Kentucky and New Jersey are seeking $1.4 trillion in penalties from Meta Platforms Inc. in an upcoming trial over claims that Facebook and Instagram are purposefully addictive to young users, Reuters reports. The states calculated the potential penalties by multiplying the number of alleged violations by fine amounts set under state law, according to a report from a June court hearing. *In re Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation*, No. 22-md-3047, *response filed* (N.D. Cal. July 6, 2026).

After a two-year investigation, the European Commission has also accused Meta of using addictive features like infinite scroll and autoplay that exploit the vulnerability of minors, Reuters reports. The features violate the Digital Services Act, the EU said, adding that Meta's own risk mitigation measures are ineffective and that fines of up to 6% of its global annual turnover are possible.

A federal judge has rejected Elon Musk's bid to set aside a jury verdict concluding that he defrauded Twitter investors. U.S. District Judge Charles Breyer of the Northern District of California upheld the jury's finding that Musk's May 13, 2022, tweet, which said his purchase of the company was on hold until he received more information on how many bots were on the platform, was a false statement that caused investor losses. But the judge ruled that there was insufficient evidence that another tweet about bot users caused a market reaction. *Pampena et al. v. Musk*, No. 22-cv-5937, 2026 WL 1948057 (N.D. Cal. July 6, 2026).

Antitrust

The EU General Court has dismissed Apple Inc.'s challenge to its designation as a "gatekeeper" under the Digital Markets Act, Reuters reports. The ruling strengthens the hand of EU regulators seeking to curb Big Tech's power, and subjects Apple to strict obligations aimed at increasing competition. Apple said in a statement that the DMA's mandate "goes beyond what is lawful and proportionate, threatening to erode decades of privacy and security protections."

Planet Fitness faces investor suit over misleading growth claims | Secondary Sources | National

(July 16, 2026) - Planet Fitness Inc., its CEO and former chief financial officer are facing a proposed securities class-action lawsuit alleging they misled investors about the company's marketing strategy and growth prospects.

Matsunaga v. Planet Fitness Inc. et al., No. 26-cv-576, *complaint filed* (D.N.H. July 14, 2026).

The fitness company, CEO Colleen Keating and former CFO Jay Stasz concealed that a new marketing campaign was "actively intimidating" its core customer base of casual gym goers, shareholder Norie Matsunaga says in a complaint filed July 14 in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire.

The company's stock price plunged more than 31% in May following corrective disclosures, the suit says.

Matsunaga seeks to recover damages on behalf of all investors who purchased Planet Fitness stock between Nov. 6, 2025, and May 6, 2026.

'Resonating' messaging?

According to the complaint, Planet Fitness painted a rosy picture for investors in late 2025 and early 2026, touting "significant progress" and a "strong join trend."

During a November 2025 investor call, Keating claimed the company's marketing "has legs to extend into 2026" and that "the messaging is resonating and most importantly, it's driving joins."

The company also unveiled plans for a three-year growth algorithm, premised on the continued success of its marketing and a planned price increase for its popular "Black Card" membership from $24.99 to $29.99.

The company also issued strong guidance for 2026, including systemwide sales growth of 4% to 5%, the complaint says.

Price hike paused, stock drops

The optimistic outlook continued into 2026, even after Stasz's abrupt departure March 9, the suit says. At the time, Planet Fitness reaffirmed its full-year financial guidance, but the truth emerged on May 7, when the company announced a "slower than expected start" to the year, the complaint says.

On an earnings call, Keating admitted the company's marketing, which had shifted to feature "more advanced aspirational gym goers," had less resonance with its traditional base. "We may have pivoted too far," she said.

Planet Fitness slashed its guidance for same-store sales growth to just 1%, paused the national rollout of the Black Card price increase and withdrew the three-year growth forecast it had introduced six months earlier.

The news caused the company's stock price to fall from $63.96 to $44.01 in a single day, a decline of about 31.19%, according to the complaint.

Alleged securities law violations

Matsunaga alleges the defendants knew their marketing was failing and that the company was "experiencing a significant headwind in net member joins" even as they publicly touted its success.

The complaint points to analyst reports following the May 7 disclosure, with one suggesting that the company's "attempt to thread the needle by attracting existing fitness club users while maintaining its appeal to first-time gym goers backfired by essentially intimidating its core market."

