

CALIFORNIA COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT,
DIVISION THREE

Onetaste Incorporated v. Netflix, Inc.

Onetaste · No. B339113 · Decided November 20, 2025

SUMMARY

The California Court of Appeal affirmed an order granting Netflix's special motion to strike OneTaste Incorporated's defamation complaint under California Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16. The court held that OneTaste failed to make a prima facie showing that Netflix published challenged statements in its documentary with actual malice. The opinion discusses the anti-SLAPP framework, the clear-and-convincing evidence standard for actual malice, and the relevance of evidence concerning a publisher's subjective belief.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Adams, J.; Egerton, Acting P. J.; Hanasono, J.
JURISDICTION	California Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District, Division Three
DECIDED	November 20, 2025
DOCKET	B339113
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	OneTaste appealed from an order granting Netflix's special motion to strike its defamation complaint under California's anti-SLAPP statute, Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review applies to an anti-SLAPP ruling. The appellate court reviews the issues independently of the trial court's reasoning and affirms if the decision is correct on any theory.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published and certified for publication in the Official Reports.
PARTIES	Onetaste Incorporated v. Netflix, Inc.

TOPICS

- defamation
- free speech
- civil procedure
- appellate procedure
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether OneTaste's defamation claim arose from Netflix's protected activity under Code of Civil Procedure section 425.16.
2. Whether OneTaste demonstrated a probability of prevailing on its defamation claim by making a prima facie showing that Netflix published the challenged statements with actual malice.
3. Whether OneTaste's constitutional and public-policy challenges to the anti-SLAPP statute were preserved and supported.
4. Whether the Court of Appeal should consider documents and evidence presented for the first time on appeal through requests for judicial notice or augmentation.

HOLDINGS

1. OneTaste's defamation claim arose from Netflix's distribution of a documentary concerning matters of public interest, which constituted protected speech activity under the anti-SLAPP statute.
2. OneTaste failed to make a prima facie showing, by clear and convincing evidence, that Netflix published the challenged statements with actual malice.
3. The court generally would not consider evidence that was not before the trial court, and OneTaste's requests for judicial notice or augmentation were properly denied except for augmentation with the trial court's tentative ruling.
4. OneTaste forfeited its constitutional and public-policy challenges because its briefing failed to specify a constitutional injury or provide cogent argument and supporting authority; its due-process challenge to the discovery stay also failed because it did not seek limited discovery under the statute.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In determining whether a defendant’s anti-SLAPP motion has merit, courts engage in a two-step process.”
(13-14)

“The actual malice standard . . . requires a showing that the allegedly false statement was made ‘with knowledge that it was false or with reckless disregard of whether it was false or not.’” (15-16)

“OneTaste did not demonstrate a probability that it can produce evidence “ ‘ “ ‘ “command[ing] the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind” ’ ” ’ ” that Netflix subjectively believed Blanck’s allegations were false or that it acted with reckless disregard as to whether the challenged statements were false or not.”
(22-23)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

OneTaste operated a wellness company promoting a sexual practice called orgasmic meditation. Former employees and community members made allegations that OneTaste exploited participants and directed or encouraged sexual activity, abuse, and other harmful conduct. Netflix later released a documentary recounting

allegations by former employee Ayries Blanck and others that OneTaste subjected Blanck to sexual assault and condoned violence. OneTaste claimed the documentary's statements were false and sued Netflix for defamation.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

OneTaste sued Netflix for defamation based on statements in a documentary concerning alleged sexual assault and abuse involving a former OneTaste employee. The Los Angeles County Superior Court granted Netflix's anti-SLAPP motion, concluding that OneTaste failed to show a reasonable probability of prevailing, including because its evidence did not establish falsity or actual malice. The Court of Appeal affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

CASES CITED

- Equilon Enterprises v. Consumer Cause, Inc. (2002) 29 Cal.4th 53, 67
- Ojje v. Brown (2019) 43 Cal.App.5th 1027, 1036
- Wilson v. Parker, Covert & Chidester (2002) 28 Cal.4th 811, 821
- 1-800 Contacts, Inc. v. Steinberg (2003) 107 Cal.App.4th 568, 585
- Billauer v. Escobar-Eck (2023) 88 Cal.App.5th 953, 964-965
- Conroy v. Spitzer (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 1446, 1451-1452
- Gaynor v. Bulen (2018) 19 Cal.App.5th 864, 876
- Balla v. Hall (2021) 59 Cal.App.5th 652, 675
- Edward v. Ellis (2021) 72 Cal.App.5th 780, 793
- Annette F. v. Sharon S. (2004) 119 Cal.App.4th 1146, 1167
- Collins v. Waters (2023) 92 Cal.App.5th 70, 73, 81-85
- Christian Research Institute v. Alnor (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 71, 84-85, 88
- Reader's Digest Assn. v. Superior Court (1984) 37 Cal.3d 244, 258-259
- McGarry v. University of San Diego (2007) 154 Cal.App.4th 97, 114, 117
- Reed v. Gallagher (2016) 248 Cal.App.4th 841, 862
- Frankel v. Kizer (1993) 21 Cal.App.4th 743, 747, fn. 4
- Antonovich v. Superior Court (1991) 234 Cal.App.3d 1041, 1053
- Young v. CBS Broadcasting, Inc. (2012) 212 Cal.App.4th 551, 564
- Harte-Hanks Communications v. Connaughton (1989) 491 U.S. 657, 692, fn. 37
- Fletcher v. San Jose Mercury News (1989) 216 Cal.App.3d 172, 189
- Khawar v. Globe Internat., Inc. (1998) 19 Cal.4th 254, 262, 277
- Lockley v. Law Office of Cantrell, Green, Pekich, Cruz & McCort (2001) 91 Cal.App.4th 875, 882
- Fremont Indemnity Co. v. Fremont General Corp. (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 97, 113
- Ross v. Seyfarth Shaw LLP (2023) 96 Cal.App.5th 722, 745-746

- Save Lafayette Trees v. East Bay Regional Park Dist. (2021) 66 Cal.App.5th 21, 29, fn. 2
- Hughes Electronics Corp. v. Citibank Delaware (2004) 120 Cal.App.4th 251, 266, fn. 13
- MMM Holdings, Inc. v. Reich (2018) 21 Cal.App.5th 167, 187
- Briggs v. Eden Council for Hope & Opportunity (1999) 19 Cal.4th 1106, 1122-1123
- Hassan v. Mercy American River Hospital (2003) 31 Cal.4th 709, 723
- Sweetwater Union High School Dist. v. Gilbane Building Co. (2019) 6 Cal.5th 931, 945
- Frittelli, Inc. v. 350 North Canon Drive, LP (2011) 202 Cal.App.4th 35, 41

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/california-court-of-appeal-second-appellate-district-division-three-california-court-of-appeal-secon/2025/onetaste-incorporated-v-netflix-inc-g3r98slf>