

AMENDED Exhibit 417

PLAINTIFFS' OMNIBUS OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' MOTIONS FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Case No.: 4:22-md-03047-YGR

MDL No. 3047

In Re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation

Geoffrey M. Drake, *pro hac vice*
TaCara D. Harris, *pro hac vice*
King & Spalding LLP
1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30309-3521
Telephone: (404) 572-4600
Facsimile: (404) 572-5100
Email: gdrake@kslaw.com
tharris@kslaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants
TikTok Inc., ByteDance Inc., TikTok Ltd.,
Byte Dance Ltd., and TikTok LLC

Additional counsel listed on signature page

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA – OAKLAND DIVISION

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

Case No. 4:22-MD-03047-YGR (PHKx)

MDL No. 3047

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO ALL
ACTIONS

**THE TIKTOK DEFENDANTS’
OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO
PLAINTIFFS’ REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION, SET 4**

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 36 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendants TikTok Inc., ByteDance Inc., TikTok Ltd., ByteDance Ltd., and TikTok LLC (collectively, “the TikTok Defendants”) submit their responses to Plaintiffs’ Requests for Admission, Set 4.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The TikTok Defendants’ responses are and will be made solely for purposes of this action and are directed to Plaintiffs with active claims against the TikTok Defendants. The TikTok

1 to different meanings and fail to describe with reasonable particularity the information sought. The
 2 TikTok Defendants further object that this Request references data or information from an
 3 identified source such that the TikTok Defendants are unable to speak to its veracity, in violation
 4 of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 36(a)(2).

5 **Response:** Subject to and without waiving these Objections and their Objections to
 6 Definitions and Instructions above, having conducted a reasonable inquiry, the TikTok Defendants
 7 lack sufficient knowledge to admit or deny this Request as stated.

8 **REQUEST NO. 28:** Admit that You use age-determining technology—“grade level,” the
 9 algorithm for which is based on Users’ behavior and other metrics—for purposes such as
 10 advertising.

11 **Objections:** The TikTok Defendants object to this Request as overly broad, unduly
 12 burdensome, disproportionate to the needs of the case, and seeking information that is not relevant
 13 to any party’s claim or defense. The TikTok Defendants further object to this Request because of
 14 its use of the term Users, which is objectionable for the reasons stated *supra*. The TikTok
 15 Defendants also object to this Request as vague and ambiguous. Specifically, the terms/phrases
 16 “use,” “age-determining technology,” “grade level,” “algorithm,” “behavior,” “other metrics,” and
 17 “advertising” are vague and ambiguous because they are subject to different meanings and fail to
 18 describe with reasonable particularity the information sought. The TikTok Defendants further
 19 object that this Request is overly broad to the extent it is not limited to the TikTok Platform, as
 20 defined *supra*, or the Relevant Time Period, as defined by Judge Kang’s June 20, 2024 Order.

21 **Response:** Subject to and without waiving these Objections and their Objections to
 22 Definitions and Instructions above, the TikTok Defendants admit only that they offered one or more
 23 models that are trained on data sets to recognize patterns and make non-determinative predictions
 24
 25
 26

1 about a user's age band or level—13-17, 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, or 55+—to aid in the age
2 appropriate delivery of advertisements to TikTok users. Except as explicitly admitted, the TikTok
3 Defendants deny this Request.

4 **REQUEST NO. 29:** Admit that You do not use age-determining technology—"grade
5 level," the algorithm for which is based on Users' behavior and other metrics—to identify and
6 remove children under 13 from the TikTok Platform.

7 **Objections:** The TikTok Defendants object to this Request as overly broad, unduly
8 burdensome, disproportionate to the needs of the case, and seeking information that is not relevant
9 to any party's claim or defense. The TikTok Defendants further object to this Request because of
10 its use of the terms TikTok Platform and Users, which are objectionable for the reasons stated
11 *supra*. The TikTok Defendants also object to this Request as vague and ambiguous. Specifically,
12 the terms/phrases "use," "age-determining technology," "grade level," "behavior," and "other
13 metrics" are vague and ambiguous because they are subject to different meanings and fail to
14 describe with reasonable particularity the information sought. The TikTok Defendants further
15 object that this Request is overly broad to the extent it is not limited to the TikTok Platform, as
16 defined *supra*, or the Relevant Time Period, as defined by Judge Kang's June 20, 2024 Order. The
17 TikTok Defendants also object to this Request to the extent it implies the TikTok Defendants do
18 not use methods or technologies to detect and remove accounts for users that violate the TikTok
19 Platform's minimum age requirements in the United States specifically. The TikTok Defendants
20 further object to this Request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, seeks to establish or suggest
21 a legal duty, or purports to require the TikTok Defendants to perform or provide legal analysis, or
22 would impose a duty on the TikTok Defendants in violation of Section 230 or the First Amendment.
23
24
25
26

Objections: The TikTok Defendants object to this Request as overly broad, unduly burdensome, disproportionate to the needs of the case, and seeking information that is not relevant to any party's claim or defense. The TikTok Defendants also object to this Request as vague and ambiguous. Specifically, the phrases "purpose of engaging" and "communities that they serve" are vague and ambiguous because they are subject to different meanings and fail to describe with reasonable particularity the information sought. The TikTok Defendants further object to this Request to the extent it calls for a legal conclusion, seeks to establish or suggest a legal duty, or purports to require the TikTok Defendants to perform or provide legal analysis, or would impose a duty on the TikTok Defendants in violation of Section 230 or the First Amendment.

Response: Subject to and without waiving these Objections and their Objections to Definitions and Instructions above, the TikTok Defendants deny this Request.

Dated: April 2, 2025

KING & SPALDING, LLP

/s/ Geoffrey M. Drake

Geoffrey M. Drake, *pro hac vice*

TaCara D. Harris, *pro hac vice*

King & Spalding LLP

1180 Peachtree Street, NE, Suite 1600

Atlanta, GA 30309-3521

Telephone: (404) 572-4600

Facsimile: (404) 572-5100

Email: gdrake@kslaw.com

tharris@kslaw.com

Kristen R. Fournier, *pro hac vice*

King & Spalding LLP

1185 Avenue of the Americas, 34th Floor

New York, NY 10036-2601

Telephone: (212) 556-2100

Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

Email: kfournier@kslaw.com