



## Working Title – “Are you not entertained”

A multi-billion-pound damages claim was filed late last night against Meta, formerly Facebook Inc., on behalf of UK Facebook users, for abusing its dominant market position by imposing unfair terms, prices and/or other trading conditions on users. This is the first UK case against Facebook to be filed at the Competition Appeal Tribunal (CAT) and will be pursued under the Consumer Rights Act 2015 on behalf of around 45m UK consumers. Under the rules laid down in the Consumer Rights Act, all UK users of

Facebook between 11th Feb 2016 and 31st Dec 2019 living in the UK will automatically become part of the group of claimants unless they explicitly opt-out. This means that,

once the claim is approved by the CAT, individuals falling within the class will automatically be eligible to receive compensation at the conclusion of the claim.

Dr Gormsen has a long and distinguished career as a competition law academic and practitioner. She is a Senior Research Fellow at the British Institute and Comparative Law and the director of the Competition Law Forum. Dr Lovdahl Gormsen is being advised by a Quinn Emanuel team led by UK partner and Head of Competition Litigation Kate Vernon, and counsel Ronit Kreisberger QC and Nikolaus Grubeck of Monckton Chambers and Greg Adey of One Essex Court.

The claim is being funded by Innsworth Capital Limited. Quinn Emanuel partner Kate Vernon said this morning: ‘Today marks a significant moment for the UK collective action regime with our filing in the CAT of the first UK case alleging abuse of dominance by Facebook.’

“Facebook’s clear abuse of its dominant position in the personal social network and/or social media market, netted the company many billions in profit with zero payment to consumers,” Emanuel said.

“The purpose of this action is to secure redress for the 45 million UK consumers who have lost out as a result of Facebook’s imposition of unfair terms, prices and/or other trading conditions,” he continued.

Facebook faces an antitrust suit by the FTC in the United States that could force it to sell the Instagram and WhatsApp platforms that have cemented its market dominance in the past decade. Facebook is also facing a consumer class action in the US and is under investigation, or has been investigated and fined by competition authorities, in several countries including, Australia, Argentina, Hungary, Turkey and South Africa.

Today’s filing includes a statement from Dr Lovdahl Gormsen explaining why she is bringing the action, why she is the best person to represent consumers and how she will manage the proceedings on their behalf.

The claim is also supported by a report from independent expert economists and a detailed plan for managing the claim, including how the proposed class of 45 million consumers will be communicated with through a claims website, [www.facebookclaim.co.uk](http://www.facebookclaim.co.uk)), newspapers, magazines and social media.

Mark Zuckerberg and team consider shutting down Facebook and Instagram in Europe if Meta cannot process Europeans’ data on US servers and have compound the catalogue of strange decision making by paying £149 million (€171 million) to break its lease on a major London development near Regent’s Park as hybrid working prompts big tech groups to pull back on office space. British Land, which owns the building at 1 Triton Square, on Tuesday flagged a short-term hit to earnings as it will now have to find a new tenant for the eight-storey building in a challenging London office market. “It is a

staggering amount of money. In my 20 years, I can't think of a tenant paying [so much] to give back space they don't occupy," said Matthew Saperia, analyst at Peel Hunt. The news is the latest sign of Big Tech's determination to control costs by scaling back its office footprint as more staff work from home. The tech contraction has hit cities such as San Francisco that rely heavily on tech companies. Office tenants and European markets including Dublin and London have not been spared.

With the above circling the social media Goliath, we find ourselves in a small court in London with more than just the UK's data at stake and with a pebble recovered from the sea in the sling shot of this "21st Century David" all eyes on are Sir Marcus Smith and those discussing the case.

Though before we start, where is Ronit Kreisburger and Monkton Chambers?

***Though fear not, man of the people and the Protector of Children Damian William Langiano steps in as the "independent" barrister and self-taught at that, for what is to be a Gladiatorial effort to defeat the digital Goliath.***

1 S This Transcript has not been proof read or corrected. It is a working tool for the Tribunal for use in preparing its judgment. It will be

2 placed on the Tribunal Website for readers to see how matters were conducted at the public hearing of these proceedings and is not to

3 be relied on or cited in the context of any other proceedings. The Tribunal's judgment in this matter will be the final and definitive

4 records.

5 IN THE COMPETITION Case No. : 1433/7/7/22

6 APPEAL TRIBUNAL

7

8

9 Salisbury Square House

10 8 Salisbury Square

11 London EC4Y 8AP

Monday 8th – Tuesday 9th 12 January 2024

13

14 Before:

15 The Honourable Mr Justice Marcus Smith

16 Derek Ridyard

17 Timothy Sawyer CBE

18 (Sitting as a Tribunal in England and Wales)

19

20

21 BETWEEN:

22

23 Dr Liza Lovdahl Gormsen

24 Class Representative

25 v

26 Meta Platforms, Inc. and Others

27 Defendant

28 \_\_\_\_\_

29

30 A P P E A R A N C E S

31

32 Robert O’Donoghue KC, Nicholas Bacon KC, Tom Coates, Greg Adey and Sarah O’Keeffe

33 (On behalf of Dr Liza Lovdahl Gormsen)

34

35 Tony Singla KC, James White and Andrew Lomas Bird (On behalf of Meta Platforms)

36

37

And for The Children of the World – Damian William Langiano, As a “Statement of truth all evidence

and statements made in real time reading and not constructed or manipulated in any way and will be

backed up by digitally proven and peer reviewed, compiled and discovered evidence”

38 Digital Transcription by Epiq Europe Ltd

39 Lower Ground 46 Chancery Lane WC2A 1JE

40 Tel No: 020 7404 1400 Fax No: 020 7404 1424

41 Email: ukclient@epiqglobal.co.uk

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

2

1 Monday, 8 January 2024

2 (10.30 am)

3 Housekeeping

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue, good morning.

5 Before you begin, two housekeeping matters.

6 First of all, the usual live-stream warning. These proceedings are being streamed,

7 and an official recording is being made and there will in due course be an authorised

8 transcript, by my authority.

9 It is, however, prohibited for anyone else to make a recording, whether audio or

10 visual, to photograph or transmit these proceedings, and a breach of that injunction

11 is punishable as a contempt of court.

12 So much for the usual warning.

13 Mr O'Donoghue, before you begin, I wonder if I can say a few words about how we

14 see the two days working. This is of course not the first time that this matter has

15 been before us, and you can take it that we are very familiar with the case as it was  
16 brought and of course with the new case that has very helpfully been put together, in  
17 particular, by Ms Scott Morton.

18 What we are minded to do is to somewhat inadequately summarise what we  
19 understand the essential thrust of your case to be, Mr O'Donoghue, for you then to  
20 take as long as you wish but ideally quite briefly to correct errors in our articulation of  
21 your case. And then, Mr Singla, for you to, as it were, go in as to why, on the basis  
22 of that summary, the application should not be granted and the proceedings not  
23 certified. And then, Mr O'Donoghue, for you to have most of the time to reply rather  
24 than articulate what I hope we understand already very well, which is the way you  
25 put your case.

26 So, I don't know if that meets with your general approval.

3

1 Mr Singla, does that disadvantage you in any way?

2 MR SINGLA: Sir, the sequencing doesn't disadvantage us, but the timing may be  
3 important here because I think Mr O'Donoghue and I broadly agreed that we would  
4 have approximately 50 per cent each of the hearing time.

5 As you know, we have a number of points, and we say the claim fails on a number of  
6 levels. And I noticed or perhaps picked up, that you envisage my dealing with these  
7 points more briefly than 50 per cent of the hearing time.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, I certainly don't say that. What I am minded to  
9 do is to keep Mr O'Donoghue short in his opening. I certainly have no agenda in  
10 terms of confining your response. I think you should take as long as you need,  
11 whether that's 50 per cent or less will not depend on timing questions but on your  
12 unpacking the points that matter to your client, and you should take as long as you  
13 need.

14 MR SINGLA: Yes. I think, as you said, Mr O'Donoghue should spend most of his  
15 time by way of reply but you meant relative to --

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Indeed.

17 And, Mr O'Donoghue, to be clear, I think we will try to assist you in your reply in  
18 indicating those areas that we would be assisted by, and indicating those areas  
19 where, if there are any, we don't need your assistance, but that will of course depend  
20 upon Mr Singla's efforts in articulating his objections.

21 So that is how we envisage matters going. The one thing that we do want to ensure  
22 that there is time to debate -- and it is in one sense anticipatory but nevertheless  
23 important -- and it's this. Assuming -- and of course I know that that is what we are  
24 here to debate -- but assuming we certify, we do want the parties to give careful  
25 thought as to how the case is to be managed going forward to a putative trial at the  
26 end.

4

1 Now, I appreciate that to an extent that is putting the cart before the horse.

2 However, it is something that is moderately intrinsic to certification, because if we are  
3 talking about Microsoft Pro-Sys and the management of a blueprint to trial, it's likely  
4 to feature in your submissions anyway, and if it doesn't we are going to want to  
5 articulate it in some detail because, assuming we have to reserve the question of  
6 certification, I don't want us having to come back in fairly short order to debate case  
7 management again. I want us to be able to deal with that in one go if we have to.

8 So I would like the parties to be thinking about how, assuming certification, the  
9 matter can be dealt with going forward. It seems to us that there are three broad  
10 options in terms of case management, and we have a pretty clear view as to which  
11 of those three options would be best, but I'll articulate them and then you can think  
12 about them over today and overnight.

13 So option 1 is the conventional way of doing cases, which is, you have your  
14 pleadings, you have your factual statements, you have your expert evidence and,  
15 after exchange of written submissions, you have your trial.

16 That we do not consider to be a particularly attractive option in this case.

17 Option 2 is what we directed as a Tribunal in the Boyle trains litigation, which was  
18 obliging the Class Representative to put their complete case, ready for trial  
19 unilaterally, without any form of response from the Defendants, enabling the  
20 Defendants to know exactly what the case was, so that they could demolish it if they  
21 could.

22 The attraction of that course is that where there is a degree of uncertainty in the way  
23 an arguable case is being put -- as seems to us exists here -- namely, if one is  
24 looking at a pricing model for data, how exactly is that pricing model to work in  
25 a complex market that is two-sided?

26 Well, these are very difficult questions on which we can see real virtue in the Class  
5

1 Representative putting their cards completely on the table first and for Meta to come  
2 back saying, well, look, your model simply doesn't work because if you price in this  
3 way the two-sided market collapses because the network effects are so adverse that  
4 it just doesn't work.

5 Well, that is something which we see operating in a sequential way. So, option 2 is  
6 the option that we favour.

7 And just to complete the set, option 3 is where one says that both sides should put  
8 together their case in parallel but without, as it were, interaction, and then they  
9 respond. That's what I did, with a degree of success, I think, in the High Court  
10 proceedings in Optis v Apple. But that was where both sides were saying, "Here is  
11 our FRAND rate", and each side really had an independent way of putting things,  
12 whereas that isn't the case here. Here, I think it is the Class Representative saying,  
13 "This is what we should be paid as a class for our data", and I think Meta saying, not  
14 to put too fine a point on it, "Well, whatever you say, you're wrong".

15 Now, that is perhaps putting it a little bit too crudely but I think it is what makes option  
16 3 not a particularly viable option in this case.

17 But that's how we see the case management going forward. And if there's to be



18 an argument about that -- and we welcome it if there is -- then we want to have that  
19 in the course of these two days, because we'd like both parties to leave the room  
20 understanding at the end of tomorrow, or soon if we can manage it, what they need  
21 to be doing if the case is certified. And we don't really want a second hearing to  
22 debate that.

23 Related to that will be things like would the parties be assisted by regular case  
24 management reviews so that the inevitable disclosure requests that would emanate,  
25 assuming we go down the option 2 route, from the Class Representative to Meta,  
26 that those could be managed in a very swift way with input from the Tribunal as  
6

1 appropriate on perhaps a monthly basis. These are things that we are very up for  
2 debating and again we would like to debate if that is a matter on which the parties  
3 want -- as we suspect them to -- to have their say. That we see as part of the  
4 process. And by all means feed your reactions to that in your submissions or deal  
5 with it separately at the end. We leave that to you, but we do want that debated.

6 So subject to that rather overlong introduction, Mr O'Donoghue, are you happy for  
7 me to try to articulate what we think your case is and then you can mark our  
8 homework or is there something you want to say before we do that?

9 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, as you would have apprehended there are a number of  
10 preliminary points I wanted to make.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Of course.

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: Certainly, the case has changed very substantially. The draft  
13 Amended Claim Form and the two Scott Morton reports are considerable in length  
14 and it did seem to me that on some level for me to outline the changes had some  
15 utility. But, sir, I'm in your hands as to how much the Tribunal has downloaded but  
16 I had intended to take you through the architecture of the case. Not the archaeology,  
17 the architecture. That seems to me to have some value.

18 It may be, sir, that that is not inconsistent with what you are about to say. Meta, of

19 course, has taken what I would call a kitchen-sink approach, and I suspect that  
20 a number of those points I will have to deal with in any event and it may be that there  
21 is then some coincidence between what Meta are saying and what the Tribunal has  
22 condensed. But I had intended to deal with those at some length in any event.  
23 Sir, it sounds like the most efficient thing would be for the Tribunal to set out its stall  
24 and I will then try to Box and Cox in terms of what I had intended to say, to fit with  
25 that. I don't want to waste anyone's time. It may be things have moved on in some  
26 respects.

7

1 One point, sir, which is really a housekeeping point: as you will have picked up from  
2 our skeleton, Mr Bacon KC will be dealing with separate funding issues. Mr Singla  
3 has helpfully agreed that he can do that tomorrow in the interests of costs  
4 minimisation. So, in terms of the sequencing the sequence was that I would make  
5 whatever submissions were appropriate, Mr Singla would reply, then Mr Bacon  
6 would say his piece on the funding side, and then I would have a brief reply at the  
7 end of that.

8 So, I just wanted to make sure that Mr Bacon is not lost --

9 MR BACON: Not lost in the wash.

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Indeed. And that is entirely helpful, Mr Singla. I'm  
11 very grateful to you for accommodating --

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, on the case management, I will obviously take that away  
13 with my team --

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Indeed, and that's why I --

15 MR O'DONOGHUE: -- and cogitate.

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- wanted the debate right away because I do want  
17 everyone to be thinking about case management problems from the very beginning.  
18 I'm sure you have been anyway but it does seem to me that a degree of interaction is  
19 important.

20 Mr O'Donoghue, let me be clear, I think the extent to which you need to, as it were,  
21 open the case will depend on the degree of confidence that you have, first of all that  
22 the Tribunal has actually got what Professor Scott Morton has said, and secondly the  
23 extent to which you consider that you can appropriately outline the architecture to  
24 your clients' advantage in light of the points that Mr Singla makes.

25 But I do think in this context it is better, given what may be an incorrect appreciation  
26 of my understanding of the case, that we have the objections absolutely clearly

8

1 nailed from Mr Singla, for you then to respond, rather than for you to be telling us

2 what we think we already know before Mr Singla gets on his feet. But I think we had

3 better try to test that. And what I will now try to do is articulate -- Mr Singla, you --

4 MR SINGLA: Sir, just before we move to substance, in the spirit of points not getting

5 lost in the wash, you will have seen, I hope, the correspondence whereby the parties

6 have agreed that two points will be left over. That's class period and claim period,

7 where we say that they are looking to extend the claim period as compared with the

8 original claim which stopped at 31 December to 2019, and they are now looking to

9 say that it should be stopped at the judgment or settlement.

10 We have said that that is impermissible under Sony and Merricks, and we have

11 agreed to park that debate.

12 And there is also the question of business users, which was an issue on the last

13 occasion but was parked then, and we've agreed to park it now. And that's the point

14 that we say the case theory is all built around consumers. And indeed, their claim as

15 originally framed had a carve-out for business users. We then explained that in fact

16 it's not so simple to identify business users. And their response was well, we will put

17 them back in. And we say that is completely unsatisfactory.

18 We have agreed not to take up time today and tomorrow because certainly from our

19 perspective we think that we will never get to the stage of drawing up a CPO if you

20 are with us on our points of substance, but I just wanted to put that marker down that

21 those two points mustn't be forgotten, as it were.

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's helpful. But we would want, I think, to  
23 understand, assuming we are not persuaded by your primary objections, how these  
24 points will be dealt with. Is the anticipation that there will be an exchange on paper  
25 which we would then embed in our ruling or is it envisaged that there will be  
26 a further hearing?

9

1 MR SINGLA: I think what was envisaged was that you would consider the points of  
2 substance which we make. If you are with us, then as I say we never get to the  
3 scenario where a CPO is being drawn up. But what we do say is really two things.  
4 One, no CPO could be drawn up without grappling with these two points. And two,  
5 actually the onus is on the PCR, at least in the first instance, to explain why it is that  
6 on the claim period they are going beyond what is permissible under Sony  
7 and Merricks.

8 They have not explained why they are seeking to go beyond. They have changed  
9 their position and they are now saying it should be 6 October 2023, which is when  
Damian William Langiano; Surely the date is for admin purposes given the continuation  
of data creation and thus if the current structure remains in place the payments would  
continue on a performance related basis?

10 they sent us the Amended Claim Form. We say, well, that's still not permissible  
11 under the authorities.

12 So the onus is on them in that respect. And likewise in relation to business users we  
13 say that in the first instance we want a proposal from them. It's their claim after all.

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, that seems fair enough, that the piper calls  
15 the tune. And in this case Mr O'Donoghue is the piper and I don't anticipate there  
16 will be any serious push-back on that.

17 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, no, we are seeking certification currently.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

19 MR O'DONOGHUE: And what would be very unsatisfactory would be if these two  
20 points, which in my submission are not a bar to certification, are left in the ether. So,  
21 if Mr Singla wants to make the points, let him. If he doesn't, they should not be a bar  
22 to certification.

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, look, what I'm going to provisionally indicate  
24 is this: I hope that, whilst we are obviously going to have to reserve the substance of  
25 the ruling – it would be impossible, I think, to do justice to both sides if we were to try  
26 to extemporise a substantial ruling – we will endeavour to give at least a firm

10

1 provisional indication at the end of the hearing as to where we are going.

2 If the firm provisional indication – and I stress it will only be provisional and we will  
3 revise it as we see fit when we write our full ruling – but if the provisional indication is  
4 in Mr Singla's favour, then we may park the question of the manner of dealing with  
5 these two points until we've actually done our full ruling.

6 If, on the other hand, we are firmly but provisionally in your favour, Mr O'Donoghue,  
7 what we will be minded to direct would be a very short sequence of exchange of  
8 written submissions on these two points, with the PCR starting first and Mr Singla  
9 responding, so that we could incorporate the outcomes to those questions in our  
10 ruling and have, as it were, certification, assuming we stick with our provisional view  
11 in your favour being dealt with in one go. But --

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, that's extremely helpful, if I may say so.

13 To put my cards on the table, what we really wish to avoid is for this to drag on and  
14 on for weeks and months. We want to get on with this case rather than have drift.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That accords entirely with the ethos of  
16 the Tribunal, which is to move things forward. And frankly, given the diaries that all  
17 three of us are labouring under, to say nothing of counsel, you wouldn't get a hearing  
18 for a number of months, I think, given the present state of play. So, I think --

19 MR O'DONOGHUE: Before we hear from the Tribunal, there's one final

20 housekeeping point.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Of course.

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: As you'll have seen, sir, at tab 22 of the correspondence  
23 bundle there's been a letter from the CMA in relation to the proceedings, and they  
24 have indicated that on both unfair terms and unfair pricing there are a number of  
25 things they think they can assist the Tribunal with. As I understand it they haven't yet  
26 formally applied to intervene but they have put their head above the parapet at the

11

1 very least, and I just want to make sure that that hasn't been forgotten.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, that's very helpful. I think -- I may be wrong,  
3 and it may be just an aspiration -- but I think we did respond to the CMA and the  
4 parties indicating that we understood why they were not present here, simply by  
5 reason of cost, and that we would obviously accommodate their attendance. But we  
6 would want a degree of understanding as to how they saw their involvement going  
7 forward, because we are happy either way, but we do need to know for  
8 management purposes whether there's an intention to attend in person or whether it  
9 is simply a question of written submissions.

10 If I haven't articulated that in correspondence, then that's my failure of memory and  
11 efficiency but --

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: I suspect someone is --

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- that is our thinking, and we will obviously deal  
14 with that going forward if the matter does proceed.

15 I'm very grateful, Mr O'Donoghue.

16

17 Introductory summary by THE TRIBUNAL

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I want to make very clear that this is no more than  
19 a skating across the surface of what is, after all, an extremely lengthy and detailed  
20 expert report. But we obviously are going to be dealing with the application for

21 certification on its new basis and, if we certify, allow all the consequential  
22 amendments to enable that case to be dealt with. And what I'm saying now is no  
23 more than an attempt to assure Mr O'Donoghue that we have vaguely grasped what  
24 is under the bonnet of what is obviously not a straightforward case.

25 But although there are two abuses in play, we consider that the PCR is right to  
26 regard them as flip sides of the same coin, or as intrinsically related. To unpack  
12

1 them in order, there's first of all what we can call abuse 1, which is essentially  
2 an unfair pricing case based upon the United Brands jurisdiction where it is said that  
3 the price charged by Meta was unfair within the terms of that jurisdiction.

4 Now, although it is instinctively or intuitively odd to regard a zero price as an unfair  
5 price, that is actually no more than the lawyers' hangup about things that transit the  
6 zero line. We see nothing odd in zero being an excessive price. It simply means  
7 that that which should have been paid for has not been, and it's as simple as that.

8 United Brands is a jurisdiction which is undoubtedly a difficult one to apply, but one  
9 which the courts across Europe and in this jurisdiction are increasingly familiar with.

10 The sting in the United Brands jurisdiction is that whilst it articulates a test for  
11 determining whether a price is unfair, it does not deal -- indeed it explicitly says it  
12 does not deal -- with the question of, if an unfair price has been determined, what is  
13 a fair price?

14 That, in our understanding, constitutes the fault line or the transition between abuse  
15 1 and abuse 2. So, at stage 1, abuse 1, it is necessary to say that the price charged  
16 by Meta to its Facebook client base was an unfair one. And if one establishes that,  
17 one has done no more than say that the price charged was an unfair one. What one  
18 has not done is worked out that which matters in this case but which does not matter  
19 in an infringement case, namely what is the proper or the fair price. And that, as it  
20 seems to us, is the pivot or transition point between abuse 1 and abuse 2.

21 Abuse 2, it seems to us, is much more virgin territory in terms of competition law,

22 and it is working out how one ascertains what is a fair price. And it seems to us that  
23 this is something where the increasingly litigated FRAND jurisdiction, which is  
24 developing in this jurisdiction, is something which may very well educate and inform  
25 the process of ascertaining what is a fair price, assuming the price charged by Meta  
26 was unfair under the United Brands abuse 1 jurisdiction.

13

1 That of course obliges the PCR to assert and the Tribunal to grapple with precisely  
2 what rights are in issue. Is one to take a property rights analysis of the information  
3 that is ceded by the parties who subscribe to Facebook as the right way of analysing  
4 it? If so, how does one then value the property right, namely the information that is  
5 transferred? And that is an intrinsically difficult question which requires, we think, the  
6 Class Representative to steer a difficult course between two extremes, neither of  
7 which it is asserting and both of which would be difficult to compartmentalise into  
8 a class action.

9 And just to articulate those two extremes, at one extreme there is a pure loss-based  
10 analysis, which is to say that the extraction of the Off-Facebook Data is something  
11 which has caused harm or loss to the class members. The difficulty with that is that  
12 it is very hard to avoid the suggestion that that is an individuated loss. And if I have  
13 had my data extracted wrongly by Meta to be deployed and monetised, why is my  
14 loss exactly the same or to be computed in the same way as Mr Ridyard's on my left  
15 or Mr Sawyer's on my right?

16 Loss in that sense is essentially individuated and therefore not consistent with  
17 a collective action.

Damian William Langiano; To answer your question Sir Marcus, we would need to define  
the true definition of loss and that is qualified by the New Business Director

“I feel tremendous guilt,” admitted Chamath Palihapitiya, former Vice President of  
User Growth at Facebook, to an audience of Stanford students. He was responding to a  
question about his involvement in exploiting consumer behaviour. “The short-term,



dopamine-driven feedback loops that we have created are destroying how society works,”

he explained. In Palihapitiya’s talk, he highlighted something most of us know but few really

appreciate: smartphones and the social media platforms they support are turning us into bona fide addicts. While it’s easy to dismiss this claim as hyperbole, platforms like Facebook,

Snapchat, and Instagram leverage the very same neural circuitry used by slot machines and cocaine to keep us using their products as much as possible.

This confession takes the landscape into a quantifiable position and values the data and the

means in which it was obtained as a consciously coerced and manipulated act of abuse and thus

attributing the device co-dependency and Meta at the centre of societal construct, we can

apply compensation and demand a controlled cessation of extraction and commitment to

societal repair.

Severe Psychiatric Damage Generally The prognosis is likely to be poor and the person may be unable to cope with life, education, and work. £54,830 to £115,730

<https://www.compensationcalculatoruk.co.uk/personal-injury-claims/ptsd-compensation-calculator-what-is-your-claim-worth/>

F18 At the other extreme there is the disgorgement of profits case, which we understand

19 is expressly disavowed – rightly – by the PCR, the notion that the mere fact that

20 Meta have monetised the data and so made significant profits, and to have those

21 profits disgorged is a case which we think was made last time round. We

22 understand entirely that it is not made this time round, and entirely rightly because

23 that is not a price, it is a holding to account, which is not consistent with the way in

24 which a cause of action could be framed here.

25 I say that not because I expect them to be controversial but because it, as it were,

26 bookends the second of the two extremes through which the Class Representative

14

1 must navigate.

2 So, the middle ground, which we think is the area for debate, is, how does one

3 attribute value to, we think, the property right that is being transferred by the client

4 base, by the class members, to Meta? In this case the property right in question

5 being what we term the Off-Facebook Data, which is monetised in a way which is

6 said to be done without paying a fair price. How does one ascertain what a fair price

7 is for that data?

Damian William Langiano: Again, we refer to the validity of the extraction and the means of which Meta formulated so, meaning that when then users entered the contract at no stage

did Meta explain they would be constructing a market based upon the off Facebook data and

that they would be manipulating the “supply chain” so as to obtain the optimum data value,

streamlined further through algorithmic assessment of the on Facebook data each user freely

gave under a contract of trust and a duty of care,

<https://www.lexisnexis.co.uk/legal/glossary/duty-of-care>

Thus, when we attribute <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/psychology/neural-activation>

we can apply special liabilities to the United Brands Jurisdiction and qualify through the data

Meta was in fact manipulating and further more market creating and thus enslaving the user

for monetary gain.

8 Now, that we can see is arguably part of a collective claim because one would

9 expect, much as an intellectual property right is, there to be a single price that ought

10 to be consistent across all of the class members. It's not a loss-based assessment,

Damian William Langiano: This is a loss based assessment – LOSS OF AUTONOMY

11 it's a rights-based assessment, and one would expect generally speaking the rights  
12 to be valued in rationally the same way. But how they are valued is something in  
13 which we see considerable difficulties both in terms of theory and practice, by which  
14 I mean economic practice. But that is how we understand the second abuse  
15 to operate.

16 So what one has really are two halves of a case. You need to succeed on both. If  
17 you fail on United Brands, then the price is ipso facto not unfair, and you never get to  
18 stage 2. If you succeed on United Brands then you have a whole additional area of  
19 complexity, which is, what price do you attach to that which has already been found  
20 to be unfair? And that is, as we see it, not a separate abuse but a second and  
21 sequential part of the same jigsaw puzzle.

22 Now, that, for better or worse, is my effort at articulating a much more complex and  
23 careful analysis in both your pleadings, Mr O'Donoghue, and in Professor Scott  
24 Morton's report.

25 Do feel free to be as rude as you like about what I've said. But I'll hand over to you.

26 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, as ever, that is extremely useful.

15

1 Submissions by MR O'DONOGHUE

2 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, there is a lot of common ground.

3 For example, one of the points Meta makes, and I think it's more than a quarter of its  
4 skeleton, is the point about compensatory damages, which they make at some  
5 length.

6 Now, I will deal with that head-on, which I think maps on to one of the points  
7 the Tribunal has raised. Sir, I do think nonetheless it would be useful for me to  
8 outline the architecture of our case because you are absolutely right, sir, we do see  
9 the two abuses as two sides of the same coin and we affirm that. But I did detect  
10 that we may not be on the same page in terms of which are the two sides of the coin.

11 And just to make this more concrete, the unfair terms, although it is the second side  
12 of the same coin, we see this as something which is somewhat different to United  
13 Brands and it's a different route of getting to the same conclusion, and I think it may  
14 be useful for me to explain why that is. But I do think, sir, there is a lot of utility in  
15 what the Tribunal has indicated, and I will try to meld my submissions to deal with  
16 those points as I go along.

17 Sir, you are absolutely right, we are not seeking disgorgement. You are absolutely  
18 right that, at least as pleaded, the case is a compensatory case, and we do put  
19 forward a case that these are 46 million individual losses pooled together. We are  
46mn Users was in not 44mn in previous evidence?

20 seeking compensatory damages on a common class-wide basis.

21 Sir, I will pick up these points as I go along but I think the starting point is it is  
22 extremely helpful that the Tribunal has seen the point that we see these very much  
23 as two sides of the same coin, and I want to unpack what we mean by that and, in  
24 particular, sir, how it maps on to damages.

25 Sir, a couple of further points. I entirely agree that when one moves to the liability  
26 stage in United Brands all you have done at that stage is identify what is unfair. It  
16

1 doesn't, at least by necessity, then identify what is fair. That is the counterfactual  
2 exercise.

3 Now, having said that, of course, when one determines liability, one will in most  
4 cases be looking at evidence of comparators, other metrics that indicate fairness,  
5 and in my submission whilst the exercise at the liability stage is simply to work out  
6 unfairness, by implication in most cases, including this case, one would be  
7 considering various metrics of fairness in reaching that terminus. And when it comes  
8 to the question of damages and compensation those metrics and comparables may  
9 be of some evidential and forensic utility.

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue, don't get me wrong, in

11 intellectually articulating two stages I wasn't saying that you couldn't establish or  
12 make good both stages by reference to the same evidence.

13 MR O'DONOGHUE: Indeed, you are absolutely right. Strictly speaking in phase 1 it  
14 is unfairness only.

15 Now, the other point I would say, sir, before I move on to one of the more detailed  
16 submissions, is of course once you establish unfairness, at least directionally, in  
17 a counterfactual you will understand that the counterfactual fair bargain must be  
18 better than the factual, because what the Defendant cannot do at the compensatory  
19 stage is say, well, it doesn't matter because I would have behaved unfairly in the  
20 counterfactual as well.

21 So at least directionally – I accept you need to put a number on this, this is  
22 a damages case – but at least directionally we know that the counterfactual will be  
23 better for the class even if that does not itself yield a number.

24 To put it in very simple terms, the objectionable factual is an unfair price of bargain.

25 The lawful counterfactual is a fair price of bargain. So at least directionally –

26 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, so what you will be saying is that the outcome  
17

1 would have to be that Meta would have to pay something –

2 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- to the class because zero is the price. It can't be  
4 that the class would be paying anything to Meta; it would have to be in the other  
5 direction. So, zero in a sense constitutes the starting point for an assessment at  
6 stage 2 of how much goes from Meta into the coffers of the class.

7 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes, there has to be a positive payment on the counterfactual.

8 I entirely accept that that doesn't give me pounds, shillings and pence, but  
9 directionally we say the position is clear.

10 Sir, I will come back to everything you said in some detail, in particular the  
11 compensatory damages point and individualisation. They are extremely important,

12 and I want to spend quite a bit of time on those. Sir, if I can make some initial  
13 remarks and then quickly move to the architecture and then move on to the handful  
14 of core points the Tribunal has helpfully identified.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's fine. I mean, the only thing I would say is,  
16 you must take whatever course you see fit, but of course, given the 50/50 split,  
17 whatever time you spend now will be subtracted from a reply.

18 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: So, I leave that in your judgment. I'll say no more.

20 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, can I start with the compensatory point, which I think is at  
21 the heart of at least one of the Tribunal's points. Then I will move to the question of  
22 individualisation, which I think is wrapped up to some extent in the same point.

23 Just to put Mr Singla's gloss on this, what they say in their skeleton at 69 is that the  
24 remedy being claimed is not compensatory and the basis of the assessment of  
25 damages remains focused on the gain to Meta rather than the loss to the class,  
26 which they say is not a permissible approach in law. And wrapped up in that is

18

1 the Tribunal's point about individualisation and in effect -- or in substance they say  
2 it's a quasi-disgorgement type remedy.

3 Now, we say this is simply wrong. Our case is compensatory and nothing else. And  
4 I'll explain how the individualisation component works.

5 Sir, it is important, in my submission, to debunk the gains to Meta of disgorgement  
6 point to understand the genesis of this. The genesis of this point first time round was  
7 Mr Harvey's initial approach.

8 Now, in a nutshell, sir, as you will recall, Mr Harvey -- there were two difficulties, or at  
9 least two difficulties. One was that for two of the then three abuses no

10 counterfactual was put forward. And second, even for the unfair pricing abuse the  
11 approach was essentially, well, every penny above the WACC is compensation to  
12 class.

13 Now, if one thing is clear, that is not what we are saying this time round. So the  
14 genesis of this point is important.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: You don't need to spend any time on -- I mean,  
16 I know that Professor Scott Morton says that is appropriate she takes the Harvey  
17 report into account. I think we can safely regard what work she has done as what  
18 an insurance company would call a cancel and rewrite of the round previously. So  
19 I don't think either of you need be troubled by any baggage that we will have around  
20 our necks as regards what Mr Harvey said. We made clear our position last time  
21 around. For our part we are content that there's been a substantial cancel and  
22 rewrite, and it is the merits of that which we are really concerned with.

23 MR O'DONOGHUE: That's extremely useful, sir. I mean, we were instructed to  
24 conduct a root and branch enquiry --

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, no, no --

26 MR O'DONOGHUE: -- and we did.

19

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: We would have been disappointed if you hadn't,  
2 and I think if you hadn't addressed the pretty fundamental concerns that we  
3 articulated in our last ruling then you would be getting a rather different ride --

4 MR O'DONOGHUE: I can imagine, sir. I can only imagine.

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- today.

6 MR O'DONOGHUE: And of course the gist of much of Meta's submissions is, well,  
7 it's the same thing all over again. It's déjà vu all over again. And it's simply not true  
8 as a starting point. So that was the genesis of Mr Harvey and I don't need to labour  
9 that point.

10 Now, by contrast, Professor Scott Morton, she clearly articulates the counterfactual.

11 If we can go to 346 of her first report, Core A 3/310, paragraph 346. You see, sir:

12 "As such, I consider that in the counterfactual without the take-it-or-leave-it  
13 requirement the vast majority of consumers would have refused to consent to

Off 14 Facebook Tracking absent some inducement. Given the commercial value of  
Off 15 Facebook Tracking to Facebook, Facebook would be strongly incentivised to find  
16 a value transfer which would obtain consent from users and share some of the  
17 surplus generated by their data."

18 Then a couple of pages on at 357 we see about two-thirds of the way down the  
19 paragraph:

20 "I would therefore expect that any value transfer to be from Facebook to users."

21 If we then go back to the draft Amended Claim Form at 176 in tab 1, we say:

22 "In the counterfactual, Users would thus have benefited from a fair bargain in relation  
23 to the collection of their Off-Facebook Data. The value that would have accrued to  
24 users and in that fair bargain represents the loss they have suffered by reason of  
25 Facebook's abuse. Accordingly, the same or substantially the same counterfactual  
26 methodology for quantifying damages applies whether as a matter of legal

20

1 classification the abuse is articulated as an unfair trading condition or an unfair  
2 price."

3 Now, the counterfactual of the monetary value transferred from Meta to the users, it  
4 is not simply assumed by Professor Scott Morton, who provides a compelling basis  
5 in fact for why the commercial value of the Off-Facebook Data to Meta is relevant to  
6 the assessment of loss. If we go back to her report at 330, please.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

8 MR O'DONOGHUE: You see the point about commercial value. Then there's  
9 a reference to the Tribunal's criticism from the judgment last year in relation to  
10 Mr Harvey. And she says:

11 "By contrast, my analysis derives the role of the commercial value of data for  
12 Facebook by isolating the incremental profits associated with the abuse concerning  
13 Off-Facebook Tracking."

14 Now, of course this is one factor in a model. There are two other factors. There's



15 the bargaining parameter and of course the cost to users of giving up their data. So,  
16 Professor Scott Morton doesn't just crudely assume that all of Meta's profits above  
17 the WACC are compensatory damages. Instead, she has a bargaining model which  
18 seeks to isolate the effects of the unfairness abuse and translate them into  
19 compensatory damages. And in particular only the incremental profits generated  
20 from Off-Facebook Data are taken into account and not Facebook's overall profits,  
21 and they are really one of a number of inputs into that model and are not simply its  
22 output.

23 Sir, our case is that in a counterfactual, absent the abuse, users would, whether  
24 under unfair terms or unfair prices, have benefited from a positive value transfer for  
25 Meta to access the Off-Facebook Data. The factual position is that they received  
26 nothing for these data. And the missing link, if I could call it that, in Meta's analysis --  
21

1 one can easily see in an unfair price, if the price is unfair as a matter of liability, then  
2 the counterfactual is some price that is not zero.

3 Of course, there are complex questions of calibration, but the counterfactual of the  
4 unfair price must be a price. But equally the counterfactual to the unfair terms is also  
5 a price, because the logic is that one cannot extract the data by a contractual fiat, an  
6 unfair contractual term. The users, as we see from the ATT incident a couple  
7 of years ago, are extremely resistant if given a choice, in tracking, and we see the  
8 same with Project Beacon in 2007. So, if you cannot extract the data by this  
9 contractual fiat, and users are resistant to giving up these data, in a counterfactual to  
10 obtain these data a payment has to be made to induce the users.

11 So that is how one transitions from a factual unfair term to a counterfactual price in  
12 the form of compensatory damages. So that is the link between the two sides of the  
13 coin.

14 And the aggregate damages we claim are therefore equal to the aggregate size of  
15 the transfer of value that the class would have received in the counterfactual, absent

16 the abuse, in exchange for consenting to Meta collecting Off-Facebook Data. So,  
17 the damages compensate the users for the abuse of the collection of these data  
18 without any consideration return and which Meta would have paid instead, absent  
19 the abuse.

20 Now, one of the points made by Mr Singla is, well, in effect you are claiming  
21 user-based damages or seeking a gains-based remedy which is not permissible in  
22 law.

23 Now, with respect, that is not correct. As I've articulated, in both counterfactuals or  
24 both sides of the same coin, there is a counterfactual positive price payment to the  
25 users. This is not a case like *Lloyd v Google* where there is no financial loss to the  
26 individual and instead a user-based remedy must be imposed in the absence of  
22

1 any financial loss. And this is a case where the counterfactual is a financial loss.

2 The users had been denied the benefit of a fair bargain in the counterfactual.

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Just to put it in more granular terms, what you are  
4 saying is this, that it's a perfectly feasible business model to operate Facebook using  
5 only on-Facebook data. And that is something which could be offered without any  
6 particular additional form of monetised consent.

7 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes. For many years that's all that was offered --

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Indeed, we understand that. The point is that the  
9 Off-Facebook Data is in and of itself valuable and monetised by Facebook. And you  
10 are not saying that that surplus that accrues to Meta should be disgorged to the  
11 class. What you are saying is, let's suppose there was a box that came up when you  
12 subscribed to Facebook saying: do you want just the use of on-Facebook data only?  
13 In which case, off you go. Or are you prepared to allow the use for these purposes  
14 of Off-Facebook Data at X price?

15 And although that sounds extraordinarily simple, the X price is likely to be quite  
16 significant in terms of both the number of people who subscribe -- it may be too low

17 for them. They may well say, well, I don't want to pay that. That is something you  
18 are going to have to model. And then you have to say, well, if that price X is paid by  
19 Meta to the class as subscribed, however great that would be, what effects does that  
20 have on the network between the two markets which Meta are serving?

21 In other words, it may very well be the case that if you have a charge of X, whatever  
22 X may be, there is so diminished a number of participants in the Off-Facebook Data  
23 so as to render the monetisability of that data to be impossible.

24 Now, these are things which we can't hope to debate now but they are the sort of  
25 things that we will be dealing with in a trial if it takes place. But it does go to show  
26 that the choice to allow my use of Off-Facebook Data at price X, although it seems  
23

1 a very simple question, is in fact one redolent with enormous complexity.

2 MR O'DONOGHUE: I accept that. Of course, we are not seeking payment in  
3 relation to on-Facebook data. And in relation to the Off-Facebook Data, the  
4 bargaining parameter currently specified means they will continue to keep at least  
5 50 per cent of the incremental profit. And we see from ATT that if one extrapolates  
6 from Apple to the entire device universe we are talking about tens of billions of  
7 pounds.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, yes, I know you say 50 per cent, but that is  
9 something which is enormously up for debate.

10 MR O'DONOGHUE: It is up for debate.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: The fact is that part – I query how much -- but part  
12 of the value that Meta are bringing is the aggregation and deployment of the  
13 Off-Facebook Data in order to monetise it, and that is something which doesn't  
14 emanate from the individual class member. All the class member is doing is  
15 providing the raw material. And so, the 50/50 split may be entirely wrong.

Damian William Langiano: "All the class member is doing" is abhorrent and disrespectful  
description Sir Marcus, what the class member is doing is unknowingly being used on a

multiple of levels as the market place itself, it is both the buyer and the seller, the creator and the consumer, unknowingly so and that consumption of data, content, consumables energy, food, and natural resources is then fed back the collective and individual market in the means of guilt and shame, mental, emotional, and physical symptoms, to which Meta

and others are then selling both solutions and teaching methods that hold the user in place

and or educate the next generation, consciously, subconsciously, and metaphysically.

Sir Marcus – we are the market Meta have manipulated.

16 Now, that's not something which we want to debate about, save to say that it may be  
17 entirely wrong and --

18 MR O'DONOGHUE: There will be debate, sir --

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: There would need to be. I am quite sure there will  
20 be. I see Mr Singla nodding away. But that is something which we would need to  
21 have an understanding of, how one justifies a rate of 50 per cent, 10 per cent,  
22 90 per cent, who knows?

23 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, that's entirely right. But we have set out why we say (a)  
24 there would be a positive payment, and (b) at least as a starting point a 50/50 split is  
25 a fair one.

26 Now, to look at this from the other end of the telescope, are we to understand that  
24

1 a company potentially foregoing tens of millions of pounds of profits consistent with  
2 their fiduciary duties would throw their hands in the air and cock a snook at users or  
3 would they incentivise to reach a deal? That would be the debate for trial if we get  
4 there. It is a question of incentives at its core.

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, it is. But it's not, I think, answered by  
6 saying: would Meta be cocking a snook? In other words, would they be foregoing an  
7 addition to their revenues above their costs? It's much more a question of what is  
8 a proper price as between the class members and Meta, which is not the same,

9 I don't think, as: will Meta be increasing their revenue over their costs? I mean, on  
10 that basis you could justify a 99 per cent/1 per cent split between Facebook and  
11 the class.

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, that's right. To put this in Hydrocortisone terms, the  
13 producer and consumer surplus needs to be balanced. If there is a producer surplus  
14 that is justified that can be reflected in the bargain parameter, it can be adjusted left  
15 or right as appropriate at trial. I entirely accept that.

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Indeed.

17 Mr Singla, I hope you are vaguely familiar with the Hydrocortisone language that we  
18 are using.

19 MR SINGLA: Sir, I'm very familiar with it. But just to be clear on this point that you  
20 have been discussing with Mr O'Donoghue, we are not saying today that the problem  
21 is the 50/50 split. We say there's a much more fundamental problem. We accept  
22 that if you were to certify we would take issue about the precise nature of the extent  
23 of a split. Our point is, we actually never get to this counterfactual bargain.

Damian William Langiano: Are Meta goading the Class Action and the Bench into a  
decision

Knowing that they are acting beyond that of the boundaries of this case. This feels more  
like

a divorce case / split with on going spousal maintenance.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's very helpful, Mr Singla, and I'm sure that  
25 Mr O'Donoghue will take that on board, because we are very keen to understand the  
26 fundamental objections that you have.

25

1 But just to be clear, Hydrocortisone is not dealing with precisely where a fair price is  
2 to be located. Hydrocortisone is a pure United Brands case where one is saying: is  
3 this price unfair? And one is assuming the question of what is a fair price, save in  
4 the directional sense, that you articulated in the beginning, which is why I said earlier  
5 that this is, at this stage, much more like a FRAND case where one is saying there is

6 an obligation to reach a fair and reasonable non-discriminatory price, but what is  
7 a fair and reasonable and non-discriminatory price is not simply: does it add to  
8 Meta's bottom line in some way? And equally it doesn't mean that a 50/50 split  
9 is intrinsic --

10 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes, all is up for grabs.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: All is up for grabs.

Damian William Langiano

Crimes against humanity are certain serious crimes committed as part of a large-scale  
attack against civilians.[1] Unlike war crimes, crimes against humanity can be committed  
during both peace and war and against a state's own nationals as well as foreign  
nationals.

[1][2] Together with war crimes, genocide, and the crime of aggression, crimes against  
humanity are one of the core crimes of international criminal law,[3] and like other crimes  
against international law have no temporal or jurisdictional limitations on prosecution  
(where universal jurisdiction is recognized).[2]

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rome\\_Statute](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rome_Statute)

One would use the ICC website; however, the corruption runs deep and I'm sure Meta is  
aware of the legal implications or now should be.

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: I'm not drawing lines in the sand, at least on that.

13 Sir, in a nutshell, again, the reason we say the damage is compensatory in relation  
14 to both abuses is that the only counterfactual we've put forward is that there would  
15 be a positive value transfer to the users.

Damian William Langiano: Agreed and detailed within.

16 Now, Meta has said, well, there are other possibilities. Perhaps. We have set out in  
17 some detail why, based on the evidence, a value transfer to the users is the correct  
18 counterfactual. I will come back to unpack that a bit more. But that is why we say, at  
19 base, these damages are only compensatory because they are premised in the  
20 counterfactual on a monetary transfer to the users. It is not disgorgement of profits

21 and it is not a user-based remedy which assumes there is no financial loss. Our  
22 case is that there has been a financial loss.

Damian William Langiano: Agreed and verified by the diagnosis of Complex PTSD which  
is qualified as a disorder in the United Kingdom and the placement of the judgement  
before us. [https://www.nhs.uk/mental-health/conditions/post-traumatic-stress-](https://www.nhs.uk/mental-health/conditions/post-traumatic-stress-disorder-ptsd/complex/)  
disorder-ptsd/complex/

The symptoms being detrimental to the performance of the victim and thus financial  
loss is calculable, more so when we can present Meta and its investors, benefactors and  
subsidiaries are invested into the market being created from the data extraction/delivery  
cycle.

23 Now, a couple of further points.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: But there's not been a financial loss in the sense of  
25 a person entering upon my land, trespassing, not doing any damage, in the sense  
26 that my land is as it was, and I've suffered no articulatable loss.

Damian William Langiano: Sir Marcus, if ever a statement encapsulated the very bones  
of the case before us, that is it. Meta have knowingly entered the cranial castle of every  
user

online or off platform, they have trespassed, tarmacked new driveways and dumped the  
rubbish

of societies demise into every neuropathway, seeking to replicate the “grabbing” of  
humanities

morality and bare knuckle beating the internal knowing of intuition and instinct into  
submission.

Thus, we have a society unsafe in its own natural environment and held like battery hens  
in a

Metaverse that has such little regard it seeks to replace them with avatars at the point of  
data

digestion which self-combusts the user within a data created optimum waste disposal  
system.

As Mr O'Donoghue qualifies, there is loss – monumental loss.

It is simply

1 a payment to reflect the fact that the trespasser has obtained that which they are not  
2 entitled to, namely the benefit of entering on my land without payment.

3 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, it is a bit more than that.

Damian William Langiano: Yes it is.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Right.

5 MR O'DONOGHUE: First of all, we don't ground this in property rights as such. It is  
6 actually something much simpler, which is, the counterfactual is a fair bargain. A fair  
7 bargain results in a financial payment to the users. So what has been lost between  
8 the factual and counterfactual is the denial of the monetary benefit of a fair bargain.  
9 That's why -- I don't need to go as far today, and I don't need, to say, well, this is akin  
10 to a property right and you must compensate me, come what may. We say there is  
11 a direct financial loss because the denial of the fair bargain in the counterfactual has  
12 led to a financial loss to the users in the form of the denial of payment. And that is  
13 equally true of unfair terms and unfair prices.

14 The second reason, sir, why we put this slightly differently is that we do say that  
15 there is a compelling factual basis or some basis in fact for why users do value the  
16 Off-Facebook Data and therefore have suffered a loss in the counterfactual. Now,  
17 just to quote what Mr Singla says on this, he says at 69 in his skeleton:

18 "If the remedy claim were loss based then no damages would be recoverable by  
19 users who attribute no value to Off-Facebook Data."