The company's statements concealed that its projections were unachievable and that it would be forced to overhaul its marketing strategy, in violation of Sections 10(b) and 20(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, 15 U.S.C.A. §§ 78j(b) and 78t(a), the suit says.
By Westlaw Today

Google, Epic Drop Bid To Alter Injunction In Antitrust Case

(July 15, 2026, 7:42 PM EDT)--Epic Games and Google have withdrawn their joint bid to alter an injunction issued after Epic's win in its antitrust case regarding Google's Android app policies.

Google confirmed in the four-page notice filed Tuesday that it will continue to comply with the injunction and that it is prepared to begin the remedies listed within it. The parties will appear in court on Thursday for a hearing.

Tuesday's notice comes just one day after U.S. District Judge James Donato **told both companies** he wouldn't keep going back and forth with them about the changes they wanted to make to an injunction he had issued.

Epic filed an antitrust suit against Google in August 2020, shortly after bringing a similar one against Apple over its behavior with its App Store. The company accused both technology giants of creating monopolies through their app platforms and using that power to control what apps users could download. The suits went after both companies' treatment of paid applications as both generally charged a 30% commission on any money made on or through apps sold in their stores.

Judge Donato handed down a three-year injunction in 2023 in the Google matter that required it to open the Android operating system to competitors. Google appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court, and Epic said they worked out a deal they believed would end the appeals.

But Economist Nancy L. Rose filed a declaration with the California federal court Friday outlining issues she had with the injunction, saying that "three sets of changes in the [Revised Proposed Modified Injunction] remain in tension with the purpose of the remedy and do not appear to be supported by evidence the court requested."

Rose took issue with the proposal to replace distribution through the Google Play store with the registered app store program, a change that would restore Google's ability to "pay for its own prime placement" in the app platform, and link-out fees that would allow Google to charge companies a fee to include a download link that would let it "impede if not block what is likely the most efficient and least costly channel through which a developer can tell its users about alternatives to Google Play distribution."

The case is Epic Games Inc. v. Google LLC et al., case number 3:20-cv-05671, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

Meta Tries Again To Nix Android Users' Browsing-Profile Suit

law360.com/articles/2501529/meta-tries-again-to-nix-android-users-browsing-profile-suit

(July 15, 2026, 9:26 PM EDT)-- Meta on Wednesday took a second stab at nixing an amended consolidated litigation alleging it matched users' browsing activities to their Facebook accounts for targeted advertising purposes and personalizing content, telling a California federal judge the plaintiffs consented to the conduct, which was disclosed in Meta's privacy policy.

In a 34-page brief, Meta Platforms Inc. moved to dismiss a first amended complaint filed by plaintiffs who claim the company exploited an Android communications channel to link users' browsing activities to their Facebook or Instagram pages. The plaintiffs **say** Meta violated the Android security protocol known as "sandboxing," which is meant to prevent one app, like a browser, from accessing information in another app, like a social media platform.

In May, U.S. District Judge Rita F. Lin issued an order granting-and-denying in part Meta's previous motion to dismiss the plaintiffs' initial lawsuit.

"This court previously allowed most of plaintiffs' claims to survive dismissal," Meta says in its Wednesday motion. "Respectfully, that order was wrong, and did not fully address Meta's arguments — which compel dismissal."

The motion continues, "Above all, plaintiffs' claims fail because they consented to the conduct at issue. Meta's privacy policy discloses that Meta collects identifiers from third-party sites, including the '_fbp cookie,' and uses them to 'match your activities with your account.' Every named plaintiff agreed to that policy, and none disputes it."

Wednesday's motion is the latest development in a lawsuit the plaintiffs filed last summer, claiming Meta violated Android's "sandboxing" security protocol.

Meta's Pixel tracking tool can be installed on websites to help businesses and advertisers measure what visitors are viewing, what they're buying and other such metrics, but it also allows Meta to intercept and gather users' activities on those websites, the plaintiffs claim.

Several weeks **after presiding over oral arguments** on Meta's initial dismissal motion, Judge Lin largely allowed the plaintiffs' claims to proceed. She found that the users plausibly argue that Meta's privacy policy — which lays out some of the information the company gathers and shares, including for advertising purposes — did not disclose "that it would perfectly match Android browsing activity to Meta accounts by opening a backdoor to users' Facebook and Instagram apps.'"

