

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

OCTOBER 2021

VOL. 7 NO. 8

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



LexisNexis

**EDITOR'S NOTE: QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**FIVE THINGS YOU SHOULD EXPECT TO BE ASKED  
AFTER A CYBER SECURITY INCIDENT**

Kelly Blair, James Lloyd, Aravind Swaminathan,  
and Laura Nonninger

**FTC SETTLES COPPA ACTION AGAINST  
"COLORING BOOK FOR ADULTS"**

Tracy Shapiro and Libby J. Weingarten

**SECOND CIRCUIT ARTICULATES INJURY  
STANDARD IN DATA BREACH SUITS**

Rahul Mukhi and JD Colavecchio

**SUED FOR A DATA BREACH OUT OF STATE?  
DON'T FORGET A PERSONAL JURISDICTION  
DEFENSE**

Timothy J. St. George, Ronald I. Raether, and  
David N. Anthony

**FIFTH CIRCUIT LATEST TO CRY TAINT ON DOJ  
TAINT TEAM**

Elliot S. Rosenwald, Marcus A. Asner, and  
Alexis Gannaway

**RECENT CYBERSECURITY AND RANSOMWARE  
GUIDANCE THAT EVERY BUSINESS SHOULD BE  
REVIEWING**

Elizabeth F. Hodge and Christy S. Hawkins

**FRENCH COURT PROVIDES GUIDANCE ON DATA  
TRANSFER SAFEGUARDS AND SUFFICIENT  
PROTECTIONS AGAINST ACCESS REQUESTS  
FROM U.S. AUTHORITIES**

Ricky C. Benjamin and Christy S. Hawkins

**PRC DATA SECURITY LAW: WHAT YOU NEED TO  
KNOW**

Clarice Yue, Michelle Chan, Sharon Zhang, and  
Tiantian Ke

**CHINA PUBLISHES NEW DRAFT REGULATIONS  
ON DATA SECURITY MANAGEMENT OF  
AUTOMOBILE OPERATORS TO PROTECT PRIVACY**

Jenny (Jia) Sheng, Chunbin Xu, and  
Esther Tao

# Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

---

VOLUME 7

NUMBER 8

October 2021

---

**Editor's Note: Questions and Answers**

Victoria Prussen Spears 251

**Five Things You Should Expect to Be Asked After a Cyber Security Incident**

Keily Blair, James Lloyd, Aravind Swaminathan, and Laura Nonninger 254

**FTC Settles COPPA Action Against "Coloring Book for Adults"**

Tracy Shapiro and Libby J. Weingarten 259

**Second Circuit Articulates Injury Standard in Data Breach Suits**

Rahul Mukhi and JD Colavecchio 264

**Sued for a Data Breach Out of State? Don't Forget a Personal Jurisdiction Defense**

Timothy J. St. George, Ronald I. Raether, and David N. Anthony 267

**Fifth Circuit Latest to Cry Taint on DOJ Taint Team**

Elliot S. Rosenwald, Marcus A. Asner, and Alexis Gannaway 271

**Recent Cybersecurity and Ransomware Guidance That Every Business Should Be Reviewing**

Elizabeth F. Hodge and Christy S. Hawkins 274

**French Court Provides Guidance on Data Transfer Safeguards and Sufficient Protections Against Access Requests from U.S. Authorities**

Ricky C. Benjamin and Christy S. Hawkins 279

**PRC Data Security Law: What You Need to Know**

Clarice Yue, Michelle Chan, Sharon Zhang, and Tiantian Ke 283

**China Publishes New Draft Regulations on Data Security Management of Automobile Operators to Protect Privacy**

Jenny (Jia) Sheng, Chunbin Xu, and Esther Tao 287

## 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@lexisnexis.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

Customer Service Web site ..... <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (937) 247-0293

---

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 [251] (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 © 2021 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.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

(2021-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, Baker & McKenzie 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 2021 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 inquires 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 articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

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

# Sued for a Data Breach Out of State? Don't Forget a Personal Jurisdiction Defense

*By Timothy J. St. George, Ronald I. Raether, and David N. Anthony\**

*Entities sued for a data breach – even one that is consolidated into a multidistrict litigation proceeding in the defendant's home state – should not forget the personal jurisdiction defense, which can provide a powerful tool to streamline certain legal aspects of the case and ensure that litigation occurs in a defendant's home forum, and not everywhere else.*

