

Exhibit 172

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
et al.,
Plaintiffs,

v.

META PLATFORMS, INC, Instagram, LLC,
Meta Payments, Inc., Meta Platforms
Technologies, LLC., et al.,
Defendants

IN RE: SOCIAL MEDIA ADOLESCENT
ADDICTION/PERSONAL INJURY
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:
4:23-cv-05448

MDL No. 3047

Case No. 4:23-cv-05448-YGR

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Magistrate Judge: Hon. Peter H. Kang

REBUTTAL TRIAL REPORT OF CARL S. SABA, MBA, CVA, ASA, ABV

February 20, 2026

encounter types, so there was not perfect overlap with the BEEF Survey. Nevertheless, the 2025 study indicates a high rate of bad encounters persisted among Instagram Teens well after the latest dates of my analysis.

7. McCrary misunderstands my Aged-Up Teen profit calculation in suggesting a “but-for” world.

136. The McCrary Report asserts that my “...analysis of Meta’s revenues and profits from Teens and Aged-Up Teens... is conceptually flawed and methodologically unsound.”²⁰² McCrary faults my calculations for not including a hypothetical “but-for” world, and that I assumed that “...absent Meta’s alleged violations of UDAP Statutes, Meta would not have earned any profits associated with Aged-Up Teens Users.”²⁰³

137. There are two problems with McCrary’s assertion. The first is that McCrary misunderstands my assignment, which was to calculate profits associated with Teens, and Aged-Up Teens that exceeded certain time spent thresholds. My assignment was not to calculate incremental profits relative to a “but-for” world as suggested by McCrary. I note that the calculation of Meta’s Teen revenue in my Opening Report²⁰⁴ is conservative because it applies the lower ARPU value to certain Teens (i.e., Teens with a stated age over 18), for whom Meta was earning higher ARPU.²⁰⁵ The effect of this conservative approach is that my Opening Report understates the revenue and overstates the losses associated with Teen users.

²⁰² McCrary Report, p. 3.

²⁰³ McCrary Report, p. 94.

²⁰⁴ Opening Report, Section X.2.

²⁰⁵ Meta’s analysis reflects that global revenue would be 0.6% lower if “actual teens” earned revenue based on predicted age rather than stated age. Meta’s analysis also found that “predicted youth / stated adults have roughly 40% the ARPU of average adults.” See META3047MDL-277-00007522-7526 at 7522 and 7525.

138. Secondly, McCrary does not provide any methodology or support to quantify a “but-for” world absent Meta’s alleged violations. In such a world, where Meta did not engage in Plaintiff’s alleged unfair and deceptive practices, McCrary would need to consider how that may have altered the company’s business model and operating results between 2012 and 2024. That would include impact on myriad factors, such as user acquisition and retention rates, network effects on its social media platforms, competitive position, advertiser acquisition and retention rates, and resulting revenues and cost structure.

139. McCrary suggests that I should engage in speculation on this hypothetical “but-for” world, yet he provides no plausible framework or alternative calculation to address this purported issue. He only suggests that I should have assumed certain “Teens would have just spent *less* time on Instagram and Facebook...”²⁰⁶ in the “but-for” world. In doing so, McCrary does not explain how *much less time* should have been assumed in this hypothetical, or the basis for that particular assumption, in order to quantify the impact on my calculations. McCrary also makes a faulty implicit assumption that the only difference if Meta did not engage in the alleged unfair and deceptive practices would be that the subject Teen cohorts would have spent less time on the platform, instead of considering the broader impact to the company’s business model and financial results. For example, had Teens spent less time on the platform, it may have impacted Meta’s relationships and revenue generation from advertisers, Meta’s capital spending plans, scale economies, network effects across Teens and other age groups, economic competition, market share, investment and market capitalization, acquisition and growth, among other factors. McCrary did not analyze these factors and made

²⁰⁶ McCrary Report p. 94.