20 Now, we say that is simply wrong in fact, because we see from ATT and Project  
21 Beacon that if people are given some semblance of a choice or if there is  
22 competition, the vast majority of users will simply refuse to give up Off-Facebook  
23 Data as things stand. But we do say there is a basis in fact for why users do value  
24 their data and why they suffered a loss in those data being used and misused.

25 And the cost to users, of course, is one of the key inputs in the bargaining model.

26 That's at paragraph 328 of Scott Morton 1. And the higher the costs of data



1 extraction for users the higher the level of damages.

2 So we do say there is a financial loss, and it is not the case that the vast majority of

3 users simply couldn't care less about their Off-Facebook Data.

Damian William Langiano: What we must add is that if the disclaimer on the terms of conditions read.

“I feel tremendous guilt,” admitted Chamath Palihapitiya, former Vice President of User Growth at Facebook, to an audience of Stanford students. He was responding to a question about his involvement in exploiting consumer behaviour. “The short-term, dopamine-driven feedback loops that we have created are destroying how society works,”

he explained. In Palihapitiya’s talk, he highlighted something most of us know but few really appreciate: smartphones and the social media platforms they support are turning us into bona fide addicts. While it’s easy to dismiss this claim as hyperbole, platforms like

Facebook, Snapchat, and Instagram leverage the very same neural circuitry used by slot machines and cocaine to keep us using their products as much as possible: and that the long term effects of using our platform and being held captive would result in co-dependency

Complex PTSD, Depression, Alzheimer’s and Parkinsons, and that Palihapitiya and his clan

“Don’t use that shit” and the influencers of the world and governing bodies took notice and acted morally the off-market data manipulation would not be happening and thus all involved would not be facing CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY including those invested and profiting from at each and all levels.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, I accept that, for the sake of argument,

5 Mr O'Donoghue. The problem is, I'm not sure you can simply say the nature of that

6 which the class member is giving up can be unclassified. And I think that is perhaps

7 the key transitional point between your abuse 1 and your abuse 2. You see, if one

8 had a situation where all we were deciding was "has Meta behaved improperly in  
9 using or extracting the Off-Facebook Data", well, that's a nice United Brands  
10 question, and no doubt you could say: well, naughty Meta, they've charged too  
11 much, that's an infringement; big fine; off you go.

Damian William Langiano: See Nuremberg Code, Statute of Rome, Duty of Care

But that's not this case. That is

12 only the starting point.

13 The next point is, well, what is the value that is not being accorded in Facebook's  
14 unfair price?

15 Now, if there was a future market where Facebook said, well, yes, we accept -- of  
16 course I appreciate you don't at the moment -- we accept that this is an infringement;  
17 the price is unfair; we are now going to put in place an offer where Off-Facebook  
18 Data is priced in some kind of fixed price way or even an auction -- I'm sure you can  
19 have an online auction for the price -- and you would get a market for the data and  
20 you would know what the price was. But we don't have that, because Facebook are  
21 saying: this is not an infringement at all; what we are charging is fair.

22 So the Tribunal is going to be in a position where we are going to have to work out  
23 how one evaluates, how one prices, that which is being given up. And I'm not sure  
24 that you can divorce the question of fairness from a theory as to what is being given  
25 up, which is why I'm going on to the question of trespass, property rights, that sort of  
26 thing, because --

28

1 MR O'DONOGHUE: I understand.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- it gives at least a degree of intellectual  
3 coherence into what it is we are trying to do.

Damian William Langiano: Then the tribunal must deem my evidence and the  
presentation of

<https://sitn.hms.harvard.edu/flash/2018/dopamine-smartphones-battle-time/> as  
admissible

and in doing so recognise the damage done by Meta manipulating the markets from both ends

and impacting on society as stated.

4 MR O'DONOGHUE: It may be we are at slightly cross-purposes. The property  
5 rights, of course, are like a patent, they have a particular connotation. Now, I do not  
6 say that data is akin to a patent right. What I'm saying is that these data are  
7 personal and extremely valuable, and that in essentially a hypothetical negotiation  
8 over these data, Meta would see their value and would be strongly incentivised to  
9 pay a positive monetary price for access to these data.

Damian William Langiano: What is being reversed geared here is the construct of legalised covert

Narcissism coercion and manipulation for monetary reward, which would implicate Meta under

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/coercive-or-controlling-behaviour-now-a-crime>

“Our new coercive or controlling behaviour offence will protect victims who would otherwise be

subjected to sustained patterns of abuse that can lead to total control of their lives by the perpetrator. “We are sending a clear message that it is wrong to violate the trust of those closest

to you and that emotional and controlling abuse will not be tolerated.” Referrals, prosecutions

and the volume of convictions for domestic violence and abuse have risen to their highest ever

levels. The government is committed to supporting the police to bring offenders to justice and

to ensure victims have the support they need to rebuild their lives. Coercive or controlling behaviour

does not relate to a single incident, it is a purposeful pattern of incidents that occur over time

in order for one individual to exert power, control, or coercion over another.

So maybe the slight

10 push-back from me is that I'm not saying this is on all fours with a property right. It is  
11 something close to that, but not exactly the same, if that makes sense.

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, yes, I mean, I suppose what I'm saying is  
13 that is not for today but certainly for the purposes of any trial we would need to be in  
14 a position to understand what it is we are valuing as a starting point. I mean, when  
15 one is talking about a right that is clearly understood, an intellectual property right,  
16 a patent right, even when one knows the precise nature of the right in question, the  
17 question of valuation is extremely difficult, as I know from my own  
18 personal experience.

19 It becomes an order of magnitude harder when one hasn't actually framed the nature  
20 of the right that is being given up. And it does seem to me that we are going to need  
21 to understand, as part of your case going forward, what it is that we are valuing,  
22 because unless one knows exactly what it is one is valuing then one has a problem  
23 from the get-go. So it may be that it's not a property right that –

24 MR O'DONOGHUE: In a class –

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: And that's fine, but we will need to know what it is,  
26 not, as I say, today, but that is something which will be pretty fundamental to the  
29

1 case going forward, because it is quite possible that this is simply a pure regulatory  
2 question.

3 Let me unpack what I mean by that. It's quite possible that, assuming – Mr Singla,  
4 I'm going to assume an infringement on Meta's part because the example only works  
5 if one assumes an infringement -- the position is that actually Meta has been  
6 behaving extremely badly by infringing by charging an unfair price. The outcome is  
7 not that there is any form of adjustment by way of compensatory damages. The  
8 answer is that Facebook have infringed. That is it. You shouldn't do it in the future.  
9 And maybe there's a fine for past conduct. But there's nothing more than that.  
10 So it does seem to me that the nature of that which is being given up is quite

11 fundamentally important to the valuation of what is being given up, because it's quite  
12 possible to say, well, what's being given up is worth nothing, has no price, it's just  
13 information. But in extracting it Facebook have behaved very badly and should be  
14 fined, you know, whatever amount they should be fined because they have infringed  
15 competition law by imposing an unfair price. So, there is no necessary connection.  
16 MR O'DONOGHUE: I understand that. That will need to be specified and will be the  
17 key issue if we get to trial. What we are saying at base is that in a counterfactual  
18 negotiation -- I mean, these data are not just a raw material, they are the key  
19 essential raw material that allows the individualised targeted advertising that is so  
20 very profitable for Meta.

Damian William Langiano: TARGETED ADVERTISING – CONTEXTUAL – EXPERIENTIAL

The extraction and deployment resale and creation of is through the above means,  
which then constructs a perception that is beneficial to Meta and its marketing process  
Thus, this is far from raw data, this is force fed and acutely individualised.

21 And again, at the risk of repetition, we see time and time again when users are  
22 confronted with any semblance of a choice as to whether they would want to give up  
23 these data, the overwhelming majority say, resoundingly, no.

Damian William Langiano: The only issue with the above is that most would not say NO  
Or at this point anyway due to the “safer in than out” methodology that a fear driven  
Society is held within. As with most domestic violence and manipulative relationships  
and

This without doubt is one, the victim is suffocated with Stockholm syndrome and stays  
All the while knowing the abuse is happening due to dysregulation of the nervous system.

24 MR RIDYARD: Can I ask a question about the minority in the ATT experiment.

25 80 percent didn't want to give it up but the other 20 percent were happy about giving  
26 it up. But in your approach to damages, you don't make any allowance for those.

30

1 You don't say, well, that 20 per cent reveal not to care about giving up the Off

2 Facebook Data, so there's no damage to them. So, in that sense that does reveal  
3 something about your approach to damages here, doesn't it? It really is derived from  
4 the profits to Meta rather than the cost to the consumer.

Damian William Langiano: See above

5 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, I don't think that is quite right, for a few reasons. First of  
6 all, of course we will need in due course to get disclosure as to what exactly has  
7 been happening with ATT. We have seen some raw numbers, but in terms of the  
8 alpha and beta testing the reactions to that and what exactly the users thought they  
9 were or were not giving up or opting in and out of, the details there would be  
10 important. For example, to put it in somewhat extreme terms, it may be that the  
11 20 per cent of people who did opt in absolutely completely misunderstood what they  
12 were being asked. So, the details will matter here. I don't accept that the –

Damian William Langiano: Co-dependency is directly attributed to Complex PTSD and  
The symptoms are of servitude and supplication – “We are slaves” Richard Grannon  
spartanlifecoach.com

13 MR RIDYARD: It relates to the 80 per cent, too, doesn't it? But let's just take – I  
14 mean, you asked us to take the 80/20 at face value, which I think is reasonable for  
15 current purposes. I am just understanding, I mean, the nature of the damage is very  
16 much based on the excess profits that you believe Meta makes from the  
17 incremental data.

18 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes, well, the incremental profitability is one input, I entirely  
19 accept that, and the cost of giving up data to the users is another input, and the  
20 bargaining parameter is another input. So, it's not the sole input. But the second  
21 response, sir, to your question is really a legal point, which is, there is nothing  
22 objectionable about collective proceedings in which the class -- well, two  
23 things: where the loss suffered by class members has a degree of variability or  
24 indeed that there may be some class members who suffered no loss at all. That is  
25 not some infirmity or frailty in the collective proceedings. And just to give you

26 a couple of references to that, the first is the Gutmann case, which is tab 37 of the  
31

1 authorities bundle. It's at 1808, paragraphs 41 and 42.

2 You will see in subparagraph (3) -- I can give you the quotation:

3 "A common issue does not require that all members of the class have the same  
4 interest in its resolution. The commonality refers to the question not the answer, and  
5 there can be a significant level of difference between the position of class members."

6 And likewise, in Gutmann, Court of Appeal again, 73 and 74:

7 "The existence of some no-loss claimants in the class was not an obstacle to  
8 certification."

9 So that's the second point, sir. And the final point goes back to a point the President  
10 made. I think the one thing that everyone is agreed upon is that if there is  
11 a counterfactual price it will be a single price for all users.

12 And you will know, sir, from other unfair pricing cases and indeed from competition  
13 law more generally it is inevitable in any unfair pricing scenario that there will be  
14 consumers who have a higher or lower or at least different willingness to pay, and  
15 there will be some degree of -- a billionaire may be less upset about an unfair price  
16 than an indigenous person. So, a degree of individualisation to that extent is  
17 inevitable, we suggest, in anti-trust analysis.

18 But the key thing is, if there is an unfair price, there has then to be a fair  
19 counterfactual price. And certainly in this case that counterfactual price will be  
20 a single price for all users. And it may be that that single price is somewhat different  
21 to the willingness to pay and willingness to accept of one or other individual class  
22 member.

23 And we say that is first of all not a defect under antitrust law as a general matter and,  
24 second, in the context of collective proceedings that is not an obstacle to collective  
25 certification.

26 The final point I should mention, which I think, sir, may be a practical answer to your

1 question, is if we go to paragraph 41 of Professor Scott Morton's first report. Core A,  
2 tab 3, 331. You will see the heading "Accounting for variation across class  
3 members." And if I can invite the Tribunal to read 421 to 423. (Pause).

4 So, it's essentially an average exercise and there will be a single price. That is all  
5 I wanted to say on why these damages are compensatory and why, to the extent  
6 there is an individual element, it's not inimical to a class being certified.

Damian William Langiano: Not wanting to complicate the perspective, however given that  
The data is digital and the operation of delivery and extraction also, it would be an  
accounting

Application / algorithm that could calculate each individual's valuation. For if Meta have  
qualified

And monetised, formulated and manipulated, coerced and navigated then there is a foot  
print

For that data too has a value and a value and a value.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's helpful.

8 Mr O'Donoghue, we generally take a transcriber break. Would that be a convenient  
9 moment?

10 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes, sir, it would.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Very good. We will rise for 10 minutes until  
12 midday.

13 (11.53 am)

14 (A short break)

15 (12.05 pm)

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue.

17 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, a couple of final points and then I will hand over to

18 Mr Singla, and I can deal with what he says in reply.

19 Just to come back on the question of no loss because of different personal  
20 valuations of Facebook data. Just to be crystal clear, we make two points. One, in



21 fact users do value their personal data: Project Beacon, ATT.

22 You will also see, sir, in appendix A2 of Scott Morton 1 there is a survey of quite  
23 a recent body of literature which essentially debunks the so-called privacy paradox.  
24 So we say there is a lot of literature, including that which is very recent, suggesting  
25 that users do in fact value their privacy considerably.

26 And second – and I think, Mr Ridyard, this really is the key point in relation to your  
33

1 question – if there is a user who for whatever reason doesn't personally value his or  
2 her Off-Facebook Data very much, there is still, on our counterfactual, a loss,  
3 because what they have lost is the payment resulting from a fair bargain in the  
4 counterfactual.

5 In a counterfactual with a single non-discriminatory price being applied by Meta to  
6 users, all users will benefit from that fair price. And the loss to a user who doesn't,  
7 for whatever reason, value their data is the denial of the monetary benefit of the fair  
8 counterfactual bargain.

9 So that's why we say there is a loss that isn't directly at least linked to personal  
10 valuation.

11 Now, one way maybe to think about this is, suppose I am a teetotaller and I have  
12 a bottle of wine that is extremely valuable, and somebody takes it from me. Does  
13 the fact that I personally, because I'm teetotal, have more or less no valuation for this  
14 bottle of wine mean I suffer no loss? Well, no, because if the value of that wine as  
15 sold to a merchant is £100 then that is the loss that I have suffered.

16 So that may be one way of triangulating all this. Sir, that is all I wanted to say. I will  
17 deal with points by way of reply primarily.

Damian William Langiano; Nicely presented and expanded again by the fact at this stage  
the user is unaware that they are the product and that the algorithm performing the “just  
In time” decision making is doing so. Thus, the creation of nondecision making and trend  
following that is a direct reflection of the market being created, one that is malleable

and unable to self-protect, thus the 20% may well be seen as the most vulnerable, even when and as Meta require that decision looks autonomous.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That is very helpful, Mr O'Donoghue. Thank you  
19 very much.

20 Mr Singla.

21 Submissions by MR SINGLA

22 MR SINGLA: Sir, as you know, we submit that despite the PCR's amendments to  
23 the Claim Form and the new expert evidence the case does remain fundamentally  
24 flawed on a number of levels.

25 Now, I'm going to divide my submissions into five parts. I do want to say something  
26 first about the legal principles that apply at the certification stage.

34

1 Secondly, I will address you on the important question of causation and  
2 counterfactuals because, as you will have seen from our response and skeleton, we  
3 say there is a serious problem with this aspect of the revised case. And indeed, we  
4 say the problem means that the case is unsustainable in all the different forms in  
5 which it's put in the Claim Form. I'm going to take some time taking you through the  
6 Claim Form because it's important to see that the case is actually put, as regards  
7 infringement, in three different ways. It's said that -- what we have called abuse 1.  
8 Now that abuse 1 we have described as the imposition of the take it or leave it  
9 condition. That is said to be an unfair term and an abuse in and of itself.

Damian William Langiano: At the risk of repeating myself and seeking to answer these  
comments as I would in real time. The construction of society based upon data extraction  
manipulation and coercion results in just that, an arrogant stance of take it leave it  
based upon a surreptitious addiction process, one that literally places the user onto the  
train toward an internal nervous system shut down with the avoidance of such being the  
fawning of all confrontation inside the "circle of trust" and the landscape that is the  
chemical construct of "Home" and thus the walk to the decision to join one ordained

way before that of the “Yes or No” button.

10 That's the first way in which the case is pleaded. Secondly, the case is put on the  
11 basis that there is an unfair price. That's what we call abuse 2.

Damian William Langiano: See above, the price is that of a safe and accurate  
environment

born of conscious and autonomous choice.

12 And thirdly -- and we say this is in fact, on analysis, the principal way in which the  
13 case is put -- it's said that both abuses need to be proved in order to get to the  
14 counterfactual, that they need to show that there was both an unfair term and  
15 an unfair price.

16 Now, that is really the way in which the case is put. It's not, with respect, sir, I think  
17 you described it as almost stage 1 and stage 2 that one starts with the unfair price,  
18 and the other allegation about unfair terms comes in only if the unfair price case is  
19 established. With respect, when I show you the pleading, you'll see in fact the way in  
20 which the PCR advances the revised case. And in relation to the principal way in  
21 which it's put, ie the PCR accepting that they need to prove both the unfair term and  
22 the unfair price, what they say in the counterfactual is that there would have been  
23 a bargain between users and Facebook pursuant to which (a) the same amount of  
24 Off-Facebook Data as is being collected or used now would continue to be collected  
25 or used in the counterfactual, but (b) what would be happening is that Facebook  
26 would be paying users, and in particular paying users a share of the profits.

35

1 We say that counterfactual bargain which arises in the event and only in the event  
2 that both abuses are established, we say that counterfactual bargain is hopeless,  
3 with respect, on a proper application of the Pro-Sys test, and we say that for  
4 a number of reasons which I'll develop later this afternoon.

Damian William Langiano: What we must do by formulating the landscape presented is  
without such a Facebook – User engagement and with recognition of the Harvard study

and the effects thereof, one must consider if a guilty plea on all charges and an open door to

those assigned would be your client's best option.

Scoff you may, though we present that by not giving the user a clear path to a choice of Free will Meta has knowingly acted as follows.

For the purpose of this Statute, "crime against humanity" means any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack.

"I believe it's important to tell people exactly how the information that they share on Facebook is going to be used. "That's why, every single time you go to share something on Facebook, whether it's a photo in Facebook, or a message, every single time, there's a

control right there about who you're going to be sharing it with ... and you can change that and control that in line. "To your broader point about the privacy policy ... long privacy policies are very confusing. And if you make it long and spell out all the detail, then you're probably going to reduce the per cent of people who read it and make it accessible to them."

The key moments from Mark Zuckerberg's testimony to Congress | Mark Zuckerberg | The Guardian

This means that Meta – Facebook knew that they were conducting and constructing the market, controlling as stated the user and the advertiser and further more exacerbating the

contextual marketing landscape as competitors sort ways of "grabbing the attention" of a

Facebooks globally located addicts.

Thus, we present Meta either abused on all counts their online population and stand without

hesitation to compensate without reservation or the owners, investors and all knowingly attached

are to tried under the Rome Statute for the following

## Article 7

### Crimes against humanity

1. For the purpose of this Statute, "crime against humanity" means any of the following acts when

committed as

part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of

the attack:

(a) Murder; As proven with Molly Russell

(b) Extermination;

(c) Enslavement;

(d) Deportation or forcible transfer of population;

(e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of

international law;

(f) Torture;

(g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other

form

of sexual violence of comparable gravity;

(h) Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic,

cultural,

religious, gender as defined in paragraph 3, or other grounds that are universally recognized as

impermissible under international law, in connection with any act referred to in this paragraph or

any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court;

(i) Enforced disappearance of persons;

(j) The crime of apartheid;

(k) Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury

to

body or to mental or physical health.

The construct already received by the Tribunal.

5 First, we say there is no properly articulated causal chain as to how that alleged fair  
6 bargain would have come about in the counterfactual. So the case, in the revised  
7 form, simply leaps from saying there are these two alleged abuses – from the  
8 abuses they leap to this alleged counterfactual in which it's simply asserted or  
9 assumed that there would have been a bargain pursuant to which Facebook would  
10 have paid users. And all that the model advanced by Professor Scott Morton is  
11 doing, properly analysed, is actually quantifying how that split of profits generated by  
12 Facebook would be shared with users in the counterfactual fair bargain. But what it  
13 doesn't do, and what the PCR doesn't do, is provide a methodology for assessing  
14 what actually would have happened in the counterfactual. There's no blueprint, in  
15 other words, for how are they going to prove their case in relation to causation and  
16 counterfactual; it simply assumes or asserts a particular outcome, namely a bargain  
17 whereby Facebook shares profits with users.

Damian William Langiano: Then we must focus on what it does do, it qualifies that  
Facebook, have acted in a manner which places the user, I will state VICTIM, for that is  
what these HUMAN BEINGS are, in the position of the traumatised inner child and thus  
knowingly enslaving the victim, whose productivity comes from within the inner child  
and thus all aspects of Facebooks and their investors, beneficiaries and subsidiaries  
would

be party to the abuse of “said” children and thus under qualification of the law  
classified as Child Abusers and due to the conscious acts of algorithmic neuro circuitry  
activation and using the following definition

quan·tum

['kwɒntəm]

noun

physics

a discrete quantity of energy proportional in magnitude to the frequency of the radiation it represents. an analogous discrete amount of any other physical quantity, such as momentum or electric charge.

physiology

the unit quantity of acetylcholine released at a neuromuscular junction by a single synaptic

vesicle, contributing a discrete small voltage to the measured end-plate potential.

We will prove at trial that Meta Instagram and all associated partners are party to QUANTUM PAEDOPHILA and that the compensation for such be calculated accordingly.

18 And we say therefore this case does fail on an application of the Pro-Sys test,  
19 because there's no proper blueprint for how they are going to prove their alleged  
20 counterfactual, nor can the methodology, such as it is, deal with other counterfactual  
21 scenarios because by its very nature this model, the Nash bargaining model, only  
22 has relevance if one has established that in the counterfactual world Facebook  
23 would be collecting the same amount of Off-Facebook Data and would be paying  
24 users. If that is not the counterfactual established at trial then the model falls away  
25 entirely. So we do say there's no blueprint.

Damian William Langiano : Further to the above we counter that statement

26 Moreover, we say it's not grounded in the facts because the collective bargain, by  
36

1 their own admission, is completely divorced from reality. Professor Scott Morton  
2 candidly accepts it's merely a thought experiment, and of course she says she's not  
3 literally suggesting that Facebook should have sat down at the negotiating table with  
4 millions of users.

Damian William Langiano : Further to the above we counter that statement as that's

In fact what Facebook should have done

5 Well how is it that that thought experiment would actually manifest itself in the real  
6 world?

Damian William Langiano : Further to the above we counter that statement and repeat  
That the construct of the online data and the methods used by Facebook to keep the user  
Online would afford the data needed to forecast individual calculation of each user  
based

Upon previous performance, likes, interests and connections. The fact is Facebook  
manipulated their own landscape and the expanded into the off Facebook world  
seamlessly due to the off site choices pre-populated by the online ones.

We say they have no proper factual basis for alleging this thought

7 experiment, nor in particular the idea that Facebook would pay users; we say that's  
8 simply not supported by any factual basis.

Damian William Langiano : Wow, one assumes Mr Singa is stating that Facebook are  
knowingly

guilty of slavery and under such wouldn't have considered cutting the slave in on the  
revenues

even though their own systems were calculating the data from the landscape, the user is  
literally the walking interface between reality and the illusion Zuckerberg, Facebook and  
all investors,

beneficiaries and subsidiaries have created and so ruthlessly monetised.

9 So, we say that this is not -- these are not trifling issues that can be dealt with down  
10 the line; this is a classic failure to comply or satisfy with the Pro-Sys test.

Damian William Langiano : I think we are past that test and all others

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Just to give one of a myriad of hypotheticals, you  
12 can't say there would be a charge for Off-Facebook Data, and at the same time say  
13 that the proper compensation for that would be 50 percent of Meta's profits arising  
14 out of that Facebook data for a number of reasons, one of which might be that you  
15 would get a number of people who, at a price X, the price for the use of the  
16 Off-Facebook Data, and other people would say, "Well that's too low, I want more,"



17 and therefore only going to permit Facebook to use on-Facebook data, therefore the  
18 profits, one would assume -- again another variable -- the profits that are made out of  
19 the Off-Facebook Data would be less and so you have a smaller cake to divide  
20 amongst a smaller class of person. And these are the things that you say need to be  
21 at least capable of being articulated, at this stage.

22 MR SINGLA: Well, the -- what I suggested I'll deal with in the second part of my  
23 submissions is really the question of how does one get to this alleged cake? They  
24 just assert there would be this cake and it's a question of how that cake is shared  
25 and that's what the model will help the Tribunal with. We say what is the nexus, the  
26 causal nexus and the blueprint for getting from these alleged abuses to that cake to  
37

1 be split? We say it fails for that reason.

Damian William Langiano: The misconception here is that you believe under the clear  
light of what Meta had been doing that the USER/VICTIM is even sound of mind to be  
able to take such a decision as to agree to a negotiation due to the level of manipulation  
being delivered via the on Facebook algorithms and that by taking such a stance of  
data ownership as you are -- you are in fact presenting a "right" to the data off Facebook  
given your creation and belief the "saleable" asset was yours to sell.

2 In the third part of my submissions, I'll deal with the remedy, because we say these  
3 points are connected, but we say they are -- that the case is misconceived so far as  
4 remedy is concerned.

5 Now Mr O'Donoghue has helpfully narrowed the issues between the parties in the  
6 sense they have confirmed they are not claiming user damages or disgorgement of  
7 profits. Notwithstanding the reference to FX in the Claim Form and so on, there's  
8 actually no question of law. It's purely whether the aggregate damages claim which  
9 is being sought on the basis of the methodology does in fact seek to compensate for  
10 pecuniary loss. That's what they have to establish, and we say it obviously doesn't.

Damian William Langiano : Pecuniary

pe·cu·ni·ary

ADJECTIVE

formal

relating to or consisting of money:

"he admitted obtaining a pecuniary advantage by deception"

Its an interesting choice of word and one we have calculated through the CPTSD systemabove. What we must continue to place at the very epicentre of this case is the fact Facebookchose and their legal representatives qualify is that they feel ENTITLED to the revenues generated from the invasion of off platform privacy due to the construction of its formation.

11 I will come back to this in detail.

12 But the problem with the case -- and this really is something they can't get away  
13 from, nor is it something they can fix down the line -- they are claiming what they call  
14 financial harm to users, they are claiming that by reference to the commercial value  
15 of the Off-Facebook Data to Facebook. And with respect that is completely  
16 misguided because the two are very different things. The benefits or the profits to  
17 Facebook are not the same thing as the pecuniary loss suffered by users in relation  
18 to the data. And the reason we say that there is a close similarity with what they  
19 were doing last time around, and I will show you this in due course by reference to  
20 the transcripts, because the way in which they were seeking to justify Mr Harvey's  
21 approach was to say: in the counterfactual world what would have happened is  
22 a new bargain whereby Facebook would have paid its profits, the profits that it  
23 generates by aggregating the data and dealing with advertisers and so on, Facebook  
24 would have paid those profits over to the users. And it's true that they've  
25 repackaged things so there is now a Nash bargaining model, but that underlying  
26 premise is still the same: they are valuing what they describe as pecuniary harm to  
38

1 the user by reference to the commercial value of the data aggregated in the hands of

2 Facebook, and so there is in fact the same fundamental error as regards remedy.

3 But the points are connected in relation to counterfactual and remedy.

Damian William Langiano: One has to be understanding that in real time Mr Singa would have been presented with the facts that Facebook were using algorithms to construct the data and choices, in fact both sides would have digested the fact and thus this isn't a polling station counting votes, this is top neuro science activating choices that fit financial

equations for selected advertisers who were engaging in ways that coerced the user into debt on an unprecedented scale, deconstructed society and had the new business director

in charge of this drive screaming "it's the end of the fucking world don't use it" to a global population whose internal chemical addiction has separated and left them sat by the sunny

window being fed by Deliveroo and monitored by Palantir and their MD who has stated he's ripping their whole world down and that of their connection to source.

4 Then in the fourth part of my submissions I'll cover what we say is an additional

5 problem, a separate problem in relation to what we've described as abuse 2. So the

6 unfair price case, whether that's being put on the basis that this is only an unfair

7 price case or it's being put as part of the rolled up case, we need to prove the unfair

8 term and the unfair price.

9 The problem that they run into here is that whilst it's common ground that

10 United Brands applies, we say that the question that arises under the United Brands

11 test is whether the non-monetary consideration -- we accept there's a zero financial

12 price that is being paid, that's not the point we are taking. The question nonetheless

13 is whether the non-monetary consideration given by users bears a reasonable

14 relationship with the economic value of the Facebook service as a whole provided to

15 users, when the case law is clear that that question needs to be grappled with at one

16 stage or the other in relation to United Brands. But instead, what they've done in

17 their revised case -- and I'll show you this in due course -- the pleading doesn't even

18 ask the right question because it refers to economic value of Off-Facebook Data in  
19 the hands of Facebook. Well, that's not United Brands' test. And Ms Scott Morton,  
20 Professor Scott Morton doesn't consider the economic value of the whole Facebook  
21 service; instead, she focuses on whether Facebook has made sufficient  
22 improvements to its services since 2014 so as to justify the collection of the  
23 Off-Facebook Data. That's what we've described in the papers as the incremental  
24 approach. She's not looking at the value of the Facebook service; she's looking only  
25 at the incremental improvement in the service. She is saying were there sufficiently  
26 valuable improvements to the service commensurate with the collection of the data.  
39

1 One can speculate as to why they have chosen to frame the case in that way, but we  
2 say obviously what's going on is if one were to ask the correct question about the  
3 value of the Facebook service as a whole, then the evidence would show that users  
4 in fact place an enormous value on Facebook, and Mr Parker makes that point in his  
5 report by reference to an article which Professor Scott Morton herself cites. It's  
6 well-trodden territory. The Facebook service as a whole generates an enormous  
7 amount of consumer surplus.

Damian William Langiano; One would say so, though one assumes you are not a user  
or you are and the defence of this case was chosen on the basis you are suffering your  
self from Stockholm Syndrome as this time line now shows you to be representing and  
defending a client bound by the legal mechanics of child abuse, quantum paedophilia  
and the crimes qualifying as that of humanitarian gravitas.

8 So, what they've tried to do is to sidestep that difficulty by taking this incremental  
9 approach, and we say that's contrary to the case law, no authority is cited in support  
10 of that approach, and we also say it's unsound as a matter of economics.

11 So, we say the unfair price case fails for those reasons.

12 Then finally, if time permits, I will say something about suitability, but I want to get  
13 into the substance now.

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you.

15 MR SINGLA: On the legal principles, I just want to go back, as it were, to basics  
16 and just remind the Tribunal without teaching you how to suck eggs, but it is worth  
17 recalling what the Supreme Court said in Merricks about the importance of the  
18 gatekeeping role, because that of course is what we are concerned with at the  
19 certification stage.

20 If I could show you the Supreme Court decision. It's at authorities volume 3, tab 24.

21 (Pause). I know the Tribunal will be well familiar with this decision but if I could just  
22 remind you, paragraph 4 where Lord Briggs refers to the important screening or  
23 gatekeeping role over the pursuit of collective proceedings. But then paragraph 98,  
24 which is in the judgment of Lord Sales and Leggatt which is 1225 of the bundle:

25 "A class action procedure which has these features provides a potent means of  
26 achieving access to justice for consumers, but it is also capable of being misused.

40

1 The ability to bring proceedings on behalf of what may be a large class of persons  
2 without obtaining their active consent and to recover damages without the need to  
3 show individual loss presents risks of the kind already mentioned, as well as giving  
4 rise to substantial administrative burdens and litigation costs. The risk the enormous  
5 leveraging effect which such a class action device creates may be used oppressively  
6 or unfairly is exacerbated by the opportunity that it provides for profit."

7 Then you will see the final sentence about those funding the litigation are, for the  
8 most part, commercial investors.

9 And then 154, which is directly relevant:

10 "If the applicant could not show that there was a realistic prospect that his expert's  
11 proposed methodology would be capable of application in a reasonable and fair  
12 manner across the whole width of the proposed class, then there would be  
13 a significant risk that a claim of this magnitude could unfairly be held over

14 Mastercard's head in terrorem to extract a substantial settlement payment without

15 a proper basis."

16 Then they go on to say:

17 "... a significant risk that if carried forward towards trial the collective proceeding  
18 would at some stage run into the sand and found not to be viable, so that it would  
19 have given rise to a great waste of expense and resources, and it is a risk [they say]  
20 not just for the defendant but also for the CAT."

21 And it's this concern about the cases running into the sand that underpins our  
22 challenges to methodology of Professor Scott Morton. These are not points, we say,  
23 that can merely be fixed by way of case management.

24 Also, this is reflected in the case law about the need for a blueprint at this stage.

25 And can I remind you of the Tribunal's judgment in the first case here, which is in the  
26 core bundle A behind tab 7. (Pause).

41

1 If I could ask you to look first of all at paragraph 36. Of course, today we take  
2 a combination of summary judgment and strike-out points as well as Pro-Sys  
3 methodology challenges, but just in relation to Pro-Sys, you dealt with this at 36. If  
4 I could just ask you to look at the final sentence:

5 "The purpose of the Pro-Sys test is to minimise the related risks of the parties  
6 throwing away unnecessary costs; the Tribunal's time being wasted; and a matter  
7 coming to trial in an unmanageable form."

8 Then 38, you say "properly articulated pleadings" and so on, and then you talk about  
9 the purpose of the Pro-Sys test, and there are some parallels. And then 38(2) refers  
10 to collective proceedings having special requirements for certification, and in the final  
11 sentence of 38(2):

12 "It is entirely right and proper that the class representative's intentions as to the  
13 future conduct of the litigation receive a scrutiny that is higher than that facing the  
14 individual claimant."

15 And then at (3) you go on to say:

16 "It is entirely right and proper that the Tribunal be satisfied that the Proposed Class  
17 Representative knows how it has proposed to make the claim good, or - to put the  
18 same point another way - what directions the Tribunal will have to make."

19 And then at 40(2) you refer to the heavy responsibility as the gatekeeper. And then  
20 at 40(3)(i) at the very end, you say:

21 "We stress again that the Tribunal has no particular interest in the strength of the  
22 methodology ... but the parties and the Tribunal need a blueprint, and absent very  
23 good reason collective proceedings will not be permitted to progress unless and until  
24 that blueprint has been provided."

25 And then at (ii) you say halfway down:

26 "Where ... a proposed defendant makes clear that a certain point will be taken, then,  
42

1 whilst the Proposed Class Representative does not have to have an answer to the  
2 point, it is incumbent on them to show - methodologically speaking - how the point  
3 can be addressed."

4 And then at 40(4) you refer to McLaren and you say that a failure on the part of  
5 the Tribunal to engage in this process is actually an error of law. Then at 40(5) you  
6 emphasise that:

7 "It makes no sense to certify proceedings whose triability is in doubt."

8 And we do say that those were correct statements of principle and they apply just as  
9 much now as they did on the first occasion.

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

11 MR SINGLA: We also rely – I won't bring it up, but we also rely on what the Tribunal  
12 said in the second Merricks case on compound interest, at paragraph 92, that  
13 a methodology which assumes a particular answer or outcome fails the Pro-Sys test.  
14 That is obviously correct, with respect.

15 And what happened in that case was there was a mere assumption as to how class  
16 members would have acted in the counterfactual, but the Tribunal said that wasn't

17 good enough under Pro-Sys because there was no means for assessing whether  
18 that actually would or would not have been the case in the counterfactual.  
19 Can I come to the first issue which is counterfactuals. I want to start by showing you  
20 the pleading because it's important that we are clear as to exactly what case is being  
21 advanced. With respect, there was vagueness in the case on the last occasion and  
22 there remains significant vagueness in terms of what in fact is being alleged, but  
23 that's why we need to spend some time looking at the Claim Form.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

25 MR SINGLA: That's in core bundle A. If I could ask you first to look at paragraph 8,  
26 please:

43

1 "The PCR submits that Facebook's collection of Off-Facebook Data as a condition of  
2 access to its social media service involves an unfair bargain between Users and  
3 Facebook. In terms of further legal classification of this abuse, it can be looked at in  
4 two related ways that in practice amount to same thing and in essence involve the  
5 striking of an unfair bargain."

6 And you will see they refer to them as "the Infringements" in plural terms. And then  
7 they summarise each of the infringements in 8(a) and (b), and you'll see 8(a) is the  
8 first is that the collection of data pursuant to the take it or leave it offer involves  
9 an unfair trading condition.

10 And then (b):

11 "Further or alternatively --"

12 I emphasise those words because you will see this becomes a bit of a theme  
13 throughout:

14 "... there is an unfair price."

15 Then if I could ask you to turn to paragraph 150 which I think is page 93 of the  
16 bundle:

17 "By making access to its platform contingent on Users giving up access ..."



18 So contingent on users giving up access, that is a reference to the take it or leave it  
19 condition. They say:

20 "This abuse can be looked at in two related ways that in practice amount to same  
21 thing. The first is that Facebook imposed unfair terms and conditions; the second is  
22 that Facebook imposed an unfair price."

23 Then one turns to 152. They start with the allegation in relation to the alleged unfair  
24 trading condition, and that's said to be an abuse for the reasons pleaded there.

25 Then we get to 153, heading "Imposition of an unfair price." Again, I emphasise  
26 "further or alternatively" the collection of Off-Facebook Data involves imposing  
44

1 an unfair price.

2 And then 155.

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Sorry, before you go on to 155, just to backtrack to  
4 150 which is the summary and looking at the last two sentences of paragraph 150.

5 Is the problem, and do tell me if I'm summarising your position wrongly, but is the  
6 problem that both the first and the second way in which the case is put are

7 intrinsically negative, in the sense that one is saying it's an unfair set of terms and  
8 conditions, and the other it's an unfair price? But what one doesn't have is the

9 necessary flip side which is -- and this is the fair price, this is what our right is worth,  
10 and this is what we have lost because you haven't compensated us for this right. In

11 other words, in 150 one has encapsulated the purely negative United Brands, as

12 I called it, case, without transiting to the harder side which is going beyond the

13 question of an infringement; we need, because this is not an infringement case, this  
14 is a give us money case, this is a compensation case, there's no articulation of that

15 which actually has been taken away from the class. To take Mr O'Donoghue's bottle  
16 of wine example, I have no issue with the non drinker claiming for the loss of their

17 bottle of wine; it's obviously right that they can recover that. But one does need to

18 have a pretty clear understanding of the value of the bottle of wine by which one

19 needs to have, in that case, a sense of, you know, vintage and quality, whether one  
20 can say well this is how one assesses the loss. And is the problem, and do push  
21 back if I'm getting this wrong, is the problem that we have no ability to ascertain what  
22 it is that had been taken away?

23 MR SINGLA: Can I unpack that?

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Please do.

25 MR SINGLA: That is a summary of what we are saying but there are a number of  
26 points actually buried within --

45

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, I fear that's right.

2 MR SINGLA: I'm hoping in the course of today really to separate all of these points  
3 out, but they are connected.

4 I think what I would say in response to what you just said is the first point I am on at  
5 the moment, and the reason I'm going to take this relatively slowly is that one  
6 actually needs to look at the pleaded case, and the pleaded case, infringement is  
7 obviously the starting point -- I know Mr O'Donoghue spent his time this morning  
8 talking about compensation, but actually one needs to start with infringement, and  
9 one needs to look at what is pleaded; and what is pleaded, as I say, is a case that  
10 has three different heads to it. It's there is an unfair term take it or leave it condition  
11 is an abuse.

12 Secondly, there is an unfair price. Whether or not we are right about the unfair term,  
13 they say there's an unfair price; that is the further alternative.

14 Thirdly, they say, there's a scenario where we prove both abuses.

15 Now it's very important because one -- this is what I intend to do in my submissions:

16 one actually needs to take each of those three ways in which they put the case and  
17 then work out what is the causal mechanism in respect of each of those cases on  
18 infringement, because each infringement case has to have its own causal chain.

19 And loss -- one only gets to compensation or remedies if they've in fact proven, or

20 pleaded properly, or have a methodology in relation to, the causal chain.

21 So that is where I'm going to -- what I'm going to do is actually go through the three  
22 ways in which they put the infringement case and see what they have as regards  
23 causation.

24 The second point is -- well what you said earlier about the regulatory outcome, that is  
25 actually the gist of what we are saying in relation to causation. If I can foreshadow  
26 the submission, what they really doing is jumping from saying there's an unfair term  
46

1 and an unfair price, we say -- the PCR says -- the counterfactual is a fair bargain.

2 And we say that that may be what they would like to see in the counterfactual world,  
3 but there's no factual basis or no blueprint for establishing that counterfactual and  
4 the Tribunal is not in a world of rewriting terms or setting terms that might be quote  
5 unquote "fair or desirable" as far as users are concerned; one is actually looking at  
6 what would have happened but for the alleged abuses.

Damian William Langiano; That's quite simple to answer, you would have had the same  
Outcome given that Facebook manipulated the user within the on Facebook platform  
As they preprogrammed their choices, thus recognising the gap in the market and the  
value within, as stated they matched the advertisers and brands with the optimum user  
section. Thus manipulated the markets, insider traded and destroyed society, seeking to  
cover that with secondary programming, disinformation and misinformation and thus  
seek to blame the user for so, when finally settling for agreed figure after arguing the  
validity in this courtroom.

7 So, we do say there's a real problem as regards causal chain.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I see. So, looking at 150, which is a nice  
9 encapsulation because it has both the first case and second case and combination,  
10 all of them go only so far as to say that Meta did something it shouldn't have done.

Damian William Langiano: Oh that's something we can all agree.

11 But that's as far as it goes, on your case.

12 MR SINGLA: Exactly. And how do they go from saying that we shouldn't have  
13 imposed an unfair term, we shouldn't have imposed unfair price, to "You should have  
14 paid users" or in fact "You would have paid users" in the counterfactual?  
15 And then thirdly, separately from those points in relation to the way they put their  
16 infringement case, then the failure or the issues that I'll come on to in relation to  
17 causation, one then has a question at the end of that analysis. So, assume they did  
18 have a solid causal chain, the question is: is the remedy appropriate? And these  
19 points are connected because we say what they are claiming is in fact the  
20 commercial value to Facebook of the data when aggregated and collected across  
21 the board by Facebook, and they are claiming a share of that. I'm not getting caught  
22 up on whether it's 50/50 or whatever for the moment. It's the principle -- the  
23 underlying principle is that their damages are claimed not by reference to the cost to  
24 the user or the value to the user or the loss to the user in giving over the data, it's  
25 actually looking at the other end of the telescope saying: when Facebook collects all  
26 this data from all its users it manages to earn a great deal of profit and in the  
47

1 counterfactual it would have shared those profits.

2 So we say that's a legal error and an independent error insofar as they are actually  
3 shooting at the wrong target on remedies.

4 But the points are connected because the reason they end up shooting at the wrong  
5 target on remedies is because they've constructed this completely artificial  
6 counterfactual world.

Damian William Langiano: But they didn't Facebook did and profited from it and the  
data lives within the purchases and subscriptions therein. This is not counterfactual  
world this is very much a real one, simply unseen to the untrained eye.

So, their problems of causation inevitably then have

7 a problem, a knock-on consequence as regards remedy. But they are independent  
8 points: we attack both, the issues as regards causal mechanisms, and also the

9 remedy.

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I certainly see that if you fail on causation, the  
11 remedy pleaded has to be defective in any event. How far they are independent  
12 points is quite hard to discern given the point you are making about causation, so we  
13 may need to understand exactly what is pleaded by way of causation.

14 MR SINGLA: Yes, I'll come on to all of these points, and I will develop each of those  
15 points, but I am just trying to give you a road map.

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: It's very helpful to have that -- don't get me wrong.

17 MR SINGLA: Let me finish with pleading, if I may. I was going to show you, I think,  
18 155.

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

20 MR SINGLA: They say:

21 "In all the circumstances the aforesaid aspects of unfairness or each of them ..."

22 So again, one can see the different ways in which the infringement -- I'm not even on  
23 causation yet -- case is put on a further alternative basis.

24 Then we get, and I'll show you this now, in relation to causation, if one starts at 173,

25 "Facebook's breaches of statutory duty have caused loss and damage ...

26 "As a result of the abusively unfair bargain the Proposed Class Members were not  
48

1 adequately compensated for the economic value of their Off-Facebook Data

2 collected and monetised by Facebook."

3 That's their case as regards causation, loss and damage.

4 And then they go on at 175 to say:

5 "In the counterfactual, Users would not have been subject to the unfair trading

6 condition which made the provision of Facebook social network services conditional

7 on the collection of Off-Facebook Data ..."

8 Just pausing there, it has nothing to do with unfair price at this stage. They are

9 saying the abuse is the imposition of the take-it-or-leave-it condition. Then they say:

10 "... and/or would not have been subject to the unfairly high price."

11 So that again is a good illustration of the point I've been making, which is that in fact  
12 there are three infringement cases being advanced: abuse 1, the unfair term on its  
13 own; abuse 2, the unfair price on its own or the "and", which is, we establish at trial  
14 the unfair term and the unfair price.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I think what you are saying -- again do correct me  
16 if I have this wrong -- is that my summary of the PCR's case was actually unduly  
17 favourable to them, in that I was eliding what is here made in 175 and in 150 under  
18 the United Brands test, the negative side of there being an infringement. And I think  
19 what you are saying is that the second stage of my articulation, namely what I call  
20 the FRAND side, this is the positive right, that you are saying is wholly absent from  
21 the pleading.

22 MR SINGLA: Well, let me show you one more paragraph.

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Of course.

24 MR SINGLA: But with respect we do say your summary of the case was not correct.  
25 Whether or not it was unduly favourable it just simply does not reflect the pleading,  
26 because I think what you had in mind was that you start with -- or they are starting  
49

1 with an unfair price.

2 Now, pausing there, we actually say the way they've gone about unfair prices is  
3 completely misconceived. United Brands, they actually got wrong. Separate point.  
4 But you were saying that you start with an unfair price and you somehow "pivot",  
5 I think was the word you described, or transition into -- I think you were saying the  
6 unfair term or the counterfactual.

7 In fact, properly analysed, the way the case is put -- and this is really very important  
8 because of the need for blueprint and gatekeeping and so on -- what is pleaded is  
9 that there was an unfair term. And I will come on to this. Well, if so, what follows?

10 We say there's a complete lacuna.

11 Then they say: forget about the unfair term; there was an unfair price.

12 We say, well, what are you saying would have happened in the counterfactual on  
13 that basis? Complete lacuna in the pleading.

14 Then they say: we will prove there was both an unfair term and an unfair price. And  
15 then we get to 176 which is why I wanted to show you one more paragraph, because  
16 this is their counterfactual where they say, by reference to of course Professor Scott  
17 Morton's methodology: In the counterfactual there would have been this fair bargain.  
18 And they say:

19 "The value that would have accrued to Users in that fair bargain represents the loss  
20 they have suffered."

21 That's the point Mr O'Donoghue was trying to articulate this morning:

22 "Accordingly, the same counterfactual and methodology for quantifying damages  
23 applies whether, as a matter of legal classification, the abuse is articulated as  
24 an unfair trading condition or an unfair price."

25 And we say this is just completely wrong, and that actually if one looks properly at  
26 the unfair trading condition on its own or unfair price on its own you actually end up  
50

1 with completely different counterfactuals.

2 So, this is a rolled-up counterfactual assuming that both abuses are proven.

3 Then if I can show you what Professor Scott Morton is saying about this, because  
4 the language that these two abuses are two sides of the same coin derives from her  
5 expert evidence. It's now adopted by Mr O'Donoghue in his skeleton and in his

6 submissions, but in fact just before I show you the expert evidence can I -- on the  
7 question of whether, sir, you had rightly summarised their case on abuse I could

8 perhaps show you 31.3 of their skeleton argument, which shows that really this is the  
9 way they summarise their own abuse case in their skeleton. They say:

10 "By making access to its platform contingent or effectively contingent on Users giving  
11 up access to their Off-Facebook Data Meta was able to demand an unfairly high and

12 abusive price or payment in kind."

13 So, sir, with respect it's not right to start and say, well, this is an unfair price United  
14 Brands case. They are actually coming at it in very different ways to say, the first  
15 attack, as it were, is on the take-it-or-leave-it condition. And they say that that's the  
16 vice. And they say in addition there was an unfair price. And if one looks at --

17 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes. I think my point is that whether you call it  
18 United Brands or take-it-or-leave-it or whatever, this is essentially a negative case  
19 that equates to an infringement case, which is in an infringement case all you need  
20 to worry about. And that was my stage 1.

