

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

SEPTEMBER 2025

VOL. 11 NO. 7

PRATT'S  
**PRIVACY &  
CYBERSECURITY  
LAW**  
REPORT



LexisNexis

**EDITOR'S NOTE: IT'S ABOUT DATA** Victoria Prussen Spears

**DATA PRIVACY IMPLICATIONS OF DOJ BULK SENSITIVE PERSONAL DATA RULE UNDER EXECUTIVE ORDER 14117 AS SEEN THROUGH THE LENS OF VENDOR CONTRACTING AND INTERNATIONAL NORMS**

Frederick C. Bingham, Jeewon K. Serrato and Shruti Bhutani Arora

**STEERING CLEAR OF ECPA LIABILITY: WHAT CONNECTED VEHICLE COMPANIES SHOULD KNOW ABOUT RESPONDING TO GOVERNMENT PROCESS**

Ian L. Barlow, Brandon J. Moss and Elizabeth K. Drill

**HOW SAFE IS YOUR MULTI-FACTOR AUTHENTICATION? COMPLYING WITH THE NEW YORK STATE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCIAL SERVICES AND OTHER CYBERSECURITY REGULATORS**

Mark L. Krotoski, Brian H. Montgomery and Johnna Purcell

**NINTH CIRCUIT PRIVACY RULING COULD BE USED TO EXPAND POTENTIAL FORUMS FOR E-COMMERCE LAWSUITS**

Attison L. Barnes, III, Duane C. Pozza, Enbar Toledano and Leah C. Deskins

**CALIFORNIA PRIVACY PROTECTION AGENCY INTENSIFIES ENFORCEMENT: RECENT ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS AND TRENDS**

Arsen Kourinian, Lei Shen, Amber C. Thomson and Megan P. Von Borstel

# Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

---

---

VOLUME 11

NUMBER 7

September 2025

---

**Editor's Note: It's About Data**

205

Victoria Prussen Spears

**Data Privacy Implications of DOJ Bulk Sensitive  
Personal Data Rule Under Executive Order 14117  
as Seen Through the Lens of Vendor Contracting  
and International Norms**

207

Frederick C. Bingham, Jeewon K. Serrato and  
Shruti Bhutani Arora

**Steering Clear of ECPA Liability: What Connected  
Vehicle Companies Should Know About  
Responding to Government Process**

218

Ian L. Barlow, Brandon J. Moss and Elizabeth K. Drill

**How Safe Is Your Multi-Factor Authentication? Complying  
With the New York State Department of Financial Services and  
Other Cybersecurity Regulators**

223

Mark L. Krotoski, Brian H. Montgomery and Johnna Purcell

**Ninth Circuit Privacy Ruling Could Be Used to Expand  
Potential Forums for E-Commerce Lawsuits**

229

Attison L. Barnes, III, Duane C. Pozza, Enbar Toledano and  
Leah C. Deskins

**California Privacy Protection Agency Intensifies  
Enforcement: Recent Enforcement Actions and  
Trends**

232

Arsen Kourinian, Lei Shen, Amber C. Thomson and  
Megan P. Von Borstel

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:  
Deneil C. Targowski at ..... (908) 673-3380  
Email: ..... Deneil.C.Targowski@lexisnexus.com  
For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:  
Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385  
Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341  
LexisNexis® Support Center ..... <https://supportcenter.lexisnexus.com/app/home>  
For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call  
Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940  
Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3362-4 (print)  
ISBN: 978-1-6328-3363-1 (eBook)

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print)  
ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online)

Cite this publication as:  
[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT’S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [page number]  
(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);  
Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [7] PRATT’S PRIVACY &  
CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [179] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2025 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

*An A.S. Pratt Publication*  
Editorial

Editorial Offices  
630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800  
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200  
[www.lexisnexus.com](http://www.lexisnexus.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

(2025–Pub. 4939)

# *Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors*

---

## **EDITOR-IN-CHIEF**

**STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ**

*President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **EDITOR**

**VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS**

*Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

## **BOARD OF EDITORS**

**EMILIO W. CIVIDANES**

*Partner, Venable LLP*

**CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA**

*Partner, Holland & Knight LLP*

**RICHARD D. HARRIS**

*Partner, Day Pitney LLP*

**JAY D. KENISBERG**

*Senior Counsel, Rivkin Radler LLP*

**DAVID C. LASHWAY**

*Partner, Sidley Austin LLP*

**CRAIG A. NEWMAN**

*Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP*

**ALAN CHARLES RAUL**

*Partner, Sidley Austin LLP*

**RANDI SINGER**

*Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP*

**JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI**

*Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP*

**TODD G. VARE**

*Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP*

**THOMAS F. ZYCH**

*Partner, Thompson Hine*

---

*Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report* is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2025 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquiries and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of their employer, its clients, the editor(s), RELX, LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Co., Inc, or any of its or their respective affiliates.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

# Ninth Circuit Privacy Ruling Could Be Used to Expand Potential Forums for E-Commerce Lawsuits

*By Attison L. Barnes, III, Duane C. Pozza, Enbar Toledano and Leah C. Deskins\**

*This article discusses a recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit that plaintiffs will cite to attempt to expand where e-commerce platforms can be subject to courts' specific personal jurisdiction, particularly in privacy-related cases in that circuit.*

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, sitting en banc, has issued an opinion in *Briskin v. Shopify, Inc.*,<sup>1</sup> that plaintiffs will cite to attempt to expand where e-commerce platforms can be subject to courts' specific personal jurisdiction, particularly in privacy-related cases in that circuit. In an outlier opinion, the court departed from courts' historical reluctance to broadly find personal jurisdiction in cases involving products and/or services offered nationwide, particularly in scenarios where at-issue products or services only "enter" a jurisdiction as the result of a consumer's unilateral actions.