No business is immune from threats created by cyber criminals and other hackers. In 2020 alone, over 155.8 million individuals were affected by a data breach.<sup>1</sup> Data breaches also continue to cause significant business interruption and cost, many of which now include ransomware as an element of the attack. According to 2020 data, there were 676 breaches that included ransomware as an element of the attack, which was a 100 percent increase as compared to 2019.<sup>2</sup> Further, ransomware attacks made up 81 percent of financially motivated cyberattacks in 2020 and the average cost per breach was \$4.44 million.<sup>3</sup>

Lawsuits have always been a possible consequence of a breach, with the frequency of suits increasing as more attorneys join the plaintiffs' bar and courts allow cases to survive motions to dismiss. Frequently, breached entities have consumers who reside across the country. And, plaintiff consumers who have had their data compromised usually wish to sue the breached entity in their home state. Thus, after an entity announces a data breach, it is possible for dozens of lawsuits to be filed in various state and federal courts across the country. Such an occurrence can create significant legal and administrative complications, as it can become extremely burdensome to defend lawsuits all over the

---

\* Timothy J. St. George is a partner at Troutman Pepper Hamilton Sanders LLP representing clients in federal and state courts, at both the trial and appellate levels, focusing his practice in the areas of complex litigation and business disputes, financial services litigation, and consumer litigation. Ronald I. Raether leads the firm's cybersecurity, information governance, and privacy team, and is a partner in the firm's consumer financial services group. David N. Anthony is a partner at the firm with a national litigation practice representing companies in highly regulated industries, including consumer financial services companies. The authors may be reached at [tim.st.george@troutman.com](mailto:tim.st.george@troutman.com), [ron.raether@troutman.com](mailto:ron.raether@troutman.com), and [david.anthony@troutman.com](mailto:david.anthony@troutman.com), respectively.

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.statista.com/statistics/273550/data-breaches-recorded-in-the-united-states-by-number-of-breaches-and-records-exposed/#:~:text=In%202020%2C%20the%20number%20of%20data%20breaches%20in,of%20sensitive%20information%20due%20to%20less-than-adequate%20information%20security.>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.govtech.com/blogs/lohmann-on-cybersecurity/2020-data-breaches-point-to-cybersecurity-trends-for-2021.html>.

<sup>3</sup> <https://atlasvpn.com/blog/ransomware-accounts-for-81-of-all-financially-motivated-cyberattacks-in-2020>.

country. For example, such a scenario can create a situation where various and divergent choice of law principles can come into play, often pointing to the laws of numerous states, as opposed to being subject to a uniform choice of law analysis.

One potential solution is to move to dismiss out of state cases for lack of personal jurisdiction under the Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 12(b)(2). For plaintiff consumers to bring suit where they respectively reside, there must be personal jurisdiction over the out of state breached entity.

Even if plaintiffs, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1407, move to centralize the litigation into a multidistrict litigation proceeding, the personal jurisdiction defense is still relevant. In a multidistrict litigation proceeding, the transferee court has personal jurisdiction over the defendant only to the same extent as the transferor court.

Thus, the relevant personal jurisdiction inquiry is made by reference to the court where the action was originally filed, even after the case is transferred somewhere else.<sup>4</sup>

## FEDERAL PERSONAL JURISDICTION STANDARDS

A federal court may assert either specific or general personal jurisdiction over a breached entity defendant. Unrelated to the allegations of the suit, general personal jurisdiction is based on more persistent contacts with the forum state.<sup>5</sup> This high standard requires a defendant to have continuous and systematic contacts with the forum state, and a plaintiff consumer must be able to show that the forum state is one “in which the corporation is fairly regarded as at home.”<sup>6</sup>