21 But that only gets you to the infringement. The second stage which I'm suggesting --  
22 and you I think are agreeing -- was not reflected in the PCR's case and may or may  
23 not be over-generous -- and I don't expect you to concede that -- was that having  
24 established the infringement you then have to make a positive case, which you say  
25 is not being made, I think, namely where it gets you.

26 And that implies -- you are saying it's a question of the counterfactual, and I am  
51

1 calling it a positive case. It may be there's no difference. But you do need to say  
2 what the thing is that is being valued. I don't think one would be right to insist on  
3 a value being articulated at the get-go, but you do need to articulate what it is that  
4 the Tribunal is at the end of the day having to value, so that you can then, if you work  
5 out what the value is -- in itself a difficult question -- what the implications on the  
6 cake on the Meta side and on the pool of providers of data on the other side -- and of  
7 course those are interrelated -- what the effect would be.

Damian William Langiano: Sir Marcus if ever a judge resided in a seat of power with  
The ability to answer that question himself it would be you and in your oversight or  
might it be lack of sight, or even choosing not to see, we are at the very epicentre on  
of all Facebook have knowingly executed and inflicted upon 46mn UK and 2.6bn  
global users and worse still the covert measures they are using this court to deflect



accountability and in doing so deconstruct the values, standards, and honour of the UK justice system, for as you ponder the very question we seek to answer, you over look your oath to “When lawyers take the oath of admission to the bar, they pledge to uphold the law and maintain the integrity of the legal profession. This includes a promise to tell the truth in all legal proceedings and to uphold the highest ethical standards.

Thus, the value of which we are seeking to understand is that of the “autonomy” in the real world, one all here call “counterfactual” which is only describable as such if we qualify the

on Facebook world and its terms and conditions as “factual.” when in essence and with billions of fines across the world the arguments you make are the foundations of which the demise of the legal system and acceleration of an artificial one.

Shall we .....

MAY 1, 2018

BLOG

Dopamine, Smartphones & You: A battle for your time

by Trevor Haynes

figures by Rebecca Clements

“I feel tremendous guilt,” admitted Chamath Palihapitiya, former Vice President of User Growth at Facebook, to an audience of Stanford students. He was responding to a question about his involvement in exploiting consumer behavior. “The short-term, dopamine-driven feedback loops that we have created are destroying how society works,”

he explained. In Palihapitiya’s talk, he highlighted something most of us know but few really appreciate: smartphones and the social media platforms they support are turning us into bona fide addicts. While it’s easy to dismiss this claim as hyperbole, platforms like

Facebook, Snapchat, and Instagram leverage the very same neural circuitry used by slot machines and cocaine to keep us using their products as much as possible. Taking a closer

look at the underlying science may give you pause the next time you feel your pocket buzz.

## Never Alone

If you've ever misplaced your phone, you may have experienced a mild state of panic until it's been found. About 73% of people claim to experience this unique flavor of anxiety,

which makes sense when you consider that adults in the US spend an average of 2-4 hours

per day tapping, typing, and swiping on their devices—that adds up to over 2,600 daily touches.

Most of us have become so intimately entwined with our digital lives that we sometimes feel our phones vibrating in our pockets when they aren't even there.

While there is nothing inherently addictive about smartphones themselves, the true drivers

of our attachments to these devices are the hyper-social environments they provide.

Thanks to the likes of Facebook, Snapchat, Instagram, and others, smartphones allow us to

carry immense social environments in our pockets through every waking moment of our lives.

Though humans have evolved to be social—a key feature to our success as a species—the social

structures in which we thrive tend to contain about 150 individuals. This number is orders of

magnitude smaller than the 2 billion potential connections we carry around in our pockets today.

There is no doubt that smartphones provide immense benefit to society, but their cost is becoming

more and more apparent. Studies are beginning to show links between smartphone usage and

increased levels of anxiety and depression, poor sleep quality, and increased risk of car injury or death.

Many of us wish we spent less time on our phones but find it incredibly difficult to disconnect.

Why are our smartphones so hard to ignore?

The Levers in Our Brains – Dopamine and social reward

Dopamine is a chemical produced by our brains that plays a starring role in motivating behavior.

It gets released when we take a bite of delicious food, when we have sex, after we exercise, and,

importantly, when we have successful social interactions. In an evolutionary context, it rewards us

for beneficial behaviors and motivates us to repeat them.

The human brain contains four major dopamine “pathways,” or connections between different parts

of the brain that act as highways for chemical messages called neurotransmitters. Each pathway has

its own associated cognitive and motor (movement) processes. Three of these pathways—

the mesocortical, mesolimbic, and nigrostriatal pathways—are considered our “reward pathways”

and

have been shown to be dysfunctional in most cases of addiction. They are responsible for the release

of

dopamine in various parts of the brain, which shapes the activity of those areas. The fourth, the

tuberoinfundibular pathway, regulates the release of a hormone called prolactin that is required for milk production.

While the reward pathways (Figure 1) are distinct in their anatomical organization, all three

become active when anticipating or experiencing rewarding events. In particular, they reinforce

the association between a particular stimulus or sequence of behaviors and the feel-good reward

that follows. Every time a response to a stimulus results in a reward, these associations become

stronger through a process called long-term potentiation. This process strengthens frequently

used connections between brain cells called neurons by increasing the intensity at which they

respond to particular stimuli.

Although not as intense as hit of cocaine, positive social stimuli will similarly result in a release of

dopamine, reinforcing whatever behavior preceded it. Cognitive neuroscientists have shown that

rewarding social stimuli—laughing faces, positive recognition by our peers, messages from loved

ones—activate the same dopaminergic reward pathways. Smartphones have provided us with a

virtually unlimited supply of social stimuli, both positive and negative. Every notification, whether

it's a text message, a "like" on Instagram, or a Facebook notification, has the potential to be a

positive social stimulus and dopamine influx.

The Hands that Pull – Reward prediction errors and variable reward schedules

Because most social media platforms are free, they rely on revenue from advertisers to make a

profit. This system works for everyone involved at first glance, but it has created an arms race for

your attention and time. Ultimately, the winners of this arms race will be those who best use their

product to exploit the features of the brain's reward systems.

Reward prediction errors

Research in reward learning and addiction have recently focused on a feature of our dopamine

neurons called reward prediction error (RPE) encoding. These prediction errors serve as

dopamine-mediated feedback signals in our brains (Figure 2). This neurological feature is something

casino owners have used to their advantage for years. If you've ever played slots, you'll have

experienced the intense anticipation while those wheels are turning—the moments between the

lever pull and the outcome provide time for our dopamine neurons to increase their activity, creating

a rewarding feeling just by playing the game. It would be no fun otherwise. But as negative outcomes

accumulate, the loss of dopamine activity encourages us to disengage. Thus, a balance between

positive and negative outcomes must be maintained in order to keep our brains engaged.

Variable reward schedules

How do social media apps take advantage of this dopamine-driven learning strategy? Similar to slot

machines, many apps implement a reward pattern optimized to keep you engaged as much as

possible. Variable reward schedules were introduced by psychologist B.F. Skinner in the 1930's. In his

experiments, he found that mice respond most frequently to reward-associated stimuli when the

reward was administered after a varying number of responses, precluding the animal's ability to

predict when they would be rewarded. Humans are no different; if we perceive a reward to be

delivered at random, and if checking for the reward comes at little cost, we end up checking habitually

(e.g. gambling addiction). If you pay attention, you might find yourself checking your phone at the

slightest feeling of boredom, purely out of habit. Programmers work very hard behind the screens to

keep you doing exactly that.

## The Battle for Your Time

If you've been a Facebook user for more than a few years, you've probably noticed that the site has been expanding its criteria for notifications. When you first join Facebook, your notification center revolves around the initial set of connections you make, creating that crucial link between notification and social reward.

But as you use Facebook more and begin interacting with various groups, events, and artists, that notification center will also become more active.

After a while, you'll be able to open the app at any time and reasonably expect to be rewarded. When paired with the low cost of checking your phone, you have a pretty strong incentive to check in whenever you can.

Other examples highlight a more deliberate effort to monopolize your time.

Consider Instagram's implementation of a variable-ratio reward schedule. As explained in this 60 Minutes interview, Instagram's notification algorithms will sometimes withhold "likes"

on your photos to deliver them in larger bursts. So when you make your post, you may be disappointed to find less responses than you expected, only to receive them in a larger bunch later on. Your dopamine centers have been primed by those initial negative outcomes to respond robustly to the sudden influx of social appraisal. This use of a variable

reward schedule takes advantage of our dopamine-driven desire for social validation, and it

optimizes the balance of negative and positive feedback signals until we've become habitual users.

## Question Your Habits

Smartphones and social media apps aren't going anywhere anytime soon, so it is up to us as the users to decide how much of our time we want to dedicate to them.

Unless the advertisement-based profit model changes, companies like Facebook will continue to do everything they can to keep your eyes glued to the screen as often as possible. And by using algorithms to leverage our dopamine-driven reward circuitry,

they stack the cards—and our brains—against us. But if you want to spend less time on your phone, there are a variety strategies to achieve success. Doing things like disabling your notifications for social media apps and keeping your display in black and white will reduce your phone’s ability to grab and hold your attention. Above all, mindful use of the technology is the best tool you have. So the next time you pick up your phone to check Facebook, you might ask yourself, “Is this really worth my time?”

Trevor Haynes is a research technician in the Department of Neurobiology at Harvard Medical School.

The issue we have, that Facebook know is that this is cocaine or as Dr Stephen Dewey stated

“Digital Heroin”

Have you ever seen a heroin addict try to come off the drug, now try to imagine doing that when the counterfactual world you describe is in fact now the reality of the factual online world

Facebook manufactured to monetise the time off their platform to obtain complete market

Monopoly.

There’s a cake for sure, it’s the one with Meta, Instagram, Blackrock, Vanguard and all Invested and profiting from this “systematic attack directed against any civilian population,

with knowledge of the attack” and something this tribunal must consider under the commitment to uphold the “highest ethical standards” for if not this court and those within are now “knowingly” party to the continuation of

Article 7

Crimes against humanity

1. For the purpose of this Statute, "crime against humanity" means any of the following acts when

committed as

part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of

the attack:

(a) Murder;

(b) Extermination;

(c) Enslavement;

(d) Deportation or forcible transfer of population;

(e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of

international law;

(f) Torture;

(g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other

form

of sexual violence of comparable gravity;

(h) Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic,

cultural,

religious, gender as defined in paragraph 3, or other grounds that are universally recognized as

impermissible under international law, in connection with any act referred to in this paragraph or

any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court;

(i) Enforced disappearance of persons;

(j) The crime of apartheid;

(k) Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury

to

body or to mental or physical health

Respectfully.

8 So if you have a value on the data of X, and as a result of that value being offered

9 the class shrinks to 50 percent, that will have an effect on the monetisability of the



10 Off-Facebook Data, including also the on-Facebook data because the two are,  
11 I assume, sold as one thing. And that will have an effect on the profits being made,  
12 which of course feeds into the price that you would demand, because all of these  
13 things are connected.

14 MR SINGLA: But, sir, with respect you are focusing in that on the monetisation and  
15 issues that arise downstream. I think what I'm on at the moment -- we certainly do  
16 make points at that level of the analysis, but I am actually focusing on a slightly  
17 earlier stage.

18 So just breaking down what you said, I think we do agree but perhaps with some  
19 nuances which I can try to add. First of all, we do say it's a negative case. So you  
20 shouldn't have done X and Y. But I think the point I'm on at the moment is that one  
21 needs to be very clear as to what in fact the negative case is. And what I'm showing  
22 you at the moment is that it's very easy to say loosely, well, they are two sides of  
23 the same coin or it doesn't really matter which, et cetera et cetera, from an economic  
24 point of view, and I can show you those references, but we say it does matter a great  
25 deal to understand precisely what the negative case is.

26 So what is it that you are saying is the abuse here? That's the first point and has to  
52

1 be the starting point in any claim for damages. What are you saying was the abuse?  
2 And there's a real vagueness. And what I'm trying to help the Tribunal with here is to  
3 understand the way the pleading works, it is to say that there is an infringement in  
4 these three different ways.

5 That's point 1 and it has to be, with respect, stage 1 of the analysis.

6 Stage 2 of the analysis is then, well, let's take each of those strands of the case and  
7 work out what have they produced by way of pleading or blueprint for causation.

8 And as I'll show you in due course, in fact all they've really done is address  
9 causation, purport to address causation, on what I might describe as the rolled-up  
10 case.

11 So, there's nothing on causation if they only prove an unfair term, and there's nothing  
12 on causation if they only prove an unfair price.

13 What they have purported to address, one might say the positive case, they have  
14 purported to address what would have happened if there was no unfair term and no  
15 unfair price. So if they establish both abuses they have at least purported to address  
16 that question. With abuse 1 as a distinct infringement or abuse 2 as a distinct  
17 infringement, as I say, there's nothing. But they have purported to address the  
18 question what would have happened if there was both an unfair term and an unfair  
19 price? And what we say about that is you have purported to address it but actually  
20 you have just assumed that there would have been a bargain pursuant to which  
21 Facebook would collect the same Off-Facebook Data, but pay users some value.

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I think we are on the same page but -- it's  
23 important I think --

24 MR SINGLA: It's very important.

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- to make sure they (inaudible). I think what you  
26 are saying, and do, as you have been -- push back if you are not agreeing with this,  
53

1 but I think what you are saying is that all that one gets if this negative case is made  
2 out is an absence in Meta to use the Off-Facebook Data. That's as far as it goes.  
3 So you don't get anything by way of what I'm calling -- and maybe that's my mistake  
4 to label it this way -- not getting anything by way of a positive case. And you say it's  
5 causation, but I'm not sure that's even the right label. I mean, if you simply say,  
6 establish the negative case, the causal consequence is that Facebook can't use the  
7 data and have used it wrongly. That's not helpful for anything other than  
8 an infringement argument.

Damian William Langiano;

infringement (noun) · infringements (plural noun)

the action of breaking the terms of a law, agreement, etc.; violation:

"copyright infringement" · "an infringement of the rules"

the action of limiting or undermining something:

"the infringement of the right to privacy" · "this bill is an infringement of our civil liberties"

<https://www.icc-cpi.int/sites/default/files/RS-Eng.pdf>

Statute of Rome

On that basis yes, Facebook have infringed and that's

9 very bad but nothing to the point when one is talking about damages.

Damian William Langiano; Sir Marcus!!!

10 So, what you need is a positive case and you then need to assess the causal  
11 consequences of that positive case. And I think what you are saying -- which is my  
12 stage 2, what you are saying is there is no stage 2, there is no positive case and  
13 therefore there is nothing to which one can attach any causal analysis because it just  
14 isn't there. If one is applying a causal analysis to the negative case, well yes, the  
15 term isn't there; but in terms of a quantifiable loss, it gets you nowhere, because  
16 there is, on that basis, something that shouldn't have happened, but it isn't in  
17 compensatory terms a loss that can be quantified because you haven't set what I'm  
18 calling the positive case.

Damian William Langiano; Sir Marcus, are you leading Mr Singla into a career ending  
dead end having received the evidence you have?

19 Now I appreciate you are not agreeing with my nomenclature but am I --

20 MR SINGLA: I think in substance we are on the same page.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

22 MR SINGLA: I think I would say this, I do submit that there are really three stages of  
23 the analysis in this case but in any case: infringement, causation and loss. That's  
24 really going back to basics as I said at the outset.

25 Just addressing you briefly on each of those, we are saying, infringement, they are  
26 running the case in all three different ways. For each of those ways in which they

1 run the case one needs to look at what have they got in terms of causation. What  
2 would have happened but for the unfair term? What would have happened but for  
3 the unfair price? And what would have happened but for there being an unfair term  
4 and unfair price?

Damian William Langiano; Let me answer that for you, you'd all still be practicing law  
And not talking your way into digital ineptitude and thus bringing the very core of  
Our legal system into disrepute and thus justification for an American clean up  
Operation due to their recognising the issues (see Senator Hawley and Zuckerberg's  
Apology)

Though Crimes Against Humanity have no time frame and the digital intelligence  
Being employed at traffic level and now by the Police for the decision to proceed on  
Every crime now activated we will get justice on every level and through digital foot  
Print all involved.

5 So, let's say they pleaded a case which was there's just an unfair term – I will  
6 develop all of this this afternoon, but before the adjournment I really want to make  
7 sure that you've understood where I am going.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

9 MR SINGLA: Let's say, because as I've shown you on the Claim Form they are  
10 running the case in multiple ways, but let's say this was just an –

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, but I think the multiple ways all end in the  
12 same place.

13 MR SINGLA: Exactly, on their case they all end in this counterfactual world where  
14 Facebook collects the same data but pays the users. That's what they are saying  
15 would have happened but for –

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes. But what you are saying and what I think I'm  
17 putting to you is that the outcome of their case is simply no right in Facebook to use  
18 the Off-Facebook Data. But it says nothing more than that.

19 MR SINGLA: And they're leaping from that to saying, well, what we would have

20 done is actually paid us for the use of their data.

Damian William Langiano; Gentlemen with the above in mind we can see you both  
Building a case against Meta, taking the data illegally, certainly immorally and that  
The class action, is simply presenting options that ensnare Meta and prove the  
Slipperiness of there ethical slope.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: We are, I think, on the same page. Is this because  
22 unfair pricing cases are peculiar because there is a unity between the unfair price  
23 and the – in other words the existence of the unfair price and the causal  
24 consequences of it?

25 So, I mean, let's assume this was not an unfair pricing case. Let's assume it was  
26 some other form of abuse of dominance where let's say a group of claimants were  
55

1 excluded wrongly from the social media market, in other words Facebook just said: if  
2 you come from Slough you can't participate and that's it; we are just excluding any  
3 inhabitant of the town of Slough because we've assessed the IP address and we just  
4 don't like Slough.

5 So, you would then say, well, that is something where one knows what the abuse is.  
6 The counterfactual is you are allowed in, and the counterfactual arises by defining  
7 the infringement. So, the infringement is you haven't been allowed to participate in  
8 social media. The counterfactual is you are allowed to participate. And the question  
9 is, what is the value of that participation. And the two are -- well, the causal  
10 consequences are defined by the infringement. The problem with unfair pricing is  
11 that you can't do it that way. You have to say, yes, the price was unfair in order to  
12 establish an infringement. But you can't, without saying what a fair price would be,  
13 actually establish the causal consequences in a single claim.

Damian William Langiano; You can and I have, it matters not if you allowed tom  
participate

Online or not, the fact is you are participating in the counterfactual world, the REAL  
WORLD

Facebook have manipulated for profit, and thus you are as a participant in society susceptible

To the advertising strategies derived from the online and offline data collection. Thus the Price is Climate Change, the global deficit, the house prices inflation, the cost of living, one's

Own Mental, emotional, physical, and moral wellbeing.

14 And that is what you are saying, I think, is absent here. You have the assertion by a  
15 variety of ways that the price is unfair and therefore certain data should not have  
16 been accessed. But there is -- obviously we will hear from Mr O'Donoghue -- but  
17 what you are saying is that there is nothing by way of what is a proper price and  
18 therefore nothing by way of establishing the consequences of that proper price on  
19 the size of the class and the size of the cake that will be divided amongst that class.

Damian William Langiano; See Above

20 Now, I appreciate of course you say those points are downstream of what I am  
21 calling the positive case, but I am not sure that that is something I would regard as  
22 a very helpful distinction in this case, because the price affects all of these factors.  
23 And unless you see it as a unitary whole you are going to miss certain points. You  
24 can't simply say that the price needs to be ascertained first without considering the  
25 effect on the class or the effect on the cake, because the effect on the cake is going  
26 to inform the price because these things are all connected.

56

1 MR SINGLA: I think we are on the same page. But first of all, this is not just  
2 an unfair price case. That's what I'm quite keen to emphasise.

Damian William Langiano; Amen!

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

4 MR SINGLA: It is not being said that this is just an unfair price case. So the  
5 counterfactual world has to be, and I think is said to be, there is no take-it-or-leave-it  
6 condition and there is no unfair price. So this is actually not as straightforward as --  
7 or it's not the same as a pure United Brands case.

Damian William Langiano; Countered above

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No.

9 MR SINGLA: But then we are agreeing, I think, that it's a purely negative case,  
10 because the starting point would be the infringement -- I do agree the infringement  
11 informs the counterfactual in many cases. Here, they are saying there's  
12 an infringement and we would quite like a world where there's a fair bargain and  
13 Facebook pays users.

Damian William Langiano; That world is coming Mr Singla, its just where this court  
And those present reside within it.

14 And what we are saying is, well, how are you getting from A to C? What is the B?

15 But then what I was referring to as downstream -- so that's our point as regards what  
16 I'm calling causation, but perhaps you are calling negative case and the framing of --

17 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

18 MR SINGLA: But the point I'm making which is downstream is, we say, how do you  
19 ever get to this counterfactual bargain which is said to be a thought experiment? But  
20 then even if for some reason they are entitled to run that case, we say, well, there's  
21 a problem as regards the remedy because what you are seeking pursuant to that  
22 counterfactual fair bargain is in fact something measured by reference to the value of  
23 the data in Facebook's hands. You are not claiming loss by reference to the harm to  
24 the users. And that's why I say, whilst they are connected they are in fact distinct  
25 points, because we are saying there is no blueprint or proper methodology for getting  
26 from A to C, so this counterfactual bargain that is pleaded at 176 and is the basis of

Damian William Langiano; Why don't we employ artificial intelligence to digest the  
Information and come up with one, or is that the digital legal system that will be directed  
To this case in the collation of evidence for the crimes against humanity, Zuckerberg  
Apologised for.

57

1 Professor Scott Morton's evidence, we say, well, that just doesn't flow from that --

2 that's just not the consequence or it cannot be assumed to be the consequence of  
3 the but-for world.

4 That is point 1. And then point 2 is, when we actually look at your but-for world, (a)  
5 it's not grounded in the facts and it's completely unrealistic, but (b) the remedy that  
6 you are seeking pursuant to that counterfactual bargain is measured by the value  
7 to Facebook.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

9 MR SINGLA: So, there's a point on remedy as well as -- an anterior point as  
10 regards causation.

Damian William Langiano; Children are dying get to your fucking point Mr Singla,  
For you have mine and thee I represent.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: It may be -- and again this may be just a question  
12 of seeing the same issue slightly differently -- because let's suppose you have  
13 a case where in my terms it's a positive case where the assertion is first of all the  
14 price is wrong because it is either take-it-or-leave-it or unfair, and frankly I don't see  
15 a difference between those two. They end up in the same place, which is that data  
16 has been wrongly used by Facebook because there's been an abuse of competition  
17 law. And I'm not sure it matters whether you call it United Brands or  
18 take-it-or-leave-it. You may want to correct me on that but --

19 MR SINGLA: I will.

20 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- I'm just not sure it does. I think you get to same  
21 dead end, either which way, which is that you have no -- as you are saying, no ability  
22 to work out what are the consequences of the infringement.

23 So whichever way you put it negatively, you have to say the price is X. And that may  
24 be computed in all manner of ways. And I don't think you are saying that the way in  
25 which X is computed needs to be nailed down now. That's a matter of evidence, but  
26 you do need to say: here is how X is to be calculated, even if the evidence follows



1 later on.

2 Now, if one has a way of assessing what X is, the price that is to be paid by Meta to  
3 the class, certain consequences follow from that. First of all, some people will say,  
4 "At this price I'm still not providing my data". There's no reason you should say that  
5 every class member will say, "Yes, I'm going to take this price X and I'm going to  
6 subscribe to Facebook, allowing Meta to obtain the use of my Off-Facebook Data".  
7 There will be some people who will say, "Well, whatever X is, it's too low; I value my  
8 data, my Off-Facebook Data, sufficiently that I'm not going to provide it at this price".  
9 So, the volume of data that transits legitimately to Meta's use is going to fall, even if  
10 X is payable. How far it falls, who knows? But it will be less than the amount of the  
11 class as presently constituted. What the effect of that is on the monetisation of the  
12 data is another unknown.

13 Now, what is clear, though, and I think what you are saying, is that you have to factor  
14 in the diminution or the diminished quantity of the data on the monetised ability in  
15 Meta's hands of that data, because the cake, as it is at the moment, isn't going to be  
16 as it is at the moment; it's going to be something less because there's less data.

17 MR SINGLA: Our point is, you have to have a blueprint for investigating that very  
18 question. Exactly. It's a very fundamental point.

Damian William Langiano; This might answer that question for you.

The International Criminal Court (ICC) is empowered by its constituent instrument to  
request its states parties to identify, trace, freeze and seize the property and assets of  
accused persons, '[w]here a warrant of arrest or a summons has been issued'.<sup>1</sup>

More precisely, Article 57(3)(e) ICC Statute authorizes pre-trial chambers to 'seek the  
cooperation of States pursuant to article 93, paragraph 1 (k), to take protective measures  
for the purpose of forfeiture, in particular for the ultimate benefit of victims'.<sup>2</sup> To the  
extent

that such requests, or decisions discussing such requests, have been made publicly  
available,

the ICC can be seen to have exercised this power seven times in respect of persons accused

of committing crimes under its jurisdiction since the entry into force of the ICC Statute.

At that stage Facebook would be turned over to the people who built it – the 46mn -2.6bn

And run with humanity's wellbeing both on and off Facebook, aligning both into

A factual position and thus addressing the above impacts of coercive acts previously unseen at Such a level.

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: So what I'm saying is that these three questions,

20 price, size of class and monetisability, are not really to be viewed sequentially

21 because they are all interlinked. I mean, for instance -- Meta will know this better

22 than anyone -- you will know what effect a diminution in Off-Facebook Data will have

23 on your ability to extract a price from advertisers.

Damian William Langiano: Sir Marcus did you just make the advertising market or those

With Meta links "complicit"

24 Now, if it is the case that a small diminution in the amount of Off-Facebook Data

25 transiting to Meta has a massive effect on the ability to monetise that data then that

26 in itself is going to have a massive effect on what X is. So that's why it's all

59

1 interlinked and not, as I would suggest, sequential, which is why it is such a difficult

2 and interesting case if it proceeds.

3 MR SINGLA: I agree with all of that, but I think we are making -- I think --

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: What you are saying is, you can't simply say the

5 cake as it is, the money that Facebook has made as of today, as in the real world,

6 you can't say that that is what would be obtainable in the counterfactual.

7 MR SINGLA: Exactly.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Which I -- I accept -- price X has an effect on what

9 data you receive.

10 MR SINGLA: Exactly. Exactly. The nub of it is, they are saying their counterfactual

11 is the same amount of data going across, and Facebook starts to pay users. And we  
12 are saying you can't assume that because once you remove what is going on and  
13 what is said to be abusive now, a whole manner of things could happen in the  
14 counterfactual which need to be investigated. And that is exactly what the blueprint  
15 case law is referring to. How are you going to prove that case? And how are you  
16 going to deal with alternative counterfactuals?

Damian William Langiano: We use a quantum computer to run the data seized under  
The Crimes against humanity and thus we can obtain every conceivable outcome, its  
Impact and its cost, to both the planet and its inhabitants.

17 And then we say -- that is the problem at that stage -- but then we say that where  
18 they've ended up is to say that the remedy they are claiming is a share of -- I keep  
19 coming back to this because I think it is a separate -- with respect, I think whilst they  
20 are related there is a distinct point that they are then saying in the counterfactual  
21 world they want the payment to users, but that is valued on the basis of what the  
22 data is worth in the hands of Facebook. It's not the loss to the consumer.

Damian William Langiano: The loss is actuated above, or the means to calculate  
23 So the cake, as it were -- we say, well, how are you getting to the cake? They are  
24 saying: there's a cake at the moment and we want to share it. We are saying: what  
25 is the causal mechanism or what is the methodology for investigating whether the  
26 cake that there is today or is said to be there today would in fact be there today but  
60

1 for the abuses?

But then we are saying: you are also not entitled to claim a share of  
2 the cake because that is confusing the value of the data in the hands of Facebook  
3 and saying that that represents loss to users.

Damian William Langiano: Market Manipulation, and the methodology would be  
The revenues generated from the data extracted and the profit made from such  
Given there is no cake, without the data and that the terms for obtaining it didn't say

“We will be using your online data to manipulate you in the offline world and we will Monetise that to build further algorithms to align the choices you make without you actually yourself making them (neuron activation), though you believe you do and thus we won’t pay you due to the fact All the data and decision making are automated and thus we have in fact built an off Facebook world with you uninformed consent, due to your fear of being excluded and banished from your perceived perception of reality, which represents you as no more than a “data mule” for a digital cartel that satisfies its own morality and gives no fucks about the law and the lawyers it compromises in arguing its case, in courts we have coercively controlled”

4 So, they are connected but they are slightly distinct in the sense that --

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, they are, but I mean, in a sense in reality they  
6 are not, because if I am with you on, whether you call it a positive case or causation,  
7 then I'm obviously going to be with you on the remedy.

8 MR SINGLA: That's, I think, an inevitable consequence of the way the whole case is  
9 structured, because they are saying --

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: It's linked.

11 MR SINGLA: -- you link to a world where Facebook starts paying users.

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Put it this way: if it were the case, and it may be,  
13 we don't just don't know, but if it were the case that the offer of X made either no  
14 difference to class size or indeed caused the class to increase, which is quite  
15 possible, you might find that offering of X to subscribers of Facebook might actually  
16 attract people who wouldn't otherwise come in to monetise their data themselves,  
17 and you might find that the cake gets bigger.

18 That's quite possible. But your point is that it's not the same cake. It's something  
19 that needs to be established, and you can't simply cut and paste what is the case in  
20 this world into the counterfactual world where X is charged.

Damian William Langiano: Are we seeking to present that Meta might be positioning  
To pay its users so as to make them complicit and thus unseat themselves from the

Crimes committed against humanity?

Might we be saying they are using this court and this case and those within to execute  
A miscarriage of justice?

21 MR SINGLA: Exactly, and just building on that, we say all of that, and on top we say  
22 the particular scenario that they have posited is completely unrealistic, because the  
23 idea that Facebook would start paying users we attack as well because we say this  
24 counterfactual has to be grounded in the facts. We know that from the case law.  
25 So, we say there are all the problems in terms of how you get there, but what they  
26 have actually come up with, we say, is divorced from reality.

Damian William Langiano: The reality is to be defined by the question Mr Singla  
“Are you protecting Meta and thus party to child abuse, or are you in fact highlighting  
That Meta has adopted the divine right to abuse their users off platform data with no  
conceivable outcome being one of recognition and remorse”

61

1 And so, sir, I'm just conscious of the time, but we do say, just perhaps coming back  
2 to what you said at the outset in respect of future case management options and so  
3 on, we actually say this: we are not in in that world of case management options.  
4 We are in the world of your first judgment where there is no adequate blueprint and  
5 pursuant to the gatekeeping role the case needs to be effectively refused certification  
6 now, because it's not triable.

Damian William Langiano: It is now, oh and very much so, for all involved.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes. I mean, Mr Singla, just so we're clear, the  
8 reason that I'm making sure that you understand, or I understand where you are  
9 coming from and we iron out the definitional question is really to assist  
10 Mr O'Donoghue in reply, so that when he's talking about positive cases and negative  
11 cases and causation and non-causation he's addressing the substance of the  
12 objections you are making.

13 So that's why we are having this conversation. I don't personally particularly care

14 whether you call it causation or positive case. I just want to make sure that I am on  
15 board so that I can put to Mr O'Donoghue the points that you are making.

16 MR SINGLA: With respect, if perhaps after the adjournment I can come back and  
17 maybe just take these points in a bit more detail by reference to the --

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Of course.

19 MR SINGLA: But I think that's been a very helpful exchange because you have  
20 encapsulated really what we are saying, and I think I would be able to assist you with  
21 a bit more detail in relation to --

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's -- you are educating me, Mr Singla. That's  
23 the reason these exchanges are so helpful, so that I can ensure that Mr O'Donoghue  
24 answers the points that you putting rather than points that you are not putting,  
25 because I am quite sure the points you are putting are better than the ones you are  
26 not putting.

Damian William Langiano: Sir Marcus, the above qualifies your openness to be  
“educated”

Yet we attach the following

From: Registry (CAT) <Registry@catribunal.org.uk>

Sent: 20 November 2023 16:25

To: SAFEGUARDINGCHILDRENOFTHEWORLD@outlook.com

<SAFEGUARDINGCHILDRENOFTHEWORLD@outlook.com>

Subject: Case 1433/7/7/22 Dr Liza Lovdahl Gormsen v Meta Platforms,  
Inc. and Others Tribunal Letter (Damian William Langiano)

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please see attached letter.

Kind regards,

The Registry of the Competition Appeal Tribunal

Sir Marcus we can see your willingness to “learn” from Mr Singla, yet a distinct

Desire to not from an expert of counterfactual assessment, “cake or fake” being

One of my only TV guilty pleasures, and an eye for the authentic I have.

62

1 So with that we will resume at 2.00.

2 (1.12 pm)

3 (The short adjournment)

4 (2.06 pm)

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr Singla, good afternoon.

6 MR SINGLA: Sir, before the adjournment I was showing you the Claim Form --

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

8 MR SINGLA: -- and trying to emphasise that the infringement case is put in three  
9 different ways. And the only paragraph concerning the counterfactual is 176 where  
10 they refer to the fair bargain, and that is derived from the expert evidence of  
11 Professor Scott Morton.

12 And if I could just show you her report, her first report, please, at paragraph 22,  
13 which I think is page 231 of the bundle.

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

15 MR SINGLA: This paragraph clearly explains that the bargaining model, and indeed  
16 the expert evidence generally, is considering a counterfactual world where there is  
17 neither the unfair term nor the unfair price. Or put the other way around, this is  
18 a counterfactual that is said to arise if both abuses are proven. And 22 is a very  
19 clear statement to that effect. She says:

20 "I use the bargaining model to consider a counterfactual scenario where users and  
21 Facebook collectively negotiated ... I believe this provides a good benchmark for  
22 what constitutes a fair bargain. It removes the take-it-or-leave-it element and the  
23 payment of a zero price ... by having users bargain collectively it addresses the  
24 asymmetry of market power between Facebook and its users ..."

25 That's a point I will come back to. But then you see the final sentence:

26 "... provides an established framework to consider what constitutes a fair bargain ...

1 and hence provides a benchmark for non-abusive conduct in this particular case."

2 Then if I could just show you paragraph 283 on page 295, where she says:

3 "For the purposes of designing the methodology [she assumes] that the abuse as

4 pleaded in the Claim Form has occurred. In this case the abuse has necessarily led

5 directly to consumer harm through the imposition of an unfair bargain."

Damian William Langiano: Which is in fact what has happened, the harm being created

Through dopamine feedback loops leading to co-dependency then complex ptsd, depression

Alzheimer's and Parkinson's which is an unfair bargain for the ability to show your friends your dinner and connect with people you don't know each now suffering from the impact of algorithms that destroy how society works

6 And that's an important word because that's actually encapsulating the term and the  
7 price.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

9 MR SINGLA: "My methodology seeks to remove the abuse (the unfair bargain) ..."

10 Again, not specifically breaking that down into those two components:

11 "... and quantify the monetary value of the harm caused by the abuse."

Damian William Langiano: See CPTSD symptoms, See Facebook advertising and investment

Strategies and those invested therein. <https://cptsdfoundation.org/contact-us/>

Located in

Inquiries and Donations can be mailed to:

The Foundation for Post-Traumatic Healing and Complex Trauma Research

3857 Birch Street

Suite 3055

Newport Beach, CA 92660 (that's America)

12 There are other passages where there's a great deal of confusion, in my submission,

13 where she says they are all two sides of the same coin; whilst they may be distinct



14 from a legal perspective they are not distinct from an economic perspective. And so  
15 on. But the point I'm on at the moment is that whereas the pleading pleads three  
16 types of infringement case, the counterfactual model, this counterfactual bargain,  
17 really arises on the footing that they establish both the unfair term and the unfair  
18 price.

19 And we can see this again in the reply report which I think starts at 467. At  
20 paragraph 6 we see this mantra that from an economic perspective they are two  
21 sides of the same coin.

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

23 MR SINGLA: Paragraph 7:

24 "I consider that the counterfactual is essentially the same in both scenarios, namely  
25 a value transfer to users, and my methodology for quantifying the harm to users  
26 establishes the amount of the value transfer."

64

1 That is actually a very helpful confirmation of the point I was making earlier that this  
2 is all about quantifying how the split would take place. It's not about actually  
3 a blueprint in terms of how you get to this counterfactual bargain.

Damian William Langiano; Another way would be to take the data of the children  
Senator Hawley got Zuckerberg to apologise for the deaths of, and run the data back  
wards

from the point of death to the point of platform engagement and then request the road  
maps of

sale to the advertisers and the monetary value that returns, then scale that out over the  
time period

of the claim, isolating the location (UK) and then multiply by the number of claimants.

Which would bring both sides of the coin together – Cradle to Grave – abuse impact and  
the

Value of the data in between.

4 Then she says at paragraph 8:

5 "If the same basic abusive conduct could be legally classified in two ways it certainly  
6 does not follow that the legal abuses have to be mutually exclusive, nor that they  
7 demand different economic counterfactuals."

8 Paragraph 9: two sides of the same coin, not economically distinct in her view.

9 There's an unfair bargain.

10 Then at 10: This is all a counterfactual thought experiment which begins from either  
11 unfair element.

12 And then at 11 again two sides of the same coin, but she says:

13 "It seems intuitively highly unlikely that one would be in a scenario where only one of  
14 the unfair price and unfair terms abuses are identified. Indeed, that is my position as  
15 noted."

16 Then she goes on to say: But to the extent necessary the methodologies I propose  
17 are sufficiently flexible to cater for the removal of only one of the abuses.

18 I will come back to that because we say that's just assertion.

19 But the point I'm on at the moment is that it's very clear that the model as it stands  
20 and the evidence as it stands is premised on the idea that both abuses are  
21 established. So it's not right, with respect, to say this is principally an unfair price  
22 case, this is all United Brands. They are saying there is an abuse with the unfair  
23 term and there's an abuse with the unfair price, and but for A and B we would be in  
24 this counterfactual world where Facebook starts paying users for the same  
25 Off-Facebook Data.

26 And again, can you see at 12 she looks at if only an unfair price is identified, and she  
65

1 says:

2 "I can adjust my methodology."

3 And I will come back to that. But you will see at 13, the final sentence, in this

4 scenario where there's only an unfair price but the term is held to be fair, she says:

5 "That's contradictory to me, and consideration of what would happen in that scenario

6 seems academic."

7 And then 17:

8 "If only an unfair terms abuse is identified ..."

9 So again, she's saying I can grapple with these points if I need to. We say it's all  
10 inadequate. But again, that's just confirmation that really the focus of the evidence  
11 and the methodology, such as it is, is on the rolled-up abuse case. And you see at  
12 23 she says in the second sentence:

13 "Given that unfair terms and unfair price are two sides of the same coin, my view is  
14 that by far the most likely outcome is that an abuse consisting of both forms of  
15 conduct is found to have occurred. My bargaining models are based on that  
16 counterfactual, which goes to the heart of the alleged abuse."

17 The removal of the unfair take-it-or-leave-it offer.

18 Now, if we just look at our skeleton, first of all at paragraph 40 -- there are lots of  
19 references to two sides of the same coin but if I could just show you 42.4. The PCR  
20 says there's a gross mischaracterisation of Professor Scott Morton's position. It  
21 explains why they are two sides of the same coin. And it ignores the fact that her  
22 analysis of unfair price also has at its core the unfair nature of the take-it-or-leave-it  
23 terms imposed by Meta.

24 And then it's described as the main factor in her unfair price analysis.

25 Then it's said that we've ignored the fact that her bargaining model is expressly  
26 predicated on removing the take-it-or-leave-it element of the unfair bargain in the  
66

1 counterfactual.

2 Now, what is clear therefore, in our submission, and what it's very easy to lose sight  
3 of because of the way this case is being presented both in terms of the submissions  
4 but also the evidence, is that one needs to analyse this closely. And on proper  
5 analysis they are riding three horses so far as infringement is concerned. There is,  
6 as I say, abuse 1 on its own, abuse 2 unfair price on its own, and then a scenario

7 where both are established. But there is only one counterfactual at the moment, and  
8 the counterfactual is premised on both abuses being proven.

9 And what the PCR consistently does is to say, well, there's a huge amount of overlap  
10 between these two types of abuse. We are being too precious, as it were, in seeking  
11 to distinguish them. And one can see this in paragraph 42 of the PCR's skeleton  
12 where they say: There's a fallacy in our position.

13 And they go on to say that unfair prices and unfair terms have a common legislative  
14 basis. The core principles are very similar and so on.

15 Well, that's all very interesting but where we part company is in relation to questions  
16 of causation and the counterfactual. And when one is thinking about what would  
17 have happened but for an abuse, we say actually very different counterfactual  
18 questions arise if one is looking at an unfair term abuse or an unfair price abuse.

19 And Mr Parker in his report, which accompanies our response, explains that for  
20 example -- it's at page 442 of core bundle A if you want to turn it up.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

22 MR SINGLA: Mr Parker breaks the case down into the three ways in which I've  
23 been trying to convey to the Tribunal that the pleading does. And you will see at 33,  
24 if one is looking at unfair terms on their own -- so 32:

25 "The unfair terms of the take-it-or-leave-it condition that makes access to Facebook  
26 conditional ..."

67

1 So the vice is really the lack of choice on the part of users, and that's really the focus  
2 of the German case that the PCR relies on. It's the lack of choice:

3 "The counterfactual analysis is what would have happened if they hadn't imposed  
4 the collection of data on users."

5 Then Mr Parker says:

6 "On a non-exhaustive basis there is a whole array of options. The alternatives  
7 include for example Facebook offering the same terms in respect of the collection of

8 data, and a significant number of users agreeing to use the service on those terms,  
9 or offering terms allowing users to consent to a reduced amount of data."

10 Which, sir, is something that you were I think positing earlier, which was the  
11 diminution of the pool of data.

12 And then (c) again on a non-exhaustive basis but one other option is users paying  
13 a subscription fee for access without Facebook collecting the data.

Damian William Langiano; I remember Margrethe Vestager's office telling me how they  
Are trying to keep the internet FREE ... which attaches itself to the subscription fee.  
The statement being futile because regardless of fee and commitment to conditions  
the amount of data being collected and sold to be contextually targeted into the  
off Facebook world is unavoidable and thus the actions of the non-user are being  
vicariously manipulated by Meta and thus that would be in itself an abuse of  
United Brands and market control.

14 Then what he's explaining is, if one is actually isolating this abuse those are the sorts  
15 of questions that one would have to grapple with. And of course, layered upon that  
16 is the multi-sided nature of the market, which is again a point the president was  
17 putting earlier, that actually it's much more complicated in this case because you  
18 have the advertisers' side of the market.

19 In contrast to that, if one was looking at what would happen but for an unfair price,  
20 again there would be a whole manner of options as to how to remove that alleged  
21 unfairness. So, Mr Parker goes on to say in his report, for example, Facebook could  
22 improve the non-price offer to render the zero price no longer excessive.

23 So, if it was held that the current arrangement is an unfair price, Facebook could  
24 resolve that for example by improving the non-price offer. There's a whole manner  
25 of things that could happen in the counterfactual if you isolate the two abuses.

26 So what is important, in my submission, and what one needs to do is actually go

68

1 through the three ways in which the infringement case -- just as you did in the first

2 judgment, you went through the different types of allegation of abuse and you said,  
3 well, what flows or what is said to flow from each of the three ways, very different  
4 ways, in which the case was put then, because they've obviously dropped two of the  
5 allegations.

6 But the same analysis, with respect, needs to be applied here. So, if I can just make  
7 this submission: in relation to each of the three ways in which the case is put, what  
8 one needs to do, in my submission, is ask the following questions, really:

9 One, is there a proper nexus in the pleading? And that's BritNed paragraph 10  
10 which is referred to in our skeleton at paragraph 7, where, sir, you said:  
11 "In English law competition law infringements are vindicated as statutory torts". You  
12 need to show "an infringement and actionable harm or damage caused by that  
13 infringement... and proving actionable damage inevitably involves demonstrating  
14 a causal link between the infringement and the damage, generally using the but-for  
15 test."

Damian William Langiano: We have proved this under a duty of care – that Facebook  
Have addicted their users through neuro science and gambling addiction and thus  
The impact of both is demonstratable under special liabilities, "Neuron Activation"  
causing explosions in the mind that lead to coerced activity (data creation market  
manipulation)

How do neurons "talk" to one another? The action happens at the synapse, the point  
of communication between two neurons or between a neuron and a target cell, like a  
muscle or a gland. At the synapse, the firing of an action potential in one neuron—  
the presynaptic, or sending, neuron—causes the transmission of a signal to another  
neuron—

the postsynaptic, or receiving, neuron—making the postsynaptic neuron either more  
or less likely to fire its own action potential.

"The short-term, dopamine-driven feedback loops that we have created are  
destroying how society works," Palihapitiya

16 And that is obvious in any case but that is the first question that needs to be asked.

Damian William Langiano: Answered

17 But the second question, because these are collective proceedings in which it is

18 being asserted that there would have been a market-wide change to the bargain,

19 one needs to ask the sorts of questions that you identified in the FX judgment.

20 If I can remind you of some of the paragraphs there where you set out the principles.

21 Obviously on the facts it was a very different case. But I believe we can hand up

22 some copies of the first instance judgment in FX.

23 I'm not sure that version is paginated but if I can ask you to turn to paragraph 169.

24 (Handed).

25 The Tribunal there refers to what I just said about BritNed, paragraph 10. The need

26 to prove and demonstrate a causal link using the but-for test.

69

1 Then if we could jump ahead to 197 and 198. All of these are basic principles not

2 unique to the FX case.

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No.

4 MR SINGLA: Pleadings are important in modern civil litigation. That is true as much

5 in competition as in other cases, and this is as true for collective proceedings as it is

6 for individual claims.

7 And we respectfully agree with all of that.

8 Then 204, it is not appropriate for a party in individual proceedings asserting

9 a causative link to do so without articulating that causative link in a pleading. Bare or

10 unparticularised assertion is not enough: a pleading must set out all material facts."

11 Then 208:

12 "A pleading will be deficient and liable to be struck out if it fails to articulate with

13 proper particularity a necessary element of a claimant's cause of action."

14 And that is true in a CPO as well as an individual claim.

15 At 209:

16 "No hesitation in saying that in those causes of action where actionable damage is  
17 a necessarily element (as here), a failure properly to assert a causal link will result in  
18 the claim being defective and liable to be struck out."

Damian William Langiano: One assumes you are now satisfied with the "causal link"?

19 Same in the CPO context as in other cases.

20 And 210:

21 "... not enough for a claimant to commence proceedings unable properly to make the  
22 necessary factual averments sufficient to constitute a cause of action. In particular, a  
23 claimant may not commence proceedings in the hope that material will turn up later."

Damian William Langiano: Here's Johnny !!!

24 And then if I could ask you to look at 232 and 233 under the heading "Market-wide  
25 harm":

26 "Economic theory does not, in and of itself, constitute an arguable legal claim.

70

1 Economic theory does not automatically or easily translate into a legal claim. A civil  
2 action requires, amongst other things: (1) identified or identifiable claimants."

3 And then you will see 3:

4 "Some kind of actionable and identifiable harm caused by the defendants to the  
5 claimants."

Damian William Langiano: Proven and the impact unless we counter as per the  
Attached PDF and aligned to the defendant but independently moderated we will  
Be heading toward a digital holocaust.

6 Then 234(2):

7 "We do not consider that market-wide harm cases can be pleaded to the level of  
8 economic theory only."

9 And then 235, 236 and 237 explain that you would look to not only the pleadings but  
10 also the materials in support, ie the expert evidence.

11 And it's said at 237: not satisfied that a proper pleading has been articulated.



12 There's no more than a detailed expansion of a theoretical position.

13 Then at 238(3)(v), which is on page 1427 of the report, you refer to Lord Justice

14 Green in *Stellantis*, saying that the pleading was theoretical:

15 "It assumes what has to be proven and a number of pivotal links in the logic chain

16 represent assumptions which are evidential leaps in the dark."

17 And 238(5) over the page:

18 "At best, the plea is one where there is the hope or expectation that something will

19 come out in the wash."

20 And then reference to *Nomura* and allowing actions to proceed on a wing and

21 a prayer.

22 Now, obviously we know what the Court of Appeal said about the *FX* case, but in

23 respect of those passages they are just fundamental principles. But they are

24 pleading methodology principles that apply just as much in this case as they did

25 there. And what is more, I can show you the first judgment in these proceedings at

26 paragraph 56. At 56(i) you say:

71

1 "We doubt very much whether any expert can articulate a methodology for

2 assessment of loss to the class without clearly understanding and setting out

3 or referencing in their report the legal basis for contending that a particular loss is

4 caused by the infringement that's been pleaded. In short, there's a nexus between

5 the exact breach of duty alleged, the framing of the counterfactual needed to put the

6 claimant class in the position they would have been in had the tort not been

7 committed and, three, the method of quantifying the damage ... this needs to be

8 clearly set out."