"But effective consent does not require the defendant to explain precisely how it collects and uses the data it says it can collect and use," Meta argues in its motion Wednesday. "Consent instead turns on whether a 'reasonable user' would understand 'that an action would be carried out,' not on the technical means by which it happens. Here, what plaintiffs say harmed them is the matching of their browsing activity to their accounts. That was disclosed."

The amended complaint adds claims Meta collected IP addresses through the pixel in an attempt to revive the plaintiffs' pen register claims under the California Invasion of Privacy Act, Meta says. But, the judge already found that Meta's policy explains it gathers browsing data including cookie data, and uses cookies to help match their browsing activities to their Facebook profiles, Meta argues.

"The court should have found consent based on that disclosure; its contrary conclusion was wrong on two grounds," Meta says. "First, the policy's terms explicitly disclose the particular, or at least substantially the same, data collection and use that plaintiffs challenge, permissibly using broad language to do so. Second, neither plaintiffs nor the court may narrow the privacy policy's broad, unqualified language based on extrinsic beliefs about how cellphones work, which are not rooted in Meta's disclosures."

Furthermore, the judge's prior dismissal order was based on the idea that reasonable users could believe that account-matching wouldn't take place on their devices, which addresses the wrong inquiry, Meta argues. Whether a user believed it would not indicate whether the challenged conduct fell within the scope of the language in the privacy policy that the plaintiffs accepted, the motion adds.

Nor does the privacy policy make any qualification or promise that the matching would simply be approximate, or that Meta would stop short of identification, the motion says. Meta's policy explains that matching is accomplished through emails, cookies and advertising device IDs and also discusses the possibility of a perfect matching, the motion adds.

"Allowing a plaintiff's alleged 'reasonable expectations' to trump the words of a contract is fundamentally problematic because it makes it impossible to determine what the contract objectively means — as there are different possible expectations that reasonable people may hold," Meta says. "In particular, people have widely varying beliefs about how technology works (or no beliefs at all) depending on how technically savvy they are."

Meta argues the plaintiffs don't rectify problems Judge Lin identified with their pen register claims. The judge said they didn't claim, that the tool worked as a pen register since they don't say it records dialing, routing, addressing or signaling information, Meta says. Either way, the plaintiffs can't pursue these claims since the alleged sharing of IP addresses does not constitute a privacy injury that's sufficient for standing under Article III, the motion contends.

IP addresses are simply data that's affiliated with a device and captures outgoing IP addresses that the device is communicating with, Meta says. IP addresses are also generally visible to each other, and they have to be for the devices to communicate with one another, the motion says.

"Thus, if any process for collecting a device's IP address constitutes a 'pen register,' then every device on the internet is operating a pen register — and every internet user is therefore a criminal — because devices must collect the IP addresses of other devices for internet communication to work," the motion argues.

The plaintiffs are represented by Michael W. Sobol, Michael K. Sheen, Amelia A. Haselkorn and Douglas I. Cuthbertson of Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein LLP, Philip L. Fraietta, Yitzchak Kopel, Max S. Roberts and Victoria X. Zhou of Bursor & Fisher PA, Tina Wolfson, Theodore W. Maya, Alyssa D. Brown, Sarper Unal and Lisa Cintron of Ahdoot & Wolfson PC, and Gary M. Klinger, William Edelman and Mariya Weekes of Milberg LLC.

Meta is represented by Serrin Turner, Nicolas Luongo, Brad Baglien and Melanie M. Blunschi of Latham & Watkins LLP.

The case is In re Meta Android Privacy Litigation, case number 3:25-cv-04674, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

Zillow Brass Sued By Investors Over Redfin Noncompete Deal

(July 15, 2026, 9:03 PM EDT)-- Executives and directors of online real estate marketplace Zillow have been hit with a shareholder derivative suit accusing them of allowing the company to enter into an anticompetitive agreement with rival Redfin Corp. that led the federal government to file a still-ongoing antitrust suit in September.

According to the complaint filed by Zillow shareholder James Ross on Tuesday, the company agreed in February 2025 to pay $100 million to Redfin to take over its multifamily rentals advertising business. The deal also required Redfin to stop displaying any third-party multifamily listings or to compete for its own multifamily advertising customers for up to nine years, according to the suit.

The "partnership" ultimately exposed Zillow to damaging antitrust regulatory scrutiny, the suit claimed.

"Zillow suffered substantial harm, including but not limited to money damages, reputational damage, exposure to significant securities litigation liability and massive destruction of stockholder value," the complaint said.

