

## Meta AI Copyright Lawsuit Partially Survives Motion to Dismiss

On March 7, 2025, U.S. District Judge Vince Chhabria granted in part and denied in part Meta's motion to dismiss a lawsuit filed against the company by a coalition of authors alleging that Meta used the authors' copyrighted books without authorization to train its Llama AI models. The plaintiffs contend in their complaint that Meta's actions constituted direct copyright infringement and that the company removed copyright management information (CMI) in violation of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act

to conceal the infringement. Meta, meanwhile, asserted that its training qualifies as fair use, and it argued the case should be dismissed because the authors lack standing to sue.

In his ruling, Judge Chhabria [stated](#) that the plaintiffs have alleged a sufficient injury for Article III standing. With respect to the CMI claims, he found "Meta's removal of copyright management information is an interference with a property right

that is closely related to the kind of property-based harms traditionally actionable in copyright." Additionally, he found they sufficiently alleged direct copyright infringement and intentional removal of CMI to survive the motion to dismiss. The court did, however, dismiss the claims under the California Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act, noting that the plaintiffs did not allege unauthorized access to their computers or servers, only to their data in the form of books.

## Clearview AI Settlement Approved in Face-Scan Privacy Lawsuit

On March 20, 2025, U.S. District Judge Sharon Johnson Coleman [granted](#) final approval for a potentially landmark \$51.75 million settlement in the multidistrict litigation against Clearview AI. This settlement resolves allegations that the company unlawfully collected and shared biometric facial data from publicly accessible internet pages with law enforcement. The lawsuit involves up to 125,000 members and underscores the ongoing debates surrounding the use of biometric data in today's digital landscape.

State attorneys general raised concerns that this settlement fails to provide adequate protections against future harm. In response to these concerns, Judge Coleman noted that the availability of nationwide injunctive relief may be limited because of certain state laws' potential inability to apply extraterritorially.

Moreover, Judge Coleman pointed out that Clearview's separate 2022 agreement with the American Civil Liberties Union



already limited the injunctive relief available to these plaintiffs because, among other things, it effectively narrowed Clearview's client base to federal and state government agencies and their contractors and also imposed a five-year ban on the company's business

operations in Illinois, further limiting its activities.

One of the most contentious aspects of the settlement is that it does not provide immediate monetary compensation to victims. Instead, class members are offered a 23 percent equity stake in Clearview, contingent upon a future public offering or sale, which could potentially amount to approximately \$52 million based on current valuations. This arrangement has faced significant criticism, as plaintiffs and their lawyers will receive a stake in the company's uncertain future value rather than a guaranteed lump-sum payment.

The absence of injunctive relief, combined with the unconventional financial structure of the settlement, leaves class members without any immediate and specific relief. This settlement resolves over five years of litigation over the objections of 22 state Attorneys General and the District of Columbia.