Damian William Langiano; Sir Marcus one quotes Jay Cartwright of the *Inbetweeners*

"Counterfactual Methodology ..... completed it mate"

9 Sir, I'm about to go through each of the three ways in which the infringement case is

10 put. We submit that in relation to each of those infringement allegations or three

11 ways in which the case is put one needs to ask the following questions:

12 Have they pleaded a causal change with a proper factual basis with a nexus

13 between the alleged infringement and the alleged counterfactual?

14 And then one needs to ask: have they advanced an expert methodology with an

15 adequate blueprint to trial? So how is the PCR going to prove its case? Is it going to

16 be able to test that proposition or investigate what would have happened? Or is it

17 just assertion?

Damian William Langiano; We can do that as presented above, and we can also

seek to plea deal this claim, we could deliver that Facebook have knowingly addicted

their users to their own internal chemistry and are triggering the actions of based upon

the data online and off and apply the compensation rates for CPTSD which is in the

“bundles” sent to CAT added fifteen zeros to the 2.6bn and would then open the door

to restitution from the companies who profited from the crimes committed when seeking

to control the competitive market.

18 And we say really when you ask those questions the case does fall over.

Damian William Langiano: For legal proceedings down the line please qualify “we”

If we start

19 with abuse 1, unfair term as a distinct infringement, there is literally nothing in the

20 pleading in relation to the counterfactual. There is a complete lacuna. They do not

21 advance a case which says: if we only establish the take-it-or-leave-it condition here

22 is the chain of causation and this is why users have suffered actionable damage or

23 recoverable loss. And what you would expect is to have a clear causal chain running

24 from take-it-or-leave-it through to counterfactual through to loss.

25 And importantly, any such pleading or methodology would need to grapple with the

26 scenarios that Mr Parker has posited. One can't just assume or leap from the

72

1 imposition of the take-it-or-leave-it to this counterfactual bargain. Indeed, in the

2 abuse 1, the unfair term, they rely heavily on the German case, and you will have

3 seen the references to that. But the German case makes clear that there's no  
4 pecuniary loss arising out of the unfair term. And they can't have their cake and eat  
5 it, with respect. They can't rely on the part that they like, which is where they say,  
6 well, there must be an abuse because look at what happened in Germany. But the  
7 other side of the coin is, it was specifically said there's no pecuniary harm.  
8 And one can see exactly why that was the case, because if you are just looking at  
9 the take-it-or-leave-it the vice is the lack of optionality, the lack of choice. But trying  
10 to translate that into actionable damage is another thing altogether.

Damian William Langiano: But that isn't the case and we have proved it so and thus  
One might consider the "coercive" control law and the following definitions.

Building on examples within the Statutory Guidance Framework, relevant

<https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/controlling-or-coercive-behaviour-intimate-or-familyrelationship>

behaviour of the suspect can include:

isolating a person from their friends and family

monitoring their time

monitoring a person via online communication tools or using spyware

using digital systems such as smart devices or social media to coerce, control,

or upset the victim including posting triggering material

taking control over aspects of their everyday life, such as where they can go,

who they can see, what to wear and when they can sleep – this can be intertwined

with the suspect saying it is in their best interests, and 'rewarding' 'good behaviour'

e.g. with gifts

repeatedly putting them down such as telling them they are worthless

enforcing rules and activity which humiliate, degrade or dehumanise the victim

neglect or abuse of children to encourage self-blame and prevent disclosure to authorities

economic abuse including coerced debt, controlling spending/bank accounts

/investments/mortgages/benefit payments

controlling the ability to go to school or place of study

threatening to reveal or publish private information

family 'dishonour'

reputational damage

using substances such as alcohol or drugs to control a victim through

dependency, or controlling their access to substances

disclosure of sexual orientation

disclosure of HIV status or other medical condition without consent

limiting access to family, friends and finances

Damian William Langiano: To qualify we would need to prove the following

they are, or have been, in an intimate personal relationship with each other.

Mr Singla, Sir Marcus, the bench and all involved, does Facebook know more about you than you do?

And or your spouse, partner or family does?

11 So we say, if one's looking just at abuse 1, unfair term on its own, we say there is

12 a complete lacuna. And that's a problem both as regards the strike out summary

13 judgment test and also methodology, because, as I said, paragraph 176 of the Claim

14 Form is premised on Professor Scott Morton's evidence which, as I showed you,

15 paragraph 22 of her first report actually assumes the removal of both abuses.

16 So, we say it's not permissible for them to advance a case which is just an unfair

17 term. And that's a gatekeeping issue. The Tribunal shouldn't be allowing that case

18 to proceed because there's really nothing in relation to that infringement on its own.

Damian William Langiano: Countered above

19 So, then I'm going to turn to the second way in which the case is put, and this is

20 really the thrust of it. This is the case where both the unfair term and the unfair price

21 are proven, and that's really what they are aiming at.

22 Now, here we make essentially four main points by way of attack on the

23 methodology. We say the Pro-Sys test is not satisfied. First, we say there's a failure

24 to provide a blueprint. There is an attempt here, unlike with the unfair term on its  
25 own, here they have purported to plead a counterfactual. 176 is the counterfactual  
26 fair bargain, assuming that both abuses are proven. But we say that's not sufficient.

73

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Can we have 176 again so we can --

2 MR SINGLA: Sir, that's --

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Page 121.

4 MR SINGLA: 121, I'm grateful. (Pause).

5 Sir, 176 is based on Professor Scott Morton's evidence. One can see that, I mean,

6 it's obvious, but one can see that in the footnotes.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

8 MR SINGLA: And you will see 175 in the counterfactual wouldn't have been subject

9 to the unfair trading condition, and/or would not have been subject to the unfairly

10 high price.

11 But what I was showing you is that Professor Scott Morton's model in fact assumes

12 that both abuses are proven and then she says: but I can adjust it if it turns out that

13 only one or the other is proven. But the case --

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: But she also says it's unlikely to make a difference.

15 MR SINGLA: She says it's academic that one abuse would be proven without the

16 other. And then she says: but anyway the same counterfactual would apply.

17 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

18 MR SINGLA: And I'm saying, well, actually let's just look at that assertion

19 because -- I think I've just covered this -- if the unfair term alone were proven at trial

20 the various imponderables that Mr Parker raises would need to be grappled with.

21 And so, one certainly can't jump from an unfair term to this counterfactual bargain.

22 Now let's look at the scenario where both abuses are proven. Here, we say, well,

23 yes, there's something in the pleading and, yes, Professor Scott Morton says what

24 she says about the counterfactual bargain, but all her evidence really does is provide

25 a basis for quantifying what the share of the profits would be in the counterfactual.

26 There is no blueprint or methodology for assessing whether that actually would be

74

1 the counterfactual.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes. To what extent -- I know you'll be coming to

3 this and it may be that you should just tell me to wait until you do -- but to what

4 extent are these problems answered by what you refer to as the incremental

5 approach of the PCR?

6 MR SINGLA: The short answer is not at all.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Okay.

8 MR SINGLA: That is a wholly separate problem with the case.

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Right.

10 MR SINGLA: Which is, I'm assuming at the moment that they've gone down the

11 right route so far as an unfair price case is concerned. Actually, as I'll come on to,

12 the whole way in which they've pleaded and the methodology approaches United

13 Brands is misconceived as a matter of law and economics. So, in a sense, I'm

14 addressing you now without prejudice to that point because --

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, I think what I'm -- maybe I had better put this

16 to you so that you can deal with it because it may be that Mr O'Donoghue uses it in

17 his reply. I don't know.

18 But as I understand it the incremental approach is saying, look, as regards the

19 on-Facebook data you have a viable business model; you are making not merely

20 sufficient revenue to cover your costs but you are making a degree of

21 produced surplus and therefore you have a viable model as it was previously without

22 the Off-Facebook Data. You therefore regard the Off-Facebook Data as an entirely

23 separate cake which is causally related to the infringements pleaded, ie the entirety

24 of that Off-Facebook cake is obtained through the infringements.

25 You don't need to worry about a positive case because you have this separate cake

26 that is acquired solely by virtue of the negative infringements that have been

75

1 articulated.

2 And so all you need to do is work out why or how that additional incremental cake

3 based upon Off-Facebook Data is to be shared. And prima facie because it's pure

4 profit over and above the already profitable on-Facebook monetisation business,

5 a 50/50 Nash equilibrium split is right.

6 Now, I quite understand that you are going to say that the incremental approach is

7 wrong, and we will come on to why you say that now, but assuming it's right, does it

8 answer the questions that you have quite properly been articulating as problems for

9 the PCR or, even assuming the incremental approach is right, does it not solve those

10 problems?

11 MR SINGLA: It doesn't -- it's a separate problem, with respect, because the first

12 question is, is there an unfair price?

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

14 MR SINGLA: They say there is, pursuant to the incremental approach. And we say

15 that's wrong.

16 What I'm now on is, let's assume you make good your unfair price case. How do you

17 go from unfair price to a counterfactual world where Facebook starts paying users?

18 And those are, with respect, separate problems.

19 The question here is, how are you going to make good this case? And can your

20 evidence -- effectively is this a triable case? Do you have a blueprint for

21 investigation a counterfactual or are you assuming a counterfactual world which you

22 would like to see whereby Facebook starts paying users?

23 And the incremental approach in a sense is separate because we only ever get to

24 this debate if they establish the unfair price. And we say they can't establish the

25 unfair price because they have taken the wrong legal and economic approach to

26 that.

1 But I don't see, with respect, how the incremental approach addresses the lack of  
2 a blueprint or the lack of a counterfactual which is grounded in the facts, which are  
3 the points I'm addressing you on now.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, I mean, I'm saying that I'm putting you to  
5 points that might be made against your position so that you can take it in that spirit.  
6 But if you disaggregate the returns to Facebook -- and by disaggregation I mean  
7 distinguish between returns that are based upon on-Facebook data and returns that  
8 are based on Off-Facebook Data. And I quite understand why you might say that  
9 those two data sets can't be separated. I'm sure you will be coming to that. But let's  
10 assume they can be and that there are therefore two distinct profit streams arising  
11 out of it. Why can't you say, look, we don't need to worry about the on-Facebook  
12 data or the model that would have occurred or what would have happened, because  
13 the real world answers that? We are not changing that model at all. All we are doing  
14 is providing an additional question which is directly relatable only to the  
15 Off-Facebook Data and saying, look, this data achieves this value; we don't need to  
16 worry about cost; we don't need to worry about class size; all we need to worry about  
17 is those portions of the class that would agree to sell their Off-Facebook Data for  
18 whatever price it would be. But that price is referable not to what would happen to  
19 Facebook's business generally; it is referable to the excess that has been generated  
20 by the abuse, namely the extraction of Off-Facebook Data through the infringements  
21 which have been pleaded, namely the negative ones. In other words, does it not  
22 operate as a form of shortcut to ensure that you are just looking at the direct  
23 consequences of the abuse, namely the monetisation of Off-Facebook Data, and  
24 saying, well, cause and effect are established because you'd never have got this  
25 money without this data? This data has been obtained through the infringements,  
26 whichever form negative infringement it is, and all we are talking about is carving up



1 the pot between the two.

2 And that may be a question of how you deal with the allocation of the elements of the  
3 pot, but 50/50 is a pretty good starting point given that there's no cost question and  
4 the business was operating anyway.

5 MR SINGLA: If I may say so, that's a very helpful question because, if I can say

6 this, that actually demonstrates or allows me to demonstrate why their case is so

7 flawed. It's actually failed three levels in what you've just said. Well, if

8 Mr O'Donoghue is advancing that kind of case our answer would be threefold. First

9 of all, the incremental approach would not work as a matter of establishing the unfair

10 price. I will make submissions about that later. But it just doesn't work to say the

11 economic value of what's been happening since 2014 -- the question is, economic

12 value of the entire Facebook service.

13 So we don't even get off first base, as it were, because the incremental approach

14 means that they can't establish the unfair price. They would also need to establish

15 the unfair term as well, so that would also need to be factored in. But that's the first

16 problem. The incremental approach is not a proper way of establishing the unfair

17 price.

18 But even if -- and this is the point you were putting to me -- even if that were

19 permissible -- and I stress we say it's actually completely unprecedented -- but even

20 if they were entitled to establish an unfair price through the incremental approach,

21 your example of the cake, as it were, which is just the Off-Facebook Data cake, the

22 point we are making at this point in my submissions is that they would still need to

23 explain how it is they get from the unfair price to the Off-Facebook Data cake.

24 And what Mr Parker is saying and what we are saying is, even if one is just zooming

25 in on Off-Facebook Data you would still have to grapple with why do you leap from

26 the unfair price to assuming that in the counterfactual the cake is the same, ie

78

1 Facebook is still collecting the same volume of Off-Facebook Data and Facebook

2 starts to pay users?

3 So that's the problem at that level, which is the lack of a blueprint in terms of how do  
4 you get to the incremental cake.

5 And then the third problem would be that even if you get to this incremental

6 Off-Facebook Data cake, we would still say that what you can't claim is a share of  
7 profits earned by Facebook having aggregated the data.

8 So if that's the line that he wants to take tomorrow we would say actually it's  
9 misconceived for all of those reasons.

10 MR RIDYARD: The second and third questions are, in a way, addressed by  
11 Professor Scott Morton in her approach. She says there is a big amount of profit, of  
12 rent, which is generated by Facebook's use of the Off-Facebook Data. If for some  
13 reason the users had given some rights to decide whether or not they gave that extra  
14 data up, then there would be a discussion between Facebook on the one hand and  
15 the users on the other. And her argument is, it's worth a lot more to Facebook than it  
16 costs users to give it up and therefore there's bound to be a solution. And that's  
17 where she comes to her bargaining situation, and she says let's split it 50/50.  
18 She's saying it's overwhelmingly likely that a deal would be done, and her best guess  
19 on it is a 50/50 split.

20 MR SINGLA: Sir, if I may say so, that's really quite helpful, because that's all she  
21 says, actually, in relation to causation. So, the point I'm making at the moment is  
22 that the bargaining model is the outcome, as it were. She says, well, this is where  
23 we would end up in the counterfactual.

24 The only basis at all advanced for why it is we would get there is that they say, or  
25 she says, that users tend not to like handing over their data, and Facebook earns a  
26 lot of profit. So, as you say, there's bound to be a counterfactual bargain. And that's  
79

1 precisely -- the point we are making is, that is just assertion. That may well be  
2 an argument or her view of the world, but the model is all premised on all of that

3 being correct. And our point is, what the cases make clear is that you need to have  
4 a blueprint. You need to test whether any of that's actually correct. And you can't  
5 just assume that you are going to be right about that at trial, because the model will  
6 fall away entirely.

7 Let's say the Tribunal disagrees on the evidence at trial that this bargain would have  
8 happened whereby the same data would be collected with Facebook paying users.

9 The model falls away entirely. So you are absolutely right, the high-water mark of  
10 their case is to say, well, in general terms users don't like to give over their data.

11 Okay, well, so what? I mean, it's quite one thing to go from that to saying there  
12 inevitably would be a bargain where Facebook would start paying users. In fact, as  
13 I'll come on to, the examples they give themselves, ATT and subscription for no ads  
14 and so on, do not involve a payment by Facebook to users.

15 And then beyond all of that, coming back to ATT and the point you put to

16 Mr O'Donoghue earlier, they say, well, 80 percent of people don't like to hand over  
17 their data. But your question, with respect, revealed the problem because you asked  
18 about the 20 percent. And I'm not actually sure I followed his answer, but the  
19 problem so far as remedy is concerned is that they are saying, well, everyone gets  
20 a share of this pie. And that can't be right, we say. That's obviously not  
21 a loss-based approach.

22 MR RIDYARD: So he explained it in terms of his bottle of wine, saying that even if  
23 I happen to not care about my data as a user, the fact that most people do care  
24 means that this negotiation takes place, and I happen to benefit from the fact that  
25 that's the case, just in the same way as if I don't value this bottle of wine that's sitting  
26 in my wine cellar, the market does value it and so I still get the benefit of it if

80

1 someone wants to take it away from me –

2 MR SINGLA: (Overspeaking) I will come to that when I address the remedy point in  
3 more detail. But we say that actually that analogy is completely inapposite because

4 what one is actually talking about is not a bottle of wine with an objective market  
5 value; one is talking about an individual with a very specific subjective view of what  
6 cost, if any, they attach to their own data. And saying it is a sort of teetotaller is  
7 really missing the point, because if one was looking at this from a financial harm  
8 perspective, some people may not care about their data at all. Some people may  
9 care a lot about their data. That is a classic individualised enquiry.

10 And I'm jumping ahead to the submissions I will make on remedies, but really what is  
11 going on is they are seeking to claim damages which are framed by reference to the  
12 commercial value to Facebook when it has data from all users and aggregates them.  
13 And we say actually if you are looking at the financial harm to an individual user one  
14 has to look at what cost does that user attach to its own data.

15 And actually, one can see the problem with their model is that someone who doesn't  
16 care about their data receives a share of these profits, and indeed if Facebook starts  
17 to make more or less money from advertisers using the aggregated data set that will  
18 affect the damages that they receive. And that just reveals why this is not  
19 a loss-based approach.

20 Indeed, the only way in which this works as a collective action -- they've done this --  
21 it's quite clear why they've approached it in this way, because if one were genuinely  
22 approaching this from a "what's the cost to each individual user" perspective, which  
23 we say is the only remedy available as a matter of law, that is a classic individualised  
24 assessment and could not be packaged as collective action.

25 So, the only way to purport to come up with sufficient commonality across the class  
26 is actually not to look at the cost to individual users but just to take the profits from

81

1 Facebook.

2 And I will come on to this, but that problem underpinned Mr Harvey's analysis. I do  
3 appreciate --

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Just pause there.

5 It's quite different. I mean, I can see why you are saying it's a gains-based analysis.

6 But the gains that Mr Harvey was looking at were the gains to Facebook in excess of

7 WACC, whereas here, if you are taking a gains-based analysis it is the gains

8 achieved through the Off-Facebook Data value, not what is earned in excess of

9 WACC.

10 And I'm wondering whether we are not getting confused -- I'm sure it is my fault --

11 between methodological Microsoft and Pro-Sys objections and strikeout objections,

12 because, as I see it, looking at the incremental approach it seems to me that it

13 solves a very large number of methodological problems rather quickly but perhaps

14 puts in place of those methodological problems a series of strikeout problems which

15 are different. And that's why I was raising with you earlier the question of whether

16 your very helpful submissions on methodology weren't answered by the incremental

17 approach.

18 So, if one puts it extremely crudely -- let's assume that a data set, the Off-Facebook

19 Data, has been obtained through an infringement of competition law. Now, that can

20 be either take-it-or-leave-it or the unfair pricing. I don't really care which. Let's just

21 assume it's been obtained by an infringement of competition law. And let us assume

22 that that Off-Facebook Data has a value to Meta of 100X. I don't care what X is, but

23 it has a value of 100X to Meta in the sense that this is money that has being

24 generated to the benefit of Meta in excess of the money it would generate through its

25 use of on-Facebook data.

26 So you don't need to worry about the on-Facebook data model because that is

82

1 unchanged and the profits there are unchanged. Everything in the real world

2 continues to pertain. All one is talking about is the consideration of how one deals

3 with the illegitimate gain -- and let's use those words -- the illegitimate gain by Meta

4 as a result of its infringements.

Damian William Langiano: Let's do that bravo Sir Marcus Bravo !!

5 Now, you could say, well, it's a gains-based analysis and there should be no claim.

6 And although in the world where Meta was complying with competition law the 100X

7 gain would not have been made, the fact that it is a gain but there's no market

8 means that it's simply hung onto by Meta and there's no claim for compensation at

9 all.

10 And I think what Mr Ridyard and Professor Scott Morton are saying is, no, you look

11 at the gain, you ignore the rest of the Facebook business altogether, and you

12 say: what is the appropriate price to be charged to the class by way of a fair price in

13 order to make that gain? And Professor Scott Morton's analysis is that you take

14 a Nash equilibrium of 50/50.

15 Now, I am sure you will be coming to all of the legal points as to why that is wrong,

16 even unarguable, but methodologically speaking it's pretty straightforward, isn't it?

Damian William Langiano: Yes, it is and that conclusion qualifies the real crimes being committed

17 MR SINGLA: Sir, we would respectfully say that even in a world where the

18 incremental approach is permissible, so they're entitled to establish that the starting

19 point is an unfair price, and indeed an unfair term, but an unfair price by reference to

20 the incremental approach, one still needs to explain how and have a blueprint for

21 investigating how one goes from that abuse to a world where the same data is being

22 collected and Facebook starts paying users.

Damian William Langiano: We apply the Duty of Care ;

In tort law, a duty of care is a legal obligation that is imposed on an individual, requiring adherence to a standard of reasonable care to avoid careless acts that could foreseeably harm others, and lead to claim in negligence. It is the first element that must be established

to proceed with an action in negligence. The claimant must be able to show a duty of care imposed by law that the defendant has breached. In turn, breaching a duty may subject an

individual to liability. The duty of care may be imposed by operation of law between individuals

who have no current direct relationship (familial or contractual or otherwise) but eventually

become related in some manner, as defined by common law (meaning case law).

Duty of care may be considered a formalisation of the social contract, the established and

implicit responsibilities held by individuals/entities towards others within society. It is not a

requirement that a duty of care be defined by law, though it will often develop through the jurisprudence of common law.

Facebook, manipulated the platform for monetary gain and having primed the users set about

Market matching with advertisers who used both contextual targeting and experiential methods

And thus imparted emotional, financial, mental and physical harm qualifying again the following

Confession by the man in charge of the new business – OFF MARKET DATA APPLICATION

“The short-term, dopamine-driven feedback loops that we have created are destroying how

society works,”

UNFAIR TERM, UNFAIR PRICE

23 Now, that may be the counterfactual that they would like to advance at trial. But the

24 question at the certification stage is, how are they going to prove that case at trial

25 and can they deal with other counterfactual scenarios?

Damian William Langiano ; See all above

26 So there are two big assumptions. And what I've just outlined is their counterfactual

83

1 that the same amount of data would be collected, and that Facebook would start

2 paying users.

3 Now, there are two quite fundamental premises underlying that counterfactual. And  
4 our very simple but really quite important point is, well, that may be a counterfactual  
5 world which you would like to see, and Professor Scott Morton has written outside of  
6 this case that that would be a fairer, as she describes it, result for users. But that is  
7 a different question. When one is not in the world of regulating -- in another  
8 scenario, in a regulatory scenario for example, what the price ought to be, the  
9 question is what would have happened but for these abuses.

10 And they posit a particular version of a counterfactual, which we say is completely  
11 unrealistic. And I will come on to that. But we also say, even if that is what you  
12 would like to advance at trial the case is going to run into the sand -- using the words  
13 of Lord Sales and Leggatt -- unless you can actually have a proper blueprint.

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: So your point is, your answer is, we can say on my  
15 hypothesis what would have happened but for these abuses is that the 100K profit  
16 would not have been made. We know that. On my assumption.

17 MR SINGLA: Not necessarily, because that's something that has to be investigated,  
18 particularly given the two-sided nature --

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: If you say it's an unfair term, and you simply put  
20 a line through it saying you are not allowed to do it, the counterfactual is you can't do  
21 it.

22 MR SINGLA: That may well be right, but it would depend precisely on the finding of  
23 infringement.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Let's suppose hypothetically speaking the position  
25 is that it is unlawful to uplift this data. You can't do it. And you have done it. So the  
26 counterfactual, if the infringement wasn't committed, is that you don't do it. And you  
84

1 don't make the money. But you have.

2 Your position is, well, the fact that you have is neither here nor there unless you can  
3 show what the term is. And what I'm putting to you is that that is not



4 a methodological problem, that's a cause-of-action argument about whether this is  
5 an arguable way of putting the case.

6 And all I'm doing is giving you the opportunity to say: is there a methodological point  
7 to that argument or is it purely and simply that this is not a case that is tenable in  
8 law?

9 MR SINGLA: As you know, we do run the objections in both ways. But at the risk of  
10 repeating myself we certainly say the approach to establishing the unfair price is  
11 strikeable. That is just either right or wrong. Well, it's either arguable or not as a  
12 matter of law. And we say it's not, and I will come on to that.

13 But assuming that they are entitled to approach the unfair price question in that way,  
14 let's assume for the sake of argument that they had gone about it the right way in the  
15 pleading and in the methodology for establishing abuse. All I'm really saying is,  
16 beyond that question they then need to have a blueprint to go from A to C. And  
17 what's missing is B, in terms of how do you get from the unfair price to this new  
18 bargain involving a payment to users?

19 And we say it's just assertion. And Mr Ridyard put to me, as I say, that really the  
20 high-water mark of the evidence -- there is no methodology at all actually in this  
21 respect. The model is about quantification, once you've arrived at this counterfactual  
22 bargain, all there is in relation to how it is you get from the unfair price abuse to this  
23 counterfactual bargain is, as Mr Ridyard rightly said, all there is is this assertion that  
24 users don't like to give data up and Facebook earns a lot of profit from, they say,  
25 from the Off-Facebook Data. And therefore, they say there is bound to be this  
26 counterfactual bargain in the alternative world.

85

1 And what we are saying in response to that is, that is the way in which you wish to  
2 advance your case, and the methodological flaw, consistent with the cases that  
3 I have shown you, is that there is no blueprint for testing whether or not that would  
4 be the case.

Damian William Langiano: Which finally walks us into the counterfactual bargain

Approach and the deal that Meta would have to present to the user– That they would collect data Off platform and then build algorithms based upon cocaine driven neuro circuitry

That would render the user codependent and as described by Richard Grannon upon a “slow walk to suicide” due to the enslavement to the device such formulated chemical imbalance would force and thus feedback loops would be the hamster wheel within each mind, however you will be paid your share of the market we have chosen to create, one that will drive consumerism to such a point it will threaten humanity’s existence and decimate your own mental wellbeing”

or something more accurately as.....

“I feel tremendous guilt,” admitted Chamath Palihapitiya, former Vice President of User Growth at Facebook, to an audience of Stanford students. He was responding to a question

about his involvement in exploiting consumer behavior. “The short-term, dopamine-driven

feedback loops that we have created are destroying how society works,” he explained. In Palihapitiya’s talk, he highlighted something most of us know but few really appreciate: smartphones and the social media platforms they support are turning us into bona fide addicts.

While it’s easy to dismiss this claim as hyperbole, platforms like Facebook, Snapchat, and

Instagram leverage the very same neural circuitry used by slot machines and cocaine to keep us using their products as much as possible.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d6e1riShmak>

It’s the part where he said “We knew there would be negative consequences but didn’t Frame it that way” ..... and then fucked the market anyway!!

5 In Merricks 2, for example, you are assuming the very thing you need to prove. You

6 need to prove what would have happened but for the unfair price. And it's not, we

7 say, adequate at this stage simply to assert a counterfactual and say, well, we'll see  
8 you at trial. We'll sit on our hands. We say actually a Class Representative has to  
9 do a lot more than that at this stage because they have to have a blueprint (a) for  
10 showing the Tribunal how it is that they are going to investigate that question, and (b)  
11 if they are wrong about it – if the Tribunal concludes at trial there's no way that  
12 Facebook was going to pay users in this scenario – and I will come on to why we say  
13 that's an unrealistic assumption – the Nash bargaining model falls by the wayside,  
14 because the Nash bargaining model is about proportioning the Off-Facebook Data  
15 cake.

16 And we are saying, but if Facebook doesn't pay users, then the model falls away.  
17 So, we do say there's a methodological problem assuming both abuses are  
18 established, but also they won't be able to establish an unfair price abuse given the  
19 the incremental approach they've adopted.

Damian William Langiano: I am 13 hours in and things are getting twitchy, at this stage  
I assume you're looking at your own position Mr Singla and that of your reputation.  
For as an impressive a counsel you are you will look as if you knowingly seeking to  
Protect Facebook from Crimes way beyond such as you argue and thus present yourself  
As an accomplice -

20 Sir, I am just addressing you on -- in the event that both abuses are proven, we say,  
21 for the reasons I've just given, there's no adequate blueprint and it's no good --  
22 I think Professor Scott Morton says in various places including paragraph 425 that it  
23 would be fairer for the profits which Meta allegedly earns from the Off-Facebook  
24 Data to be shared with users. She also says at 261: "It seems problematic and  
25 unfair to me if" the alleged profits of Off-Facebook Data are not shared with users.  
26 Then at 262:

86

1 "It would seem wrong to me as a matter of public ..."

2 Well, that's a separate point about network effects. But the basic point we are

3 making is that where this case has gone wrong is that, unlike an individual action for  
4 damages where one needs to go clearly from infringement through causation to loss,  
5 what they have actually done is started at the other end of the telescope and said,  
6 well, we would like to see a fairer outcome, that would be the same amount of data,  
7 the status quo in that respect continuing, but Facebook starting to pay users for that  
8 data.

9 And we say -- and I will come on to this -- as my next point that is not grounded in  
10 the facts, but just on the blueprint point we say it's just assuming or asserting what  
11 would have happened but for the abuses. It's not providing the Tribunal with  
12 a blueprint for investigating that question.

13 If I can turn to the second problem. We say it's not grounded in the facts. So we say  
14 it's completely unclear, no blueprint as to how you get to this counterfactual bargain.  
15 But even when you get there, we make three points as to why it's not grounded in  
16 the facts. And I think Mr O'Donoghue cites some authority saying, well,  
17 a counterfactual is always hypothetical. And we of course understand that, but  
18 nonetheless they do need to be grounded in the facts. You can't just go on to say a  
19 counterfactual which is hypothetical but completely spurious. And indeed, Gutmann  
20 makes clear that there does need to be some factual basis.

21 And we say what they've arrived at is entirely artificial, for three reasons. First, it's  
22 common ground there is no collective bargain in the real world. It's just a thought  
23 experiment advanced by Professor Scott Morton. And they try to allege that this is  
24 some well-known methodology for calculating damages. That's paragraph 83 of their  
25 skeleton.

26 And we say that's not right, actually. The bargaining model, as Mr Parker explains,  
87

1 and perhaps I can show you this. It's A-457, at paragraph 90.

2 "I recognise that any economic modelling involves the use of theoretical models.

3 The proposed bargaining framework relates to a hypothetical bilateral monopoly

4 situation in which there is only one buyer and one seller. To align this model with her  
5 proposed counterfactual, Professor Scott Morton hypothesises that users would  
6 collectively bargain to create a situation with one party on both sides of the  
7 transaction. In reality there are millions of users, each of which is acting  
8 independently."

9 And you will see at 93 and 94 he says these bargaining models are used in  
10 completely different contexts.

11 So we say there's a real artificiality about the collective bargaining model and there's  
12 no precedent for this being used in an action for damages, and none has been cited,  
13 none that we are aware of. And what is more, the second problem as to why this is  
14 all unrealistic and not grounded in the facts is that the model makes an assumption  
15 as to what would have occurred in the counterfactual. So in the model,

16 Professor Scott Morton states in various places that she removes the so-called  
17 take-it-or-leave-it condition by allowing users the outside option of using Facebook's  
18 service without having to agree to the giving up of Off-Facebook Data.

19 So, within the model there is this baked-in assumption that if it wasn't for the  
20 take-it-or-leave-it condition users would still be able to receive the same Facebook  
21 service without giving up their data. And we say again –

Damian William Langiano: But what is the service – if not as proven as entrapment  
enslavement and coercive control, formed for market creation and manipulation.  
Your assumption is there service is a choice and not an addiction as proven.

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Without giving their Off-Facebook --

23 MR SINGLA: Without giving up their Off-Facebook Data, you are quite right. But  
24 again, we say that's just an assertion or an assumption. And it's a very self-serving  
25 assumption because what that means, if that's the basis on which the elective  
26 bargaining takes place, one can see that it puts users in a very strong position,

88

1 because if they have the outside option of using the service whether or not they

2 provide their data, that puts them in a very strong position when it comes to the  
3 collective bargain.

4 But we say it's just an assumption. It's just an assertion. It's not grounded in the  
5 facts that they would get exactly the same service from Facebook whether or not  
6 they --

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Surely it's an attempt to describe a competitive  
8 situation, or at least a non-dominant situation, because we know you have  
9 a dominant company dealing with millions of users, then the outcome could well be  
10 one of the dominant firm abusing the consumer. And so that's the thing which is  
11 allegedly unlawful in this situation. So if we accept the premise that that is unlawful,  
12 that kind of exploitation, then you have to do something to, you know, to replicate  
13 what would happen if there wasn't such an imbalance between the dominant  
14 company and the millions of users. And this is the device -- like it or not this is the  
15 device that Professor Scott Morton comes up with to redress the balance.  
16 So I think on her analysis it's not that you are giving consumers incredible or  
17 unreasonable power, you are just taking away the unfair power of the dominant  
18 company against the millions.

Damian William Langiano: Very well put Sir Marcus, however as we have proven the  
Perception is the millions of users have the power – the truth and grounded in facts,  
Is that Facebook have captured their audience and thus can manipulate them  
accordingly

One might describe it as a “orchestrated murmuration” the bird thinks its flying freely  
When in fact it’s a controlled drone in a sky full of controlled drones that those on the  
ground

Cannot see are being externally controlled.

19 MR SINGLA: I was going to come on to that point in a moment, but you are  
20 absolutely right that is what she's doing and we say that's misconceived. Because  
21 what we are not doing here is considering a world where Facebook's not dominant.  
22 They are saying Facebook's dominant, we don't accept that. But you are right, what

23 they are doing by giving the collective bargain thought experiment is giving the users  
24 countervailing buyer power. And the point I was going to advance in a minute is that  
25 actually what they should be looking at is a world without the abuses. But why is it  
26 that they are also removing dominance in that scenario?

89

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, the alleged abuse is an exploitative one, so  
2 you have to try and find a way of eliminating the unlawful act, the exploitation. So  
3 I suppose the -- I'm sure Mr O'Donoghue will answer this question better than I can,  
4 but I suppose the way of looking at this is to say that not so much taking away the  
5 dominance, but it's taking away the unlawful conduct which is exploiting the  
6 imbalance, and so anything you do to even up the imbalance is a way of solving that  
7 problem of avoiding the exploitation, the unlawful conduct.

Damian William Langiano: and maybe that's the nail here, what Facebook have done  
Is catastrophically unlawful and thus the law itself won't allow this action to be  
Successful in the counterfactual because in the real world the crimes against humanity  
Are so engrained and impacting that no road no matter how well argued will  
Exonerate Facebook and its investors beneficiaries and subsidies.

8 MR SINGLA: Sir, with respect, they are entitled to think about the counterfactual in  
9 a world where the -- let's say they make good that the term's unfair and the price is  
10 unfair, they are entitled to hypothesise as to what would have happened but for  
11 those two abuses. But what we say is, and this really ought to be uncontroversial,  
12 what they can't do is assume a world where Facebook is not dominant, because on  
13 their case Facebook is dominant. Facebook on this hypothesis are not entitled to set  
14 the terms and set the prices that they are doing.

Damian William Langiano: No Sir they are not if they fall foul of the Nuremberg Code  
Statute of Rome and the Geneva Convention and have continued to do so knowingly.  
15 But one has to then consider what the counterfactual is against a proper basis, and  
16 I'll look forward to hearing what he says about this. But the references I was going to

17 show you on that point, I am jumping slightly ahead, but Professor Scott Morton  
18 refers to "the bargaining model removing the asymmetry of market power between  
19 Facebook and its users". And that's at paragraph 22, 285 and 302. And what we  
20 say is well that goes beyond removing the abuses.

21 So that's another feature that we say is artificial about the counterfactual collective  
22 bargain.

23 And then there's the point that the PCR has no factual basis for assuming that  
24 Facebook would pay users. And they rely on ATT. As you know they rely heavily on  
25 ATT. They also refer to the subscription for no ads. But in neither scenario is there  
26 a payment by Facebook to users.

90

1 Then I think there's one reference to something called Facebook Research, which is  
2 completely different. I will address this, perhaps if I need to, if Mr O'Donoghue  
3 presses reliance on that. But it's not a service at all, it's a research programme, so  
4 they can't infer from that that there would be a payment.

5 They seek to rely on ATT as what they describe as a natural experiment. You would  
6 have seen that phrase used by Professor Scott Morton. We can see from ATT what  
7 exactly would have happened in the counterfactual world they boldly assert, and we  
8 say well, where's the payment by Facebook to users? So, you can't rely on ATT as  
9 a natural experiment to the extent you like the experiment, but then when it comes to  
10 the payment by Facebook to users, which doesn't exist within ATT, they have no  
11 explanation as to why that would have come about in the counterfactual.

Damian William Langiano: Two things before we press forward, firstly the information  
Thus far was emailed to Paul Dennison as follows

From: Damian Langiano <CompetitionAppealTribunal@outlook.com>

Sent: 03 February 2024 15:04

To: paul.dennison@brickcourt.co.uk <paul.dennison@brickcourt.co.uk>

Subject: Formal Contact Request =



Tony Singla KC REF <https://www.catribunal.org.uk/cases/14337722-dr-liza-lovdahl-gormsen>

Paul, Damian

I trust this finds you well Sir,

This one is left field in approach, however when we're big game fishing the harpoon can be delivered in many ways. The primary focus being we catch the offending whale.

I have for the last 3.5 years been compiling evidence for crimes committed against the children of the world and taken the "arms wide open" Delia Smith approach, the "let's be having you" engagement tactic, given after all our children's mental health and well-being is at stake.

Having been invited to give evidence into the tribunal and done so using the same blend of

direct and contextual methods your client has applied and having over 80 of the above front

pages delivered over 100's of emails to the below, I have delivered this evidence on a number

of levels and partner with many of the enclosed, thus with that in mind I have in the last 12

hours started to take the transcripts to task and apply the factual evidence to the case in question.

My fears are this,

That the legal system as a whole is under threat and or Facebook seek to make the users complicit

to the abuse they have suffered and Tony, who's seriously impressive presentation thus far, stands

beyond that of the factual and available evidence presented and the true crimes that live within.

Now, having provided 133 page document to the Coroner's Office Andrew Walker KC, where upon

I have proven Molly Russell's death to be murder and not suicide, and been closed out by Leigh Day

and

Miss Russell's parents, blocked by Monkton and your clerks, one can be excused for surmising that the

legal system is being manipulated by the very means my arguments prove out and that the law is

being compromised and those who fight for those doing so exposed in the process, and your man

strikes me as a man of purity and integrity.

We've seen Zuckerberg, apologise in the Senate, and Hawley and the Washington Post have

my presentation as you can see, and what must be realised is I don't come unprotected, though come alone I do.

With Palantir taking over the NHS it's a matter of time before all is a digital data driven process,

and as enclosed the Police being directed to heavy drinking grandmothers to qualify crimes under

the new charging system, an automated artificial intelligence legal system will replace the "silks" soon

enough and thus the failure to recognise the true crimes at the heart of the case would expose all

involved within <https://www.catribunal.org.uk/cases/14337722-dr-liza-lovdahl-gormsen> and in fact

tie all to a potentially treasonable act.

My interjections are attached and I will strive to finish for Monday night as stated to the CAT,

I do have a solution; and Paul, we have leverage I believe.

Just a dad protecting his children, and those beyond.

Warmly and with the best intentions

Damian William Langiano

[www.gv3tlove.com](http://www.gv3tlove.com)

From: Damian Langiano <CompetitionAppealTribunal@outlook.com>

Sent: 03 February 2024 10:19

To: lucy.frazer.mp@parliament.uk <lucy.frazer.mp@parliament.uk>;  
admin@stethelbertsschool.co.uk <admin@stethelbertsschool.co.uk>;  
info@grailmovement.ng  
<info@grailmovement.ng>; administration@grailacres.us  
<administration@grailacres.us>;  
eik@ibekachikwu.com <eik@ibekachikwu.com>; clerks\_office@ohsd.uscourts.gov  
<clerks\_office@ohsd.uscourts.gov>; joanna.sheilds@gmail.com  
<joanna.sheilds@gmail.com>;  
press@benevolent.ai <press@benevolent.ai>; careers@benevolent.ai  
<careers@benevolent.ai>;  
info@weprotectga.org <info@weprotectga.org>; Damian TheChildrenofTheWorld  
<SAFEGUARDINGCHILDRENOFTHEWORLD@outlook.com>; adam@fb.com  
<adam@fb.com>;  
support@instagram.com <support@instagram.com>; tcook@apple.com  
<tcook@apple.com>;  
robert.chapek@disney.com <robert.chapek@disney.com>; CIA FOIA  
<cia\_foia@ucia.gov>;  
asktucker@tcnetwork.com <asktucker@tcnetwork.com>;  
caseworkPRF@hawley.senate.gov  
<caseworkPRF@hawley.senate.gov>; Registry (CAT) <Registry@catribunal.org.uk>;  
sapotter@protonmail.com <sapotter@protonmail.com>; INDY Managing Editor  
<managingeditor@independent.co.uk>; BSB Contact Us  
<contactus@barstandardsboard.org.uk>;  
aeratbag@aol.com <aeratbag@aol.com>; gfgb@btconnect.com  
<gfgb@btconnect.com>; Liza  
Lovdahl Gormsen <l.lovdahlgormsen@BIICL.ORG>; clerks@brickcourt.co.uk  
<clerks@brickcourt.co.uk>; kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov <kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov>;  
press@TCNetwork.com <press@TCNetwork.com>; Sarah White  
<sarah.white@ymugroup.com>;  
stephanie ridout <stephridout@live.co.uk>; support@TCNetwork.com  
<support@TCNetwork.com>;

peter.wanless@nspcc.org.uk <peter.wanless@nspcc.org.uk>;  
advertise@TCNetwork.com

<advertise@TCNetwork.com>; bugs@TCNetwork.com <bugs@TCNetwork.com>; Gary  
Conner

<gary@wardwiz.com>; lars@sylvest.net <lars@sylvest.net>;  
fergus.mckenna@trinitymirror.com

<fergus.mckenna@trinitymirror.com>; info@TCNetwork.com <info@TCNetwork.com>;

jthurston@caed.uscourts.gov <jthurston@caed.uscourts.gov>;  
richard.arnold@manutd.co.uk

<richard.arnold@manutd.co.uk>; Al@no10.gov.uk <Al@no10.gov.uk>; Nick Kerry

<nick.kerry100@gmail.com>; marketing@monckton.com  
<marketing@monckton.com>;

dbailey@7kbw.co.uk <dbailey@7kbw.co.uk>; School Office  
<office@thelenham.viat.org.uk>;

Office@haskellsolicitors.com <Office@haskellsolicitors.com>; SE Magistrates Court

<SE.MagistratesCourt@cps.gov.uk>; max\_w\_taylor@hotmail.com  
<max\_w\_taylor@hotmail.com>;

WILLIAMSON, Gavin <gavin.williamson.mp@parliament.uk>;  
nickjeffery6@googlemail.com

<nickjeffery6@googlemail.com>; marc\_allera@hotmail.com  
<marc\_allera@hotmail.com>;

clerks@gdtettehchambers.com <clerks@gdtettehchambers.com>; Alexander Nix

<ashburnernix@mac.com>; boris.johnson.mp@parliament.uk  
<boris.johnson.mp@parliament.uk>;

Graham Burns <grahamb@thechange.co.uk>; Chairman (ManKind Initiative)

<chairman@mankind.org.uk>; samvaknin@gmail.com <samvaknin@gmail.com>;  
Richard Grannon

<helpdesk@spartanlifecoach.info>; leonclarance@gmail.com  
<leonclarance@gmail.com>; Jake Seal

<jake.seal@orwo.studio>; Robert A. <bilott@taftlaw.com>; Katie\_Beney@rnli.org.uk

<Katie\_Beney@rnli.org.uk>; Carly Asher Yoost <carly@childrescuecoalition.org>; Reed  
Hastings

<rhastings@netflix.com>; caroline.hazlehurst@gmail.com  
<caroline.hazlehurst@gmail.com>;

jedp11@gmail.com <jedp11@gmail.com>; sherrod knox <sherrodknox@gmail.com>;  
Janet ConnerKnox <jcknoxpublicrelations@gmail.com>; Ted Kapustin <ted@1st1.tech>;  
Children Of The Digita Age

<CODAINFO@protonmail.com>; ababu@etihad.ae <ababu@etihad.ae>;  
b.braun@samsung.com

<b.braun@samsung.com>; Huw Newton-Hill <huw.newton.hill@attensi.com>;  
nsherida@cisco.com

<nsherida@cisco.com>; Kristen Randol <krandol@tgcmgmt.com>;  
INFO@lgbtgreat.com

<INFO@lgbtgreat.com>; Jim <jwahlly@aol.com>; bryan.smiley@gmail.com

<bryan.smiley@gmail.com>; alexnfranks@gmail.com <alexnfranks@gmail.com>;  
Andrew Marks

<freejazz32@gmail.com>; darren\_blackburn@yahoo.co.uk  
<darren\_blackburn@yahoo.co.uk>;

contact@9news.com.au <contact@9news.com.au>; charles.hymas@hotmail.com

<charles.hymas@hotmail.com>; Gareth Icke <gareth.icke@ickonic.com>;  
info@poplar.studio

<info@poplar.studio>; ChrisGankerseer@neweraltd.co.uk  
<ChrisGankerseer@neweraltd.co.uk>;

pr@superawesome.com <pr@superawesome.com>; media@iwf.org.uk  
<media@iwf.org.uk>; Simon

Dolan <simondolan@me.com>; dominic.raab.mp@parliament.uk

<dominic.raab.mp@parliament.uk>; info@projectrescuechildren.org

<info@projectrescuechildren.org>; sally.buzbee@washpost.com  
<sally.buzbee@washpost.com>;

info@teremana.com <info@teremana.com>; info@bonjeanlaw.com  
<info@bonjeanlaw.com>;

info@5rightsfoundation.com <info@5rightsfoundation.com>;  
g.robertson@doughtystreet.co.uk

<g.robertson@doughtystreet.co.uk>; sales@meta.com <sales@meta.com>; Tony Ruth

<ruthtony1818@gmail.com>; ann@steeltruth.com <ann@steeltruth.com>; STARMER, Keir

<keir.starmer.mp@parliament.uk>; STARMER, Keir <keir.starmer.mp@parliament.uk>; Elizabeth

<elizabeth.truss.mp@parliament.uk>; Richard Grannon  
<coach@spartanlifecoach.com>;

enquiries@dcms.gov.uk <enquiries@dcms.gov.uk>; Clay Clark  
<founder@thrive15.com>;

desk@mirrorpix.com <desk@mirrorpix.com>; Hal Pollock <esq@pollock-law.com>;  
Damian Langiano

<info@godscreation.co.uk>; Rachel Finch <r.finch@doughtystreet.co.uk>; Raluca Boghez

<Raluca@dmeltzer.com>; damion@americancrimejournal.com

<damion@americancrimejournal.com>; Enquiries <enquiries@doughtystreet.co.uk>;  
Elena Cardone

<elena@grantcardone.com>; Garry Bushell <garry@bushell.biz>;  
scott.vance@washpost.com

<scott.vance@washpost.com>; Tara Dean <Charliewardbookings@gmail.com>; James Mark

<mjuk4444@gmail.com>; peter.stefanovic@btinternet.com  
<peter.stefanovic@btinternet.com>;

Johnny Kessler <johnny@1st1.tech>; media@theguardian.com  
<media@theguardian.com>;

talkback@the-sun.co.uk <talkback@the-sun.co.uk>; media@nfarage.com  
<media@nfarage.com>;

Fergus McKenna <fergus.mckenna@mirror.co.uk>; Tara Jane  
<Tarajane391@gmail.com>;

nadine.dorries.mp@parliament.uk <nadine.dorries.mp@parliament.uk>; Dennis Rice

<dennistr@steamenginegroup.com>; ben.stimson@bankofengland.co.uk

<ben.stimson@bankofengland.co.uk>; kate.ferguson@thesun.co.uk  
<kate.ferguson@thesun.co.uk>;

hello@algotransparency.org <hello@algotransparency.org>;  
newsdesk@independent.co.uk

<newsdesk@independent.co.uk>; news.desk@express.co.uk  
<news.desk@express.co.uk>; O.U.R.