For that reason, a breached entity is generally only subject to general personal jurisdiction in its state of incorporation and where its principal place of business is located. To be subject to specific personal jurisdiction, the cause of action must arise out of or relate to the breached entity’s contacts with the forum state.<sup>7</sup> A plaintiff consumer must show that the breached entity purposefully established minimum contacts in the forum state, such that it should reasonably anticipate being sued there.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See *In re Showa Denko K.K. L-Tryptophan Prod. Liab. Litig.-II*, 953 F.2d 162, 165 (4th Cir. 1992); accord *In re: Cmty. Health Sys., Inc.*, No. 15-CV-222 (N.D. Ala. Sept. 12, 2016) (“Some of the claims in this case were originally filed in this court and in other federal courts in Alabama, but many of the claims were transferred to this court from other fora to be consolidated into this MDL. The undersigned, as the transferee judge in an MDL, possesses all the jurisdiction and powers over pretrial proceedings in the actions transferred to [her] that the transferor judge would have had in the absence of transfer.”).

<sup>5</sup> *ALS Scan, Inc. v. Digital Service Consultants, Inc.*, 293 F.3d 707, 712 (4th Cir. 2002).

<sup>6</sup> *Goodyear Dunlop Tires Operations, S.A. v. Brown*, 564 U.S. 915, 924 (2011); *CFA Inst. v. Inst. of Chartered Fin. Analysts of India*, 551 F.3d 285, 292 n.15 (4th Cir. 2009).

<sup>7</sup> *Fidrych v. Marriott Int'l, Inc.*, 952 F.3d 124, 132 (4th Cir. 2020).

<sup>8</sup> *Perdue Foods LLC v. BRF S.A.*, 814 F.3d 185, 189 (4th Cir. 2016).

## PERSONAL JURISDICTION AND DATA BREACH LITIGATION

The breached entity's jurisdictional relationship to the forum state must arise out of contacts that the defendant itself created, not that the plaintiff consumer created.<sup>9</sup> A consumer's place of purported injury alone is insufficient.<sup>10</sup> The relevant inquiry focuses on where the alleged acts or omissions by the breached entity occurred, focusing on factors like where the breached entity's technology department is located and where its security team resides.

For example, in *GreenState Credit Union v. Hy-Vee, Inc.*,<sup>11</sup> the plaintiff credit union alleged that the defendant failed to implement adequate data security measures. The plaintiff sued in Minnesota. The defendant breached entity was incorporated in Iowa and had its principal place of business in Iowa.

The court dismissed the action for lack of specific personal jurisdiction. The court noted that the defendant's information technology department, which was responsible for maintaining data security, and its chief technology officer, who was responsible for making decisions regarding data and information security policies and practices, operated out of a facility near defendant's headquarters located in Iowa, not in the forum state of Minnesota.

Likewise, in *Braun v. Mediant Communications, Inc.*,<sup>12</sup> the court also found a lack of personal jurisdiction. In this case, several of the defendant's email accounts were hacked and an email server was compromised, resulting in unauthorized parties gaining access to plaintiff's personal information. Here, the claims arose from an email hack. The defendant presented evidence that its business email is supported, staffed, and maintained in North Carolina.

The court then determined that there was no evidence that any of the defendant's actions in Florida gave rise to the claims.

## CONCLUSION

Based on these standards and authority, entities sued for a data breach – even one that is consolidated into a multidistrict litigation proceeding in the defendant's home state – should not forget the personal jurisdiction defense. The relevant inquiry is focused on the breached entity's actions. Thus, the location of the alleged acts or omissions asserted against a breached entity is key when determining personal jurisdiction and can serve as a solution to help a breached entity minimize its litigation risk.

---

<sup>9</sup> *Walden v. Fiore*, 571 U.S. 277, 284 (2014).

<sup>10</sup> *Id.*

<sup>11</sup> No. CV 20-621 (D. Minn. Nov. 10, 2020).

<sup>12</sup> No. 19-62563-CIV (S.D. Fla. Apr. 14, 2020).



When a plaintiff consumer alleges that a breached entity failed to take reasonable measures to ensure data security, the relevant factors courts have used to determine whether or not personal jurisdiction exists turns the focus on where the entity's cybersecurity personnel reside and where its information technology department is located.

While such a dismissal will be without prejudice and still allow potential refiling, these personal jurisdiction principles can provide a powerful tool to streamline certain legal aspects of the case and ensure that litigation occurs in a defendant's home forum, and not everywhere else.