

Morrison & Foerster Client Alert

April 11, 2014

FTC v. Jerk.com: Did the FTC's "Jerk.com" Complaint Just Turn API Terms into Federal Law?

By D. Reed Freeman, Jr., John Delaney and Adam Fleisher

The Federal Trade Commission's [announcement](#) earlier this week that it had filed a complaint against Jerk, LLC and its websites like "jerk.com" ("Jerk") looks at first glance like a run-of-the-mill FTC Section 5 enforcement action involving allegedly deceptive practices online. But hidden in the facts of Jerk's alleged misbehavior is a potentially significant expansion of the FTC's use of its deception authority.

According to the FTC's [complaint](#), Jerk allegedly led consumers to believe that the profiles on its websites were created by other users of the website. The company also allegedly sold "memberships" for \$30 a month that supposedly included features that would enable consumers to alter or delete their profiles, or to dispute false information in the profiles. Jerk also charged consumers a \$25 fee to email Jerk's customer service department, according to the FTC's complaint.

The FTC alleges that Jerk created between 73.4 million and 81.6 million unique consumer profiles primarily using information such as names and photos pulled from Facebook through application programming interfaces, or APIs. The complaint states that "[d]evelopers that use the Facebook platform must agree to Facebook's policies," such as obtaining users' explicit consent to share certain Facebook data and deleting information obtained from Facebook upon a consumer's request.

These alleged facts lend themselves to a straightforward violation of Section 5 of the FTC Act for deceptive acts or practices. Jerk allegedly represented that the content on its websites was user-generated, while it was in fact primarily pulled by Jerk from Facebook, making Jerk's representation false and misleading. The FTC, however, has gone well beyond this straightforward deceptiveness accusation here. Rather than simply alleging that Jerk's representations were false and misleading because the content was not generated by users, but rather from Facebook information, the complaint goes much further in alleging that Jerk "populated or caused to be populated the content on the vast majority of Jerk profiles **by taking information from Facebook in violation of Facebook's policies....**" (Emphasis added.) The fact that the information was pulled from

UNITED STATES

California

Tiffany Cheung	(415) 268-6848
Rebekah Kaufman	(415) 268-6148
Christine E. Lyon	(650) 813-5770
David F. McDowell	(213) 892-5383
Daniel F. Muto	(858) 720-7959
Purvi G. Patel	(213) 892-5296
Andrew Serwin	(858) 720-5134
William L. Stern	(415) 268-7637
Nancy R. Thomas	(213) 892-5561
David M. Walsh	(213) 892-5262

New York

Cindy Abramson	(212) 336-4178
Melissa Crespo	(212) 336-4354
John F. Delaney	(212) 468-8040
Peter McLaughlin	(212) 336-4290
Michael B. Miller	(212) 468-8009
Sotirios Petrovas	(212) 336-4377
Suhna N. Pierce	(212) 336-4150
Marian Waldmann	(212) 336-4230
Agarwal Miriam H. Wugmeister	(212) 506-7213

Washington, D.C.

Patrick Bernhardt	(202) 887-8771
L. Richard Fischer	(202) 887-1566
Adam J. Fleisher	(202) 887-8781
D. Reed Freeman, Jr.	(202) 887-6948
Julie O'Neill	(202) 887-8764
Obrea O. Poindexter	(202) 887-8741
Cynthia J. Rich	(202) 778-1652
Andrew M. Smith	(202) 887-1558
Nathan David Taylor	(202) 778-1644

EUROPE

Berlin

Hanno Timmer	49 30 72622-1346
--------------	------------------

Brussels

Joanna Łopatowska	32 2 340 7365
Karin Retzer	32 2 340 7364
Alja Poler De Zwart	32 2 340 7360

London

Ann Bevitt	44 20 7920 4041
Caroline Stakim	44 20 7920 4055
David Varney	44 20 7920 4058

ASIA

Beijing

Gabriel Bloch	86 10 5909 3367
Jingxiao Fang	86 10 5909 3382
Paul D. McKenzie	86 10 5909 3366