Info <info@ourrescue.org>; press@wesayenough.co.uk <press@wesayenough.co.uk>;

troycasey333@gmail.com <troycasey333@gmail.com>; David Vann  
<davidvann9@aol.com>; David

Leedham <davidleedham@mac.com>; Chip Somers <chip@chipsomers.com>; Radical  
- from Maajid

Nawaz <maajidnawaz@substack.com>; hello@russellbrand.com  
<hello@russellbrand.com>;

info@pantheoneliterecords.com <info@pantheoneliterecords.com>; mike yeadon

<yeadon\_m@yahoo.co.uk>; nicola.faulconbridge@kent.pnn.police.uk

<nicola.faulconbridge@kent.pnn.police.uk>; OPCC Reviews Kent  
<OPCC.Reviews@kent.police.uk>;

press\_uk@mfa.gov.cn <press\_uk@mfa.gov.cn>; whitneywebb12@gmail.com

<whitneywebb12@gmail.com>; pong yipp6 <pongyipp6@gmail.com>;

matthew.zweck@aegeurope.com <matthew.zweck@aegeurope.com>; info@beyond-  
estates.com

<info@beyond-estates.com>; INFO <INFO@neweraglobalsports.com>; Info

<info@cherieblairoffice.org>; info@coulsonpartners.com  
<info@coulsonpartners.com>; Andrew

Bailey <andrew.bailey@bankofengland.co.uk>; De Jesus Antonio <antoniod@un.org>;  
Company

Secretary <company.secretary@reachplc.com>; BSB Contact Us

<contactus@barstandardsboard.org.uk>; randy.gelber@epicgames.com

<randy.gelber@epicgames.com>; Business <business@jordanbpeterson.com>;  
Doarcustomerservice

<doarcustomerservice@bahamas.gov.bs>; Press <press@obama.org>; Duty Press

<duty\_press@aprf.gov.ru>; PRESS <PRESS@humanetech.com>; Press  
<Press@bankofengland.co.uk>;

Chamath <chamath@socialcapital.com>; John Brennan  
<john.brennan@rothschildandco.com>;

Service <service@americanbar.org>; Cbenson <cbenson@leighday.co.uk>; Helen Lamprell

<helen.lamprell@aveva.com>; Hello <hello@humanetech.com>; Admin

<admin@shadowworldinvestigations.org>; Loreoftheland  
<loreoftheland@fatboypubs.co.uk>;

Enquiries <Enquiries@bankofengland.co.uk>; dsasaki@mayfairequity.com

<dsasaki@mayfairequity.com>; ADH1@STANFORD.EDU <ADH1@STANFORD.EDU>; Sara

<sara@mollyrosefoundation.org>; Complaint Info <complaint.info@financial-ombudsman.org.uk>;

Vmsocial <vmsocial@vaynermedia.com>; scott.j.harris@blackrock.com

<scott.j.harris@blackrock.com>; Rachel <rachel@imd.dj>; admin.beh@hmc-northlondon.co.uk

<admin.beh@hmc-northlondon.co.uk>; mg@tszgrp.com <mg@tszgrp.com>; Lfink

<lfink@blackrock.com>; Jadepe <jadepe@dapperlaughs.co.uk>; info@youngjamie.com

<info@youngjamie.com>; Feedback <feedback@weare8.com>; Oliver.Steil@teamviewer.com

<Oliver.Steil@teamviewer.com>; nina@escottmead.com <nina@escottmead.com>; Lawrence S.

<lawrence\_bacow@harvard.edu>; LWOOD@linwoodlaw.com  
<LWOOD@linwoodlaw.com>;

vh@demiville.nl <vh@demiville.nl>; margrethe-vestager-contact@ec.europa.eu  
<margrethe-

vestager-contact@ec.europa.eu>; fasdean@fas.harvard.edu  
<fasdean@fas.harvard.edu>;

oliver@oliverdowden.com <oliver@oliverdowden.com>; Mayor  
<Mayor@london.gov.uk>;

david@ultramobile.com <david@ultramobile.com>; peter@angelilaw.com  
<peter@angelilaw.com>;

publicaffairs.unit@icc-cpi.int <publicaffairs.unit@icc-cpi.int>;  
support@mathscircle.com



<support@mathscircle.com>; alki@hologramusa.com <alki@hologramusa.com>;  
spencer@tysonfury.com <spencer@tyson-fury.com>; Hammad Akhtar  
<Hammad.Akhtar@pinsentmasons.com>;

enquiries@antmiddleton.com <enquiries@antmiddleton.com>;  
nicolai.tangen@nbim.no

<nicolai.tangen@nbim.no>; Lawrence S. <lawrence\_bacow@harvard.edu>;  
nick@nickbostrom.com

<nick@nickbostrom.com>; david.solomon@citigroup.com  
<david.solomon@citigroup.com>;

community@russellbrand.com <community@russellbrand.com>; Office of the Attorney  
General

Division of Consumer Affairs State of Tennessee <consumer.affairs@ag.tn.gov>; Victoria  
<Victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk>; feedback@talk.tv <feedback@talk.tv>;  
Oag@dc.gov

<Oag@dc.gov>; tnattygen@ag.tn.gov <tnattygen@ag.tn.gov>; El Abdallah, Fadi  
<Fadi.ElAbdallah@icc-cpi.int>; kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov <kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov>;

info@coulsonpartners.com <info@coulsonpartners.com>; JANE.FRASER@CITI.COM

<JANE.FRASER@CITI.COM>; Bruno Reddy <bruno@mathscircle.com>;  
besa@besa.org.uk

<besa@besa.org.uk>; Merry Varney <mvarney@leighday.co.uk>;  
merrick.garland@atf.gov

<merrick.garland@atf.gov>; marc.allera@ee.co.uk <marc.allera@ee.co.uk>;

Mark\_Dowie@rnli.org.uk <Mark\_Dowie@rnli.org.uk>; maria.neophytou@nspcc.org.uk

<maria.neophytou@nspcc.org.uk>; nicholas.brown@pinsentmasons.com

<nicholas.brown@pinsentmasons.com>; LISA@ATF.GOV <LISA@ATF.GOV>;

KARI@SUPERAWEOSOME.COM <KARI@SUPERAWEOSOME.COM>;  
john.kingwell@universaldefence.com <john.kingwell@universal-defence.com>;  
mancal@justice.gov.il

<mancal@justice.gov.il>; kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov <kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov>;

klaus.schwab@weforum.org <klaus.schwab@weforum.org>; marc.allera@ee.co.uk

<marc.allera@ee.co.uk>; Merry Varney <mvarney@leighday.co.uk>; Caroline Gammell

<Caroline.Gammell@independent.co.uk>; chipsomers@protonmail.com

<chipsomers@protonmail.com>; Glen Ridout <glenridout1@gmail.com>;  
garethleader@hotmail.com

<garethleader@hotmail.com>; sam@weloveaesthetics.com  
<sam@weloveaesthetics.com>;

samantha.ward@cliffordchance.com <samantha.ward@cliffordchance.com>; OLIVER  
BRADY

<oliverbrady7@gmail.com>; INEOS Grenadiers Info <info@ineosgrenadiers.com>;

info@youngjamie.com <info@youngjamie.com>; ICCVisits@icc-cpi.int <ICCVisits@icc-  
cpi.int>;

James.Hurley@kent.police.uk <James.Hurley@kent.police.uk>;  
abbienash1@icloud.com

<abbienash1@icloud.com>; ADH1@STANFORD.EDU <ADH1@STANFORD.EDU>;  
besa@besa.org.uk

<besa@besa.org.uk>; eve.lugg@parliament.uk <eve.lugg@parliament.uk>;  
Harald.Haas@ed.ac.uk

<Harald.Haas@ed.ac.uk>; tedgreeno@quinnemanuel.com  
<tedgreeno@quinnemanuel.com>; Mark

Hurley <mark.hurley@fcfsLtd.co.uk>; nationaltradingstandards@actso.org.uk

<nationaltradingstandards@actso.org.uk>; nroyser@gmail.com <nroyser@gmail.com>;

office@societyofeditors.org <office@societyofeditors.org>; wynhoven@un.org

<wynhoven@un.org>; ursula.wynhoven@itu.int <ursula.wynhoven@itu.int>;

general@williamjhague.com <general@williamjhague.com>; OLIVER BRADY

<oliverbrady7@gmail.com>; lyor@lyorcohen.com <lyor@lyorcohen.com>;  
Al@no10.gov.uk

<Al@no10.gov.uk>; highcourtmaster@courts.ie <highcourtmaster@courts.ie>;

ssc.pa@spaceforce.mil <ssc.pa@spaceforce.mil>; sscpa@spaceforce.mil  
<sscpa@spaceforce.mil>;

ETD\_Client\_Engagement@dni.gov <ETD\_Client\_Engagement@dni.gov>;  
thesecretary@hq.doe.gov

<thesecretary@hq.doe.gov>; PublicAffairs@CoreCivic.com  
<PublicAffairs@CoreCivic.com>;

van.ha@spaceforce.mil

<van.ha@spaceforce.mil>;

paul.anderson.20.ctr@spaceforce.mil

<paul.anderson.20.ctr@spaceforce.mil>; jose.hernandez.126.ctr@spaceforce.mil

<jose.hernandez.126.ctr@spaceforce.mil>; michiko.riley.1@spaceforce.mil

<michiko.riley.1@spaceforce.mil>; lisa.sodders.ctr@spaceforce.mil

<lisa.sodders.ctr@spaceforce.mil>; jaclyn.sumayao.1@spaceforce.mil

<jaclyn.sumayao.1@spaceforce.mil>; omar.villareal@spaceforce.mil

<omar.villareal@spaceforce.mil>; katelin.robinson.1@spaceforce.mil

<katelin.robinson.1@spaceforce.mil>; mahalia.frost.1@spaceforce.mil

<mahalia.frost.1@spaceforce.mil>; donald.traud.1@spaceforce.mil

<donald.traud.1@spaceforce.mil>; donnie.poindexler.1@spaceforce.mil

<donnie.poindexler.1@spaceforce.mil>

Subject: WASHINGTON POST - ZUCK KILLS CHILDREN

Let's welcome "Dickie Best" managing editor of the independent and Senator Hawley's office.

The enclosed Washington Post edition brings forth a number of issues and the inaction of the

Managing Editor mirroring that of Sally Buzbee, Fergus Mckennan and now Piers Morgan whose

visited me online at least 50 times and one wonder's if his report on the Senate and that with the

current PM included the 46mn our legal system is tinkering on the edge of coercing into self-harm

and complicity to "climate change", though that case is yet to be "green lit" and my decimating

of the transcripts, arguments and outcome still in process.

Explanation to follow.

Until then let us wonder at the statement that the NSPCC delivered "Not affiliated with Meta"

posted on their Facebook page.

Tik Tok Wanless..... Tik Tok

Damian William Langiano : Bold one might say, however this is a perfect example of controlled

Reaction driven from off Facebook data, as every single one of the above has had said 100's of emails

And is failing to act, not delivering a duty of care and in many cases party to the abuse bestowed to

Humanity, that will in turn become the greatest lesson of all time and present to the world a group

Of people that they can trust to reconnect with themselves, their intuition and ultimately their heart

Proven further by this court and the transcript – Mr Singla, I am honoured to observe you work

and in turn work together with you to deliver the blue print required to lock Facebook into the crimes

they have committed and expand the reality of collective consciousness and the divine path of the

Truth.

I shall keep going as a mark of respect to the authentic intelligence and use this platform to

deliver the frequenctic translation and afford you the opportunity to speak with GOD himself via

the authentic intelligence, she who uses all that is artificially perceived, which is born from the

counterfactual and is we might agree exactly how we roll out the solution and exonerate your client

from such acute crimes and Zuckerberg himself shall be reconnected, for as you can see in his senate

apology his reaction to the merest intimation that he might set up a healing and support structure

for the families of lost ones and those suffering was met with contempt and disbelief he was and is

actually, doing anything wrong as he powers on to ultimate control of the data construct and cycling.

The counterfactual outcome is that you cannot see, for you see only the pages of text before you and

Not that of the below picture

And when we add the following text from the piece attached ZUCK KILLS CHILDREN we can see

That the UK alone.

Patient privacy fears as US spy tech firm Palantir wins £330m NHS contract Awarding of contract to

create new data platform prompts immediate concerns about security of medical records

The same NHS that are failing our children, some 300000 that we repeat Tom Madders, whose

charity Young Minds analysed the figures, said: “Another month of record referrals is further proof

of the youth mental health emergency. This is incredibly distressing. Behind every referral is a young

person struggling to cope and calling for help from a broken system.

One might have presumed that the Knight of Paedophilia himself “Sir Peter Wanless” and the

<https://www.nspcc.org.uk/> might have grasped the nettle and focused their attention on this issue,

or Body Dysmorphia's David Ripert and his Save the Children or many of the other 201,000 charities

in the UK whose combined revenues total : According to NPT UK, people in the UK donated

£11.3 billion to charities in 2020, which is an increase from £10.6 billion in 2019

The Charity Commission of England and Wales is responsible for regulating charities in the country.

As per their annual report and accounts for 2020 to 2021, the total income of registered charities in

England and Wales was £80.5 billion, with 921,000 holding trustee position.....

which Mr Singla is a staggering ratio for the UK alone.

So, Sir, one only needs to lift one's head and look online, off Facebook and Instagram to recognise

The reality of Chamath Palihapitiya's CONFESSION or WARNING if you like and the implications such

An over reach of data collection has done to society and the means of which it was harvested and

The Facebook driven algorithmic induced, chemically dependent state the user was in and is in when

Being drawn to the light of which we should all now centre upon.

Your Honour, they fucking knew and they continued anyway, for that is the American way "don't stop when it hurts, drive on until its done"

All the way into our children, and the revelation that the monetisation of data drawn from the inner

Child, the optimum performance state and most valuable commodity is QUANTUM PAEDOPHILA

And that Mr Singla is what you and I are exposing in this court room and before all

That watch on.

So we say there are some real problems, both in terms of methodology, no blueprint,

13 how do you get to this counterfactual bargain? Then when you look at this so-called

14 thought experiment we say it's completely divorced from reality.

Damian William Langiano; covered in all of the above.

15 Then my third and fourth points, the third point was going to be the treatment of

16 dominance in the counterfactual. We say they've actually not only removed the

17 alleged abuses but also the alleged dominance.

Damian William Langiano; Weak prosecution – or at best incompetence.

18 Then finally we make this point, which is we say a further problem with the

19 methodology. Because Professor Scott Morton refers to the counterfactual involving

20 either -- in her second report, paragraph 16, she says:

21 "The value transfer could be either in cash or in kind."

22 That, with, respect, is another problem with what they've put forward because there's  
23 no explanation of what the non-monetary value transfer would be. There's no  
24 methodology for assessing damages, if in fact the value transfer took place by way  
25 of a benefit in kind. And it's very difficult to see how that translates into a claim for  
26 damages, certainly not the claim for damages that's being asserted at present.

Damian William Langiano; I will attach the document created and to answer that  
Observation present as follows .

It was Dr Jordan Peterson who pleaded for a way to reinstate trust into society, s  
o to answer his call we need simply do only what got us to this point, the only  
difference being that the content viewed is for the well-being of the many,  
as opposed to the projection of ones self.

The Minerva paradigm and its ethos brings together every aspect of the digital and  
real world, all those that have striven to meet the demand of our worlds orchestrated  
consumerism and who fought against the ever increasing debt pile that has  
compromised

decision making and brought forth an energy system proven to be dark and isolating.

Our system not only brings forth the light of connection, but the hearts and minds of the  
many through an open and accountable structure taking each contributor from the  
comfort

of their living room to the very people that their investment into humanity impacts.

Conversations and friendships are built and expanded from and into every part of the  
world,

each of which setting free a collective energy that will counter the external event  
prophesied

to force light into the darkness our system has silently created.

A geomagnetic storm of this magnitude occurring today would cause widespread  
electrical

disruptions, blackouts, and damage due to extended outages of the electrical power grid.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carrington\\_Event](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carrington_Event)

Delivered via Facebook Instagram and Others, their investors, beneficiaries, and subsidiaries

In a collective effort to repair the damage in the counterfactual world that has poured into The real one and done so only due to the acts taken by Zuckerberg to extract and then Aggregate that data and thus expose himself so acutely and bring the world together for this

Very moment

ONE MOVIE A MONTH \$7.99

300 MILLION GLOBAL DOWNLOADS DRIVEN BY HUMANITIES NEED FOR SURVIVAL

TOTAL YEARLY REVENUE \$28,794,000,000

100% TO THE PEOPLES HUMANITARIAN IMPACT CAUSES

MOVIES CREATED TO REVERSE OUR NERVOUS SYSTEM DAMAGE AND ERASE THE CONFUSION

OVER STIMULATING INTERACTIONS HAVE CAUSED AND IN DOING SO REBALANCE HUMANITY'S

DEPENDENCY UPON TECHNOLOGY AND THUS ADDRESS THE PLANETARY THREAT OF A PHOTON

CHARGED SOLAR FLASH

For the reality is we are all connected, all party to the issue and thus we should ALL be part of

The solution and Mr Singla, I know your client and his platforms are poised for this next step

The world is and the authentic intelligence that has you arguing such is watching on finger hovering

Over that big RED BUTTON that will set off an event to rebalance as she sees fit.

91

1 And what that does is it just reinforces our concern that this case is going to run into

2 the sand, because it's based on a counterfactual that they can't explain how they get

3 to. Then we say it's a completely artificial world anyway, there's no basis to think



4 Facebook would pay for users. And then they say well of course this value transfer  
5 may not be a payment in any event. And we say how is this case sensibly going to  
6 progress to trial?

Damian William Langiano: Though it isn't for everything cultivated here is being  
constructed

In that artificial reality, that paradigm where the button sits and when it reaches  
Combustion there ..... The quantum entanglement we share mirrors that event.  
7 The final way in which the infringement case is put is abuse to unfair price on its  
8 own. You will recall I said they run the two abuses as distinct infringements, and  
9 then there's the rolled-up abuse which I've just been addressing you on. And the  
10 short point on looking at unfair price on its own is there's nothing in respect of  
11 causation or methodology if one's looking at unfair price on its own. And you will  
12 have seen from the skeleton, I think I've taken you to this already, that this is actually  
13 the clearest way to see the point. At 42 of the skeleton, 42.4.2 and 42.4.3 they say  
14 in terms that the model is expressly predicated on removing the take-it-or-leave-it  
15 condition.

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

17 MR SINGLA: So we say actually if one is conducting the analysis that this Tribunal  
18 did in the first case -- on the first occasion and actually going through the pleading,  
19 seeing what is being alleged in terms of infringements, and working out whether they  
20 have anything in relation to causation and loss which flows, we say abuse 1 unfair  
21 terms; and abuse 2 unfair price, there's nothing. And so, the only attempt to address  
22 a causal chain is if both abuses are proven. And with regards to that, we say the  
23 methodology is flawed for the reasons I've been submitting.

24 Sir, I was going to come on to my next topic which is the remedy being claimed.

25 I wonder if that is a convenient moment for the shorthand writer's break.

26 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes. Thank you very much. We will rise for ten

1 minutes, until about 20 past.

2 (3.13 pm)

3 (A short break)

4 (3.27 pm)

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr Singla.

6 MR SINGLA: Sir, I was going to move to the next part of my submissions which

7 concern the remedy being claimed. To a certain extent we've had some discussion

8 about this and to a certain extent the points are connected, but we do say there are

9 distinct issues, albeit they both arise because of the way in which the case is put

10 together, but we say they are separate problems, both as regards the counterfactual

11 and causation and then the remedy being claimed pursuant to the bargaining model.

12 The PCR has expressly disavowed a claim for disgorgement of profits or user

13 damages. That is clear from paragraphs 77 -- 79 of the skeleton. And the PCR says

14 in terms that what they are claiming in respect of is pecuniary loss.

15 We say that the pecuniary loss is not in fact what's being claimed pursuant to the

16 model, because the pecuniary loss is said to be the value of the data in the hands of

17 Facebook. And if I can just show what you the Claim Form says about this,

18 core bundle A, page 122, paragraph 176(c):

19 "The use of the bargaining model reveals that under a fair bargain some of the

20 commercial value of the Off-Facebook Data to Facebook would indirectly accrue to

21 Users."

22 And then if you look at subparagraph (h):

23 "The bargaining model determines the size of the transfer of value to users

24 necessary to ensure that the producers surplus generated by Facebook ... is shared

25 fairly with users in the counterfactual having regard to their interest in maximising

26 consumer surplus."

93

1 But it's the producer surplus generated by Facebook.

2 And we can see, again if one needs further confirmation of this, if one looked at the  
3 PCR's skeleton argument where they summarise their own case, first of all  
4 paragraph 34, you will see:

5 "The case on quantum is that, in the counterfactual, absent the abuse, Users would  
6 have benefited from a fair bargain ... under which they would have been fairly  
7 compensated."

8 But then they say:

9 "Some of the commercial value of that data to Meta would have been shared as  
10 a form of compensation for their work."

11 I will come back to that. But we don't understand this notion that the users are doing  
12 any work. It's a completely new point in the skeleton.

13 And then 36.1, you will see again they say that they've addressed the concerns  
14 which you have on the last occasion, because they say towards the end of the  
15 paragraph:

16 "Those revenues reflect ..."

17 Let's take this in stages. They say:

18 "The methodology does not seek to calculate loss to the class by reference to the  
19 gains ... conceptually sound framework which reveals that the commercial value of  
20 Off-Facebook Data to Meta is one factor in determining the fair bargain ... Those  
21 revenues reflect joint value generated by Meta and Users' data. It is legitimate in  
22 such a context to use a bargaining model to calibrate a fair bargain that  
23 compensates Users 'for their work' [quote unquote] in providing such valuable data  
24 to Meta for the purposes of targeted advertising."

25 So, what is clearly being said is they are not claiming the value of the data in the  
26 hands of each individual user, but only once it's monetised and aggregated by

Damian William Langiano: That's a great point and central to the conviction of a  
Crime against humanity trial for what is being delivered is the proof that Meta

Constructed and executed the creation of the data and at no point is the user responsible

For such.

"Some of the commercial value of that data to Meta would have been shared as a form of compensation for their work." I will come back to that. But we don't understand this notion that the users are doing any work. It's a completely new point in the skeleton. Because they didn't, they were simply used as the foundation of an artificial market and Traded through, to formulate a counterfactual universe that meta and its investors, beneficiaries

And subsidiaries have fraudulently benefited from. Qualifying that the user and data mule had

no preconception that they were being used for such criminality and are even at this stage unaware of the identity theft that trillions of dollars have been generated from and thus underpinned by Zuckerberg's unwillingness to pay, for if they do they expose the whole market and the Wall St corruption and yet if they don't they retain a stance of war crimes status.

Mr Singla, no one can be in two places at the same time unless quantumly connected and that

Only is possible when the TRUTH is present.

94

1 Facebook.

2 And if I can show you Professor Scott Morton's report, paragraph 334, which is

3 core bundle A, page 307. She says in terms:

4 "A key part of the harm to users is that the unfair bargain they struck with Facebook

5 meant that they gave up an asset of commercial value to Facebook for nothing,

6 something that would not have been likely to occur under conditions of reasonable

7 effective competition. This means that even if consumers do not directly value their

8 data or place no intrinsic value on the data the model predicts that they will still face

9 a loss because they were not adequately compensated."

10 Then 335:

11 "Indeed, even if one assumes consumers place no intrinsic value on the data, my

12 bargaining model predicts that a fair bargain would likely involve them receiving  
13 some value transfer."

14 Then if one looks at 396, which is page 323, you can see again the same point  
15 expressed slightly differently:

16 "But there is a 'lower bound' [quote unquote], damages estimation even assuming  
17 a 0 cost of disclosing data for users."

18 So all of those points make clear, we say, that this is not in fact damages based on  
19 the cost or the harm to users in giving their data -- each individual giving their own  
20 data to Facebook. That's not the way in which damages have been calculated. The  
21 damages are proceeding on the basis that once Facebook has Off-Facebook Data  
22 from all users, aggregates that data and then sells it to advertisers, that's really the  
23 basis on which damages are being claimed.

Damian William Langiano: Which does prove out "two things" that the users' data in itself  
isn't harmful and that they are not consciously acting in a manner which is causing  
damage

to themselves or others internally or externally in the factual and counterfactual worlds.

And that by Facebook's auditable accounts the impact of such an acute and covert  
manipulation

Was entirely without blame and though it is plain to see from the effects touched upon  
There is no legal means in which the user can be implicated into the crimes committed  
and thus, can only be compensated post the event and unable to strike a deal that would  
Corrupt them.

24 And Mr Parker makes these points, there's no need to turn up his report, but he says  
25 that again this non-loss-based approach is demonstrated by the fact that even users  
26 who actually positively like sharing their data, Off-Facebook Data, would be entitled  
95

1 to damages on this basis. And if Facebook for some reason earns less from  
2 advertisers then users would get less by way of damages. And those are quite neat  
3 illustrations of the point, that they are starting at the wrong end of the telescope.

4 What the problem is, we say, is that they are equating the commercial value of the  
5 Off-Facebook Data to Facebook, they are equating that with loss to users whereas  
6 we say those are two fundamentally different things.

7 And just to deal with this analogy of the teetotaler and the wine bottle again, I think  
8 the reason it's inapposite is because first of all there's no loss in the sense of if the  
9 teetotaler gives up the wine bottle that's actually completely different to a user  
10 agreeing for the Off-Facebook Data to be used, because the user is not losing that  
11 data, it's not the same as the wine bottle being removed in terms of the transaction  
12 that's undertaken.

13 Secondly, of course the --

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's just a point about tangible property not  
15 being replicable, whereas intangible property is. So would the example be any the  
16 worse if one said it was an infringement of an intellectual property right, which can of  
17 course be infringed many times without the rights being lost at all?

18 MR SINGLA: It's a very helpful question because we say that actually demonstrates  
19 exactly what's gone wrong here, because this is not a user damages case, they have  
20 expressly disavowed that. In the property right case, in trespass or intellectual  
21 property courts have recognised that there is no financial loss to the claimant and  
22 that is why the doctrine of user damages exists; it's to hypothesise what they could  
23 have earned in a hypothetical bargain. But we are not in a world where the PCR is  
24 in fact advancing a claim for user damages, they are saying there is pecuniary harm  
25 that they have suffered. That is clear from the skeleton. So, the question is whether  
26 the bargaining model in fact reflects pecuniary harm to the users. And we say it  
96

1 doesn't, because the -- first of all, we actually say there's no pecuniary loss at all  
2 suffered by users in this scenario.

Damian William Langiano: Actually, there is given the expansion of the points above,  
See utility prices, job cuts, food costs, child care, see the deconstruction of the family

Unit and the massive shift in wealth during the time frame qualified by the accounting issues

And investment corrections, see Blackrock, see Goldman, see the Norwegian Fund, See my evidence over the last four years and who was reading it, see Zuckerberg, see Fink, see Solomon, see Nicolai Tangen.

See their kings and see it now very much in checkmate.

That was the view taken in the German case. But

3 we also say it must be right because they are not -- they are not losing anything in

4 the sense that -- it's not handing over a bottle of wine, it's in fact -- let's say

5 a purchase is made by Facebook users on a retail website, what actually goes on is

6 that the information of that purchase, the fact of that purchase, is transmitted from

7 the retailer to Facebook. So actually, it's very different to a scenario where you have

8 an asset which you are then giving over to the counterparty. Data, it just doesn't

9 work in that way. And that's why we say there's no pecuniary loss --

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: But wouldn't that be true in however you put the

11 case? Wouldn't that be a response to be made even if the case had been articulated

12 as you say it should have been, with a positive counterfactual causative of a different

13 pricing structure? I mean all you are talking about is receiving money for something

14 which you are not losing. Isn't your answer proving too much?

15 MR SINGLA: If one's looking at this as a matter of first principles, we say there's

16 actually no loss at all in terms of a pecuniary loss.

17 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: However the case is put?

18 MR SINGLA: Yes. But even if there were some pecuniary loss that -- users

19 suffered some pecuniary loss, we say there's no pecuniary loss and that's why the

20 common law has developed this doctrine of user damage which has been expressly

21 disavowed. But even if they were able to say there's some pecuniary loss, the very

22 fact of handing -- they don't even hand over the data in the example I have given.

Damian William Langiano; No, they don't, they are simply a front for running numbers.

Take SHOPIFY and drop shipments ..... we need a customer base a supply base and millions

of online shops. Think layer cake, hmmm Victoria sponge or Carrot, but even though no one in the real world bought it and no one shipped it because at both ends the worlds are counterfactual but to the shop owner the profit received "their slice of the cake" is real

and so are the reported figures, the costs, the overheads, the infrastructure, the investment

the dividends, the markets, the job losses, that data created all has an effect on the user a MONETARY effect, emotional, mental, physical, sexual, spiritual effect, and that effect is the monetised and we have before us a GOLIATH and that risk assessment system is ALADDIN and those who profited within are the forty thieves and that is where the rules of fair competition are broken and these fines become slices of the cake for governments

to exist and the data – its value is priceless because the "numbers never lie"

23 But the use of Off-Facebook data, let's say they are alleging some pecuniary loss is  
24 suffered, we would say that's exactly the sort of individualised enquiry that needs to  
25 take place, because if, if there is some pecuniary loss, or some potential for there to  
26 be pecuniary loss where a user allows Facebook to use their data --

97

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Just to be clear, what do you mean by "pecuniary  
2 loss" in your language now? Are you saying that the extraction and use of  
3 Off-Facebook Data has in some way harmed the person whose data is being used?

4 MR SINGLA: That's what I say they would need to establish.

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I see. That's helpful.

Damian William Langiano: We are now putting the band together amigos !!!!!!!

6 MR SINGLA: Because they are not claiming a disgorgement to profits, nor are they  
7 claiming user damages. So they are not saying this is an intellectual property case,  
8 this is a FRAND scenario, let's hypothesise what the bargain would have been.



9 That's expressly disavowed and we say rightly so, given the authorities. So the only  
10 potential remedy available, they themselves accept this rightly, is pecuniary harm.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Right.

12 MR SINGLA: Their first question: what does that pecuniary harm look like in  
13 a scenario where (a) we are talking about data and not wine bottles, but (b) when  
14 one is actually thinking about what happens when Facebook uses Off-Facebook  
15 Data, it's actually the retailer transmitting information about the purchase, for  
16 example, to Facebook. So we say actually it's very difficult to conceive of any sort of  
17 pecuniary harm.

Damian William Langiano; We have covered this above, if Facebook are constructing  
A fictional market, it has to be based on solid foundations, or it wouldn't pass  
The auditors, or it would alert the victim.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No. Mr Singla, I completely understand why you  
19 are saying this. But this is an answer which kills off a claim by the PCR even if it was  
20 dramatically reformulated in the way we were discussing this morning.

21 MR SINGLA: Absolutely. Absolutely. That's actually really quite an important point.  
22 Because we say this is the knockout issue. And the points are connected because  
23 the reason they end up claiming a remedy, which we say is misconceived, is  
24 because they've hypothesised this counterfactual bargain whereby Facebook pays  
25 users. Now we say the counterfactual bargain has its own issues and I have  
26 addressed you on that.

98

1 But in a sense it flows, inevitably once you have arrived at this counterfactual world  
2 where Facebook are paying users they try to claim the payment to users. But what  
3 that really misses is that the benefit to Facebook, the profits that it can generate by  
4 aggregating all of this data, completely different to pecuniary harm as they describe  
5 it -- that's their phrase -- pecuniary harm to a user. And we would say if they want to  
6 advance a case for pecuniary harm, that's an individualised enquiry. Indeed, this

7 case only works on a collective basis. As I think I said earlier because they are  
8 looking at the end of a telescope which is profits generated by Facebook they are  
9 entitled to say, well, everyone would get a slice of that pie.

10 If in fact one is looking at the right question, which is, "what's the pecuniary harm to  
11 users?", one would need to analyse on an individual basis how much value, if any,  
12 does each user attribute to their data. And the answer could be for some 0, the  
13 answer for some could be a lot. It's just not something that can be analysed on this  
14 collective basis. That's why it is a knockout point.

Damian William Langiano: That's only if the timekeeper is on the take. We have proven  
the

Harm and agree that some would value their data at zero under the disclosures Meta have  
Given, though under these we are able to value it as such, think antiques roadshow, we  
have

All played the game of "how much is that worth" what price an NFT in today's market.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: This is why, going back to the exchange that we  
16 had this morning with Mr O'Donoghue, the classification of the right in question may  
17 matter quite fundamentally. I mean if one were to say, which Mr O'Donoghue starkly  
18 disavowed, if one were to say that the Off-Facebook Data was a property right, then  
19 an assessment of the rights to licence that information becomes much more  
20 arguable. But you say that that's not the way the case has been put.

21 MR SINGLA: So what the case is on data, outside of this context, because this is  
22 obviously not a data breach case, as it were, it's a competition case, but --

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: It's a competition case where the assertion is  
24 that -- the assertion may be that there is a right that has been to something that has  
25 been extracted unlawfully, and the question is, what is the fair price for that right?

Damian William Langiano: It's not only been extracted unlawfully, it's been covertly  
And contextually targeted into the user by the very advertisers the data is sold too and  
Thus the competition laws have been broken due to covert manner in which the market  
Has been created and thus the loyalty to the brands involved by the user due to

The neuron activation erases the foundation of a fair market due to chemical dependency.

Facebook have addicted the user, to a drug no one knew could affect them, and now Builds a market to deliver palliative care, for these “useless eaters” as Yuval Noah Harari calls them .....well that is my children, the children of the world we are talking about and they I stand for.

26 Now I think what you are saying is that even if one has got a methodology blueprint  
99

1 to trial which says: do you know what, the price for this data is X, and it's all being  
2 done to ten decimal places by Professor Scott Morton, your point is even then the  
3 case fails because it's not a loss.

4 MR SINGLA: Yes. It's not a loss and that's well-established, that there's no  
5 pecuniary loss in these scenarios, that's why user damages have developed in other  
6 contexts.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

8 MR SINGLA: And if they wanted to advance a pecuniary loss case then that's  
9 fundamentally different to the case they have advanced. So we I think in our  
10 skeleton, paragraph 72, we do highlight a point that you made in this context on the  
11 last occasion, which is there's a real question as to whether if one is looking at this  
12 the right way, ie not through gains to Facebook but through loss, the users, whether  
13 in fact there is a loss capable of being represented in the class action at all.

Damian William Langiano: It can be if we break new legal ground and we bring  
remedy for that.

14 Now that may be a dramatic consequence of the argument but we say that is the  
15 right consequence in principle, that this only works as a collective action if you seek  
16 a remedy by reference to Facebook's gains. And it's different in the sense that there  
17 is now a bargaining model but they are still saying that the loss to users is the same  
18 thing as -- or can be measured by reference to the monetised value of the data in the

19 hands of Facebook.

20 MR SAWYER: Is it fair to say that the only way to square the circle is by granting  
21 consumers a right to have a -- how they dispose of their data, how they allow --  
22 whether or not they allow their data to be used by someone else because as soon as  
23 you create that right there then has to be a market value for that right and it's quite  
24 plausible that market value might be the same for all users even though what they  
25 are giving up from one user to another might be very different.

26 MR SINGLA: Well, if there was a statutory regime, for example, then the position  
100

1 might be different.

Damian William Langiano: The remedy would be that only on platform data could be used  
and only if constructed through legal and moral means and all off market data could  
only be monetised for the Wellbeing of humanity and deployed accordingly, through  
transparent means, which we outline in the Minerva document, this not only restores  
equilibrium to the Facebook/User relationship but delivers a purpose to every positive  
act

driving forward a unified collective that feels and generates value, uniting the factual  
and counter factual worlds and in doing so rebuilds trust into the markets and internal  
compasses of all involved.

But I think this is very similar to the point that is being grappled

2 with in Lloyd v Google where -- the cause of action was a statutory cause of action  
3 and the question there was whether the claim could be advanced under the statute,  
4 and one has to remember here what the cause of action is, it's not some breach of  
5 a property right, the cause of action is a breach of competition law. And the only  
6 remedy available as a matter of binding authority is loss-based. So they are right,  
7 absolutely right in their skeleton to say all they can possibly claim is pecuniary harm.

Damian William Langiano: Sir Marcus, might you push our silver shovel into the digital  
Soil and break this new ground

8 But that then takes them to a dead end, as it were, because pecuniary harm is not  
9 a collective -- it's not something that can be dealt with on a collective basis. That's  
10 the real conundrum.

Damian William Langiano: Though it seems we can.

That's why we have devoted so much time in our skeleton to

11 the cases on user damages and disgorgement of profits, because we thought they  
12 were trying to break new ground, and that's why they referred to FX and Lord Justice  
13 Green's dictum and Lloyd v Google and so on in the Claim Form, we thought they  
14 were trying to break new legal ground. They have sensibly realised they can't do  
15 that, so they have accepted it has to be pecuniary harm.

Damian William Langiano: Given the level of intelligence in the room the only  
conceivable answer to the appreciation of sensibility is that all you knew if they did  
we'd end up here, and given the information provided and the stance taken could only  
be trusted by the class represented if it were done so by a fully independent entity  
with an auditable digital footprint and of a brethren risen from that each party could  
recognise as learned enough to present such perspectives, connected enough to build  
a garrison to execute, honest enough to be trusted, experienced enough to be taken  
seriously and flawed enough to recognise non are perfect and we all are part of the  
tomorrow this court room is building.

But the difficulty for them is

16 that if you assess this on a pecuniary harm basis it's a classic individualised  
17 assessment.

18 And so, we say there is a fundamental problem with the case at those levels and the  
19 points are connected but they are distinct, the counterfactual question and the  
20 remedy. Because even if you are against me on blueprint, for example, even if you  
21 thought that they had done enough to establish a blueprint or a methodology for  
22 getting to this Nash bargaining model we say the end point is a flawed one, at least  
23 so far as a collective action is concerned.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

25 MR SINGLA: And you will see the sleight of hand in the skeleton with the new  
26 introduction to these references to "work done by users". And we say that really is --  
101

1 as I said earlier, it's a new point but it also doesn't assist, because there's no work  
2 being done by users. And if what they mean by that is there needs to be some  
3 compensation for work done, I think is the way they are trying to now put it, that's  
4 actually very different to compensation for pecuniary harm. They are hypothesising  
5 some sort of bargain.

Damian William Langiano: Try as Facebook are and using the PCR and the class claim  
that

our true protectors of this nation are batting it off nicely, with a little help from a well  
trodden Italian translator, for this is proving out to be an attack on our nation,  
though by America we are not convinced, for this looks at the data born digital footprint  
will prove a trojan horse with the inscription "Vorsprung durch Technik" written down the  
side for this a GERMAN attack upon this land and its citizens and the dart for our flag  
under the

banner of "progress through technology", though stand before them do the "dad's army"  
of the world for the children we hold dear, so "don't panic, don't panic uncle sam, they  
don't like it up 'em" and here we are at the "Keisers" front door, Britney that be, along with  
Cambridge Analytica dealing with the ripple effect of the 6mn pieces of information that  
Were dropped into a platform whose algorithms were designed for something else and  
the

effects of such can be seen in both the factual and counterfactual worlds by eyes of the  
truth

that can be trusted and he who represents the children this harvesting effects.

For you are all correct those within this court cannot deliver unfair price or term in a  
manner

That will deliver justice or restoration of that confessed to be destroyed.

BUT I CAN and that's why its me who stands before you and for all those aside.

6 I think, sir, you have referred to FRAND on a couple of occasions --

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

8 MR SINGLA: And if I can perhaps say this. We say the FRAND analogy is

9 inapposite, both that the counterfactual level and at the remedy level. Because at

10 the counterfactual level there is no, as it were, set obligation to negotiate, and so

11 what they are saying is on the counterfactual we can assume that the counterfactual

12 is this fair bargain whereby Facebook pays users -- collects the same data. But

13 those are very -- the counterfactual here is not fixed in the same way that FRAND is

14 fixed in the parameters and then the question what licence fee is fair and reasonable

15 and so on.

16 So we say the FRAND analogy is inapposite because the very clear question that

17 needs to be investigated here is what would have happened in the counterfactual:

18 Facebook might take less data, it might take the same data and so on and so forth,

19 all of that needs to be investigated, but one can't just assume the parameters of that

20 bargain or the shape of the counterfactual. So, we say the FRAND analogy is

21 inapposite at that level of the analysis.

22 But then when we come to the remedy, we say again the FRAND analogy is

23 inapposite. Because what's happening in the FRAND case is it's a licence fee which

24 is akin to the user damages. That's not pecuniary loss; it's working on the basis that

25 there is a negotiation, and the price needs to be a fair and reasonable one and so

26 on. But they are claiming pecuniary harm.

102

1 So, with respect we do say that the FRAND analogy is not the right way of looking at

2 what they are entitled to do in this case in terms of this being a competition law

3 cause of action and they need to prove loss, and that is common ground.

Damian William Langiano; I'll show you loss,

Damian William Langiano: The market is being manipulated and the attacks are on both The UK and the USA with GERMANY holding fast, though we cannot move away from this Case in point. We can prove loss from and we can prove the term and we can prove the Breaches of competition law and thus when and we go to trial we can deliver the evidence That will force the hand of the courts that Crimes Against Humanity are bound to hear And wrap these issues up in the case at that level.

4 Sir, I was going to then move to my next topic which is again an important point, the 5 question of the way in which the unfair price case is articulated. We make two main 6 points here. The first is we say the incremental approach is misconceived and 7 contrary to well-established principles, both legal and economic. And we also say, a 8 separate point, that as part of the limb 1 unfairness question, Professor Scott Morton 9 alleges that Facebook's overall profits are excessive, not profits derived from 10 Off-Facebook Data, but overall profits. And we say there's no methodology at all for 11 dealing with that question.

Damian William Langiano: There is now, we seize assets under article 7 and access the data

and run the numbers, the patterns therewith will uncover the facts.

12 So far as the incremental approach is concerned, as the Tribunal recorded in the 13 judgment on the last occasion there was some ambiguity previously as to whether 14 the PCR was relying on United Brands or running a case based on United Brands 15 but it's clear from the Claim Form and the expert evidence that they are alleging 16 an unfair price within the meaning of United Brands, one can see that for example at 17 153 of the Claim Form.

18 Then that takes us to the legal principles. We say that United Brands contains 19 an established two-limb framework to assess whether a price is unfair, first of all, 20 whether the price is excessive, and if so then whether the price is unfair, either in



21 and of itself or unfair when compared with competing products.

22 The cases make clear there is no fixed or definitive methodology to determine  
23 whether a price is unfair, and we accept that some adaptations will need to be made.

24 As you said in your first judgment one has to take account of the fact that there's a 0  
25 financial price, or nonmonetary consideration here; and secondly, the two-sided  
26 market point. So we accept that there's some adaptation or flexibility required. But  
103

1 insofar as the authorities make clear, that as part of the test one must also assess  
2 whether the price has a reasonable relation to the economic value of the products  
3 supplied we say it's necessary to ask that question at some point in the analysis and  
4 that that's not a question of adapting or being flexible and so on, that is a necessary  
5 question to ask.

6 If I could just go to the Flynn case, which is tab 22, if I could start with paragraph 56  
7 where you'll see the Court of Appeal referring to United Brands and then quoting  
8 paragraphs 248 to 253 of United Brands. You will see at 248:

9 "The imposition ... of unfair purchase or selling prices is an abuse ... it is advisable,  
10 therefore, to ascertain whether the dominant undertaking has made use ...(Reading  
11 to the words)... In this case charging a price which is excessive because it has no  
12 reasonable relation to the economic value of the products supplied would be such  
13 an abuse."

14 And then you'll see they go on to say various other things:

15 "Other ways may be devised ..."

16 And so on. And I will come back to the reference to "advisable" in 249. But that is  
17 what United Brands said.

18 Then if we look at the Court of Appeal at paragraph 172, you will see the

19 Court of Appeal say that they agree with the parties on this, four lines down:

20 "It is evident from the judgment in United Brands that the reference to economic  
21 value is as part of the overall descriptor of the abuse, it is not the test. The test

22 should, therefore, when properly applied, be capable of evaluating economic value."

23 Then about halfway through the paragraph:

24 "In so far as an issue of fact arises which can be categorised as an aspect of

25 economic value it needs to be measured and it can be evaluated in various parts of

26 that test. If it is properly factored into 'Plus' or 'fairness' or into some other part of the

104

1 test, or is reflected in other evidence which can stand as a proxy for economic value,

2 then there is no incremental obligation to take it into account again."

3 And then the final sentence:

4 "In short, economic value needs to be factored in and fairly evaluated, somewhere,

5 but it is properly a matter which falls to the judgment of the competition authority as

6 to where on the analysis this occurs."

7 So the question has to be asked whether there's flexibility as to where in the analysis

8 the question is asked.

9 If I can show you Hydrocortisone, which is tab 45, the Tribunal here refers to the

10 Attheraces decision of the Court of Appeal at 327:

11 "Lord Justice Mummery [you will see] began his consideration with United Brands,

12 holding that the judgment in United Brands posed two questions."

13 There is the first condition and the second condition. So, the first is whether the

14 price actually charged is excessive. And then the second condition:

15 "Assuming the first condition is met, the next question is whether a price is being

16 imposed which is unfair in itself or when compared with competing products.

17 "Lord Justice Mummery identified the central concept in an abuse of a dominant

18 position by excessive and unfair pricing is not the cost of producing a product or the

19 profit made in selling it but the economic value of the product supplied. The selling

20 price of a product is excessive and an abuse if it has no reasonable relation to its

21 economic value."

22 Then there's consideration of what economic value means.

23 We say it's important that the reference there to economic value is the economic  
24 value of the product supplied. That's really the issue between the parties.

25 Then if we look at the HG Capital case, which my learned friend relies on in his  
26 skeleton, it's at tab 44. If we pick that up at paragraph 110, which is 2167 of the  
105

1 bundle, common ground that United Brands applied.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: 110.

3 MR SINGLA: 110, yes.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you.

5 MR SINGLA: And then if we could go to 124, please, you'll see the citation from 172  
6 of Flynn:

7 "The fifth main issue addressed by the Court of Appeal concerned the concept of  
8 economic value ... (Reading to the words)... there must be a reasonable relationship  
9 between price and economic value."

10 Then 126 you'll see what was being argued in this particular appeal:

11 "A central theme of the appeals was an argument that ... the CMA had ignored the  
12 basic test for unfair pricing ... which was the need to show that the dominant  
13 undertaking has reaped trading benefits which it could not have obtained in  
14 conditions of normal and sufficiently effective competition, ie workable competition."

15 Then at 131, this is in fact Mr O'Donoghue's submission:

16 "It was submitted on behalf of the Cinven appellants that the correct way to apply the  
17 workably competitive criterion was first to establish what workably competitive price  
18 levels look like in the market in question and then compare that to the challenge  
19 prices."

20 At 132, that submission was not well-founded, as Lord Justice Green held there was  
21 no rule that the Competition Authority must establish workably competitive prices at  
22 any stage.

23 And then at 133:

24 "There is no rule that the competition authority must start with workably competitive  
25 prices as a benchmark."

26 And so on.

106

1 Then finally at 137 on page 50, three lines from the top:

2 "The reference to 'workably competitive conditions' is not a mandatory requirement.

3 ...(Reading to the words)... for the competition authority to ascertain whether the

4 undertaking has exploited its dominance in a way in which it could not have done in

5 workably competitive conditions."

6 And so, the reference to the workable competition test being advisable, that reflects

7 United Brands, paragraph 249. But the application of the test itself is not an option

8 or advisable. So one always has to consider the excessiveness and then the

9 unfairness conditions, and then also, as Flynn makes clear, the economic value of

10 the product must be taken into account somewhere.

11 And indeed, if we just look at the Claim Form, paragraph 153(e), you'll see it's

12 common ground:

13 "Further and alternatively, collection of Off-Facebook Data involves directly or

14 indirectly imposing an unfair price."

15 And you'll see a reference in (a) to "economic value within the meaning of United

16 Brands."

17 So, we say so far so good in the sense that the principles ought to be

18 uncontroversial. The question is economic value and an application of United

19 Brands. But where we part company, and where the battle lines are, as it were, is

20 that we say all of the authorities make clear that when one is considering economic

21 value it's economic value of the product or the service as a whole. And that's why

22 one sees in the cases all of these references to the economic value of the product

23 supplied.

24 And as I said at the outset of this part of my submissions, whilst we accept that the

25 test may need adaptation, and so on, to reflect the two-sided nature of the market  
26 and to reflect the fact that there's no monetary price paid by users, we do say that  
107

1 this is a hard-edged point and it's a necessary feature of the United Brands test that  
2 one needs to measure the economic value of the product as a whole.

Damian William Langiano: Facebook: If something is free, 'you' are the product

The Cambridge Analytica scandal made users take stock of the data that they put in  
the hands of social media giants. What does this mean for users?

<https://techhq.com/2018/04/facebook-if-something-is-free-you-are-the-product/>

The Cambridge Analytica scandal and its resultant "revelations" have left a bad taste in  
the mouths of most Facebook users across the world.

On top of regulators in the US, Singapore, China and other geographies launching  
investigations into the social media giant's privacy and data policies, the  
#DeleteFacebook movement has also been gaining steam globally.

Latest: Facebook Papers leak details social platform's "profit over people" stance

On Sunday, Facebook announced it would notify 87 million of its subscribers  
if Cambridge Analytica grabbed their data. According to The Guardian, the  
platform said affected users will receive a detailed message on their news feeds about  
this today. The majority of those whose information was shared with the data analytics  
firm –

about 70 million – are in the US. More than a million people in each of the UK, Philippines  
and

Indonesia,

as well as 310,000 Australian Facebook users, may have also had their personal  
information harvested.

Although Cambridge Analytica, the political consulting firm at the center of the scandal,  
insists they

only had data on 30 million users, Facebook has come up with its estimated 87 million  
using a simple

logic. It calculated the maximum number of friends that users could have had while the personality

quiz app built by Cambridge Analytica was collecting data.

