

AMENDED Exhibit 896

**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

DOCUMENT SLIPSHEET

P-SNAP-0748

Bates Number: SNAP0010984-SNAP0010986

Custodian: BEAUCHERE_JACQUELINE

Author: JACQUELINE BEAUCHERE

Filename: B8D65D3029BCC4FD9D9081D61283AC8ADA8A1C0313FF3434C8C026F92A0ADBB7.EML

Create Date: 6/21/2022 12:18 AM

Last Modified Date: 6/21/2022 12:18 AM

TNAG BEGBATES:

TNAG ENDBATES:

MAAG BEGBATES:

MAAG ENDBATES:

File Path: /B8D65D3029BCC4FD9D9081D61283AC8ADA8A1C0313FF3434C8C026F92A0ADBB7.EML



From: Jacqueline Beauchere [REDACTED]
Sent: 6/21/2022 12:18:23 AM
To: [REDACTED]
CC: Gina Woodworth [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Family Center Follow Up Question

All good, [REDACTED] I'm on biz travel overseas. [I guess I don't know how to put on the "correct" OOO (?)]. 🙋♀

On Tue, Jun 21, 2022 at 9:00 AM [REDACTED] wrote:

Thanks Jacqueline! I saw you're on OOO currently. Absolutely none of this is urgent, so please don't feel the need to follow up any time soon.

On Mon, Jun 20, 2022 at 11:58 PM Jacqueline Beauchere <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Thanks again, [REDACTED]

Comms has pulled together some very good messaging around FC that is serving as the basis for all of our collateral. I have not yet seen any rude Qs and As, but I'll make sure some TPs on age amnesty are included.

I don't think there are any plans for community outreach. (Funny enough, I mentioned something very similar to Comms, but not exactly tied to FC.) Frankly, I worry that there isn't a ton to build an entire "Parents Nights" workshop around, for instance. That said, coupled with a (heavy-ish) Snapchat 101, it could work and I'm happy to raise it.

Stay tuned!!

On Tue, Jun 21, 2022 at 5:21 AM [REDACTED] wrote:

Thank you for the clarification Jacqueline. I know that these policies are evolving, and we will be sure to share feedback as we receive it. I am a bit concerned (maybe overly so) that legislators will frame this structure as us prioritizing a users right to essentially falsify their age (something we ostensibly don't support) over a parent's ability to utilize the Family Center functionality. I may be overthinking, but this could perhaps be an area we consider some talking points around.

On another note, Rahul and I had a really good call with Orange County late last week. I previewed for them that we would have an announcement around Family Center later this summer, and they expressed interest in learning more, and asked if we were open to doing presentations (such as a school district town hall). I am wondering if we've had similar requests, and what your thoughts are for engaging families/communities post-launch.

Thanks so much Jacqueline,

- [REDACTED]

On Thu, Jun 16, 2022 at 5:59 PM Jacqueline Beauchere <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Hi, [REDACTED] Glad you enjoyed the presentation and thanks for the follow-up.

P-SNAP-0748

One thing I'm not sure Abby mentioned is this: based on feedback from some of the third-party experts, we will offer an "age amnesty period," in which teens who may have "aged out" of Family Center (when they really should be in) can amend their age to the appropriate one, so that they can be a part of FC.

My understanding is the same as yours (i.e., we are not alerting parents/caregivers to any reason behind a rejection, or even of the rejection itself.) This from the presentation: "(I)nviters are not notified of an invitation rejection."

We, of course, don't know if the age amnesty will solve any (let alone all!) of these problems, but we're hoping many teens will aim to correct any inaccuracies.

Hope that helps at least somewhat.

Bests,

■

On Thu, Jun 16, 2022 at 1:00 PM [REDACTED] wrote:
Hi Jacqueline,

Thanks so much for coordinating Abby's presentation during this week's policy meeting. It's great to see Family Center "in action," and I'm very excited for the rollout.

I wanted to follow up on a question I had during the meeting, but wasn't 100% clear on the answer. Regarding the age restrictions, I had asked if parents/guardians/family members would be given some sort of note or prompt in the event that a family center request sent to a child was rejected because the recipient's age in-app is 18+.

We know there are users in the system who falsify their age to be older than 18, when in fact they are younger. It seems like parents should be notified of the reasoning for their request being rejected, as it could prompt the conversation about why the recipient had falsified their age and allow the parent to request them to update their profile to the appropriate age, should they wish to have that conversation with their kid. Abby's response made it seem as though we (Snap) were uncomfortable being the ones to essentially alert parents that their child may have falsified their age in our app.

Did I misunderstand our position, or how the functionality would work?

Thanks for your time Jacqueline,

- J [REDACTED]

--

[REDACTED]
Public Policy Manager
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Public Policy Manager
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]