Zillow and Redfin announced their deal on the same day that Zillow filed its 2024 annual report with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, according to the complaint. However, that report did not warn shareholders about the regulatory attention the deal would attract, the suit alleges.

The annual report was signed by Zillow's CEO Jeremy Wacksman, Chief Financial Officer Jeremy Hofmann and several other Zillow directors who are also defendants in the suit, the complaint states.

Then, in September, the Federal Trade Commission filed an antitrust suit against Zillow and Redfin.

Zillow "downplayed the allegations" by reiterating its "confidence" in the collaboration, according to the suit, but the negative impacts of the partnership emerged over the next several months, the suit claims.

On Feb. 10, Hofmann told investors on an earnings call that Zillow was facing "elevated legal expenses" impacting the company's earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization. Several weeks later, on May 6, U.S. District Judge Anthony Trenga denied Zillow and Redfin's motion to dismiss the FTC action. Following the news, shares of Zillow fell, the suit claims.

"As the market absorbed this news over the following week, Zillow's Class A stock fell to $37.86 on May 14, 2026, from a pre-disclosure per-share price of $44.83," the suit said. "During this same time period, the company's Class C stock fell from $44.53 to $37.37. Altogether, Zillow's market capitalization fell nearly $1.6 billion."

The complaint also notes that Zillow is facing a proposed **securities class action** over the agreement with Redfin in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington.

A Zillow spokesperson told Law360 in an email on Wednesday that the company will "vigorously defend against these allegations."

"Our rental listings partnership with Redfin is pro-competitive and pro-consumer, and we remain confident in that position," the spokesperson said.

Representatives of the plaintiff did not immediately respond to requests for comment on Wednesday.

Ross is represented by Roger M. Townsend of Townsend Legal PLLC, and Gregory M. Nespole, Daniel Tepper and Correy A. Suk of Levi & Korsinsky LLP.

Counsel information for Zillow and the individual defendants was not immediately available on Wednesday.

The case is Ross v. Zillow Group Inc. et al., case number 2:26-cv-02485, in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington.

Starbucks Beats Investor Suit Over Ex-CEO's Biz Statements

(July 15, 2026, 10:26 PM EDT)--Starbucks Corp. has given a plausible "alternative explanation" for its former CEO's 2024 statements about the business that were deemed misleading by investors suing the company over its "Triple Shot" reinvention plan, a Washington federal judge said Wednesday.

U.S. District Judge John H. Chun **granted** Starbucks' motion for judgment on the pleadings and dismissed the suit's remaining claims without prejudice, giving the plaintiffs a last chance to refile and address the just-dismissed claims.

Starbucks investors **had filed suit** alleging the coffee chain misled shareholders about its struggles to rethink its business amid stiffer competition in China and other matters.

The court's recent order addressed Starbucks' argument that its ex-CEO Laxman Narasimhan genuinely believed he was referring to the past quarter's results and not then-current conditions when making certain statements about Starbucks' performance during an earnings call in 2024.

Judge Chun said Wednesday the court's previous analysis of Narasimhan's alleged misconduct did not consider "whether the inference of scienter is at least as compelling as a specific alternative explanation for the conduct" and that the court will reevaluate given the defendants "specific alternative explanation" for Narasimhan's challenged conduct.

Judge Chun said Starbucks' explanation of Narasimhan's statements is "supported by the fact that the remaining statements were all made on a call titled 'Q1 2024 Earnings Call' — a call that was held for the purpose of discussing the company's Q1 2024 performance and did actually discuss that performance."

The court no longer finds the scienter allegations sufficiently compelling, the judge said.

"While the court does not wish to disturb its prior conclusion … it notes that this knowledge is insufficient to establish scienter where, as here, the challenged statements are not 'flagrantly false' and it is 'a matter of speculation' as to whether they could mislead investors," Judge Chun said.

Lead plaintiffs the Pavers & Road Builders District Council Pension Fund, Teamsters Local 237 Additional Security Benefit Fund and Teamsters Local 237 Supplemental Fund for Housing Authority Employees are represented by Luke O. Brooks, Laurie L. Largent, Kevin A.

Lavelle, Erika L. Oliver, Patton L. Johnson and Evelyn Sanchez Gonzalez of Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP, and Juli E. Farris of Keller Rohrback LLP.