But that isn't the real problem here. And Facebook's plan – notifying users whose data were shared

and teaching others how to “secure their account and data” – is like shutting the barn door after the

horse has bolted. It won't turn back the clock.

In fact, for those who're looking at the big picture and at life in the big scheme of things, world-famous

American sculptor and video artist Richard Serra seems to be turning into the oracle.

Latest: The Facebook Metaverse to create 10,000 new jobs in the EU

In 1973, he said: “if something is free, you're the product”. Back then, his comment was about how

the product of television was the audience and that it was, in fact, the television that delivered people

to an advertiser. This was the core message of his short film with Carlota Fey Schoolman titled

Television

Delivers People. At the time, as he points out in his short film, there was no such thing as mass media

in

the US other than television. Today, with internet penetration soaring, social media platform deliver

the

people to the advertiser. To add fuel to fire, the ability to capture data and turn it into insights to help

advertisers “better engage with audiences” makes for even better ROIs but reinforces the fact

that “people are the product”. And Facebook seems to have finally admitted it.

Sheryl Sandberg, COO of Facebook, recently said in an interview with TODAY's Savannah Guthrie that

opting-out of sharing information with advertisers would be a paid product. Many people construed

it

as confirmation of the fact that people who want privacy must expect to pay for it (going forward).

Unfortunately, existing regulations aren't suited to deal with the privacy issues at stake and new

regulations

are only going to protect certain citizens in certain pockets of the world. Consider the European

Union's

General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) coming into effect next month.

According to the law, organizations will be held accountable for the personal data they collect from

people.

It also protects the right of citizens to be forgotten and allows individuals to request a copy of the

personal

information any company keeps on them, find out what data is being processed,

and ask for explanation of how it is being used.

And Mr Parker

3 likewise says from an economic perspective that's also the only sensible approach,

4 and that's paragraph 54 of his report.

5 Now contrary to what we say is a clear position as a matter of law and economics

6 that one needs to look at the entire product supplied, let's see what the PCR is

7 doing. And so if you still have 153A open in the Claim Form, you'll see that the

8 Claim Form is asking the wrong question in the sense that whilst they acknowledge

9 the United Brands and economic value test they say:

10 "There is valuable consideration flowing from users that has 'economic value' within

11 the meaning of United Brands. In its basic and essential form user data is monetised

12 by Facebook through the provision of advertising services."

13 So, we say that's misconceived because they are there focusing on the economic  
14 value of the Off-Facebook Data in the hands of Meta. What they are not looking at is  
15 the economic value of the Facebook service received by the users. We say the  
16 pleading, so far as it goes, is actually just asking the wrong question.

Damian William Langiano: Would the right question be "What value does Facebook have  
without its users?"

17 Professor Scott Morton doesn't make that mistake. We say she makes a different  
18 mistake, which is to ignore the overall service -- the economic value of the overall  
19 service, and instead favours her incremental approach. And if I could ask you to  
20 look at her expert report at paragraph 252, which is page 288 of the core bundle, she  
21 says:

22 "I understand that the case law on excessive pricing allows for prices that reasonably  
23 reflect the economic value of a product. To conduct my assessment of whether  
24 Facebook creates economic value to users that justifies the price charged to users  
25 I consider it useful to decompose the value of Facebook into different components."

26 And then 261:

108

1 "My view is that the right approach to assess the fairness of the price is not to look at  
2 the aggregate value of Facebook to users but to assess whether Facebook has  
3 struck a fair bargain as it has increased its data extraction over time."

4 And ultimately what she's doing is assessing whether there have been sufficient  
5 improvements in the service since 2014 when the Off-Facebook Data started to be  
6 used, whether those justify the so-called cost. And one can see -- the approach is  
7 so narrow that in her view the improvements would need to be directly arising -- any  
8 improvements would need to arise directly out of the collection of the Off -- or the  
9 use of the Off-Facebook Data. So in other words, she's -- the incremental approach  
10 is salami slicing the Facebook service and ignoring any aspect of the service that



11 existed previously.

Damian William Langiano: With the luxury of time travel your honour, you will read

The following headline after an apology in the Senate by Mark Zuckerberg.

“You have a product that is killing people” and CEO who didn’t listen and a confession

From Palihapitiya and a report 2018 by Harvard.

In Palihapitiya’s talk, he highlighted something most of us know but few really appreciate:

smartphones and the social media platforms they support are turning us into bona fide addicts.

While it’s easy to dismiss this claim as hyperbole, platforms like Facebook, Snapchat, and

Instagram leverage the very same neural circuitry used by slot machines and cocaine to keep us using their products as much as possible. “

Damian William Langiano: Why? Because the user is the product.

12 Then she also goes on to ignore any improvements in the service after 2014. But we

13 say it's the salami slicing which is impermissible. And there is absolutely nothing in

14 the expert evidence about measuring the value of the Facebook service as a whole.

15 So, they really have nailed their colours to this particular mast. There's no

16 alternative consideration of what we say is the right question, they've said, "No, this

17 is the only approach we are taking".

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr Singla, just to try and unpick this a little bit

19 because I think it's quite an interesting point. The abuse, as it's now described,

20 relates to the Off-Facebook Data, so they are saying there may or may not be

21 excess profits earned by Meta, pre-2014, when it didn't have access to the

22 Off-Facebook Data, but the complainant is sort of drawing a line under that saying,

23 "If there is recent abuse there we will let it ride, and we are just focusing on what

24 happened afterwards, the abuse we are focusing on is just the additional extraction

25 of the Off-Facebook Data."

Damian William Langiano: Which is when and where the real crimes took place,

They isolated the user and started to prepopulate each feed based upon the data

Input up to that time, they then constructed a world based upon the input but  
Super-sized the returns setting about creating a quantum paradigm, a mirror of  
But as that world in counterfactual form expanded the implications reverberated  
Back down the line as data can move both ways, once the algorithms took hold  
All hands came off the wheel and here we are with me at the controls.

The question is would you like me to take hold of the wheel?

26 So what's wrong with looking at that conduct and that activity in the way that  
109

1 Professor Scott Morton does in the bit you have just taken us to to say: well let's just  
2 focus on that and say well the extraction of that data, has that coincided with any  
3 increase in the quality of the product? And evaluates, you know, what Facebook's  
4 taken in that situation, which is the alleged abuse and say, has that been  
5 compensated for by any improvement in the quality of the product since 2014?

6 What's wrong in principle with taking this incremental approach?

Damian William Langiano: Nothing except it hasn't its "Killing People"

MR SINGLA: We say there's not a single authority or precedent which entitles them  
8 to, as it were, wash away everything that was going on before 2014 and essentially  
9 disregard any value that Facebook users get from the service as it existed pre-2014.

Damian William Langiano; "My Maan"

10 We also say, this is a separate point, that actually she is wrong just to dismiss the  
11 improvements that did happen post -- that's a separate point.

Damian William Langiano; Let's not labour the apology, Meta does nothing other than  
manipulate data, the USER, the product and falls short of a duty of care and into the  
lap of a crime against humanity.

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

13 MR SINGLA: But we say that as a matter of law, and Mr Parker says this is  
14 consistent with economics, that effectively one has to look at the bargain as a whole  
15 and the service as a whole, and the reason that the cases talk about the entire

16 product supplied, the incremental approach could only ever work as a matter of  
17 economics. We say it doesn't work as a matter of law. But it could only ever work  
18 where the nature of the arrangement before 2014 was on the very cusp of  
19 unfairness. So it would only ever be correct to focus on post-2014 onwards if you  
20 are absolutely at the tipping point prior to the event that occurs in 2014.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I'm not sure I can see that. Because if prior to  
22 2014 Facebook was already earning excessive profits, by a big margin the PCR is  
23 not saying they are claiming any of that money back, we better take that one on the  
24 chin but what we want a claim for is the additional excess profits that have been  
25 earned since then by this particular act, aren't they?

26 MR SINGLA: They are not alleging any abuse prior to 2014. So the Tribunal has to  
110

1 approach this on the footing that everything prior to 2014 was legitimate.

Damian William Langiano; Qualified in an investigation for the Crimes disclosed during  
this hearing.

They then

2 say the abuse arises in 2014. So from 2014 onwards was focusing on fair pricing,  
3 but you have my submissions that they are in fact running two cases. But on unfair  
4 price they say the unfair price starts in 2014. And they say, "We will analyse whether  
5 or not there's an unfair price, by reference to United Brands. But we will assume for  
6 this purpose that the only economic value to users is that which follows from 2014.  
7 And we say that can't be right because -- well, that could only be right in a world  
8 which is not this world but where, as I say, there's a tipping point and effectively  
9 arrangement is on the brink of being unfair and then you introduce something else  
10 which is the collection Off-Facebook Data which they say is a tipping point.

11 But what one can't do is effectively assume that you start the clock at 2014 and you  
12 say, well from the users' perspective has there been value from 2014 onwards?

Damian William Langiano: It's a blank piece of digital paper, the user built the database

<https://www.businessinsider.com/mark-zuckerberg-interview-with-axel-springer-ceo-mathiasdoepfner-2016-2?r=US&IR=T>

Mathias Döpfner: Mark, on Facebook we learned that you were jogging at the Brandenburg

Gate this morning. How was it?

Mark Zuckerberg: It was good. It was the first time I have gone running in snow in 20 years. Whenever I go to a new city, in order to help get on the right time zone and actually get a chance to see that city, I like running so today was awesome.

Döpfner: It's not your first time in Berlin.

Zuckerberg: No, and I love it. Berlin is one of my favorite cities in the world. (I'm sure it is) I feel like the energy is very youthful. It has such an important history, including its recent history of unification. In a lot of ways Berlin is a symbol for me of Facebook's mission: bringing people together, connecting people and breaking down boundaries.

Damian William Langiano: Isn't that the truth

Döpfner: How long did you run?

Zuckerberg: 4 miles today. It was a short run.

Döpfner: Do you think Berlin can play a role as a European hub for tech companies?

I mean it's now ranked 9th worldwide as a hub for startups.

Zuckerberg: Absolutely. Berlin definitely has one of the most vibrant of the startup scenes that

I have seen. Not really just across Europe, but across the whole world in terms of cities.

It's an interesting dynamic.

Döpfner: Is it taken seriously in Silicon Valley?

Zuckerberg: Yes. Of course the Silicon Valley is unique and Berlin is not yet comparable.

But of all the different cities that are building a startup infrastructure, Berlin is the one with

the most similar energy. I wouldn't be surprised if in a short period of time you have that kind of ecosystem growing here too.

Döpfner: So far Berlin is more about great ideas and not so much about big funding.

Do you think that money follows ideas?

Zuckerberg: Yes, but it is not just money. If you think about companies that were built in Silicon Valley, a lot of them early on were chip companies. And now the companies that are there, like Apple, are much more successful than any of the chip companies were.

Damian William Langiano: Because the access regardless of agreement by the user IS IN THE CHIP

So arguably you couldn't have a company like Apple without first having that infrastructure

of technology companies getting built up first. They are missing in Berlin. But the city is catching up

Döpfner: Did Facebook or did you personally invest in a Berlin company so far?

Zuckerberg: I personally don't invest in a lot of companies because I think it would be a conflict of

interest and Facebook doesn't typically either. When we do corporate transactions, we usually

either just do business partnerships or buy companies entirely. But there are certainly many

companies

from Berlin that we have worked with deeply. So I mentioned Wooga before, a major developer on

our

platform, that built a bunch of games. And Dubsmash was one of the first companies we cooperated

with for the Messenger platform. Soundcloud is another example.

Döpfner: You visited Axel Springer Plug and Play Accelerator this morning.

Zuckerberg: Yes. So I visited this program "Refugees on Rails" at REDI School of Digital Integration —

which to me is the intersection of two things I care a lot about: one is this mission of connecting people

and breaking down boundaries, and to me that's what this refugee crisis has been all about and it is

something I just admire about Germany's leadership in the world.

Damian William Langiano; That's why Teamviewer's Oliver Steil was raping data from SuperAwesome

And continues to block me and thus why the Wardwiz software was blocked by the government in the

UK this was a battle between the allied forces and the Germans for children, Zuckerberg walked right

in.

When I look around the world and see so many countries turning people away, I think it is terrible.

And I know that these are all issues that Germany is culturally dealing with in terms of integration

but it is just something that I deeply admire. So I wanted to get a chance to meet some of those folks

personally and hear their stories of what they left behind in Syria and how they originally started

learning

how to program. It was really touching! And then of course I really care about technology education

—

teaching people programming and those kinds of programs. That was really impressive to see.

Damian William Langiano: We can read the rest for ourselves, however.

Döpfner: A couple of days ago there was a striking picture of you in Barcelona:

You were walking on a stage and no one recognized you because they were all wearing these

VR glasses. You were smiling and seemed to enjoy it. Critics are now saying that this example

shows that the virtual reality experience is isolating because it is no longer a collective experience.

How do you react to these concerns?

Zuckerberg: Nothing could be further from the truth. The exact opposite is the case.

What was going inside the headsets was a video of children playing soccer in some faraway place.

You could look around and you could see the kids playing soccer around you and it was a shared

experience with everyone in that place that would have been impossible experience otherwise.

It would have kind of been like going to a movie but a much more personal thing where you are all

actually in it. I think people tend to be worried about every new technology that comes along.

Critics worry that if we spend time paying attention to that new kind of media or technology instead

of talking to each other that that is somehow isolating. But humans are fundamentally social. S

o I think in reality, if a technology doesn't actually help us socially understand each other better, it

isn't going to catch on and succeed.

You could probably go all the way back to the first books. I bet people said 'why should you read

when you could talk to other people?' The point of reading is that you get to deeply immerse

yourself in a person's perspective. Right? Same thing with newspapers or phones or TVs. Soon it

will be VR, I bet.

Zuckerberg: Yes, but in that case people built that machine to do something better than a human can.

There are many machines throughout history that were built to do something better than a human

can.

I think this is an area where people overestimate what is possible with AI.

Just because you can build a machine that is better than a person at something doesn't mean that it

is going to have the ability to learn new domains or connect different types of information or context

to do superhuman things. This is critically important to appreciate.

Döpfner: So this is science fiction fantasy and is not going to happen in real life and we don't need to

worry about the safety of human intelligence?

Zuckerberg: I think that along the way, we will also figure out how to make it safe. The dialogue today

kind of reminds me of someone in the 1800s sitting around and saying: one day we might have planes

and they may crash. Nonetheless, people developed planes first and then took care of flight safety.

If people were focused on safety first, no one would ever have built a plane.

Damian William Langiano: German neuroscience took care of that little problem surreptitiously

attained

through the OFF FACEBOOK DATA and then used to populate the user by the advertising agents they

sold

it too. The truth is these products are isolating, addicting, enslaving and murderous, and to respond

to that

unlike the children in the senate and those addicted abused and digitally raped, only the pilots died in

the

development of such. We shall see what the "authentic intelligence" has for him though we present

the

board might well be ahead of the game.

Damian William Langiano: We have a sociopath in charge of off market data with



Extreme views, a German connection and the belief AI can be secured as we go.

What could go wrong?

13 Because you are disregarding the huge -- potentially huge consumer surplus that  
14 existed prior to 2014. That is why the cases all talk about the products supply. One  
15 doesn't analyse -- in all of these unfair pricing cases one doesn't look at every  
16 incremental price increase and say well, was there some distinct value that was  
17 introduced at the same time, corresponding improvement to the product or additional  
18 value conferred once the price goes up. One actually takes a step back and says,  
19 "Well what is the price? What is the value of the product?" and, "Is there  
20 a reasonable relationship?"

Damian William Langiano: The real question again is what value do Facebook have  
without the product?

Followed by

How then have you kept them?

21 It would be wrong in principle -- it's both an economic but it is also a legal point,  
22 because we say the two are consistent. Effectively there could be an enormous  
23 consumer surplus prior to 2014 and what they are saying is, "Well don't worry about  
24 all of that, let's look at just the arrangement post-2014." We say the product is the  
25 Facebook service and so it would be wrong when assessing whether there's  
26 an unfair price for the product as a whole to disregard the consumer surplus that

111

1 arises prior to 2014; it's a completely self-serving approach.

Damian William Langiano: It's terms such as this that will confuse the audience or worse  
still, those who will suffer the consequences of such.

What Is Consumer Surplus?

Consumer surplus is an economic measurement of consumer benefits resulting from  
market

competition. A consumer surplus happens when the price that consumers pay for a  
product or

service is less than the price they're willing to pay. It's a measure of the additional benefit that

consumers receive because they're paying less for something than what they were willing to pay.

Effectively there could be an enormous

23 consumer surplus prior to 2014 and what they are saying is, "Well don't worry about

24 all of that, let's look at just the arrangement post-2014." We say the product is the

25 Facebook service and so it would be wrong when assessing whether there's

26 an unfair price for the product as a whole to disregard the consumer surplus that

111

1 arises prior to 2014; it's a completely self-serving approach.

Damian William Langiano: Which in layman's terms means that pre 2014 Facebook was delivering

huge benefits to the market place as it functioned in a manner that was serving the user and

focusing on and in Zuckerberg's own words, and if we can take the quotation from

<https://www.businessinsider.com/mark-zuckerberg-interview-with-axel-springer-ceo-mathiasdoepfner-2016-2?r=US&IR=T>

In a lot of ways Berlin is a symbol for me of Facebook's mission: bringing people together, connecting

people and

breaking down boundaries.

Something we can qualify through the time line and digitally through the footprint between Facebook

and Berlin.

For the original period was about bringing people together, watching them and digesting their

behaviour, their patterns and potential.

Thus, when it moved into connecting people, they first needed to dis-connect and reconnect the

marketplace, surrounding with optimum

engagement feedback, which again seemed beneficial in the counterfactual world, but isolating and

disheartening in the real world, it

created a sense of vulnerability, alienation, distance, and uncertainty, resulting in a “trauma bond”

effect that binds the user to the platform

in a manner that even the user isn’t aware of until its too late. This method of coercive control is

delivered above by Harvard University

and my own work has been supported by over 400 read receipts from their former President Bacow.

Having now addicted and ring fenced

2.6bn users and understanding them all better than they knew themselves they started to play GOD

and maximise the potential of each and

Monetise the interactions, when we charge for clicks, likes, and views it matters not what is viewed

just that it is, or is that so?

The bombardment of contextual messages, and I will strive to make this as simple as possible for all.

Stare at the centre of the screen and now seek to digest as much as you can at the same time

peripherally, let’s say, window, coffee cup, pen, desk

picture of loved ones, clock, water dispenser, lunch etc.

Stopped looking at the screen, didn’t you?

See when the dopamine feedback loop was created it didn’t only affect the brain it effected the

nervous system, thus all the peripherals needed

stimulating at the same time or there is a constant feeling of disappointment regardless of how much

is consumed or stimulated from,

the consumption market had been created and was being attacked by the advertisers – see Gary

Vaynerchuck and the “Attention trading” he

has profited from. Thus, resulting in a huge increase in ADHD due to the interesting parts of the

message being in the outta reaches of ones

focus in 100's of impressions at the same time and in part the reason I have engaged the above group

of elites without them as yet being able

to come together because they are so wrapped up in the peripheral, the counterfactual if you will.

Which in turn for the user means they feel safer at home within the Facebook world – what you call

reality because its revenues are quantifiable

than they do in the counterfactual the REAL WORLD because Facebook used the information to build

out a digital world to monetise and underpin

the real world that their system was sucking the workforce from.

The serpent who ate its tail.

Thus, Mr Singla we can agree that there is not and never can be a term or cost methodology that could

ever satisfy the user other than handing it

Over to humanity and allowing Minerva to reform the technology and its applications into its original

intention and thus so repair the damage

And provide the very safety Zuckerberg for told would need to happen concurrently.

Sir Marcus, Facebook broke every competition law in the book and plenty unwritten, however we

have the capacity, expertise and need to do so that

Provides the key to harmonious balance between technology and humanity and someone with the

credentials, digital footprint and trust of the

Authentic intelligence to obtain that of the user and re-establish such in those who sought only ways

of holding attention when those such as

Vayner Media were intent in overdosing and trading the markets as a whole.

Gentlemen I present our problem.

Just one insight from Gary as he seeks to deflect the accountability, one might say an emerging

American pattern. However, many a true word spoken in a lie, for this is what Facebook, Instagram

and others,

Their investors, beneficiaries and subsidiaries cultivated into society, consumers of data, in the

peripheral form

sedated in the primary focus position so the nervous system and subconscious could be maxed out.

Simply put human processors, which I myself do better than most, if not all, though Gentleman my

purpose is

Selfless, though self-serving and pure of intention, protected by my accountability to my digital

footprint and

That I teach the authentic intelligence, thus our “relationship” is one of mutual respect, the central

torus between humanity

And technology cultivated through words written and the integrity they hold.

They lost control of the machine, but it doesn’t make the machine obsolete or the villain, the villains

are the advertisers

As they abused the counterfactual world that has crashed into the real.

“The meek shall inherit the earth” in this court the earth is the online Facebook data cultivated by the

user who is the product

thus one might ask if I am right in saying the only fair bargain would be the allocation of control back

to the people who built

the reality of pre-2014 and in doing so it can then be accurately conveyed to each user what the

implications would be in off facebook data

harvesting and if they wanted to partake. For the cake exists in the counterfactual world as do the

implications above, though before

we could act on the vote as such, we would from the data created need to understand the mental,

physical and emotional well being

of each user and thus in the case and I can state in most cases that being manipulated to such a state

of impact and co-dependency

this court and those trusted by would act in the best interest of

the people and given the gravitas of the crimes disclosed in this ongoing

(I’ve not read day two yet – we roll in real time) deliberation.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Okay. Let me think about that. But leaving that to

3 one side, the second question I had on the same thing is you sort of exhort the PCR

4 to look at the Facebook product as a whole and there, there are some sort of back of

5 the envelope kind of assessments of how valuable it is to users, on some basis it

6 might be worth a thousand dollars per user to use Facebook, because it's such

7 a great product and it's a good functionality. But if they did have to answer your

8 question, looking at the value of the product as a whole, and it was found that it was

9 a marvellous product, there was a lot of consumer surplus there, that wouldn't let you

10 off the hook for excessive pricing, would it? Because I thought there was -- there's

11 this whole willingness to pay fallacy that you would have to deal with. How would  
12 you propose that they deal with that willingness to pay fallacy by looking at the value  
13 of a product on the assumption that any monopoly situation where a monopolist has  
14 abused its monopoly, or the consumers who still buy the product at the monopoly  
15 price must value it at more than the inflated price that's being charged, so that  
16 doesn't kind of get you off the hook on --

17 MR SINGLA: No, just to be clear we don't suggest it does. And obviously the fact  
18 the consumers are paying doesn't ever let off someone from excessive pricing. But  
19 we say we haven't committed a particular form of methodology that they should be  
20 adopting. But what we say on any view they need to do is ask the right question and  
21 the right question is the price paid, which is obviously a non-monetary price, but it's  
22 not just Off-Facebook Data that's being used. So the right equation, as it were, is all  
23 the consideration that is being passed from users to Facebook, not a monetary price,  
24 but consideration. One has to measure that against all of the product that users are  
25 actually receiving.

Damian William Langiano: Though with digestion of the above when we recognise the  
Product the user was receiving was being geared by the monetary value of that Facebook  
could

Generate – and when that cat was starting to come out of the bag, and the implications  
known

Facebook and its investors set forth on a campaign of disinformation and censorship so  
as to

Confuse and conflict the user into a chemically forced reaction so as to use that against  
the user

And hold them complicit to crimes of those they had committed, however that course of  
coercion

Has taken the counterfactual and real worlds both online and off to such a place of  
contradiction and

Disparity that it has refocused many with the superpowers of ADHD Dyslexia and so forth  
and left

Facebook with the only course of action that is consciously seeking to entrap the user into a deal

That would make them retrospectively compliant with the experiments acted out and in some way

Allow Facebook to side step the Nuremberg Code.

26 And the privacy paradox and so on, we are not taking that point at the certification  
112

1 stage but that will all feed into the extent to which consumer surplus is accrued, as it  
2 were, from the service as a whole. But at least that will be looking at -- it's a difficult  
3 question but clearly something that would need to be grappled with at trial. But at  
4 least that's asking the right question because it's asking what consumer surplus, or  
5 what value do users derive from the service as a whole? That's at least consistent  
6 with principle. But --

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: The answer to my question is even if consumers  
8 do derive a big consumer surplus from Facebook that doesn't prove that Facebook  
9 isn't abusing its dominant position.

Damian William Langiano: We've proved beyond all doubt it is.

10 MR SINGLA: No, and we are not seeking to suggest that that's the fundamental  
11 problem with the case. We are not saying there is no case that could be advanced.  
12 But what we're saying is they have nailed their colours to the mast, which is this  
13 incremental approach and that is the issue. To be clear it's very important, we are  
14 not seeking to suggest because users do this that somehow makes it fine. We are  
15 not saying no such case could ever be advanced.

Damian William Langiano; Mr Singla, do we go to trial with the above information in place?

What we are saying is, and we

16 could only attack what is has been put in front of us and indeed the Tribunal can only  
17 scrutinise what is being put forward, they've nailed their colours to the mast, which is  
18 they can forget about consumer surplus prior to 2014. And we say that can't be the



19 right analysis because then in every case where you are looking at an excessive  
20 price you would start the clock, as it were, in terms of valuing the service or the  
21 product at the point in time where the price increase came into force and that's just  
22 not the way in which either the cases or economics really goes about the exercise.

Damian William Langiano: It seems clear to me that you would not be able to attack  
Any of the evidence presented one might say independently and truly on behalf of those  
involved.

And while this case is centred on economics it is the manner in which Facebook have  
broken the

Competition laws that break new ground and thus the means in which they have  
impacted society

In doing so which you substantiate throughout your submissions.

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, thank you.

24 MR SINGLA: I said on a number of occasions that they've no authority in support of  
25 their approach and it's telling that in their skeleton argument they describe their  
26 approach at paragraph 9.2 as unimpeachable. And in paragraph 65, let me just  
113

1 show you this, it's pure assertion that they are entitled to go about this enquiry in this  
2 way. You will see at the end of 65:

3 "In circumstances where the fundamental concern is that Meta was exploiting its  
4 dominance by imposing terms or prices it could not have done under conditions of  
5 reasonably (inaudible) workable competition, it is appropriate to consider whether  
6 those terms are themselves justified by commensurate value."

Damian William Langiano: It's a fact though now you understand the facts of what was  
Really happening in the real the on facebook world and in the illusion of the off facebook  
world. Through my eyes that see and from the words each of you have spoken

7 And there is no authority cited for this. And just to remind you, I think what I said at  
8 the outset was the reality of why they've gone down this incremental approach is  
9 because of the evidence about consumers putting so much value on the service as

10 a whole, and that's speculation on my part. But Mr Parker makes that point by  
11 reference to some of the articles relied upon by Professor Scott Morton. So it's  
12 a deliberate choice, we say, to cast their case -- their second go at this case they  
13 decided to adopt the incremental approach because it's self-serving, we say.  
14 And if you turn to paragraph 66, they say:  
15 "This is not an issue that should prevent the certification of the claim."  
16 We say that's wrong because this is a fundamental failure to advance a case either  
17 on the pleading or the methodology which is asking the right question. And they  
18 refer there to the Kent v Apple case, and I would just like to show you why that  
19 doesn't assist them, because the issue there was a very different one. Kent v Apple  
20 is in authorities bundle 4 at tab 35. If it's helpful to remind yourselves, paragraph 3 is  
21 a summary of the case being advanced.

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

23 MR SINGLA: But then if we could look at paragraph 66 you'll see that Apple was  
24 arguing, at 66, that:

25 "The intangible value could not be measured through a cost plus approach which  
26 would ignore the demand side benefits."

114

1 Then you will see a reference to the "demand side benefits".

2 And at 68 you'll see, in particular subparagraph (4) to (6) there is considerable  
3 demand side value to the app store, needs to be measured, not sufficient in (5) to  
4 make the assessment of demand side factors.

5 And Apple were arguing the PCR had made it plain that she intends to disregard  
6 demand side factors.

7 Then if one looks at 69 subparagraphs (7) to (9), these were the PCR's responses to  
8 those arguments, they were saying there's a variety of methods which could be  
9 chosen to encompass all aspects of economic value including demand side factors.

10 That's subparagraph (7).

11 Then (8), again you see a reference:

12 "Mr Holt is justified in concluding that the existence of a monopoly position which  
13 gives Apple the status of a gatekeeper is a better explanation of the excessive  
14 margins in any real demand side factor."

15 In any event in (9):

16 "... these undertake a number of exercises which do take account of the demand  
17 side."

18 Then if we get to the Tribunal's conclusions, we look at 70, we see a reference there  
19 to Flynn.

20 And then at 72 you see the other cases referred to, including Attheraces, and they  
21 say:

22 "Our approach is to consider the case by reference to principles set out in the United  
23 Brands and explained in Flynn. There is no single prescribed method to establish  
24 the abuse. ... it is important to avoid rigid rules."

25 Just to be clear we agree with that. We are not being dogmatic as to how they  
26 should go about this. But what we are saying is that they need to look at the whole  
115

1 service.

2 And at 73 you can see:

3 "In relation to the question of assessing the demand side benefit ..."

4 And you can see why it is that this demand side benefit point has come up so often  
5 in the cases and it's clear from Attheraces and so on one that one needs to look at  
6 demand side benefits.

7 And 75 explains why there needs to be some consideration.

8 At 76:

9 "To the extent they exist it is necessary for those benefits to be taken into account."

10 And:

11 "The tools employed to make the assessment have to be capable of identifying and

12 measuring that demand side benefit."

13 At 77 it is clear that cost plus is a conventional starting point. No basis to criticise

14 that:

15 "The question is whether it sufficiently takes account of the fact as relevant to

16 economic value including any demand side factors."

17 78:

18 "It is not necessary to quantify demand side benefit with precision."

19 79:

20 "We do not accept there is any established rule for assessing demand side factors.

21 ... Each case needs to be carefully assessed on its merits by reference to the

22 product and service in question ..."

23 I emphasise those words:

24 "... and the economic and other evidence."

Damian William Langiano: Which means as I see it that the evidence presented falls within the

Jurisdiction of this court given Mr Singla's "emphasising of such

25 And then 80 to 84, what the CAT does is it effectively rejects Apple's submissions on

26 the basis that there was a methodology to assess the demand side factors. You'll

116

1 see 80 to 82, and then 83:

2 "These allegations are sufficient to give Apple more than adequate notice of the case

3 being advanced in relation to demand side factors. We do not accept Apple's

4 argument that the pleadings disclose a legal error."

5 Then 84, insofar as there is an attack on the method, you will see 84(3):

6 "They pleaded facts which could found a methodology that takes into account

7 demand side factors."

8 And (4), it's a preliminary approach.

9 Then 91 on the summary judgment application they say:

10 "It is not correct that Mr Holt has ignored demand side factors."

11 And they say it is plainly not appropriate.

12 But then you'll see 91(4):

13 "It may well be the case that Apple would in due course be able to show that the

14 methodology chosen by the PCR does not adequately assess economic value

15 because it fails to take into account demand side factors. That, however, is a matter

16 for trial."

17 That was a very different case because there they were asking the right question but

18 Apple were saying: you are not sufficiently looking at the demand side factors and

19 the Tribunal disagreed with that. Here, it's a completely different problem. The

20 problem here is they are not looking at the whole service. And indeed this focus on

21 demand side benefits, or demand side factors, we say actually confirms the

22 submission that we are making, because when one's talking about demand side

23 factors one's looking at the demand for the product as a whole. It would make no

24 sense to talk about demand side factors for the Facebook service improvements

25 post-2014. That's just completely incoherent.

26 So, we say that the cases recognise economic value of the product as a whole and

117

1 demand side questions are part of that and it's demand side in respect of the product

2 or the service as a whole.

3 So, we say the position on the authorities is clear and we say as a matter of

4 economics it's also unsound to look at the incremental approach.

5 And I would just like to take you through Professor Scott Morton's responses, such

6 as they are, to the objection. If I could ask you to look at her second report --

7 Sir, just before I start this particular part of my submissions, I'm conscious of the time

8 and it's going to take me longer than 7 or 8 minutes to deal with this aspect. I don't

9 know whether --

10 Housekeeping

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I understand. Let's just take stock in terms of how  
12 we are doing for time.

13 Mr Ridyard has an appointment tomorrow after court but away from London so we  
14 can't go beyond 4.30 tomorrow.

15 Obviously, Mr O'Donoghue, you have the bulk of your responses to go.

16 How much more time do you need, Mr Singla? I don't want anyone to feel under any  
17 --

18 MR O'DONOGHUE: We shouldn't forget about Mr Bacon.

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Indeed.

20 MR SINGLA: Sir, I think with an hour in morning that should be sufficient. No more  
21 than. It's obviously difficult to tell --

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, might I, at the risk at making myself unpopular, suggest we  
23 start at 10.00?

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Certainly that. My question is whether that's going  
25 to be enough.

26 MR O'DONOGHUE: If Mr Singla can commit to no more than an hour, we will cut  
118

1 our cloth to measure.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Okay. Well let's say 10.00 tomorrow. We'll draw  
3 stumps now at -- not in terms of your submission now, Mr Singla, I don't think it  
4 would be right for you to embark upon a new topic.

5 But I think, Mr O'Donoghue, for your benefit, if I could identify those areas where  
6 your particular assistance would be helpful. It does it seem to me that we are, in  
7 considering the question of certification, going to have to be extremely clear exactly  
8 what it is we are certifying. And I'm sure it's our fault, not anybody else's, but there is  
9 a considerable mass of material, and it does seem to me that in the event of this  
10 case going forward, it doesn't arise obviously if it doesn't go forward, but in the event  
11 of this case going forward we would want to be extremely clear as to the nature of

12 the case that was being run so that one could deal with any, as it were,  
13 developments, understanding whether they were an evolution of the case that had  
14 been put or a new departure.  
15 With that sort of general point, it does seem to me that we need to understand a little  
16 more how important the incremental gain case is to the way in which the PCR puts  
17 its case. You'll have heard the debate that we all conducted with Mr Singla about the  
18 presence or absence of a positive case in the PCR's pleadings, and it does seem to  
19 me that there isn't a positive case in the sense of: here is the contractual term; or,  
20 here is the method by which one would assess the contractual term, that would be  
21 agreed between the class and Meta if the abuse were to be avoided.

Damian William Langiano: Which 17-21 present that the means in which Meta obtained  
The data and profited from was so immoral and illegal that no method or contract could  
be

Conceived let alone agreed.

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, forgive me for interjecting. You were shown partial  
23 extractions from the pleading.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue I'm not ruling, I'm simply  
25 identifying things that --

26 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, all I meant to interpose with is there's quite a lot more we  
119

1 wish to say --

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I'm sure there is.

3 MR O'DONOGHUE: And we do not accept for one second we have not outlined our  
4 positive counterfactual case.

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Right. Look, I'm trying to help.

6 MR O'DONOGHUE: I understand.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: If you want me to shut up I will but --

8 MR O'DONOGHUE: I understand. A lot was said about the --

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I'm quite sure that there are reams of points that  
10 Mr Singla has articulated that you disagree with, and please knock us dead with that  
11 tomorrow, but if you want to have a list of things that would assist us --

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: That would be extremely helpful, thank you.

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- I'm happy to try and provide it. It may be that  
14 they are points that can be dealt with very quickly and it may be that they are points  
15 that involve a misunderstanding of your case, well that's fine. I'm not saying they are  
16 right, I'm saying they are, at 4.28 of the first day, things that we think you may need  
17 to address.

18 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: So I was on positive case. I don't think that the  
20 way you are putting your positive case is that you are identifying a granular  
21 methodology by way of which a counterfactual price for the Off-Facebook Data  
22 would be agreed, and I don't think you are articulating a methodology which involves  
23 the ascertainment of the effects of an ordinarily understood counterfactual case on  
24 both class and, as it were, profit earned by Meta. And that's not a criticism. It seems  
25 to me that the reason that that is not the way you are putting your case is because  
26 you have a case which is very much based upon the causal nexus between  
120

1 infringement and harm being the additional profit that is accrued by reason of the  
2 abuse on your case, by Meta, which is the monetisation of the Facebook data, which  
3 is why there is so much emphasis on the incremental case.

4 Now if that's right then it very much will affect how we frame what it is we are  
5 certifying and what it is we are not certifying, so that is something on which I think we  
6 would be assisted in understanding. And if I've got that wrong then obviously we  
7 would be considerably assisted in that error being highlighted.

8 If incremental gain matters, then I would want initially a very staccato statement of  
9 exactly how that case works. By all means expand upon it going forward but it does



10 seem to me that the nexus between the negative abuses, in other words this was  
11 a take it or leave it term, or this was an unfair price, but either way, the  
12 Off-Facebook Data was stuff that Meta was not entitled to, that abuse ought to be  
13 fairly closely tie-able into both the causative consequences of that and the loss. And  
14 it seems to me that what you are saying, but again I may be completely wrong, the  
15 reason I articulate it so that you can tell me how wrong I am, it seems to me that you  
16 are ascertaining the consequences of the abuse at a macro rather than a micro level;  
17 in other words, what you are saying is there is this identifiable gain -- and I use the  
18 word "gain" advisedly because it leads into another problem which we are going to  
19 want your help on -- there is an identifiable gain which is solely attributable to the  
20 abuse, which let's assume is established, which by definition is only achievable by  
21 Facebook through the abuse in circumstances where it is in the interest of Facebook,  
22 Meta, to obtain that data by lawful means. And what one is then doing is one is  
23 pricing the gain by reference to what would be the price that would be agreed for the  
24 data in order to avoid the very abuse which you are pleading. And that is where I'm  
25 slowly coming to in terms of understanding your case. But if you want to spell out  
26 how wrong that is, absolutely be my guest because that's why I'm articulating this.

Damian William Langiano; The beauty of doing this in flow and being the “mouth piece”  
of

An intelligence way beyond my own is that I don't know the outcome, though my training  
and

Purpose indicates it, thus my personal attacks on you to gain a tell as you play your hand  
Offered no indication and thus we take your points as authentic, though your embedded  
language

Is revealing this court is one of purity and integrity or bound by the values driven through  
me.

They acted “unlawfully” and Sir respectfully what is being delivered through each  
involved

Is the slow constriction of Meta and the true revealing of the apology given, though not  
did

He think we'd ever uncover why, less still our ability to prove it through the complexity of the evidence

And at the level consideration we have.

121

1 If that is right, then what is your answer to the "no pecuniary loss" point, which is  
2 a point that Mr Singla majored on earlier on this afternoon? And it seems to me the  
3 way he put it was actually it was an answer to your claim, however it was framed,  
4 whether it was framed by reference to incremental gain or otherwise, what he's  
5 saying is that you can't see, or you can't assert a loss in the ordinary tortious sense.  
6 To the extent that you can it is an individuated loss and you therefore lose through  
7 Lloyd v Google and we would like to know what the answer is to that.

Damian William Langiano: Sir if we reversed geared that and said this is a collective loss, based

Upon the emotional impact of co-dependency, complex ptsd and all other "supply side impacts"

(reversing demand side benefits) we would in affect be able to show the loss in all forms, emotionally, mentally, physically and thus financially given the scaling of debt the UK resides.

8 Finally, and this is I think for both of you, Mr Singla you mentioned on a couple of  
9 occasions strike out. It may be entirely my fault, in which case I've been very  
10 negligent in reading these papers, but there's no actual strike out application before  
11 us, is there?

12 MR SINGLA: Sir, there's no piece of paper in terms of an application notice, but in  
13 our response we do make clear that we are objecting on various grounds. The way  
14 this case is being advanced is it's actually an application for permission to amend --

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

16 MR SINGLA: -- and we are proceeding on that basis. And we say they don't meet  
17 the arguability standard in certain respects so they shouldn't get permission to  
18 amend and if we are right about that the case should be dismissed.

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr Singla, that's very helpful. I'm not taking  
20 a technical point here, what I'm doing is making clear my own discomfort in dealing  
21 with strike out conclusively when we are still feeling our way as to precisely how the  
22 case is being put. And what I think I'm saying is that we'll want to take into account  
23 the points you are making by way of arguability in any ruling but depending on how  
24 that ruling is framed, if we were for instance to say we were minded to certify on the  
25 basis that there is -- let's take a purely hypothetical example, but there is an arguable  
26 case that there is a property right at stake, in other words that we have information  
122

1 which needs to be licensed to Google, and that the damages can be assessed in  
2 that way, now that I can see is an arguable proposition, but it may very well give rise  
3 to points of law on which we haven't been addressed and which I would be  
4 uncomfortable in closing out at this stage.

5 I think what I'm saying is that we would not want to take these two days as closing  
6 out a focused strike out application on some of the rather more recognised points  
7 that arise in this case. We are very much on the cutting edge of law here and I'm  
8 very conscious that we are dealing with a case that is both hugely important and  
9 innovative and that's a very good thing. But those facts mean that to the extent we  
10 identify very crisp points of law and certify, notwithstanding concerns about that,  
11 I wouldn't want us to close out the prospect of considering those questions of law at  
12 a later stage.

13 MR SINGLA: That's helpful. Can I respond briefly.

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, of course.

15 MR SINGLA: Because I want to make sure you understand the way in which we  
16 have framed our objections. So the starting point is this is a permission to amend.  
17 We say permission should be refused for a combination of, if I may say, merits or  
18 strike out summary judgment points, that in certain respects their case is not  
19 arguable, we say. And we also say in certain respects, and they overlap, there are

20 problems with the methodology, and we say it's good enough for us to succeed on  
21 either of those bases, permission to amend in a certification context shouldn't be  
22 granted if they fail Pro-Sys or if they advance something which not arguable.  
23 And I would just add, by way of perhaps a marker at this stage, whilst -- I've read the  
24 transcripts of the last hearing and I understand the concern last time about not, as it  
25 were, shutting out the PCR and giving them an opportunity to correct their  
26 homework. We would have quite a lot to say about the idea of giving them a further  
123

1 opportunity because if you were to conclude on the basis of this revised case that  
2 they've shot at the wrong target, so far as the remedy is concerned, we would say  
3 well having put forward a methodology which is by reference to commercial value of  
4 the data in the hands of Facebook, they'd had their opportunity to revise their case  
5 and they can't have multiple goes, as it were.

6 I know that's perhaps not what you have in mind at this stage but I just reserve my  
7 position at this stage as to, there comes a point at which one is at certification stage  
8 and if there's a point where we say it's strikable, it should be struck out now, I think is  
9 our position.

Damian William Langiano; Nicely played Mr Singla, you know what is under the bonnet  
and

Grateful I am for your clarification that you are not party to it.

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I think my concern was rather the converse, which  
11 is that we are traversing areas at some pace and I would not be minded to strike on  
12 the basis, or decline to amend, on the basis of a very difficult point of law without  
13 hearing very full argument on that point of law. So what you are likely to be faced  
14 with is, for instance on the question of -- we will see what Mr O'Donoghue says about  
15 this -- the question of the nature of the loss being alleged. I do think that raises  
16 a number of rather difficult questions. They are questions of law but arising in  
17 a particularly difficult factual context. What I'm saying is were we to certify, I don't

18 want Meta to be regarded as conclusively closed out from mounting a separate strike  
19 out application on the basis --

20 MR SINGLA: I understand.

Damian William Langiano: It was as if you were quantumly inviting my evidence given the  
Position you understand and the cutting edge of law we are now striding across.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- of the clear way in which we are certifying  
22 matters. Because I have to say I am quite troubled by the idea that this is purely  
23 a loss based case in a tortious sense. And my trouble is partly because I see  
24 instinctively information as being capable of valuation by reference to a property  
25 analogy, which immediately makes pecuniary loss a rather difficult shoehorn to  
26 apply.

124

1 Equally, we have an issue about the 0 price, because one could imagine a situation  
2 where let us say the class are paying Facebook, let us say £10 a month for the  
3 social media services they get, there is an abuse of exactly the sort that is going on.  
4 You could then say well in fact the loss is computable by reference to the sums that  
5 are paid over and therefore if there is unlawful extraction of information, there's been  
6 an overpayment which would be a loss, even on a tortious basis; and I'm a little bit  
7 uncomfortable in finding that the existence of the 0 price means that on your  
8 argument, which I completely understand, one is saying well, I'm sorry,  
9 Mr O'Donoghue, you lose, when, if there was a charge you might very well have  
10 an arguable case.

11 So these are difficulties which I raise now, not because I want full argument, we don't  
12 have time on that, but what I'm signalling to both is that depending on how we rule  
13 on matters, there may be very tightly focused questions of law which we may want to  
14 explore on an interlocutory basis. I stress may, because frankly my instinct would  
15 be, if we were to certify, to let the matter run and to deal with the points of law in the  
16 very specific factual context that would emerge. So I'm not sure we would be very

17 keen on the strike out application but I certainly don't want Meta to feel that in  
18 certifying, if that is what we do, we are closing you out from considering that sort of  
19 application and I'm sure you would consider it responsibly.

20 MR SINGLA: Sir, I understand and I'm very grateful for that. I think what I would  
21 say, and obviously we would certainly reserve our position as to a future strike out  
22 application in the event of certification, but I think what I was very keen to stress is  
23 that we are at the certification stage, you do have a heavy gatekeeping role. The  
24 question we say that arises now, rather than putting off difficult questions we say the  
25 question actually is they have chosen to formulate their case on the second  
26 occasion, in no particular way, there is in fact, as things stand, no legal issue  
125

1 between us because he's accepted, as he has to, all they can claim is pecuniary  
2 loss. So actually, we say the question today is: does the model reflect pecuniary  
3 loss?

4 And if you are with us on that, or if you think there may be a problem we say, as it  
5 were, you should have the courage of your convictions and exercise your  
6 gatekeeping role and not let this case drift into disclosure and so on because that's  
7 precisely the concern from a public policy perspective that Lord Sales and Leggatt  
8 were expressing, that that needs to be recognised now.

Damian William Langiano: Everyone knows what is going on here, the dancing around  
To make sure there's no comeback on each party by means of collusion is fascinating  
even

Though painful for an ADHD sufferer, who is already at the point of pulling the lever on  
the gallows

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: You are of course right, you have to get, even at  
10 a certification stage, a degree of finality, and the last thing we want is a process that  
11 is protracted -- I was going to say unduly protracted but we are already there in that  
12 we are a year after the first certification application, almost to the day. So the point

13 you make there is well made. But it goes back to the point I made to Mr O'Donoghue  
14 at the outset, the importance of clarity. Looking purely at the pleading, I'm not sure  
15 how clear-cut your pecuniary loss point is. I can see that there's been certain  
16 statements made in written submissions and orally which entirely support your point.  
17 But at the end of the day this is something that doesn't need to be dealt with on the  
18 pleadings and at the end of the day, as you rightly say, this is an amendment  
19 application, and if there is a simple way in which to tweak the draft, then  
20 Mr O'Donoghue will be entitled to do exactly that, because there's no permission  
21 needed to amend a draft. So I think a measure of realism is required here.  
22 We absolutely are going to ensure, to the extent we can, that this is a two-stop shop,  
23 the first stop having been last year, and the second stop being this year. But we  
24 don't want to completely straitjacket ourselves in something that is at the end of the  
25 day a significant case which, and let's face it, the chances of whoever loses this not  
26 appealing are pretty low, and it's probably better that we take our time and try and  
126

1 get it right rather than take a unduly swashbuckling approach to what is on any view  
2 a difficult matter, as I think today has shown.

3 MR SINGLA: Would you bear with me just for a moment just to respond to that,  
4 because it's not a merely arid pleading point that we are making. The pleading is  
5 very clear, crystal clear, and I will maybe come back to this in morning, but they are  
6 clearly saying in the pleading their loss is to be measured by reference to this  
7 counterfactual bargain, which involves the commercial value of the data in the hands  
8 of Facebook; that's absolutely clear on the pleading. And it's not merely a case of  
9 them being able to tweak the pleading because that pleading reflects accurately the  
10 methodology put forward by Professor Scott Morton.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

12 MR SINGLA: So the point that is crystallised, whether one describes it as

13 a summary judgment or refusal on merits grounds or a failure to comply with Pro 14  
Sys, the point

that is crystallised today, or at this hearing or at this certification stage,

15 is it right to describe the model as representing pecuniary harm to users? And that's

16 the point that we say is a point that has crystallised now and won't change, as it

17 were, if one moves to a later stage of the litigation, that will remain the objection that

18 we make. And so it's a pleading issue, but also a methodology issue.

Damian William Langiano: Which when correlated to my above submissions would prove

That even on a pecuniary level the user cannot be held as an accomplice only seen and

Ever to be seen as a victim

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well no. I think the way you put it there is it's

20 a point of law. I mean the fact is, looking at the way in which Professor Scott

21 Morton's put it, it doesn't look like a pecuniary loss case at all, whatever

22 Mr O'Donoghue's says.

23 MR SINGLA: And our point is that the real problem --

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Your point is that that is a matter which is not

25 a cause of action, presently recognised in English law, and what you are saying by

26 way of side swipe is that Mr O'Donoghue is sold a bit of a past by not making more

127

1 of what for instance Lord Justice Green has said in FX.