Hong Kong

Gordon A. Milner	852 2585 0808
------------------	---------------

Singapore

Daniel P. Levison	65 6922 2041
-------------------	--------------

Tokyo

Toshihiro So	81 3 3214 6568
Yukihiro Terazawa	81 3 3214 6585

Client Alert

Facebook in violation of Facebook's policies does not seem to be material—let alone essential—to the deceptiveness allegation. Nonetheless, the complaint only alleges that “the representation [regarding the source of the content] was, and is, false or misleading” *after* stating that Jerk took information from Facebook in violation of Facebook's policies.

The FTC is breaking new ground here. *Jerk* is not the first time the FTC has brought a case based (in part) on an alleged violation of another company's terms or policies, but it is the first time the FTC has alleged that the violation of another company's terms or policies can be part of a violation of Section 5 in its own right. In January 2000, the FTC brought a complaint against ReverseAuction.com (“Reverse Auction”), an auction website that was attempting to compete with eBay. The FTC's complaint was based, in part, on the allegation that Reverse Auction obtained and used email addresses and user IDs of eBay customers “after registering as an eBay user and **agreeing to comply with and be bound by eBay's User Agreement.**” (Emphasis added.)

Like Facebook, eBay requires users to adhere to its applicable policies. In both the *Reverse Auction* and the *Jerk* matters, the FTC charged that the applicable website operator failed to comply with the policies that applied to such website operator's actions. The crucial difference in the cases is that, in *Reverse Auction*, the FTC's theory of deception was that Reverse Auction “*represented to eBay*” that Reverse Auction would comply with eBay's policies. In light of this precedent, *Jerk* is significant because the FTC's complaint alleges only that Jerk made false representations about the *source* of its information, not about its compliance with Facebook's policies *per se*. **In other words, the FTC's complaint can be read to suggest that simply using information pulled from Facebook in violation of Facebook's policies is a deceptive act or practice, without any alleged misrepresentation to Facebook regarding the use of the information.**

The FTC's *Jerk* action thus breaks away from *Reverse Auction* by characterizing actions inconsistent with a third party's policies as deceptive in their own right, as opposed to finding any *representation* regarding compliance with those policies to be deceptive. In that light, the FTC appears to have taken a case with ugly facts (including, allegedly, public availability on Jerk's websites of photos of children that had been tagged as “private” on Facebook) and leveraged such case to allege that noncompliance with Facebook's policies themselves is part of a violation of Section 5 in its own right. If the FTC continues to pursue this theory, it would essentially be turning Facebook's policies into “federal law,” with compliance effectively enforced by the threat of Section 5 enforcement simply for using Facebook content in violation of Facebook's policies.

About Morrison & Foerster:

We are Morrison & Foerster — a global firm of exceptional credentials. Our clients include some of the largest financial institutions, investment banks, Fortune 100, technology and life science companies. We've been included on *The American Lawyer's A-List* for 10 straight years, and *Fortune* named us one of the “100 Best Companies to Work For.” Our lawyers are committed to achieving innovative and business-minded results for our clients, while preserving the differences that make us stronger. This is MoFo. Visit us at www.mofo.com.

Morrison & Foerster has a world-class privacy and data security practice that is cross-disciplinary and spans our global offices. With more than 60 lawyers actively counseling, litigating, and representing clients before regulators around the world on privacy and security of information issues, we have been recognized by *Chambers* and *Legal 500* as having one of the best domestic and global practices in this area.

Client Alert

For more information about our people and services and the resources we offer such as our treatise setting out the U.S. and international legal landscape related to workplace privacy and data security, "*Global Employee Privacy and Data Security Law*," or our free online Privacy Library, please visit: <http://www.mofo.com/privacy--data-security-services/> and "like" us on Facebook at <http://www.facebook.com/MoFoPrivacy>.

Because of the generality of this update, the information provided herein may not be applicable in all situations and should not be acted upon without specific legal advice based on particular situations. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.