## RELEVANT BACKGROUND

The plaintiff in *Briskin* (a California resident) brought several state law privacy-related claims in a federal trial court in California against the e-commerce platform Shopify, Inc. (a Canadian corporation headquartered in Canada) and two of its American subsidiaries (both incorporated in Delaware, with principal places of business in New York and Delaware, respectively). The plaintiff alleged that when he used his mobile phone browser to purchase athletic wear from an online storefront, he unknowingly provided certain private data to Shopify, "an e-commerce platform that facilitates online sales for merchants."

According to the plaintiff, when he checked out of his transaction, the company – which he alleged knew the plaintiff was located in California – not only validated his payment, but also "installed tracking cookies onto his device." Those cookies then allegedly tracked and stored personal information such as his geolocation data, his browser's identity, his IP address, and the location of the transaction itself. The plaintiff claimed that the platform then shared that information with merchants using the platform as well as third parties.

---

\* The authors, attorneys at Wiley Rein LLP, may be contacted at [abarnes@wiley.law](mailto:abarnes@wiley.law), [dpozza@wiley.law](mailto:dpozza@wiley.law), [etoledano@wiley.law](mailto:etoledano@wiley.law) and [ldeskins@wiley.law](mailto:ldeskins@wiley.law), respectively.

<sup>1</sup> \_\_ F.4th \_\_ (9th Cir. Apr. 21, 2025), <https://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/opinions/2025/04/21/22-15815.pdf>.

The district court granted Shopify's motion to dismiss the case for lack of personal jurisdiction, which a three-judge Ninth Circuit panel affirmed. The basis for those decisions was that the company, which operates a nationwide payment processing platform, did not expressly aim its suit-related conduct at California. In other words, consistent with the weight of relevant jurisprudence around the country, the three-judge panel held that "[w]hen a company operates a nationally available e-commerce payment platform *and is indifferent to the location of end-users*, the extraction and retention of consumer data, without more, does not subject the defendant to specific jurisdiction in the forum where the online purchase was made." The en banc panel of the Ninth Circuit disagreed and reversed.

## NINTH CIRCUIT'S ANALYSIS

In deciding that the federal trial court in California did have specific personal jurisdiction over Shopify, the Ninth Circuit issued three primary determinations.

First, it found that "Shopify purposefully directed its wrongful conduct toward California." (cleaned up). The court emphasized that the company "expressly aimed its conduct at California through its extraction, maintenance, and commercial distribution of ... California consumers' personal data." Key to this analysis, the Ninth Circuit explained that "express aiming" sufficient to support a finding of purposeful direction at California does not require "differential targeting," i.e., conduct focused on a particular forum. That is, it does not matter that the company "operates nationwide and . . . is agnostic as to the location" of consumers. Instead, the court held "that an interactive platform expressly aims its wrongful conduct toward a forum state when its contacts are its own choice and not random, isolated, or fortuitous" – "even if that platform cultivates a 'nationwide audience for commercial gain.'"

Second, the court found that the plaintiff's claims arose from or related to Shopify's California conduct. The court noted that the plaintiff's claims arose from Shopify's contact with the plaintiff's mobile phone, "which Shopify allegedly knew was in California," and the plaintiff's claims related to Shopify's California contacts because he "allege[d] the kind of injury that would tend to be caused by Shopify's contacts with California merchants and consumers."

Third, the Ninth Circuit found that it is reasonable to exercise specific personal jurisdiction over Shopify under the circumstances. In supporting this conclusion, it explained that the company had purposefully directed its business activities toward California and that it had not raised any other issues that might suggest personal jurisdiction would be unreasonable. In so holding, the court acknowledged but dismissed concerns that its finding "could lead to specific jurisdiction in all 50 states," stating that while that may be true, it is not unfair. Likewise, the court dismissed the company's argument that the availability of other potential forums mattered – declaring that the availability of those other forums did not render jurisdiction in California unfair.

## TAKEAWAYS

The Ninth Circuit's specific personal jurisdiction analysis in *Briskin* could have serious implications for e-commerce platforms operating within the United States, particularly those that may potentially reach consumers within the Ninth Circuit. Pursuant to the court's reasoning, an e-commerce platform may subject itself to personal jurisdiction simply by making its services available to consumers in a particular location, even if that location is not a focus of the platform. Critically, as the court acknowledged, this could subject e-commerce platforms to lawsuits *across* the country regardless of where they are incorporated and/or headquartered.

In determining how to conduct their regular business operations, e-commerce platforms (and other online entities) should be mindful of this decision, and consider whether they have arguments to distinguish its holding if they face litigation.

Additionally, it is worth noting that *Briskin* only has precedential value within the Ninth Circuit. While plaintiffs elsewhere may cite that opinion in litigating personal jurisdiction in the context of online businesses, the Ninth Circuit's decision is presently at odds with the weight of well-established law in other jurisdictions. Courts elsewhere thus may choose to disregard or distinguish its analysis and conclusions.