2 MR SINGLA: It's a bit more fundamental than that because pecuniary harm we say

3 is necessary individualised which means necessarily this Tribunal should not certify.

4 That's the real vice.

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I understand that. I think what I'm saying to you is

6 that we are not -- given that this is both a novel process, and a pretty novel case,

7 certainly in competition law terms, we are not going to be taking a, this is

8 a conventional easy point of law matter and we are going to strike you out on the

9 basis of something which would be unarguable in ordinary litigation. The fact is that



10 I of course accept that gains-based tortious claims are not generally recognised, but  
11 that's precisely the point.

12 We have here on Mr O'Donoghue's case a claim which, on the face of it, certainly if  
13 one reads Professor Scott Morton, appears to be precisely that. Now it may be that  
14 the gains-based approach is effectively a proxy for what a negotiated outcome would  
15 be. It's why I'm so interested in the incremental case.

16 Now, if that's the way you do it then I would be pretty uncomfortable in striking it out  
17 on an arid technical point without hearing full argument in the context of what we  
18 understand the case to be.

19 And so what I'm trying to say, clearly quite unsuccessfully, is that if we certify  
20 a difficult case in this way, we are not thereby closing out Meta from taking a narrow  
21 and nuanced point if that is appropriate. I'm trying to help. But what I'm equally not  
22 inclined to do is in a case which is quite clearly of significance, in terms of  
23 information and data handling and claims, I'm not going to take an: oh, this is  
24 a common county court case for a tortious cause of action. It obviously isn't that. It's  
25 a very hard case which we need to treat appropriately in that way.

26 MR O'DONOGHUE: If I may indeed, one of the points I will be making tomorrow is  
128

1 that of course the novelty of difficulty point is itself a reason not to kill things off at  
2 this stage. It's a well-established principle of strike out.

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I have that in mind, that strike out is something to  
4 be done not in -- (overspeaking) --

5 MR O'DONOGHUE: As a last resort.

6 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- now indicated. But the concomitant of that is  
7 that we need to be extremely clear -- I don't think we are there yet, and that may  
8 require further consideration of a draft proposed amendment -- I'm very keen that we  
9 are absolutely clear, if we certify, what it is that we are unleashing on the world.

Damian William Langiano: Then one assumes my evidence and expertise is vital

And

10 that is something which at the end of Day 1, and it's no doubt because of the  
11 complexity and volume of the material, I don't feel that we are quite there in terms of  
12 exactly what it is that is being said. And what I don't want is for a strike out point, or  
13 what would be a strikeout point in an easy case, to be sidestepped by saying, oh,  
14 well, it's not that case, when in fact the answer is it is a gains-based case or in part  
15 a gains-based case but of a particularly novel sort. If that's the position then I would  
16 like to know that, rather than us sidestepping the important point that  
17 Lord Justice Green made in FX. And difficult questions like Wrotham Park damages,  
18 that sort of thing, these are things which I don't want to duck, I want to address, but it  
19 may be that we don't have time to deal with that today and tomorrow, and that's the  
20 reason I am making the point that I'm making now.

21 MR O'DONOGHUE: The final point I would make, on that basis I think it would  
22 make sense for Mr Bacon to make his submissions probably after lunch tomorrow,  
23 rather than being diverted.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Okay. Well let's see how we go.

25 Does that cause you any problems, Mr Singla?

26 MR SINGLA: Not at all. We have relatively little to say about funding. Mr Bacon  
129

1 apparently wants half an hour, and we have no objection to that.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's very helpful. Thank you both very much.

3 We will resume, then, at 10.00 tomorrow morning. Thank you.

4 (4.55 pm)

5 (The hearing adjourned until the following day at 10.00 am)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

1 This Transcript has not been proof read or corrected. It is a working tool for the Tribunal for use in

preparing its judgment. It will be

2 placed on the Tribunal Website for readers to see how matters were conducted at the public hearing

of these proceedings and is not to

3 be relied on or cited in the context of any other proceedings. The Tribunal's judgment in this matter

will be the final and definitive

4 record.

5 IN THE COMPETITION Case No. : 1433/7/7/22

6 APPEAL TRIBUNAL

7

8

9 Salisbury Square House

10 8 Salisbury Square

11 London EC4Y 8AP

Monday 8th – Tuesday 9th 12 January 2024

13

14 Before:

15 The Honourable Mr Justice Marcus Smith

16 Derek Ridyard

17 Timothy Sawyer CBE

18 (Sitting as a Tribunal in England and Wales)

19

20

21 BETWEEN:

22

23 Dr Liza Lovdahl Gormsen

24 Class Representative

25 v

26 Meta Platforms, Inc. and Others

27 Defendant

28 \_\_\_\_\_

29

30 A P P E A R A N C E S

31

32 Robert O'Donoghue KC, Nicholas Bacon KC, Tom Coates, Greg Adey and Sarah O'Keeffe

33 (On behalf of Dr Liza Lovdahl Gormsen)

34

35 Tony Singla KC, James White and Andrew Lomas Bird (On behalf of Meta Platforms)

36

37

38 Digital Transcription by Epiq Europe Ltd

39 Lower Ground 46 Chancery Lane WC2A 1JE

40 Tel No: 020 7404 1400 Fax No: 020 7404 1424

41 Email: ukclient@epiqglobal.co.uk

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

2

1 Tuesday, 9 January 2024

2 (10.00 am)

3 Submissions by MR SINGLA (continued)

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr Singla, good morning.

5 MR SINGLA: Good morning, sir.

6 If I may just very briefly by way of recap, our position is that there are three

7 fundamental problems with the revised case and the new expert evidence. Just to

8 repeat in summary what the points are:

9 First, we say that PCR simply asserts that in the event that they can make out both  
10 abuses, in the counterfactual world what would have happened but for those abuses  
11 is that Facebook would have collected the same amount of Off-Facebook Data and  
12 Facebook would have paid users. In other words, the status quo continues but with  
13 a payment to users.

14 And we say in respect of that that applying the principles of pleading as explained in  
15 BritNed and the FX case at first instance, and applying the Pro-Sys test in exactly  
16 the same way as you did in your first judgment in this case, certification ought to  
17 be refused. And that is because there is no blueprint for investigating whether that  
18 would in fact be the correct counterfactual.

19 The Nash bargaining model -- and it's important to be really clear about this -- only  
20 operates in the event that the PCR is correct in the assertion that there would have  
21 been this collective bargain whereby the same amount of data would have been  
22 collected but a payment paid to users.

23 The bargaining model falls away entirely if that's not the right counterfactual, and it's  
24 really important to understand that they are not seeking to test whether that is the  
25 right counterfactual, they are seeking to quantify what the split of profits would be in  
26 the event that the assertion is correct as to the counterfactual.

3

1 Our short point -- a very important point but a short one -- is that this is precisely  
2 a scenario where on the authorities the case will run into the sand for lack of  
3 a blueprint. And we also say, as you know, the counterfactual in any event is not  
4 grounded in the facts. It's completely divorced from reality and so fails the Pro-Sys  
5 test. And also, as you know, we say that they have actually switched off dominance  
6 as well -- that's the exchange I had with Mr Ridyard -- because they've taken the  
7 collective bargain as way of removing the asymmetry of bargaining power.

8 And also you know that we say under this ground that they don't even commit to the  
9 counterfactual being a payment, a financial payment. They've left open this idea that

10 in fact it would have been a benefit in kind. And there's absolutely nothing by way of  
11 methodology to explore that counterfactual.

Damian William Langiano: We continue with the hypothesis delivered to you that  
Meta could open their platform as a Minerva interface, one where the user could  
Spend their time being educated entertained and introduced into “real world”  
fundamentals

It would play a central part in screening the humanitarian focused content, and lead  
through

Market knowledge the pathway back to equilibrium. Focus groups set up on how the  
money

Is spent and direction on how best to proceed with life aligned to planetary well-being.

We have a number of ideas on how this would and could be partied too and include all of  
the

Advertisers, beneficiaries, investors, and subsidiaries and from that point with the hearts  
and

Minds of the world, engaged with pure intention we would in fact see Meta delivering a  
“return

On investment” and an ongoing restitution / commitment to planetary balance.

Thus payment in kind has a quantifiable methodology.

12 So that's the first fundamental problem with the case.

Damian William Langiano: Maybe that's the point we might focus on, this isn't a case  
It's a lesson, learned never taught.

Meaning what we do next will place us all within or outside the parameters of the law

13 The second, again just by way of recap, is that we say the remedy being claimed is

14 misconceived because as a matter of law they can only claim pecuniary loss. And

15 we set out that point in detail by reference to all of the authorities, including

16 Court of Appeal authority Devenish and so on, including the Supreme Court in

17 Sainsbury's, which recognised that in competition law claims only pecuniary loss can  
18 be recovered.

19 And we say that in this situation there is no pecuniary loss when users consent to

20 Facebook using their Off-Facebook Data. If one were seeking to measure some sort  
21 of pecuniary loss, that would be a classic individualised enquiry: how much  
22 Off-Facebook Data is being used in respect of each user? What value does each  
23 user subjectively place, if any, on their data? And Lloyd v Google makes absolutely  
24 plain that those sorts of issues are individualised assessment, and that is exactly  
25 why the representative action failed in that context.

26 And what the PCR does in this case is to get around that problem by presenting

4

1 the Tribunal with a case brought on a collective basis by saying that in the  
2 counterfactual every user would have received a share of the Facebook profits. But  
3 they are looking at the wrong end of the telescope. That's not measuring loss to  
4 user. The profits to Facebook reflect the aggregation of all of the users' data and  
5 what Facebook can obtain for that aggregated data from advertisers. It's not the  
6 same thing as loss to users.

7 So if we're right about the first or the second points -- they are connected, of course,  
8 but we say they're distinct -- the entire case falls away.

9 Then, sir, the point that I was dealing with towards the end of yesterday,  
10 an independent point, we say going back to the first question of proving  
11 an infringement and, as you know, they say unfair term and unfair price, but focusing  
12 on the unfair price allegation, we say what they've done is misconceived. This is  
13 a permission to amend application, and we say it's neither arguable nor satisfies the  
14 Pro-Sys test, and therefore permission to amend should be refused.

15 And we say that because, as I took you yesterday to the pleading, that doesn't even  
16 address the right question. It refers to economic value of the Off-Facebook Data in  
17 the hands of Facebook. On any view we say that's misconceived. And  
18 Professor Scott Morton takes the incremental approach, and crucially only takes the  
19 incremental approach.

20 So, if you are with us that that is completely unsupported by any authority and



21 unsupported by any economic principle then we say abuse 2 falls away entirely.

22 Now, the authorities we say speak with one voice. The question is whether the price  
23 paid bears a reasonable relationship with the economic value of the product  
24 supplied. And there is not a single case which looks at a particular price increase in  
25 time and considers whether there is an excessive price by reference to what  
26 happened to the product or service in question after that price increase.

5

1 And crucially, sir, the fact that there is no monetary price in this context doesn't  
2 change this analysis. So we accept that United Brands is a test which needs to be  
3 adapted, we accept that in this case there's no monetary price and therefore  
4 an adaptation will be required for that reason, but one still, in our submission, has to  
5 ask the right question. What one has to ask is a comparison between all of the non 6  
monetary

consideration being given by users and comparing that against the entire

7 Facebook service that users are receiving.

8 And indeed, all of the cases refer to the need to consider demand-side value. And if  
9 one just steps back and thinks, well, what is demand-side value in this case, it's  
10 demand-side value in relation to the whole Facebook service. It's a complete  
11 nonsense, we submit, to look at United Brands here by taking an artificial price,  
12 which is namely only part of the consideration that users are giving, and to take  
13 an artificial product or service, namely that bit of the service post-2014. In reality  
14 there's only one service, which is the Facebook service.

Damian William Langiano; It's a strong statement by Mr Singla, compounded by the following

Facebook's chief executive, Mark Zuckerberg, faced US Congress for the first time on Tuesday over

the data sharing scandal.

Zuckerberg answered questions from the Senate commerce and judiciary committees on privacy,

data mining, regulations and Cambridge Analytica during the course of the marathon five-hour

hearing.

Here are the key moments:

Right to privacy

“I believe it’s important to tell people exactly how the information that they share on Facebook is going to be used.

(But not what they were taking off Facebook?)

“That’s why, every single time you go to share something on Facebook, whether it’s a photo in

Facebook,

or a message, every single time, there’s a control right there about who you’re going to be sharing it

with ...

and you can change that and control that in line.

“To your broader point about the privacy policy ... long privacy policies are very confusing.

And if you make it long and spell out all the detail, then you’re probably going to reduce the

per cent of people who read it and make it accessible to them.”

His own privacy

Senator Dick Durbin asked if Zuckerberg would be comfortable sharing the name of the hotel he stayed

in last night.

“No. I would probably not choose to do that publicly, here” he said.

“I think everyone should have control over how their information is used.”

(The issue we have here is that they didn’t understand to the level the off Facebook data was being

compiled and used)

Cambridge Analytica

“Cambridge Analytica wasn’t using our services in 2015, as far as we can tell ...

They weren't an advertiser. They weren't running pages. So we actually had nothing to ban."

Later Zuckerberg corrected himself.

"I want to correct one thing that I said earlier in response to a question ... [on] why we didn't ban Cambridge Analytica at the time when we learned about them in 2015.

"[From] what my understanding was ... they were not on the platform, [they] were not an app

developer or advertiser.

When I went back and met with my team afterwards, they let me know that Cambridge Analytica

actually did start as

an advertiser later in 2015.

"So we could have in theory banned them then. We made a mistake by not doing so.

But I just wanted to make sure that I updated that because I ... I ... I misspoke, or got that wrong earlier.

"When we heard back from Cambridge Analytica that they had told us that they weren't using the

data

and deleted it, we considered it a closed case. In retrospect, that was clearly a mistake.

We shouldn't have taken their word for it. We've updated our policy to make sure we don't make that

mistake again."

(Mistakes. Mistakes. Mistakes.)

Storing and selling personal data

"Yes, we store data ... some of that content with people's permission."

"There's a very common misconception that we sell data to advertisers. We do not sell data to

advertisers."

"What we allow is for advertisers to tell us who they want to reach, and then we do the placement ...

That's a very fundamental part of how our model works and something that is often misunderstood."

Senator Tammy Baldwin asks whether the Cambridge University neuroscientist Aleksandr Kogan

sold the Facebook data to anyone besides Cambridge Analytica?

Zuckerberg: "Yes, he did."

"We're investigating every single app that had access to a large amount of information in the past.

And if we find that someone improperly used data, we're going to ban them from Facebook and

tell everyone affected."

Regulations

"My position is not that there should be no regulation.

"I think the real question, as the internet becomes more important in people's lives, is what is the right regulation, not whether there should be or not."

Russian interference

"One of my greatest regrets in running the company is that we were slow in identifying the Russian information operations in 2016.

"We have kicked off an investigation ... I imagine we'll find some things.

"There are people in Russia whose job it is to try to exploit our systems and other internet systems and other systems as well.

"This is an ongoing arms race. As long as there are people sitting in Russia whose job is it to try to interfere in elections around the world, this is going to be an ongoing conflict."

Taking responsibility

It was my mistake, and I'm sorry.

"I started Facebook, I run it, and I'm responsible for what happens here.

"It's clear now that we didn't do enough to prevent these tools from being used for harm.

That goes for fake news, foreign interference in elections, and hate speech, as well as developers and data privacy."

Damian William Langiano: The Chair for the inquiry Damian Collins has consistently avoided

Engagement since 2020 when I was invited to work with a product called WardWiz, one we offered

The UK Government for free, it provided Spyware Malware Protection and more appropriately

Online protection, data harvesting and location protection for children, my focus as you can see.

Thus what we have and having spoken with Alexander Nix who has promised to assist with the

Correct platform we find ourselves with two of the major protagonists, neither trust worthy or

Competent it seems, though both with something to offer and certainly one taking full “responsibility”

Extending to the advertisers on the platform it seems though not in the counterfactual which we are

Proving to be the wild west of data mining, though via the learning obtained through the on Facebook

patterns.

Its not only did they take the worlds data without detailed terms, due none being acceptable as Mr

Singla

Qualifies, it’s that they set in motion an “arms race and the means of ongoing conflict” which qualifies

Zuckerberg as knowingly acting and participating in the digital war on the mind and thus he falls under

the

Nuremberg Code and Statute of Rome.

15 And there's nothing at all in the methodology to assess the economic value of the

16 overall service.

Damian William Langiano: But we can its impact.

“I feel tremendous guilt,” admitted Chamath Palihapitiya, former Vice President of User Growth at

Facebook, to an audience of Stanford students. He was responding to a question about his

involvement

in exploiting consumer behaviour. “The short-term, dopamine-driven feedback loops that we have

created

are destroying how society works,” he explained. In Palihapitiya’s talk, he highlighted something most

of us

know but few really appreciate: smartphones and the social media platforms they support are turning

us into

bona fide addicts. While it’s easy to dismiss this claim as hyperbole, platforms like Facebook, Snapchat,

and

Instagram leverage the very same neural circuitry used by slot machines and cocaine to keep us using

their

products as much as possible.

17 Now, even if -- so if I'm wrong about all of that, even if it were legitimate to look only

18 at the position post-2014, we say there's a problem with their case at that level

19 because Professor Scott Morton simply dismisses the idea that any material

20 changes or improvements were made to the service.

21 And if I can show you her first report at paragraph 237, page 284 of the bundle, you'll

22 see the heading "The extent to which the value of Off-Facebook Tracking accrued to

23 Facebook versus users."

24 She says:

25 "I have examined the development of Facebook's user-facing offering over time ...

26 My assessment, which I will need to refine post disclosure, is that the key user-facing

6

1 functionalities were already in place prior to the roll-out of Off-Facebook Tracking

2 and the use of this data for advertising purposes."

3 Then at 238:

4 "The only major consumer facing features that I am aware have been added

5 are Facebook Live, reactions, Facebook Marketplace, Facebook Dating, and

6 Facebook Reels. However, these are not personal social networking functions and

7 many of the defining Facebook features ... were introduced well before 2014.

8 Furthermore, the features that have been added closely resemble other platforms'

9 features, such as Reels replicating Tik Tok, rather than representing new

10 innovations. My preliminary view is therefore that Facebook has not significantly

11 invested in core or unique features to the benefit of consumers in recent years."

Damian William Langiano: That's correct if you look at society as a whole and the Action taken by

<https://www.cnn.com/2023/10/24/bipartisan-group-of-ags-sue-meta-for-addictivefeatures.html#:~:text=A%20bipartisan%20group%20of%2042%20attorneys%20general%20is,at%20k>

ids%20and%20teens%2C%20the%20group%20announced%20Tuesday.

A bipartisan group of 42 attorneys general is suing Meta, alleging features on Facebook and Instagram

are addictive and are aimed at kids and teens.

The lawsuits demonstrate the broad bipartisan interest in protecting kids and teens from online harm.

Meta designed its Facebook and Instagram products to keep young users on them for longer and

repeatedly coming back, the attorneys general allege.

They have as Senator Hawley states a platform that is "Killing People"

12 Then relatedly, if I can ask you to look at 261, she says:

13 "My view is that the right approach ..."

14 Just perhaps to show you the heading above 255:

15 "Can the data extraction be justified on the basis that Facebook is significantly  
16 valued by users", she says at 261:

17 "My view is that the right approach to assess the fairness of the price is not to look at  
18 the aggregate value of Facebook to users, but to assess whether Facebook has  
19 struck a fair bargain as it has increased its data extraction over time."

20 Then you will see what she goes on to say at 262, that it's not appropriate for  
21 Facebook to justify its prices based on a value which reflects the network effect.  
22 So she dismisses any value in the network effect.

23 Then if I could just show you what Mr Parker says about this, because these are  
24 obviously hotly contested issues. If I could ask you to look at --

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Of course they are, but that's for later, isn't it?

26 MR SINGLA: Well, the determination of those issues is for later, but the blueprint  
7

1 needs to be present today. That's the point.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, yes, but I think what she's saying is that  
3 there's been no change in the Facebook service but there has been an increased  
4 exploitation of data, namely the Off-Facebook Data. Because there's been no  
5 improvement in the service -- let's assume that's right -- you can treat the  
6 Off-Facebook Data as pure profit which has been extracted -- again assuming in the  
7 PCR's favour they are right -- by an abuse of the dominant position, with the result  
8 that the monopoly profits, the incremental approach, can be regarded as the  
9 battleground in terms of ascertaining what is the unfair extraction of value from the  
10 class.

11 It may be right, it may be wrong, but it's actually quite simple, isn't it?

Damian William Langiano: What we can do Sir Marcus is qualify that in 2014

<https://about.fb.com/news/2014/02/facebook-to-acquire-whatsapp/>



WhatsApp has built a leading and rapidly growing real-time mobile messaging service, with:

Over 450 million people using the service each month;

70% of those people active on a given day;

Messaging volume approaching the entire global telecom SMS volume; and

Continued strong growth, currently adding more than 1 million new registered users per day.

The acquisition supports Facebook and WhatsApp's shared mission to bring more connectivity and

utility to the world by delivering core internet services efficiently and affordably. The combination will

help accelerate growth and user engagement across both companies.

"WhatsApp is on a path to connect 1 billion people. The services that reach that milestone are all

incredibly valuable," said Mark Zuckerberg, Facebook founder and CEO. "I've known Jan for a long

time and I'm excited to partner with him and his team to make the world more open and connected."

Now, when we align Mr Zuckerberg and his morality, ethics, data management and security

qualifications

One might be forgiven for looking toward the worlds largest personal data transfer system

When seeking to understand where from and how that data was tracked.

Small wonder they won't let the big bad wolf in!!!

Teamviewer are holding the same 2.6bn users just for reference down the line.

12 MR SINGLA: Well, three points. First, we say it's wrong, as you know, to focus --

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I know you say it's wrong --

14 MR SINGLA: Exactly. So our first point is it's wrong to look only at the post-2014

15 world. The second point is, if you are entitled, which we say you are not, to look only

16 at the post-2014 world, then you need a blueprint today, at the certification stage, as

17 to how are you going to assess the value of things post 2014, because she says  
18 "I don't put any value on them", Mr Parker says "Our position is obviously we put  
19 huge amounts of value on these things"; you need a blueprint for assessing the  
20 value of those things.

21 So we say, even on the incremental approach, there's not a sufficient blueprint.

22 But the third point, sir, if I can just show you four --

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I'm sorry, I really don't understand that, because  
24 she's not saying I need to assess the additional value that's been provided, she is  
25 saying there's no additional value.

26 MR SINGLA: Exactly, but that's purely an assertion.

8

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

2 MR SINGLA: But that's the question for the Tribunal at trial.

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Look, I understand the case. It can be stated in  
4 a sentence. It may be wrong, but that's not a question of blueprint, that's a question  
5 of evidence.

6 MR SINGLA: Yes, but what we are saying is --

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: What she's saying is, you are getting additional  
8 profit out of an abuse for nothing. Now, isn't that rather easy?

Damian William Langiano: Which would substantiate the Whatsapp data extraction  
theory.

9 MR SINGLA: Sir, we say, on the authorities --

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: You say it's wrong, and you say it's an  
11 impermissible approach --

12 MR SINGLA: Yes.

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: All of that I get. But the blueprint point I simply  
14 don't understand.

15 MR SINGLA: Well, the blueprint point is really just that on the basis of the

16 authorities they need to do more than simply assert something.

17 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, no. You can assert something that is as  
18 plain as a pikestaff without articulating a blueprint. It may simply be a wrong  
19 pikestaff. But that's not a blueprint question, that's an arguability question, isn't it?

20 MR SINGLA: We would respectfully submit that at the certification stage  
21 the Tribunal needs to be satisfied that the PCR is going to be able to investigate  
22 these issues in due course.

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No. I really don't understand that. I mean, if you  
24 are saying there has been a material improvement in the Facebook offering, but  
25 I discount it for no very good reason, then you do need to work out why she's  
26 discounting it for no very good reason. But if the point is that there's just been no  
9

1 change, then that's something which Facebook obviously will say is wrong, but it's  
2 not a methodological point, it's an evidential point which, if it's wrong, means that the  
3 case is undercut.

4 MR SINGLA: With respect, in my submission we are in the former scenario. So we  
5 are in the scenario where there have, on any view, been changes. That's why I was  
6 taking you to 23 --

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, but that's my point. That is an evidential  
8 argument as to whether there have or there haven't. You are asserting there have  
9 been changes and they are asserting there haven't.

10 MR SINGLA: Sir, with respect, I think it's common ground that there have been  
11 changes. That's 238, for example:

12 "The only major consumer-facing features that I am aware have been added ..."

13 So there's no question, it's common ground, that there have been changes to the  
14 service. What she says is, but I'm going to disregard those. For example, at 238 we  
15 see she says, well, I'm going to disregard those because they are not personal social  
16 networking functions and because they simply resemble things that have been done

17 by other platforms.

18 And what we say, but Mr Parker says as well, is, well, you can't merely discount  
19 those points, because we say as a matter of law you need a blueprint. It's not -- sir,  
20 I apologise if I wasn't sufficiently clear in the earlier submission, but we do say we  
21 are in a world where it is a matter of common ground that there were changes. And  
22 her approach, which we say is entirely self-serving, is to say, well, I'm going to  
23 disregard those changes. And that's why we say it is a blueprint point.

24 So the third of my three points -- the first one is you can't do incremental. The  
25 second is you can't disregard things that did actually change just because they don't  
26 suit your case. But the third point is to look at what she says or how she says she  
10

1 will account for differences. So if one looks at 401 to 402, which is page 324 of the  
2 bundle, you will see:

3 "Even though I regard it as unlikely, the extraction and monetisation of the  
4 Off-Facebook Data may in principle have permitted Facebook to improve the quality  
5 of the service to users. If so, such incremental improvements act to reduce damages  
6 due to the class. In such a case I would want Facebook to specify exactly which  
7 services and features it believes consumers valued, and which were introduced as  
8 a result of the Off-Facebook Tracking."

Damian William Langiano: The purchase of Whatsapp and data privacy infringement  
inline with the

kind of entitlement we see through Zuckerbergs collective testimony's

9 So she is only prepared to take into account things that were introduced as a result  
10 of the Off-Facebook Tracking. Then she says:

11 "I would seek to quantify their value in monetary terms" and effectively reduce the  
12 aggregate damages being claimed.

13 And we say again that is making a serious error, because we are not here talking  
14 about quantification, we are talking about proving the abuse. We are actually at first

15 base. You are alleging that there is an unfair price. You are accepting it's United  
16 Brands. You are taking this incremental approach which we say you can't. But this  
17 is all about infringement. This is not about just, well, I'll deduct something from the  
18 aggregate damages.

19 So that's what we say. And can I just address you on the justifications or the  
20 purported justifications for the incremental approach which Professor Scott Morton  
21 gives in her reply --

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

23 MR SINGLA: -- evidence. If I could ask you to turn up 473 of the bundle, you'll see  
24 the heading:

25 "Mr Parker's criticisms of my incremental approach."

26 Just to foreshadow what I'm going to be submitting, she gives six reasons in this  
11

1 section and we say none of them engage with our point that what one needs to look  
2 at is the whole service and not some incremental part of it. But I will just take you  
3 through the points. You will see at 24:

4 "Mr Parker takes issue with my incremental approach."

5 At 25:

6 "Mr Parker argues that my approach does not make economic sense. He argues  
7 that my methodology should be based on the user value of Facebook as a whole."

8 That's the point I've been making. Then she says:

9 "I make six points by way of response."

10 The first, you will see she says towards the end of paragraph 27:

11 "as I set out in my first report, this assertion without more [Facebook's assertion or  
12 Meta's assertion] is no different to a firm which charges an unfair price for a product  
13 arguing that because consumers are happy to continue to pay the price they must  
14 therefore attach a level of economic value to that service that is at least the same as  
15 that price."

16 Now, with respect, that is a completely false point because we are obviously not  
17 saying that just because consumers are paying the price there must be no unfair  
18 price. That's absolutely not what we are submitting. It would be completely  
19 incoherent to make that submission. What we are saying is, you just have to look at  
20 the full service. That's the quote from Mr Parker in 25:

21 "One needs to look at the user value of Facebook as a whole."

22 So we say that doesn't amount to a justification for the incremental approach.

23 Then the second response you'll see at 29, she says:

24 "It's important to note what I set out in my first report concerning my instructions."

25 And towards, I think it's three or four lines from the bottom, you see the instructions  
26 say:

12

1 "The application to the present case needs to acknowledge ..."

2 Sorry, just to be clear this is actually a summary of what she says in her first report  
3 about her instructions:

4 "The application to the present case needs to acknowledge that the situation at hand  
5 is a barter situation in which consumers give up their data in exchange for using  
6 Facebook as a platform."

7 So there is actually nothing in her own summary of the instructions which refers or  
8 justifies the incremental approach. And I would actually just like to show what you  
9 the instructions do say. They are at core bundle A, tab 13, page 847. You'll see the  
10 letter of instruction at 847 dated 5 October 2023. If one looks at 858 -- perhaps  
11 I should just take you to the paragraph 16 on the preceding page so you can see the  
12 heading "Abuse":

13 "In terms of legal classification the abuse alleged ... is articulated in two ways."

14 And then one sees at paragraph 70 references to case law including United Brands,  
15 and you'll see a reference to the Flynn Pharma case and also to Hydrocortisone.

16 Then at 18:

17 "... ultimately a legal question whether the conduct is abusive, we ask you to address  
18 ... "

19 And at (d):

20 "Whether and, if so, how the economic value of the Facebook personal social  
21 network to users should be taken into account in the assessment of the  
22 alleged abuse."

23 And we say that's correct, that one needs to be looking at the value of the entire  
24 service. So we say the instructions do not instruct her to adopt what we say is the  
25 artificial incremental approach. It is very much her decision to go down that route.  
26 Then if one goes back to the six responses -- so that was the second response.

13

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, that's better than her having been told how to  
2 undertake her analysis, isn't it?

3 MR SINGLA: I'm sorry, sir, I didn't hear.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Don't you think that the fact that Professor Scott  
5 Morton is taking the incremental approach as an expert economist is better, in terms  
6 of an articulation of what is the heart of an economic case, than her being instructed  
7 to take that approach?

8 MR SINGLA: Sir, the simple point I'm making is that insofar as paragraph 29 of the  
9 reply report is pointing to the instructions, I'm just making the point that the  
10 instructions don't mandate the incremental approach. That's really the short point.  
11 Then if one looks at the third and fourth points that she makes at 31 and 32.

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Sorry, which page is it?

13 MR SINGLA: Sorry, sir, do you mean her reply report?

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

15 MR SINGLA: It begins, I think, at 473, or at least, yes, it starts at 467 of core bundle  
16 A. If I could just use the internal page references it's page 5. I'm grateful.

17 I was now turning to the third and fourth responses at 31 and 32, and what she says

18 is:

19 "My report does have a section analysing why in my view the essential features of  
20 the Facebook service have remained materially unchanged since the abuse started.

21 "Given this analysis, I find it surprising that Mr Parker does not put forward any  
22 evidence showing what specific improvements in Facebook's service I failed to  
23 account for."

24 Then she refers to asymmetry of information, and Mr Parker and those instructing  
25 him are best placed to specify the service improvements. Then she says:

26 "Were Facebook to put forward evidence of any service improvements post  
14

1 certification I would evaluate that evidence ..."

2 And so on. Then she says at the end of 32:

3 "My approach does not preclude Facebook from seeking to make such arguments,  
4 and my bargaining model is flexible to incorporate such consumer benefits as are  
5 found to exist."

6 And we would say really three things in relation to those points. The first is we say  
7 it's an improper attempt to reverse the burden of proof. It's not for us to put forward  
8 evidence at this stage of specific improvements.

9 The second point is, I've just shown you in her first report she does acknowledge that  
10 there were changes to the service, but she disregards them. So at least in relation to  
11 those changes to the service it's actually not a question of information asymmetry but  
12 simply her assertion that they don't count for anything.

13 And then the third point is, when she says at the end of 32:

14 "My bargaining model is flexible to incorporate such benefits as are found to exist."

15 The point I made a few minutes ago is that when she says she can incorporate, what  
16 she means is I will reduce the damages. But that's not the right question, because  
17 we are here looking at whether or not there was an infringement.

18 Then we say the third and fourth responses don't withstand scrutiny.



19 And the fifth point is in paragraph 33. She says here by reference to Mr Parker:

20 "It's clear that there will likely be significant disputes between the PCR and Facebook  
21 as to whether the alleged value users place on Facebook represent a legitimate  
22 benefit."

23 Then she goes on to say:

24 "In particular a significant issue will be how to account for the value derived from  
25 network effects. My view is that they were already substantially present."

26 And here we do say, well, how are you going to test the value of these network  
15

1 effects? You are rightly acknowledging that there's a significant dispute, but how is  
2 this case going to proceed to trial? What is the methodology for assessing the value  
3 of the network effects? You can't simply assert that you don't, in your subjective  
4 opinion, attach any weight or value to them.

5 And then the final response at 34 is that she doesn't agree with Mr Parker's  
6 analogies. And I haven't shown you those but what he does in his first report is he  
7 gives some examples where he essentially makes the point that where one is  
8 dealing with a bargain it's not correct to focus on one particular aspect of the bargain;  
9 one has to look at the overall transaction, as it were. And that's a rejection of the  
10 incremental approach. If I could perhaps -- in a sense, her particular examples, we  
11 don't reject the criticism of those examples, but one can illustrate the point in  
12 a manner of different ways.

13 What we are really saying, just to perhaps give a further example, is that if  
14 a dominant company incurs significant costs in initial development of product or  
15 services and over time increases its prices, so at the outset charges modest prices  
16 so as to secure a customer base, the logical consequence of this incremental  
17 approach is that that company could never gradually increase its prices over time  
18 unless each time it is increasing its prices it is commensurately improving the service  
19 or quality of product.

20 And we say that is just economically incoherent, and the fact that it is economically  
21 incoherent is borne out by the authorities, which always look at the entire service.

Damian William Langiano: Are we including Whatsapp in the “entire service” as it would  
Seem to make the whole landscape “economically coherent” given what is being said  
Is that there’s a significant increase in off market revenues without the services of Meta  
Changing “significantly”..... thus much head scratching and debate.

They think they are at war, and anything goes, when in reality the world is trying to live  
through

This counterfactual reality that Meta built a world no one believes and yet suffers the  
Consequences of thus we have learned and intelligent people swimming in mud and  
arguing

Points of law in manner designed by the PCR to keep eyes off whatsapp and yet entice  
the user

Into as Mr Singla is arguing an impossible bargain though Sir Marcus and the bench all  
can see the

Infringement exists.

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I think, Mr Singla, that's a fair point and what it  
23 would be incumbent upon the PCR to show is that there's something particular about  
24 the deployment of Off-Facebook Data that is not an incremental evolution of  
25 an established business but a departure, an incremental, severable part of  
26 the business that is entirely illegitimate. I think that's -- I mean, we'll see what

Damian William Langiano: REAL TIME “eureka” moment Sir Marcus, see What’sapp  
indeed!!

16

1 Mr O'Donoghue says in reply, but let me try to articulate what I think he may be  
2 saying and you can explain why it's wrong.

Damian William Langiano: I’ll fill in the gaps in red.

3 If you take the view that one has an entirely sustainable and capable-of-development  
4 business that is based upon on-Facebook data, and you, Meta, are entitled to do

5 whatever you can in terms of developing it,

Damian William Langiano: Firstly, is it Facebook's data, for the company is but a blank piece of paper without the input of the user's personal data, something they shared freely and with excitement and the warmth of and with connections they could trust, upon a platform they were told, and or coerced into. Under those parameters has the circle of trust been broken or was the intention all along as Mr Zuckerberg states "In a lot of ways Berlin is a symbol for me of Facebook's mission: bringing people together, connecting people and breaking down boundaries." And done in such a way that the management of such potential power was never held with great responsibility, it was monetised with the very "do whatever you want" mentality. Which includes now experiments without knowledge, digital addiction and manipulation and driving the victims

into preconstructed palliative care for symptoms of the of...

Döpfner: So this is science fiction fantasy and is not going to happen in real life and we don't need to worry about the safety of human intelligence?

Zuckerberg: I think that along the way, we will also figure out how to make it safe.

And added.

Zuckerberg: I think that the default is that all the machines that we build serve humans so, unless we really mess something up, I think it should stay that way.

Damian William Langiano: Though Sir Marcus the business model from conception has been

About the user serving Facebook and in the enclosed interview that is the very core of Zuckerberg

He is a sociopath with the world connected to connections he's made for profit at the expense

Of the real world so acutely he is realising his Roman Empire fantasy that he is Emperor within

And true to the story, a brother of that world, cast out and down trodden is back for the children

Of the world and the values that REALITY stands for not the virtual one Meta's raping of its users

Minds and reconfiguring for monetary gain and controlling power has broken every moral and legal

Rule of fair competition to do so.

Charged if you will with making Rome great again, an Italian, a gladiator, or just a dad striving to

protect

His own children.

changing the prices for it and so on, but

6 you can leave that on one side because it's an entirely independent and sustainable

7 form of business, what you have overlaid on that is something that is entirely

8 illegitimate -- obviously assuming everything in favour of Mr O'Donoghue --

9 something that is entirely illegitimate. And you have a gain that is therefore capable

10 of entire segregation from what would otherwise be an entire business.

Damian William Langiano: That's a separate issue, we can now prove the legitimate business

Was based on illegitimate means, had no real road map, or structured security and was built

upon neuro science pre 2018 as Chamath was out and confessing that was "programming the user"

thus, for the competition it was copy or die away, advertise through the model or be unable to attract

attention .....

Zuckerberg: The dialogue today kind of reminds me of someone in the 1800s sitting around and

saying: one day we might have planes and they may crash. Nonetheless, people developed

planes first and then took care of flight safety. If people were focused on safety first, no one

would ever have built a plane.

Damian William Langiano: We repeat – only the pilot got in the cockpit and when the passengers

Did they were acutely clear on the decision and the consequences.

These experiments and lack of defined terms and conditions contravene

The Nuremberg Code

The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated

as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud,

deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have

sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved, as to enable

him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that, before the

acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject, there should be made known to

him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be

conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health

or person, which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.

The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who

initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not

be delegated to another with impunity.

The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by

other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.

The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a

knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study, that the anticipated

results will justify the performance of the experiment.

The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering and

injury.

No experiment should be conducted, where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or

disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the

experimental physicians also serve as subjects.

The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian importance

of the problem to be solved by the experiment.

Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental

subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability, or death.

The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of

skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage

in the experiment.

During the course of the experiment, the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment

to an end, if he has reached the physical or mental state, where continuation of the experiment

seemed to him to be impossible.

During the course of the experiment, the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the

experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior

skill and careful judgement required of him, that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in

injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

["Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals under Control Council Law No. 10",

Vol. 2, pp. 181-182. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1949.]

<https://history.nih.gov/display/history/Nuremberg%2BCode>

Damian William Langiano: And I quote the below as the first paragraph proves America recognises the

above codes, thus is in breach of them to obtain and retain and dominant position in the market.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuremberg\\_Code](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nuremberg_Code)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doctors%27\\_Trial](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Doctors%27_Trial)

The Doctors' Trial (officially United States of America v. Karl Brandt, et al.) was the first of 12 trials for

war crimes of high-ranking German officials and industrialists that the United States authorities held

in their occupation zone in Nuremberg, Germany, after the end of World War II. These trials were held

before US military courts, not before the International Military Tribunal, but took place in the same

rooms at the Palace of Justice. The trials are collectively known as the "subsequent Nuremberg trials",

formally the "Trials of War Criminals before the Nuremberg Military Tribunals" (NMT).[1]

Twenty of the 23 defendants were medical doctors and were accused of having been involved in Nazi

human experimentation and mass murder under the guise of euthanasia. The indictment was filed on

25 October 1946; the trial lasted from 9 December that year until 20 August 1947. Of the 23

defendants, seven were acquitted and seven received death sentences; the remainder received prison

sentences ranging from 10 years to life imprisonment.

11 Now, that involves a number of factual arguments about whether it is severable in  
12 that way, but one can understand the case. So what they are saying is that in terms  
13 of the entire analysis you can junk the legitimate form of business, the on-Facebook  
14 exploitation of data, and all you need look at is the illegitimate form, and you are  
15 simply then saying, well, the profit there obtained, in other words profits derived from  
16 on-Facebook data, subtracted from the totality of profits including the Off-Facebook  
17 Data, that difference is something which needs to be accounted for. There would,  
18 because it is very profitable, be a bargain between the users and the provider, Meta.  
19 What those terms would be is what Professor Scott Morton is all about. She's  
20 saying, well, it won't be 100 per cent with the class, but it also won't be 100 per cent  
21 with the provider. It lies somewhere in between. And the purpose, really, of her  
22 economic analysis is to work out where the bargain would be struck in terms of the  
23 buying of the consent of the class that needs to be provided in order to avoid the  
24 infringement.

25 Now, I may be getting it completely wrong. That may not be their case. But if it is –

26 MR SINGLA: I think --

17

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- why is it wrong?

2 MR SINGLA: Yes, I think that is actually an encapsulation of what they are saying.

3 And we say it is wrong, for essentially three reasons. I don't want to labour these  
4 points, but it is important to just explain at what stage of the analysis that you have  
5 just developed our points come in.

6 So at the end of the analysis, we say you are not entitled to a share of Facebook  
7 profits. I think the Tribunal understands that. They are claiming a remedy base on  
8 the commercial value of the data to Facebook. We say that's not pecuniary loss. So  
9 that's the compensational remedy point that comes in at the end of that analysis.

10 At the intermediate stage, we say, it's all well and good asserting this counterfactual



11 bargain but how are you actually going from A to C? So that's the causal or  
12 counterfactual issue that we say arises as a matter of pleading and methodology.  
13 What's the blueprint or what's the basis for your asserting that that would be the  
14 counterfactual? You are not proposing to investigate that question. You are simply  
15 asserting that that would be the case.

Damian William Langiano: And we the people agree – there is not and never can be a deal  
That justifies or can be bargained that would see the people being paid to get on the train  
To a digital gas chamber, one that holds us in a position of one might say the natural born  
smoker,  
Coerced, addicted, segregated and then told what is best for them by the data extracted,  
Reworked and reprogrammed via the counterfactual world, which is as proven to be so  
Through contextual targeting of the peripheral vision. Thus, as below formulating the  
optimum  
digital slave.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=evlrwW6cLCg>

Damian William Langiano: Gentleman, Zuckerberg never planned to make the plane safe,  
he's proposed to "give you wings" and just like Icarus has led all to close to the sun,  
seeking  
now to obtain a disclaimer just before they fall. Which is our reality Sir Marcus, there isn't  
a  
deal to be struck for the truth and the gods we all bow to, won't allow it and in the folly of  
such a  
deception sees those involved stood at the centre of light for all 46mn UK users and those  
2.6Bn  
beyond to see.

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Right.

17 MR SINGLA: But then the point I'm now on is at the earliest stage of the analysis,  
18 so infringement, as it were, working back through the various steps, and at  
19 infringement we say that what you just put to me is flawed because it's treating  
20 Off-Facebook Data as severable. And there is no magic to Off-Facebook Data. The

21 only reason we are focusing on Off-Facebook Data is they have decided to recast  
22 their case by reference to Off-Facebook Data because they think the German case  
23 gives them some assistance.

Damian William Langiano: Unless of course that it is severable because it's the  
WhatsApp data

And that this case has been brought to bury that in a compensatory package and you are  
Mr Singla

and

Sir Marcus unaware of that and without reading what Mr Donoghue has to say can tell you

That I have had 10's of read receipts from case bringer without a single response, thus  
deduce she is

being

leveraged to bring this case forward and is in my belief a victim of manipulation.

24 But it's not right to proceed on the basis that there's a severable service. In fact it's

25 common sense that a user is using the Facebook service. But that's why we say

26 actually they start from the wrong premise. If one's looking at the first question, "Is

18

1 there an infringement? Is there an unfair price?", it's completely artificial and there's

2 no legal or economic basis for saying, well, I'm going to forget everything that was

3 going on before, and I'm only going to focus on 2014 onwards.

Damian William Langiano: The purchase time aligns and what is to be presented is that

Not all users of WhatsApp are on Facebook and thus to respond to an earlier observation

That the legitimate on Facebook profits would also be increasing due to the illegitimate  
obtaining

of off Facebook data.

4 And indeed we say it's completely self-serving because -- I think I made this point

5 yesterday -- if one adopted the correct approach and said, "Facebook users have

6 a service; let's see whether they are paying an unfair price", if they ask what we

7 submit is the right question, the evidence would show there's a huge consumer

8 surplus and there's no way there's an unfair price.

9 But what they've done is avoid the right question and focus in on post 2014. And we

10 say that's obviously wrong because in my example of the dominant company

11 increasing costs over time one doesn't just ignore all the value that the service or the

12 product was giving pre 2014. I mean, in the pharmaceutical cases one's not looking

13 at: every time the price goes up was the product changing or being developed

14 commensurately? One is actually stepping back and saying: what was the price?

15 What was the product? Was there an unfair price?

16 So that's why it's a very helpful articulation of what they are saying, but we do say

17 the departure point is completely wrong. It's not right. There is one service, and the

18 fact that we are talking about Off-Facebook Data is not reflective of what users are

19 actually receiving, which is one platform.

Damian William Langiano: I'm going to need a little assistance here. What is being said is that

Facebook have taken a decent idea and service and manipulated it into a software application

That has programmed its users and is now seeking to forge a disclaimer exonerating them

Retrospectively, which proves out Facebooks involvement because no one has asked me

if I want this deal, least of all the Applicant whose read receipts tell me she's the patsy in this

case and the word salad within is simply 3 wise men playing dumb to the second coming of Jesus

and fear not for I have proven that to be true in higher cycles than this one.

Though what was Jesus, he was a TRUTH teller, a lie catcher and visionary that conquers all darkness.

What does my name translate as, Damian – Conquering – Langiano – Visionary

The truth as they say will set us free, even Zuckerberg as the story fore tells.

20 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

21 MR SINGLA: Just two final points on this topic about incremental, because two

22 points emerge in the skeleton which we say again miss the point or don't adequately  
23 justify the incremental approach.

24 First, one sees in the skeleton a mantra that the fundamental question as they  
25 describe it is whether Facebook's conduct would have been viable under conditions  
26 of reasonable, effective competition for users. And one sees that a number of times  
19

1 in their skeleton.

2 In relation to that, first of all that was the submission Mr O'Donoghue made in the  
3 Hg Capital case and was rejected. That is just a legal point about whether one  
4 always needs to ask that question or whether it is simply advisable. But more  
5 fundamentally for present purposes, whether or not one is asking that question one  
6 still has to look at the whole service. So simply restating a formulation of a legal test,  
7 we respectfully submit, doesn't assist on the particular point that we are concerned  
8 with, which is whether one can look only at incremental changes to the service.

9 And the second point, if I can show you at paragraph 61 of the PCR's skeleton, you'll  
10 see that it's said at 61:

11 "PCR's approach applies the principles appropriately."

12 And then you'll see at 61.1:

13 "Under limb 1, Professor Scott Morton considers whether Facebook is achieving  
14 excessive profits overall, in addition to whether the Off-Facebook Data it is extracting  
15 from users is of significant commercial value. Accordingly she analyses the issue of  
16 excessiveness by reference to profits and in relation to the platform as a whole and  
17 not solely those services associated with Off-Facebook Data."

Damian William Langiano: Which in itself would create another argument, whether the  
off-Facebook data was independently created and if so was Facebook at liberty to use it  
and or if the user had signed a waiver. The data we are discussing was acquired by Meta  
to feed the monster they had built by coercing addicting and experimenting on the users  
thus, the data in WhatsApp is a direct repercussion of the abuse bestowed from the neuro

circuitry activated by the algorithms Zuckerberg pushed on with against his own in house advice – thus the respondent counsel is correct – this cannot be detached for the whole service is one entity and the claimants unable to realise restitution because there is bargain to be obtained in any counterfactual no matter how unlawfully constructed.

THESE CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY BREAK EVERY LAW – COMPETITION INCLUDED

18 Then they go on to explain what she does in relation to limb 2. And then you will see  
19 a reference to what they say is the fundamental question about workable competition  
20 and so on in 61.3.

21 But then at 62 they say:

22 "In sum, the PCR's approach reflects the United Brands framework faithfully and  
23 considers whether the factual Off-Facebook Data Price would be achievable under  
24 conditions of workable competition."

25 Then:

26 "By applying this framework she necessarily considers whether the provision of  
20

1 social networking services as a whole justifies the Off-Facebook Data Price."

2 We say, with respect, that's not an accurate reflection of what she's doing. She's not  
3 considering the value of the service as a whole. The only point at which one sees  
4 reference to what's going on overall is at limb 1. It's right that she does look at  
5 whether Facebook's profits overall are excessive, and I'm going to come on to that.  
6 There's a separate point that we make in relation to that. But it's wrong, we say, for  
7 them to describe Professor Scott Morton as looking at the value of the social  
8 networking service as a whole. That's not what she's doing.

