

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litigation

In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litigation · No. 22-cv-03580-WHO (VKD) · Decided June 27, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California resolves a discovery dispute concerning requests for revenue and profit data related to Meta Pixel use on healthcare-related websites. The court denies plaintiffs’ request for data concerning all health advertisers or domains classified in Meta’s health-related advertiser categories, but permits plaintiffs to update their list of relevant Pixel IDs and requires Meta to produce corresponding data for healthcare providers and HIPAA- or CMIA-covered entities. The court also directs the parties to file a joint status report.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Virginia K. DeMarchi
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 27, 2025
DOCKET	22-cv-03580-WHO (VKD)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The court resolved a discovery dispute concerning plaintiffs' requests for revenue and profit data associated with Meta Pixel use on healthcare-related websites and advertisers.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Discovery relevance and proportionality under the scope of the governing requests for production and the court's prior discovery order.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district-court discovery order with no reported citation.

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- hipaa
- medical records privacy
- health law
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- discovery
- health law
- commercial litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs were entitled under RFP 22 to revenue-related data for all health-related advertisers or domains in Meta's health-related advertiser classifications.
2. Whether RFPs 263 and 268 encompassed the broader request for total revenue and profits from all health advertisers or health-related domains.
3. Whether plaintiffs could update their list of Pixel IDs based on Meta's last-day-of-discovery production and require corresponding revenue-related production for healthcare providers and HIPAA- or CMIA-covered entities.

HOLDINGS

1. Plaintiffs may not rely on a broader definition of medical provider to obtain revenue-related data from all health-related advertisers because that position is foreclosed by their earlier narrower definition and the court's prior discovery order.
2. RFPs 263 and 268 do not encompass plaintiffs' demand for total revenue and profits from all health advertisers or all domains in Meta's health-related advertiser classifications.
3. Plaintiffs may update their Pixel ID list based on Meta's last-day-of-discovery production, and Meta must promptly produce corresponding revenue-related data for additional Pixel IDs associated with healthcare providers and HIPAA- or CMIA-covered entities.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court agrees with Meta. These requests do not appear to encompass the much broader scope of revenue-related data plaintiffs seek in this discovery dispute letter.” (Opinion at 4)

“For the reasons explained above, the Court denies plaintiffs request for an order requiring Meta to produce total revenue and profits from all “health advertisers,” or all domains in the “health-related advertiser verticals and classifications used for enrollment in the CoreSetup privacy program.”” (Opinion at 4-5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs sought data showing Meta's total revenue and profits from advertising associated with healthcare-related domains, health advertisers, and domains classified within Meta's CoreSetup privacy program. Meta asserted that it had already produced or agreed to produce revenue-related data for entities identified by plaintiffs through Pixel IDs and objected to a broader investigation into thousands or hundreds of thousands of entities. The court found that plaintiffs' current broad definition of medical providers was inconsistent with their earlier narrower position and that RFPs 263 and 268 did not encompass the broader demand.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The dispute concerned RFPs 22, 263, and 268 and followed an earlier May 1, 2023 discovery dispute regarding the scope of the term "Medical Provider." In the earlier order, the court accepted plaintiffs' narrower definition referring to healthcare providers and HIPAA- or CMIA-covered entities and directed the parties to confer regarding identification of relevant entities and Pixel IDs. Plaintiffs later sought broader revenue-related data, which Meta opposed as untimely, overbroad, irrelevant, and disproportionate. After oral argument on June 10,

2025, the court denied the request for broader production but permitted limited updates to plaintiffs' Pixel ID list and required corresponding production for qualifying entities.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Group, LLC, 809 F.3d 1092, 1098-99 (9th Cir.), cert. denied sub nom. FCA U.S. LLC v. Ctr. for Auto Safety, 580 U.S. 815 (2016)
- Kamakana v. City & Cnty. of Honolulu, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179-80 (9th Cir. 2006)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2025/in-re-meta-pixel-healthcare-litigation-07h3h700>