Starbucks is represented by Tyler K. Lichter of K&L Gates LLP, and Andrew B. Clubok, Susan E. Engel, Michele D. Johnson and Whitney B. Weber of Latham & Watkins LLP.

The case is Garbaccio et al. v. Starbucks Corp. et al., case number 2:24-cv-01362, in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington.

Fintech's New Brass Drained Company With Fees, Suit Says

(July 15, 2026, 8:03 PM EDT)-- A financial technology and security firm led in part by the former CEO of Honeywell International faces an investor suit alleging he and others took control of the business and turned it into a "highly leveraged conglomerate" from which they profited by "extracting exorbitant management fees" at shareholders' expense.

The City of Warren Police and Fire Retirement System filed a **complaint** Tuesday against GPGI Inc.; its CEO Jonathan Wilk; two board members, including former Honeywell CEO David Cote;and the company's subsidiary Resolute Holdings Management Inc.

The pension fund claims the defendants misled investors about GPGI's fee arrangement with Resolute Holdings and about an acquisition GPGI completed last year. The suit is on behalf of a proposed class of all purchasers of GPGI Class A common stock between Nov. 3, 2025, and May 6, 2026.

According to the complaint, GPGI, formerly known as CompoSecure LLC, was founded in 2000 as a designer and manufacturer of premium metal payment cards and "secure authentication solutions." The company went public in 2021 through a merger with a blank check company.

In August 2024, it was announced that Resolute Holdings I LP, an investment firm under the leadership of defendants David Cote and Thomas Knott, would acquire a majority interest in GPGI with a $372 million personal investment by "The David Cote Family."

The transaction closed in September 2024, at which point GPGI's dual-class share structure was eliminated, Resolute acquired a majority 60% interest in GPGI, Cote became executive chairman of the company's board, and Knott became a board member, according to the complaint. Additionally, Cote and Knott became GPGI's co-chief investment officers, the complaint says.

The pension fund says that after the deal closed and Cote and Knott were in control of GPGI, they began the next phase of their scheme by announcing a plan to spin off a newly formed subsidiary — Resolute Holdings — as a publicly traded company.

As part of the spin-off, a wholly owned subsidiary of GPGI, CompoSecure Holdings LLC, entered into a management agreement with Resolute Holdings under which CompoSecure

Holdings agreed to pay Resolute Holdings a quarterly management fee equal to 2.5% of CompoSecure's adjusted Earnings Before Interest Taxes Depreciation and Amortizationof the last 12 months, the complaint states.

"Resolute Holdings would then be responsible for 'providing [GPGI's] business with certain services, including providing oversight of its capital allocation strategy, operational practices, as well as [merger and acquisition] sourcing and execution," the plaintiffs say. "The management agreement also effectively gave Resolute Holdings dominion over the company's day-to-day operations and management team as well as [GPGI's] corporate and M&A strategy."

The agreement also included provisions that gave Cote and Knott control of GPGI for an "open-ended duration," and it allowed Resolute Holdings to enter into similar management agreements with entities subsequently acquired by GPGI, according to the complaint.

"This level of control was critical to defendants' fraudulent scheme, as it allowed Cote and Knott to retain operational control of [GPGI] even if Resolute's ownership interest in [GPGI] was later diluted by [GPGI] acquisitions paid for with [GPGI] stock," the plaintiffs argue.

Additionally, the pension fund says that the agreement meant that any acquisition by GPGI could be used to increase the management fees paid to Resolute Holdings, "providing strong incentives for [GPGI's] management to acquire new businesses even if such acquisitions were overvalued or against the interests of [GPGI] and the company's outside shareholders."

"Furthermore, by calculating management fees based on adjusted EBITDA … Resolute Holdings was incentivized to fund [GPGI's] acquisition activities with company debt," the complaint states.

The first acquisition post-spin-off was announced in November 2025, when GPGI said it would purchase Husky Technologies Ltd., a manufacturer and provider of plastic injection molding equipment, in a $5 billion cash-and-stock deal.

After closing, Husky would become an indirect, wholly owned subsidiary of GPGI and enter into a management agreement with Resolute Holdings.

"Tellingly, on the day that the Husky Acquisition was announced, the price of Resolute Holdings stock closed up 97% ($71.31) per share while the price of [GPGI] stock only increased $0.68 per share," the complaint says.

