

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litigation

No. 22-cv-03580-WHO (VKD), Dkt. No. 991 (N.D. Cal. May 5, 2025) · No. 22-cv-03580-WHO (VKD) · Decided May 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California resolves a discovery dispute concerning Meta’s advertising revenue allegedly attributable to health information collected through Meta Pixel and related business tools. The court orders Meta to provide a further answer to Interrogatory No. 18 and produce documents responsive to RFPs 283 and 287, subject to reasonable accessibility, while requiring further party conferral regarding RFPs 284–286. The order addresses the relevance and proportionality of discovery to plaintiffs’ unjust-enrichment theory.

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	May 5, 2025
DOCKET	22-cv-03580-WHO (VKD)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Order resolving a discovery dispute in multidistrict litigation concerning an interrogatory and requests for production directed to Meta's advertising revenue and profits allegedly associated with use of health information.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Discovery requests must seek relevant information and be proportional to the needs of the case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(b) (1). The court evaluated the requests for relevance, proportionality, clarity, and reasonable accessibility of the requested information.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court discovery order

TOPICS

- discovery dispute
- civil procedure
- health law
- consumer protection
- remedies

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

discovery

health law

consumer protection

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Meta should be required to provide a further answer to Interrogatory No. 18 concerning profits from advertising revenue allegedly attributable to data obtained through the Meta Pixel.
2. Whether Meta should be required to produce documents responsive to RFPs 283 and 287 concerning advertising revenue, profits, apportionment, costs, and reductions.
3. Whether the court should order production responsive to RFPs 284 through 286 where the requests relied on unclear definitions or materials not in the record.

HOLDINGS

1. Discovery concerning advertising revenue and profits associated with the alleged use of putative class members' health information was relevant to plaintiffs' unjust-enrichment theory because it could assist in reasonably approximating profits causally connected to the alleged interceptions.
2. Meta must provide a further answer to Interrogatory No. 18 concerning profits from revenue received from non-Healthcare Providers for advertising in which data obtained from putative class members through the Meta Pixel was used during the relevant class period, based on reasonably accessible information.
3. Meta must produce reasonably accessible documents sufficient to show revenue from advertisements within the agreed definition covered by RFP 283 and documents permitting apportionment of that revenue or accounting for costs and other reductions under RFP 287.
4. The court would not order production responsive to RFPs 284 through 286 at that time because it could not determine from the discovery-dispute record what documents plaintiffs sought or how those documents were likely to yield relevant information.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“This is a question that goes to the merits of plaintiffs’ claims.” (at 2)

“However, discovery must be both relevant and proportional to the needs of the case.” (at 3)

“The Court will not order Meta to produce documents responsive to these requests at this time, but will require the parties to confer further, as explained below.” (at 5)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiffs alleged that Meta's Pixel and related business tools intercepted confidential health information and that Meta used the information, alone or with other data or health inferences, to facilitate advertising. They sought information concerning revenue and profits from advertisements served by non-Healthcare Providers, including information that could help approximate the portion attributable to the alleged unauthorized use of putative class members' health information. Meta argued that the requests were overbroad and disproportionate and that its

systems made it difficult to determine whether data obtained through the Pixel affected particular advertisements.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs moved for an order requiring Meta to provide a further answer to Interrogatory No. 18 and to produce documents responsive to RFPs 283 through 287. Meta opposed the requests as overbroad and disproportionate. The court resolved the dispute without oral argument, ordered further responses to Interrogatory No. 18 and production responsive to RFPs 283 and 287, and required further conferral concerning RFPs 284 through 286.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- In re Meta Pixel Healthcare Litig., No. 22-cv-03580-WHO (VKD), 2025 WL 1191684, at *1 (N.D. Cal. Apr. 24, 2025)
- In re Google RTB Consumer Priv. Litig., No. 21-cv-02155-YGR (VKD), 2022 WL 4087514, at *7 (N.D. Cal. Sept. 6, 2022)