

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION

In re TikTok, Inc., Minor Privacy Litigation

In re TikTok Minor Privacy Litigation · No. 2:25-md-03144-GW-RAO · Decided April 11, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation ordered the centralization of six actions alleging that TikTok entities violated the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act and related regulations through the collection and use of minors' personal information. The Panel ordered transfer to the Central District of California for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings and assigned the actions to Judge George H. Wu. The proceeding was designated In re TikTok, Inc., Minor Privacy Litigation, MDL No. 3144.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karen Caldwell; Nathaniel M. Gorton; Matthew F. Kennelly; David C. Norton; Roger T. Benitez; Dale A. Kimball; Madeline Cox Arleo
JURISDICTION	United States Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation
DECIDED	April 11, 2025
DOCKET	2:25-md-03144-GW-RAO
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff in the Northern District of California moved under 28 U.S.C. § 1407 to centralize six related actions concerning TikTok's alleged collection and sale of minors' personal information, alternatively seeking transfer into an existing multidistrict litigation. The Panel considered the papers and held a hearing session.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under 28 U.S.C. § 1407, the Panel determines whether actions involve common questions of fact and whether transfer will serve the convenience of parties and witnesses and promote the just and efficient conduct of the litigation.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Procedural multidistrict litigation transfer order; precedential status not stated in the source.
PARTIES	McKissick, on behalf of A.M. v. ByteDance, Inc., ByteDance Ltd., TikTok Ltd., TikTok Inc., TikTok Pte. Ltd., TikTok U.S. Data Security Inc.

TOPICS

civil procedure

class actions

consumer protection

PRACTICE AREAS

multidistrict litigation

civil procedure

consumer privacy

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the six actions involve common questions of fact warranting centralization under 28 U.S.C. § 1407.
2. Whether the actions should be included in MDL No. 3047 concerning social-media adolescent addiction and personal-injury products-liability claims.
3. Which federal district should serve as the transferee district for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

HOLDINGS

1. The actions involve common questions of fact concerning TikTok's age verification, data-collection and data-use practices, parental-data requests, moderation policies, and compliance with COPPA and related requirements; centralization would promote convenience and the just and efficient conduct of the litigation.
2. The actions should not be included in MDL No. 3047 because that MDL is principally defined by addiction-related allegations involving major social-media platforms, while the actions before the Panel contain no addiction-related contentions.
3. The Central District of California is the most appropriate transferee district for the litigation.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“We find that the Central District of California is the most appropriate transferee district for this litigation.”
(at -2-)

“IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the actions listed on Schedule A and pending outside the Central District of California are transferred to the Central District of California and, with the consent of that court, assigned to the Honorable George H. Wu, for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.” (at -2-)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The actions allege that TikTok collects and sells personal information from children without adequate notice, knowledge, or parental consent, in violation of COPPA and the COPPA Rule. The allegations concern TikTok's age-verification procedures, collection and use of data from regular and Kids' Mode accounts, responses to parental requests to access or delete children's data, and moderation practices. Relevant documents and witnesses were expected to be located in the Central District of California, where two defendants were headquartered and a related government action was pending.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Six actions were pending in five federal districts, with fourteen additional potentially related actions identified. The moving plaintiff sought centralization in the Northern District of California or inclusion in MDL No. 3047, with the Southern District of Florida offered as an alternative. The Panel denied inclusion in MDL No. 3047, found the Central District of California to be the appropriate transferee district, and transferred the actions outside that district for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The actions listed on Schedule A that were pending outside the Central District of California were transferred to the Central District of California and, with that court's consent, assigned to Judge George H. Wu for coordinated or consolidated pretrial proceedings.

CASES CITED

- In re Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation, 637 F. Supp. 3d 1377, 1378 (J.P.M.L. 2022)
- United States v. Musical.ly, Case No. 2:19-cv-01439 (C.D. Cal.)