Following the acquisition, the complaint says, Resolute's ownership stake in GPGI was reduced to approximately 17% of total outstanding company shares, "as a result of the dilution caused by the issuance of new shares to fund the transaction."

The pension fund says that throughout the relevant period, the defendants made false and misleading statements to investors that overvalued Husky and misrepresented the benefits of the acquisition to secure funding, shareholder approval of the deal, "generate millions of dollars' worth of additional management fees, and advance defendants' fraudulent scheme to transform [GPGI] into a wealth transfer vehicle for Cote, the Cote Family, and Knott."

"As a result, GPGI's stock price reached a class period high of nearly $27 per share on the first day of the class period only to fall to less than $13 per share in the days following the class period's end, a decline of more than 50%," the plaintiffs contend.

The pension fund is represented by Samuel H. Rudman, Brian E. Cochran and Richard Gonnello of Robbins Geller Rudman & Dowd LLP, and Thomas C. Michaud of VMT Law PC.

The case is City of Warren Police and Fire Retirement System v. GPGI Inc. et al., case number 1:26-cv-05951, in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York.

Apple's 'Hide My Email' Doesn't Work As Promised, User Says

law360.com/articles/2501814

(July 15, 2026, 11:22 PM EDT)-- While Apple Inc. assures consumers it prioritizes their privacy with its "Hide My Email" feature, which purports to shield users' email addresses from third parties, the feature doesn't actually work as promised, according to a proposed class action filed Wednesday in California federal court.

When a user is asked to provide an email on an app or website that allows users to "sign in with Apple," the "Hide My Email" feature will generate a "unique, private relay address in place of the user's actual email address" that then forwards messages to the user's inbox, so the third party never receives the user's real email address, the **complaint** filed by Anthony Alvarez says.

But "security researchers have demonstrated that every email address that Hide My Email purports to hide can be unhidden, a finding independently verified by technology journalists who confirmed they could recover a user's actual email address from a Hide My Email generated email address in moments," the suit alleges.

What's more, Apple has known about the flaw since June 2025, but has done nothing about it, the complaint claims. Instead, Apple continues to tell consumers that the "Hide My Email" feature actually hides their email addresses, Alvarez says.

Even when it claimed in March that it had addressed the problem, security researchers told the company its "purported fix had failed," the complaint states.

"At no point during this period did Apple disable or pause Hide My Email, warn its customers of the flaw, or correct its privacy representations," Alvarez says. "As of the filing of this complaint, the vulnerability remains unremediated and Hide My Email continues to be sold as a core feature of Apple's privacy-protective ecosystem and of iCloud+ subscriptions."

Meanwhile, Apple continues to profit from its misleading marketing, the suit adds.

According to the complaint, a bundled version of the "Hide My Email" feature has been around since 2019 as a built-in extension of "Sign in with Apple," and is available to all Apple users. But in September 2021, another version was launched as part of the paid iCloud+ subscription tier, which ranges in price from 99 cents per month to $59.99 per month, the suit states.

Users have relied on Apple's statements that "Hide My Email" protects against spam emails, unwanted tracking, the sale of personal data, the exposure of their personal email address in a third-party data breach, and other harms, Alvarez says.

"Consumers use the feature to sign up for sensitive accounts and websites without linking them to their real identity, to avoid harassment, and to maintain their privacy, among other reasons," the suit states. "The value of the feature depends on one thing being true — that the random alias cannot be traced back to the user's real email address."

"Once a real email address is exposed, it can be cross-referenced against free, publicly accessible people-search and data-broker sites to reveal a person's name, location, and other personal details — defeating the entire privacy purpose of the feature and placing at particular risk the users who depend on it," Alvarez asserts.

According to the complaint, just about anyone — "without elevated privileges or insider access" — can link a "Hide My Email" alias back to a user's real email. The suit says independent testing has found that "100% of the aliases examined were exploitable."

The suit asserts violations of California's Unfair Competition Law, False Advertising Law and Consumer Legal Remedies Act, as well as claims of fraud, negligent misrepresentation, breach of contract, breach of implied contract, breach of implied warranty of merchantability and unjust enrichment.

It seeks statutory damages, injunctive relief, restitution, disgorgement, litigation costs and attorney fees, among other relief.

Alvarez is represented by Victor J. Sandoval, David S. Almeida and Stephanie T. Reed of Almeida Law Group LLC.

The case is Anthony Alvarez v. Apple Inc., case number 3:26-cv-07274, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.