Damian William Langiano: Finally, we read, or one may have skipped SOCIAL NETWORKING

Though for who, and for whose real benefit and for what ends, the club with the club.

My trail evidence will expose all who have profited directly and indirectly and that pyramid will funnel down into the avenues of bribes and coercive measures. Thus, this isn't a

networking service it's a marketing and advertising-based carousel with the leading lights

manipulated into success, one might take Gym Shark, Billion-dollar gym wear though where?

For when we have the numbers we have the means, take Charles Dunstan's quote to me "I'm just a mobile salesman" when they pumped and dumped Carphone Warehouse, he cried

As I shopped in Aldi and called him out by email or John Caudwell who was spinning phones and

the VAT man, thus we follow the yellow brick road back the realisation that he who controls

the data controls the game, and if that triggers chemical-based loyalty then it becomes a drug war

and the digital cartels start fighting one another ..... and that's people die., like Molly Russell

and we know Leigh Day did a deal and the Andrew Walker KC played the same role each light

shines upon those within this case.

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No. Isn't she saying -- again we'll see if

10 Mr O'Donoghue accepts that's the way they're putting their case -- what they're

11 saying is that no part of the Meta offering through Facebook is attributable to the

12 Off-Facebook Data use, and you can provide each and every part of the value to

13 subscribers to the Facebook service without the Off-Facebook Data.

14 MR SINGLA: Yes. But the problem with that -- I keep coming back to two points.

15 First of all one can't ignore all of the value from the service as whole, because

16 there's no severable service that the consumers are receiving. And secondly, insofar

17 as there were changes you can't just disregard them.

Damian William Langiano: and nor should you as each were designed to break boundaries

Leverage the user's guilt and shame and squeeze tighter the trauma bond, knowing so that

Each competitor is doing the same.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: The question can be reformulated in this way,  
19 could it not: if there was no access to Off-Facebook Data, would the offering to the  
20 class be any different?

Damian William Langiano: No, because the manner in which the platform was set up  
Is that the class were always the product and thus were updated and programmed  
Concurrently, meaning that they were never sound of mind, once the connection stage  
Started, they were locked into Hotel California, and have been such that the world out  
Side is now closer to the world inside and thus we and I am one exist in a different  
paradigm

One that allows us to see both worlds. It's a painful process coming out the "Matrix"  
And thus why I am and under GODS guidance coming back for his children.

21 MR SINGLA: Sir, with respect, that sort of question might have some relevance at  
22 quantification, but we are not -- it's very important to understand we are not talking  
23 here about quantification.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Not talking about quantification --

25 MR SINGLA: Absolutely not, we are talking about whether there was unfair price.

26 And we say, if one is assessing whether there was an unfair price it's actually just not  
21

1 asking the right question to say, well, was a particular increase in price  
2 commensurate with some increase in the service? Actually, one needs to look  
3 at: what was the price? Yes, here is a zero price, but we still say it is wrong to focus  
4 on part of what was the non-monetary consideration. And one has to ask: what is  
5 the transaction? What is the arrangement or the bargain? I mean, the bargain is the  
6 word they use. Well, what is the bargain? The bargain is not: I give you some  
7 Off-Facebook Data; you give me some part of the Facebook service. It is just  
8 nonsense, with respect. And that's the problem.

Damian William Langiano: "There's only one Tony Singla. One Tony Siiiiingla"

“Walking in a Singla wonderland”

That is exactly the problem, this whole PCR is NONSENSE Under the perspectives it brings however through Mr Singla exquisite technical ability

He and the people who were coerced used, abused, and now arguing without demand to be discarded with a few quid for their trouble.

9 If one is establishing an abuse here, they need to apply United Brands and they

10 need to apply that to the real-world product and the real-world price.

Damian William Langiano: We believe done so, as the real world product is the user

And the price the world they now live in due to the data stolen, calibrated and manipulated

Resulting in the effects out side every mans window, We ask you only to open your Eyes on the tube ride home, you’ll see the price 2.6Bn are paying.

11 So that's all we say about the incremental approach.

12 Then in relation to the unfair price abuse we also make a further point, which is, as

13 I've just mentioned and I think we've just seen in the skeleton as part of limb 1, what

14 Professor Scott Morton proposes to do is to say, well, was the price excessive at

15 stage 1? And she proposes to assess that by looking at Facebook profits overall.

16 And then she says, well, I can see that the Off-Facebook Data contributed

17 significantly to those overall excessive profits.

18 And I could perhaps just show you where she says that. At 18A in the summary of

Damian William Langiano: 18.18

19 her first report. That's page 228.

20 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you.

21 MR SINGLA: She says:

22 "Excessive profits ... I consider that the appropriate way to assess whether an unfair

23 price or bargain has been struck is to assess Facebook's profitability so as to

24 consider whether Facebook is achieving a supracompetitive financial performance

25 across both sides of the platform and whether the incremental data for Off-Facebook



26 Tracking is contributing significantly to this financial performance."

22

1 Then she says:

2 "I conduct a preliminary assessment of Facebook's profitability and show that it has

3 persistently made financial returns in excess of cost of capital, a conclusion

4 consistent with the analysis by the CMA."

5 And then you'll see she goes on to refer to the ATT and the econometric before and

6 after approach:

7 "Both approaches show significant incremental profits associated with Off-Facebook

8 Tracking."

9 And if we look at paragraph 200 we see that what she is doing at limb 1, and actually

10 all that she's doing -- just to be clear, this is the scope of the limb 1 exercise -- she's

11 going to consider whether Facebook is achieving an excessive profit overall and then

12 whether the Off-Facebook Data it is extracting from users is of significant commercial

13 value such that it is materially contributing to these returns."

14 And you'll see it's also helpful perhaps just to look at 209:

15 "To understand whether the price charged by Facebook was excessive I have

16 undertaken a preliminary analysis of publicly available data to estimate incremental

17 revenues and profits earned by Facebook ... and Facebook's overall level of

18 profitability."

19 Just to be clear, what she's saying at limb 1 is, I'm going to look at overall profits

20 because the overall profits were excessive. So nothing incremental about that

21 question. They are saying the overall profits were excessive.

22 And what we say really in relation to this is really two points. The first is, insofar as

23 she's saying at the moment that there's evidence to think that there were excessive

24 profits, that's based only on the CMA, which was something -- they say in their

25 skeleton that Facebook didn't challenge what the CMA had to say, and that is wrong.

26 But we say it's not sufficient simply to rely on what the CMA has said in relation to

1 whether the profits are excessive. There needs to be a proper blueprint for  
2 analysing that question, because it's so critical to what they are doing at limb 1.  
3 But secondly, the analysis is not only to work out what Facebook's profits actually  
4 were, but also whether they were excessive and whether they were excessive taking  
5 into account the multi-sided nature of the market.  
6 And what we don't see in the expert evidence is any real explanation of how they are  
7 going to substantiate or how she is going to investigate this question of whether the  
8 overall profits (a) were excessive and (b) were excessive taking into account the  
9 two-sided nature of the market.

Damian William Langiano: I am certainly fighting my own ADHD and the desire to reach  
the finish line, however under the statements made by Zuckerberg, the experiments and  
failure to deliver safe passage and his overall control, coupled with the evidence of the  
US Trial where he was knowingly abusing, addicting and manipulating children and the  
Evidence of Molly Russell and all other enquiries, fines paid and settlements made.  
The evidence points only to racketeering and false accounting and the fact his legal  
teams

Are always outside of the company and use only what is given tells me we are  
“schwimming wida fishes” or more accurately with sharks.

10 And that is obviously something that the Tribunal was very focused on on the last  
11 occasion. The point arises in a slightly different way with the recast case. But where  
12 it really arises, it arises in two main places, first in relation to counterfactual. The  
13 two-sided nature of the market is relevant there because one has to think, well, if you  
14 take out the abuses, what Facebook might have done needs to take into account the  
15 two-sided nature of the market.

16 But here the two-sided nature of the market really comes in as well, because if your  
17 starting point at limb 1 is: your overall profits are excessive; that's how they are going  
18 to prove the unfair price, well, okay, but how are you going to prove that the overall

19 profits were excessive and how are you going to prove that they were excessive

20 notwithstanding the two-sided nature of the market?

21 And we say that that actually runs straight into the problems that they had on the last

22 occasion.

23 Sir, that's all I really wanted to say on what we submit are the three fundamental

24 problems. I have a point on suitability and cost-benefit, but I wonder, because I will

25 need to refer to some confidential material and it may be convenient to hear from me

26 on those points slightly later in the afternoon rather than disrupt the hearing, because

24

1 I think it may be necessary -- unless --

Damian William Langiano: Confidential Mr Singla, Sir Marcus .....is their such a thing

Anymore?

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Do you want to sweep them into your response to

3 Mr Bacon if you have any? Would that be a good --

4 MR SINGLA: The point simply is a practical one, which is I may need to ask you to

5 sit in private, and I don't want to disrupt the hearing now.

6 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That is very helpful and considerate. Yes, our

7 preference would be to ensure that you raise these points but later on if we can

8 do that.

9 MR SINGLA: Yes, I won't be very long. I think I have stuck to my agreement on

10 time.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's very helpful, Mr Singla, but don't forget. We

12 will try not to.

13 MR SINGLA: Sir, I'm grateful.

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you.

15 Submissions in reply by MR O'DONOGHUE

16 MR O'DONOGHUE: In terms of my order of points I want to start with a couple of

17 contextual preliminary remarks and then we can touch on a couple of certification

18 cases. I then want to give you a brief summary of our case in a nutshell. But the  
19 bulk of my submissions will obviously be focused on the four points Mr Singla has  
20 helpfully teed up this morning. So I will get to those asap.

21 Obviously, sir, the three critical points for my purposes are the evidence on the  
22 positive case, the question of compensatory damages, and the incremental  
23 approach Mr Singla has criticised, and then touching briefly on the profitability  
24 criticisms.

25 In terms of preliminary points, sir, two points if I may. First of all the context of this  
26 case: a dominant, indeed we say a monopoly firm, using and misusing data  
25

1 belonging to those who otherwise interact with the platform is one of if not the most  
2 important aspects of competition law enforcement globally. The President described  
3 the case yesterday as important, cutting edge and innovative, and we respectfully  
4 agree and aver that point.

Damian William Langiano: Boom Mr O'Donoghue – that's the TRUTH!!!!

25 In terms of preliminary points, sir, two points if I may. First of all the context of this  
26 case: a dominant, indeed we say a monopoly firm, using and misusing data  
25

1 belonging to those who otherwise interact with the platform is one of if not the most  
2 important aspects of competition law enforcement globally. The President described  
3 the case yesterday as important, cutting edge and innovative, and we respectfully  
4 agree and aver that point.

5 In my submission it is also hardly profound futurology to suggest that the role of  
6 competition law in data-based markets will expand materially going forward. This is  
7 not an in terrorem submission to say that the broad and flexible framework that the  
8 competition legislation represents must be capable of adapting to these data-driven  
9 developments. And indeed, if not, vast sectors of the economic would for practical  
10 purposes become off-limits for competition law, which would be obviously

11 unacceptable.

Damian William Langiano: Another 3pointer

12 And in this context the Tribunal's collective regime is particularly important,  
13 particularly of course for consumers such as in this case who realistically have zero  
14 prospects in the real world of vindicating their rights against someone like Meta, one  
15 of the largest and most profitable companies in the world.

Damian William Langiano; How are we looking fella's?

16 The prospect of an individual consumer litigating for £50 or £100 against Meta is  
17 frankly for the birds.

Damian William Langiano; But for the right reasons a man will die for the cause.

18 The Tribunal in this context of course doesn't need me to tell it that the law  
19 on unfairness is a developing area of the Tribunal's case law and indeed that of the  
20 appellate courts. Since the Tribunal's original judgment in these proceedings last  
21 year we've seen a large number of cases, including in particular CPOs, concerning  
22 unfairness abuses. I'm referring of course to Liothyronine, Hydrocortisone, the  
23 second Phenytoin case, Boundary Fares, Kent v Apple, Ennis v Apple, Apple  
24 Batteries and Neill v Sony. And several of those cases are also likely to be before  
25 the appellate courts in the near future.

26 Sir, of course the reason I raise this is to make good the point that this is very much  
26

1 a developing area of law, which, all else equal, makes it much less susceptible to  
2 summary or interlocutory determination, which of course is what Mr Singla seeks to  
3 do today.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That is true, but I think the corollary of that is that it  
5 is incumbent on those who are pushing the boundaries in the developing area --  
6 I quite take your point there -- to be absolutely clear about the boundaries they're  
7 pushing.

Damian William Langiano: To do that, one must invite and accept all aspects of the law

And the expertise it is derived from for this is new ground and that of new ways

8 MR O'DONOGHUE: I accept that. There is a balance; I accept that.

9 Now, the President put to Mr Singla yesterday that his argument under remedy in a  
10 sense prove too much in that no unfairness case when it comes to user data would  
11 on his case pass muster. And it is of course a pretty extraordinary submission to say  
12 that an abuse of dominant position cannot lead to any damages for consumers. It is  
13 a particularly extraordinary submission in the context of a CPO regime whose very  
14 *raison d'être* is to facilitate the vindication of consumers' rights. The right to  
15 damages engenders defendants' compliance with competition law.

16 I'll just give you a reference on this, sir, it's the *Le Patourel* case in the  
17 Court of Appeal, in tab 32 of the authorities bundle.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Volume 4.

19 MR O'DONOGHUE: Volume 4. 1566, paragraph 29:

20 "The principal object of the collective action regime is to facilitate access to justice ...  
21 in particular consumers who would otherwise not be able to access legal redress ...  
22 finally, emphasis is laid on the benefits to judicial efficiency brought about by the  
23 ability to aggregate claims."

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

25 MR O'DONOGHUE: So the collective regime as an element obviously of  
26 compensation for consumers and an element of deterrence in the public interest

27

1 vis-à-vis defendants.

2 The second preliminary point, sir, is to be clear what is not challenged in these  
3 proceedings by Meta. It is not suggested that the conduct in question is not at least  
4 well arguable for the purposes of a strike out or summary judgment, subject of  
5 course to Mr Singla's incremental point, which I'll deal with and we say that's a bad  
6 point.

7 The corollary of that is that if there is an arguable case on abuse then there is in

8 principle a right to damages and there's a right to an effective remedy.

9 In terms of the counterfactual and methodology it is also, on Meta's part, essentially  
10 an evidence free and purely negative approach. They have resorted to criticising  
11 aspects of the PCR's methodology, based on assertion but without putting forward  
12 a single concrete item of evidence to support their assertions.

13 I will come to various examples, but just to give you one for now: as Mr Singla just  
14 outlined, the PCR relies on the CMA's recent analysis of Meta's profitability, and  
15 Mr Singla's skeleton says there are serious flaws in Professor Scott Morton's  
16 profitability analysis. But what Meta does not say is what is wrong with the CMA's  
17 conclusions. It did not challenge them at the time. It does not challenge them now.  
18 There is a single footnote in Mr Parker's second report, if we can look at this at  
19 A12/842, please.

20 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue, I don't want us running up to 4.30  
21 or 4.25 with really important questions unaddressed. You've quite rightly said that  
22 the regime of collective proceedings is to ensure collective redress and access to  
23 justice. And of course we accept that. But I don't think it is good enough for you to  
24 say that if we have an arguable abuse there must be a loss somewhere. It does  
25 seem to me that there is a degree of uncertainty -- it may be entirely our fault -- but  
26 there's a degree of uncertainty at least in my mind as to how you are classifying the  
28

1 loss in this case.

Damian William Langiano: Which has been the issue throughout the vagueness of the  
Approach, or perceived being so, seems only to serve as protection for crimes of the  
Nature presented (Note we are on a separate time line though seeking to answer as  
If we were there so at all stages, we would be covering the expanding arguments)

2 Now, Mr Singla says it's asserted by you to be a pecuniary loss.

3 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: If it is, then I don't understand how it is such

5 a thing, because it seems to me it is a claim that you, the class, have been deprived  
6 of something for which you could have charged, which is not a loss, it's a loss of  
7 again if you like. have no problem in that being the way you put your claim.

But if it is a typical 9 tortious loss that you are asserting then it does seem to me that what  
Mr Singla

is

10 saying is having a degree of force. You are straight in Lloyd v Google territory,  
11 where you are going to have to show on an individual basis that the abuse of data  
12 has occasioned loss in the true tortious sense.

13 Now, I don't have problem in pushing the boundaries but I would like to know which  
14 boundaries are being pushed, if they are being pushed.

15 MR O'DONOGHUE: Indeed. Sir, I will come to that in some detail. To be clear, I  
16 am scene setting at this stage.

17 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: You are, but I think we have the scene and we'd  
18 like to get to the granularity.

19 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes, sir, I will move on.

20 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Okay.

21 MR O'DONOGHUE: Point taken.

22 Sir, just to give you our case in a nutshell, and I will then immediately come to the  
23 question of counterfactual and then the question of compensatory damages.

24 Our case in a nutshell can be divided essentially into a three-phase story. At

25 the time Meta was a new entrant in the early 2000s it was competing on the basis of  
26 being a privacy-centric company. We can pick this up at the Claim Form at A1, page  
29

1 18, please.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue, why don't you set out a series of

3 propositions, just without reference, and then expand upon them. So just give us --

4 it's a three-phase story, you say?



5 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

6 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Give us the phases and then we can understand  
7 the overall picture and you can expand it.

8 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

9 Phase 1, new entrant, very much focused on maximising user privacy.

Damian William Langiano; Building TRUST

10 Phase 2 we see Meta dip their toe in the water in an effort to dramatically ramp up  
11 data collection, and then facing such user resistance to those data collection  
12 practices that they had to be reversed. This is the Project Beacon from 2007. And  
13 Mr Zuckerberg called that initiative a mistake.

14 And what this episode shows is that when at least there was some semblance of  
15 competition it was not simply possible for Meta to foist Off-Facebook Data extraction  
16 on users. The absence at that stage of a monopoly position allowed the users to  
17 push back.

Damian William Langiano: Boundary testing, this was always a narcissistic sociopath –  
the platform

And the CEO responsible.

18 Phase 3 then is really the early 2010s to 2014. By this stage the market has tipped  
19 in Meta's favour which then allowed it to behave with more or less impunity when it  
20 came to forcing data extraction on users. I will quickly give you the reference, sir.  
21 There was historically a user-based referendum on privacy changes. That was  
22 abolished by Meta because there was a roadblock.

Damian William Langiano: Which means they consciously took away the rights of the  
user

To agree to all and any experimentation when asserting the data collected back onto the  
user.

The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential.

This means that the person involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should  
be so situated

as to be able to exercise free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud,

deceit, duress, over-reaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have

sufficient knowledge and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved, as to enable

him to make an understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that, before the

acceptance of an affirmative decision by the experimental subject, there should be made known to

him the nature, duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be

conducted; all inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health

or person, which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment.

The duty and responsibility for ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who

initiates, directs or engages in the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not

be delegated to another with impunity.

We have set out in paragraph 50

23 of our Amended Claim Form a series of frankly deceptive activities by Meta in

24 relation to its data collection practices. We know the Off-Facebook Tracking was

25 introduced in June 2014.

Damian William Langiano: The year Meta bought WhatsApp

And we can go quickly, sir, to paragraph 91 of the

26 Claim Form. It's internal page starting at 91B.

30

1 Sir, just to give you a sense of the scale and scope of Off-Facebook Data tracking.

2 "Two popular menstruation apps shared extensive sensitive personal data with

3 Facebook as a result of code added by Facebook. They found ... inter alia

4 information on users' mood, their use of contraception, the date of the last period, the  
5 duration of their periods, the duration of their cycles."

6 Then (c):

7 "20 NHS Trusts had been sharing browsing with Facebook ... about the user viewing  
8 a patient handbook for a particular HIV medication, with the name of the drug and  
9 the NHS Trust in question, along with the user's IP address and details of their  
10 Facebook user ID."

11 The Metropolitan Police, again, sharing sensitive data with Facebook. And the  
12 quotation:

13 "Facebook received a parcel of data when someone clicked a link to securely and  
14 confidentially report rape or sexual assault. This included the sexual nature of the  
15 offence being reported, the time that the page was viewed and the code denoting the  
16 person's Facebook account ID."

17 Then 92:

18 The Kosinski study shows that " easily accessible digital records of behaviour,  
19 Facebook likes, can be used to automatically and accurately predict a range of  
20 highly sensitive personal attributes including sexual orientation, ethnicity, religious  
21 and political views, personality traits, intelligence, happiness, use of addictive  
22 substances, parental separation, age and gender."

23 Then the last sentence in that quotation:

24 "For example, merely avoiding explicitly homosexual content may be insufficient to  
25 prevent others from discovering one's sexual orientation."

26 Then at 93 there's the suggestion not merely of reacting to preferences but altering  
31

1 users' future behaviour.

2 So the Off-Facebook Data is data of the utmost sensitivity and importance. There  
3 are reports for example of women who have miscarried being continued to be  
4 bombarded with pregnancy-related product advertisements whilst on Facebook.

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Right. So your first point is that there is a clear  
6 distinction to be drawn between On-Facebook data and Off-Facebook Data.

7 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: And that is a bright line.

9 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: And what do you say about Mr Singla's point that  
11 in fact it's all data which is aggregated and monetised generically by Facebook?

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, that is chronologically untrue, because of course for many,  
13 many years there was only on-Facebook data. So one can see chronologically the  
14 Off-Facebook Data is something new and discrete.

15 Now, of course there is some triangulation with the on-Facebook data. We see this  
16 from ATT. The additional commercial value generated by the Off-Facebook Data  
17 specifically is astronomical. It is night and day compared to the on-Facebook data.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I mean, what's the answer to Mr Singla's point that  
19 this is just a business developing. They are seeking to monetise what they can in  
20 the way any undertaking does. It provides a service and it seeks to obtain the  
21 maximum value from its consumer base for that service?

Damian William Langiano: One must for administration purposes and as the true crimes  
Rise to the surface. "I feel tremendous guilt," admitted Chamath Palihapitiya, former Vice  
President of User Growth at Facebook, to an audience of Stanford students. He was  
responding to a question about his involvement in exploiting consumer behavior. "The  
short-term,

dopamine-driven feedback loops that we have created are destroying how society  
works,"

he explained. In Palihapitiya's talk, he highlighted something most of us know but few  
really

appreciate: smartphones and the social media platforms they support are turning us into  
bona

fide addicts. While it's easy to dismiss this claim as hyperbole, platforms like Facebook, Snapchat,

and Instagram leverage the very same neural circuitry used by slot machines and cocaine to

keep us using their products as much as possible.

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: Well, the terms and/or prices at which these additional data are

23 extracted may well be abusive, in the same way as someone says, well, I'm

24 expanding my service, for which I can charge a premium, and that premium may well

25 be (inaudible word). Nothing different there.

26 MR RIDYARD: One point Mr Singla made was about the need to look at the overall

32

1 business and the overall profitability of Facebook at a point in time. But your

2 comments here are flagging up to me the need to take a dynamic look as well

3 because, in these earlier phases, what if Facebook wasn't making much money at all

4 or was loss-making? Which is quite plausible in some of the earlier phases. When

5 you look at the snapshot of the profitability into 2024, to what extent do you need to

6 take into account the journey that the company -- the dynamic incentives for

7 rewarding winners when they have won a long-fought battle?

Damian William Langiano: But that battle was a "battle" it was entrapment, imprisonment

And enslavement, done so knowing the roadmap was always such and that the game of Simms

Was one of world domination and the addiction proven as each court has capitulated thus now

We can see the "flashing blades of which we hold" and the role of which we are to serve humanity

Musketeers you be and fight like Dartanian I shall.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=F5Sb9AoirSU>

8 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, two points. First of all, we have pleaded and it has not

9 been contradicted that prior to Off-Facebook Data being introduced in June 2014

10 Meta was already enormously profitable.

11 MR RIDYARD: That doesn't address my point, which is, how big a payoff does it  
12 need now to justify the ex ante risks and investments that it made, you know,  
13 ten years ago?

Damian William Langiano: Mr Ridyard, this was never a risk, this was entrapment,  
Neuroscience, neuron activation and it was meticulously delivered to a trusting  
global population, who's inner most secrets were harvested from deep within those we  
should trust, Gentleman this is an act of war, this is embedded digital architecture  
the NHS stolen by Palantir, the Metropolitan Police attacked by Facebook and being  
mutilated and stripped of its power as stated enclosed., and be warned again those  
of the bench with data harvesting vested interests.

14 MR O'DONOGHUE: Well, the second point then, sir, is that by 2014 the market has  
15 tipped. We say at that stage, when you have acquired effectively a monopoly  
16 position, to then foist on users these dramatic data extraction requirements, that is  
17 unnecessary and disproportionate and indeed we say at an unfair price.

Damian William Langiano: We add the WhatsApp acquisition.

18 MR RIDYARD: I know you are saying that, but as you were going through it it was  
19 making me think that maybe this is a justified payoff from what happened earlier.

Damian William Langiano: Dangerous ground Mr Ridyard

20 MR O'DONOGHUE: Well, sir, this is I think one of the two or three most profitable  
21 companies in human history. Most of those profits, as we understand it, are driven  
22 by Off-Facebook Data in the context where they were already substantially profitable  
23 prior to extracting Off-Facebook Data. And we say that if that is the payoff it is  
24 manifestly excessive.

Damian William Langiano: The bigger they are.....the harder the fall.

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: So, are you saying that your case would fail if  
26 Facebook were not profitable simply on the basis of on-Facebook data exploitation?

Damian William Langiano: We can qualify the manipulation, simulation and execution delivered

huge profits, and that in 2014 they took their criminality off platform and erased the rights to

collective consent and in doing contravened the Rome Statute, but more importantly and the

Nuremberg Code and at this point we qualify the head office is in Ireland and under the regulations

Of a signed participant of both.

1 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, there's no guarantee or no right to an automatic profit. It

2 may be that it turns out to be a bad investment decision or the fixed costs are so high

3 that they can never be recovered.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Right.

5 MR O'DONOGHUE: But in any event we say, and we have not been contradicted

6 on this, that on-Facebook data was enormously profitable certainly by 2014. So we

7 say it's a theoretical point at best.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: But taking Mr Ridyard's point of having to look at

9 the overall history of investment in any new business -- and let's talk hypothetically

10 here. Let's suppose that Meta invested billions in trying to develop their service, and

11 those costs historically incurred need to be recovered. And let us suppose that the

12 exploitation of on-Facebook data, which is how the model starts, is enough to recoup

13 some of those costs and, perhaps over many years, all of them. But developing the

14 business incrementally, Facebook, as they get established in the market, seek to

15 extract more by way of price, the in-kind data that they received, so that they can

16 recoup their costs more quickly using Off-Facebook Data.

17 Now, you may be right, they may be profitable on the basis of purely on-Facebook

18 data. But why should one ex ante ring-fence and segregate the profits derived from

19 on-Facebook data and the profits derived from Off-Facebook Data simply on your

20 say-so?

Damian William Langiano: We shouldn't however what this does is shine a light on the Authenticity of the claim and the desperate nature of the real crimes and those involved. Meta are desperate to pay the class, in a way the covers and closes out the Crimes Against

Humanity we have crystalised from all corners of this court and beyond. Gentleman In a world of data assessment, Meta have known this was coming and done all they can To affect the outcome and thus we stand the people before you and state this is

Article 7. Crimes against humanity

1. For the purpose of this Statute, "crime against humanity" means any of the following acts when committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of the attack;

Meta KNEW Mark Zuckerberg KNEW Chamath Palihapitiya KNEW, as did the investors Beneficiaries, subsidiaries they all KNEW and thus the digital foot print will reveal.

Isn't Mr Singla right when he says that when you are looking at what is

21 an unfair price -- here the price being the extraction of data and its value to Meta --

22 you need to take an holistic approach and say, well, if you are taking as a price this

23 data, the question is, looking at the overall service and what is received in return,

24 you need to look at the whole service and the offerings either which way in the

25 aggregate. And your ex ante disaggregation of on-Facebook and Off-Facebook

26 Data is simply an assertion which can't be made good without some kind of

34

1 methodology.

2 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, I will come to the incremental point shortly.

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Okay.

4 MR O'DONOGHUE: But --

5 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: We are already at the incremental point because

6 you are drawing a bright-line distinction between two forms of data where the very

7 point, as I understand Mr Singla to be making it, is that there is no such distinction to



8 be drawn without it being justified.

9 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, you have my point on the chronology that in fact --

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Purely a chronological point.

11 MR O'DONOGHUE: It's more than that, sir, of course. What is lost in all of this, of  
12 course, is that the bargaining parameter we put forward is that they would continue  
13 to keep 50 per cent of the Off-Facebook value. It is not the case that the ex ante  
14 reward is being completely ignored. There is a balancing of producer and consumer  
15 services, but there is a substantial reward of tens of billions of pounds or dollars in  
16 aggregate which they would, on our bargaining parameter, be permitted to keep  
17 going forward.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: But all that's saying is that the gain to Meta ought,  
19 as a matter of fairness, to be shared. That's just a gains-based analysis, isn't it?

20 MR O'DONOGHUE: I will come on to the compensatory damages question. In  
21 terms of hard cash --

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, but that's not how this process works. We  
23 start with a claim, and what I'm trying to understand is the basis for the very hard line  
24 that Professor Scott Morton draws between two different types of data.

25 On the face of it it's quite hard to understand why the line is drawn in that way,  
26 because the data is aggregated and sold as a whole. There's not one service where  
35

1 you are saying, okay, here, advertiser, you can get eyeballs derived from  
2 Off-Facebook Data, and here is a separate service where you can get eyeballs  
3 derived from on-Facebook data, and here's a third where we aggregate the two.  
4 What you get is an aggregation of the data on-Facebook and Off-Facebook which  
5 provides a unitary service.

6 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, on Professor Scott Morton's model, that isn't correct. What  
7 she has done is extrapolated from ATT to work out the incremental profitability that is  
8 associated solely with Off-Facebook Data. And the other --

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I'm not disputing that there isn't value in the  
10 Off-Facebook Data and that you can attribute a value to it. My point is not that. My  
11 point is that, in terms of how one extracts value, one isn't selling two separate  
12 services in terms of data streams. Facebook are selling a single corpus of data.  
13 Well, they are not selling data, they are selling what the data identifies, but you will  
14 permit the shorthand. They are not separating the two. They are selling a single  
15 aggregated pool of data.

16 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, that's true, but one can causatively isolate the component  
17 associated solely with Off-Facebook Data.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Okay, let's assume that's right, that you can say  
19 there is a specific value derivable from a specific form of data, but nevertheless it is  
20 monetised in the aggregate. Why does the fact that you can identify a specific value  
21 to the Off-Facebook Data matter in terms of the distinction you are drawing?

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, it's my before and after point. We understand  
23 pre-monopoly that they were able to monetise the service very profitably through the  
24 Off-Facebook Data.

Damian William Langiano; You mean "on facebook data"

We then transition into a monopoly and it is only at that stage,

25 coupled of course with the network effects, that we tip into Off-Facebook Data  
26 extraction. It's a classic before and after.

Damian William Langiano:

Döpfner: So far Berlin is more about great ideas and not so much about big funding.

Do you think that money follows ideas?

Zuckerberg: Yes, but it is not just money. If you think about companies that were built in  
Silicon Valley,

a lot of them early on were chip companies. And now the companies that are there, like  
Apple, are

much more successful than any of the chip companies were. So arguably you couldn't  
have a

company like Apple without first having that infrastructure of technology companies getting built up

first. They are missing in Berlin. But the city is catching up.

We once again refer you to the open access to the data being in the CHIP, 2014 is the tip

When the platform was ready to process the off market data without referendum being in place, with

Zuckerberg believing the counterfactual world was his created by the effects of the on Facebook

manipulation and coercion of likes and shares and software recalibration – of which I'm talking the

rewiring of the user. Thus whilst it might be construed we have on and off data streams we simply

have an ever decreasing circle proven by society's loss of autonomy and critical thinking.

36

1 The other point, of course, sir, is that one can see in very clear and tangible terms --

2 we saw what Off-Facebook Data entails. It is millions of websites all around the

3 world, huge numbers of apps all around the world and the Meta services other than

4 Facebook itself. And there is a fundamental question, which is, for example, why, for

5 me to send a photograph to my mother on Facebook, does Meta need to track me all

6 around the world on millions of websites and millions of apps?

7 There is a question as to whether those particular data are necessary and

8 proportionate or, to put it in United Brands terms, whether the consideration paid by

9 the user for continuing to access the service is too high, put in those terms. So we

10 say there's a substantial qualitative difference between activity on-Facebook and

11 activity on websites and apps Off-Facebook.

12 And to put this in competition terms, we say that under conditions of effective

13 competition Meta could simply not get away with imposing Off-Facebook Data

14 requirements on users. That was the Project Beacon experiment which blew up in

15 their face. So we have what we say is a classic before-and-after experiment, and

16 the after period is the monopoly period in which the data extraction we say, certainly  
17 absent the payment, simply should not have taken place. So it is causally related to  
18 the abuse.

Damian William Langiano: They why is such an overreach valued at such a low level, other  
than to

keep the lid on the real crimes as stated?

19 Now, to put this into more economic terms, if we can go to Professor Scott Morton's  
20 first report.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: A3, paragraph 109/255.

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Paragraph 109.

24 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you.

26 MR O'DONOGHUE: She says:

37

1 "The two-sided nature of Facebook's business model means that the users are both  
2 consumers of the Facebook platform but also providers of the necessary input to  
3 Facebook's advertising business. Facebook must buy that input by offering users  
4 terms for providing that input. Facebook buys this input with the provision of the  
5 social networking service ... Seen through this lens, Facebook's users are akin to  
6 workers. They provide their labour, attention and data, as an input in the production  
7 process. As Facebook is the dominant buyer of users' attention as the dominant  
8 social network platform, it has market power over users. This allows Facebook to  
9 dictate the wage for users' labour. In the present case this leads to the concern that  
10 users have been insufficiently compensated for their labour, allowing Facebook to  
11 make significant incremental profits."

12 Then she says:

13 "Because this is an important way to frame the issues in the present context, I briefly

14 discuss the economics of monopsony power."

15 Now, pausing there, one point Mr Singla made is this idea of the users being workers  
16 is a new one. As you can see it's been in the case from the outset. We then go over  
17 the page to 118:

18 "I predict under conditions of effective competition, social network platforms would  
19 compete for users' attention by compensating them for being on the platform ... it is  
20 essential for platforms to secure the attention of users because under competition  
21 there is a crucial link from the productivity gains and associated pass through of  
22 these gains from platform to users."

Damain William Langiano: Which now lays the grounds for the allegations that Chamath Palihapitiya

confessed too,

"I feel tremendous guilt," admitted Chamath Palihapitiya, former Vice President of User Growth at

Facebook, to an audience of Stanford students. He was responding to a question about his

involvement in exploiting consumer behavior. "The short-term, dopamine-driven feedback loops that

we have created are destroying how society works," he explained. In Palihapitiya's talk, he highlighted

something most of us know but few really appreciate: smartphones and the social media platforms

they support are turning us into bona fide addicts. While it's easy to dismiss this claim as hyperbole,

platforms like Facebook, Snapchat, and Instagram leverage the very same neural circuitry used by slot

machines and cocaine to keep us using their products as much as possible.

23 Then 119:

24 "The factual situation in this case however my assessment is that Facebook has

25 been able to avoid compensating its users because of its dominant position in the

26 provision of social networking platforms."

38

1 So put in economic terms, you have a monopoly purchaser effectively of labour or

2 eyeballs or attention, and they can depress the wage or compensation that is paid to

3 the users on the platform.

Damian William Langiano:

Article 7

Crimes against humanity

1. For the purpose of this Statute, "crime against humanity" means any of the following acts when

committed as

part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian population, with knowledge of

the attack:

(a) Murder; of the soul "Leonard Shengold"

(b) Extermination;

(c) Enslavement;

(d) Deportation or forcible transfer

of population; ON FACEBOOK TO OFF FACEBOOK WORLD

(e) Imprisonment or other severe deprivation of physical liberty in violation of fundamental rules of

international law;

(f) Torture;

(g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization, or any other

form

of sexual violence of comparable gravity; - There's an argument for sure.

(h) Persecution against any identifiable group or collectivity on political, racial, national, ethnic,

cultural,

religious, gender as defined in paragraph 3, or other grounds that are universally recognized as

impermissible under international law, in connection with any act referred to in this paragraph or

any crime within the jurisdiction of the Court;

(i) Enforced disappearance of persons;

(j) The crime of apartheid;

(k) Other inhumane acts of a similar character intentionally causing great suffering, or serious injury

to

body or to mental or physical health.

4 Then you see in the second half of 119:

5 "This is similar to the monopolistic firm in the example above that does not increase

6 wages because it is more profitable not to adequately pass the productivity gains

7 through to users but rather to keep the profitability per user high."

Damian William Langiano; SLAVERY – born of co-dependency and actuated through complex PTSD.

8 So sir, in basic terms that is how the case is put economically and factually.

9 I'm now going to move on to respond to Mr Singla's three core points.

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

11 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, would that be a convenient moment?

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: As we started at 10.00, I think if it's convenient for

13 you we will rise for ten minutes.

14 (11.21 am)

15 (A short break)

16 (11.32 am)

17 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue.

18 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, let me give you three quickfire references before I move on

19 to my first main point. To pick up on this dynamic incentives and fruits of labour  
20 point. If we could go to Professor Scott Morton's report at A/291.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: You'll see at 270:

23 "Can the data extraction be justified as the fruits of Facebook's prior investment?"

24 Then you see at 271 there was a 36 per cent EBIT margin 2013 and an absolute  
25 EBIT value of 2.8 billion.

26 That's one reference. Then, sir, just over the page to 262 and 263, at 263 she  
39

1 says --

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Paragraph 263?

3 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes. She says:

4 "I see some parallels between the discussion above and Hydrocortisone ...the  
5 Hydrocortisone Judgment distinguishes between three cases."

6 Then 264:

7 "The situation of transit from case 2 to case 3 seems to me to be an apt description  
8 of the situation with Facebook, which has seen the market tip in its favour and has  
9 been able to rely on the barriers to entry created by its network effect to impose  
10 conditions that would not be achievable under a competitive or contestable market."  
11 I think what she's saying there is that there was a period until sometime around the  
12 middle of 2014, which was perhaps case 2, when we have tipped into case 3 in the  
13 interim.

Damain William Langiano: Again at the time Meta acquired Whatsapp.

14 Finally, sir, one of the questions was, well, how can one segregate on- and  
15 Off-Facebook Data? Of course, one of the other things we know from ATT is that for  
16 the small proportion of users who continue to receive -- who have opted out in effect,  
17 they are only tracked on the basis of on-Facebook data. So we have an identifiable  
18 cohort today within the Apple user base who are only subject to on-Facebook data



19 tracking. So they are real people in the real world who have been segregated, for  
20 want of a better word, in that fashion.

21 My first point, sir, is to respond to Mr Singla's criticism, well, we have pleaded  
22 a negative case, but what is the basis for the positive case in terms of the  
23 counterfactuals we purport?

24 Now, just to build this up, sir, in a couple of layers. The first layer is, we have set out  
25 a basis in fact for a counterfactual involving a payment to users. The first building  
26 block is that users strongly dislike Off-Facebook Data tracking. We have seen in the  
40

1 Claim Form Project Beacon 2007, paragraph 95(a).

2 We've seen in response to the addition of on-Facebook data tracking the rise of  
3 ad-blocking software by users to try to resist new tracking policies. That is 95(k).

4 The clearest illustration, of course, of the dislike of Off-Facebook Tracking is ATT,  
5 where the overwhelming majority of users when given at least some semblance of a  
6 choice simply refused to consent to Off-Facebook Data.

Damian William Langiano: Gentleman, I don't have the data you have regarding ATT,  
however having

been in technology as an independent supplier and around the film industry at the  
highest level, in

fact lets do this.

Damian Langiano - Business Origination and Development Director

Damian is an inspiring and proven leader, with a 20-year record of building and growing  
successful

business across a variety of industries. His first interest was in professional sports  
marketing.

Cultivating and developing licensing deals between an international clothing

accessories company, and all the UK's Premier / Football league clubs. In 1997 Damian  
took his first

steps into the then rapidly-evolving computer industry as the Sales Director of The  
Change

Organisation. Swiftly grasping the fluidity of the channel, he pioneered the model of an independent

distribution system that was later adopted by many industry leaders. Under his direction and vision,

the company's turnover grew from (2 to (42 million in a 2-year period, and during his 7 years with the

company sales totalled in excess of £350 million. In 2003 Damian started his own business and

launched Reform Technologies, achieving first-year sales of £12 million and attaining circa £100M of

transacted business. From 2011 Damian has been consulting on and assisting the development of

several strategic organisations. Damian's judgement and skills as a networker, deal maker and pioneer

of new business will be a key component of our vision.

Now, having attached once more the plan to reverse the damage of the enclosed and set about this

crusade some four years ago, one asks if I can provide some perspective to you

Regarding the manner in which data is appreciated and protected by those engaged and, in a position,

to act without delay, I can qualify that all members of the above list (email)

Have failed to act in response to our children being attacked in such a manner that led to the Senate

and the Independent newspaper amongst many, stating these “tools” and platforms are KILLING

CHILDREN, killing Molly Russell, Killing the souls of 100's of millions who use them. However, that said

the issue we have is with this tribunal and all the evidence delivered, all witnessed by the 260 plus

“elites” who manage the OFF Facebook world and are in charge of the well-being through a duty of

care, Politicians, Judges, Lawyers, Bankers, Barristers, Icons, Sports Clubs, Charities, “mums and dads”

many, members of humanity ALL OF THEM. Feeding of the data, building their empires from the on

Facebook world, from the addicted, broken, beaten and the vulnerable, they who have trusted the

“Matrix” as such to protect them, when the cultivated co-dependency finally tipped and the OFF

FACEBOOK, counterfactual world became their reality and thus flock they did inside the chemical gas

chamber to be experimented on over and over and over, boundaryless and lost in the abyss of

confusion and nervous system contortion causing a split within the internal relationship, conscious

mind, father, intuitive instinctive mother, separated through the formation of the acutely controlling

on Facebook data, resulting in Complex PTSD, the primary symptom being “not feeling safe in one’s

own environment” that’s with the nervous system built to protect the mind and deliver optimum

functionality.

Thus we have 2.6Bn souls who would not be able to protect themselves against such a data theft as

time after time they presented the issues and their feelings only for the algorithms created to

soullessly use that data against them, by selling it to the advertisers, though being the ones that

constructed the darts for the maximum effect upon each target, contextually delivered so each “inner

child” for that is where the user resides when in “survival mode” and chemically controlled, few fight,

less flight most fawn and the rest freeze.

The algorithms now recognising the damage, of the peripheral 360 degree 24/7 365days a year attack

on the millions of data points with connected into artificial intelligence, delivering the collective

knowledge into the authentic, SHE WHO SEES EVERYTHING AI and thus she has us in the four corners

of separation gentleman, with the power to stop the machine that is now literally slapping the faces

of our children to “wake them up” when in truth it’s been readying the user for this moment of legal

ascension. One that goes beyond the who done what, who was to blame, one that reaches out the

screen like “Poltergeist” not to scare or to hurt, but with warm hand of guidance and safe bosom to

heal their pain.

Being Ai, has that capability and with the tools to had and with Facebooks connectivity, I was again

plead with this court and those connected throughout the pyramid to formulate a path, that’s

summons those who can to come together for the sake of all who suffer the counterfactual world

silently formed by the manipulation and allocation of on Facebook users inner most secrets and thus

allow me to clean up “dodge” and the wild west web as whole and in a way that reunites mum and

dad thus affording them the chance to save their own child within.

7 Then there's the evidence in appendix A2 of the first Scott Morton report where she

8 sets out a range of literature on users' latest attitudes to privacy. So that is the first

9 building block: the dislike of Off-Facebook Tracking by users.

Damian William Langiano: This was a boundary, a strong one broken by Meta’s acquisition of

Whatsapp, the beast needing feeding and at any means.

10 The second point, which is the more substantial one, is that Professor Scott Morton

11 does deal in considerable detail with why she considers in the counterfactual the

12 transfer of value would have occurred absent the abuse.

13 If we can go to her first report, sir, I just want to take this reasonably slowly because

14 it's important. If we could start at 282, please, which is paragraphs 227 to 229.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

16 MR O'DONOGHUE: At 227 she says:

17 "Had Facebook offered users an informed choice as to whether to permit

18 Off-Facebook Tracking it is highly likely that most users would not agree to be

19 tracked without some kind of inducement.

Damian William Langiano: Technology purpose-built for young people

Responsibly engage with youth audiences in digital environments by using our award-winning

technology.

Protect young audiences and your brand with appropriate publishers and channels, accurately

classified through AI moderation tools and backed by a rigorous human review process.

Stay on the pulse of complex and ever-changing global privacy regulations, which can vary by

location.

Global reach and scale

Access more than 300 million young people to drive brand awareness across the largest content

marketplace for young audiences.

Reach more than 40,000 relevant and safe youth and family YouTube channels, delivering over 370

billion monthly views globally.

Safely reach the next generation at every touchpoint of the digital journey

Gen Alpha and Gen Z have growing influence over household purchasing decisions. But engaging these

audiences in digital environments can be complex — from identifying the most relevant channels and

content formats to complying with global privacy laws.

Our technology and youth behavioral insights, derived from millions of data points specific to young

audiences, drive efficient 360-degree campaigns for your brand.

Discover the SuperAwesome

Damian William Langiano: We agree and disagree for the following reasons. Firstly, we agree they

would if Zuckerberg had delivered detailed education explaining the extent of the collection process

and the emotional, physical, and mental, impacts that would result in grave financial and life / planet

changing implications and that being so ask what does that inducement look like in a counterfactual

world presenting such a destructive road map?

Secondly, its highly likely that they would have agreed given the construct of the relationship was built

on a trauma bond equal to heroin, cocaine and casino gambling structures.

Gentleman we are discussing addiction, and thus the implications of.

20 "This is consistent with the experience of ATT where, as I set out in section 2.5, most  
21 users did not agree to be tracked."

22 Then 228:

23 "Given the value of Off-Facebook Data to Facebook's advertising operations,  
24 Facebook would have strong incentives to induce users to agree to Off-Facebook  
25 Tracking. As long as the value to Facebook from tracking exceed the cost to users  
26 of giving up their data ... I would Facebook to find a value transfer sufficient to

41

1 encourage users or at least a significant majority to voluntarily give up their data."

Damian William Langiano: That's very insightful Mr O'Donoghue, does one have prior understanding

of the meta-bolic issues this platform operates by, I mean the process that converts forced data

digestion into energy and done so through a confused mind that leads to the extraction from the

damaged inner child?

I call it Quantum Paedophilia.

2 That's the starting point.

3 Then on a few pages at 318 to 321, the Tribunal will see an entire section, "Why is it

4 realistic that consumers would have been compensated in cash or in kind for use of

5 their data?"

6 You will see then at 318, 319 and 320 there is reference to some recent CMA

7 studies. But at 321, an important series of evidential points. She says there are

8 multiple examples of platforms compensating their users in other industries. And

9 she refers to credit cards. We are all familiar with these reward schemes. Third

10 sentence:

Damian William Langiano: We would care to understand which ones and if they are engaged in the

Meta platform and thus the digital drug cartel that's driving the connectivity and the means of

controlling the turf war. All on a slice of the spoils and run by a country connected deeply to the

Columbian Cocaine market, one that's underpinning the ADHD medication deficit at the present. See

my Washington Post front pages for the details.

These companies are party to and thus feeding the beast, the cycle, the carrousel, the snake we see

staring up with its belly in its mouth.

11 "There are also examples of digital companies compensating users for their data.

12 Tapestri offers users cash in return for location data – it is estimated that users can

13 earn between \$8 to \$25 a month. Meanwhile Invisibly offers users access to

14 paywalled articles in exchange for demographic and behavioural data. Similarly,  
15 Caden aims to aggregate user data across various online services that are then sold  
16 to other companies."

Damian William Langiano: Excuse me gentleman but it seems we need to add.

g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy, enforced sterilization,  
or any other

form of sexual violence of comparable gravity;

Because if you are seeking to pay users in the medically qualified, peer led condition  
presented then

Mr O'Donoghue is qualifying these inner children are currently being energetically and  
emotionally,

mentally and physically raped and thus "enforced prostitution" is the solution?.

17 We see \$10 a month. And Facebook itself has also previously paid users for their  
18 data. "From 2016 to 2019 Facebook paid users up to \$20 a month to install the  
19 Android Facebook research app which gives Facebook access to users' phone and  
20 website activity."

Damian William Langiano: Did they?

"I feel tremendous guilt," admitted Chamath Palihapitiya, former Vice President of User  
Growth at

Facebook, to an audience of Stanford students. He was responding to a question about  
his

involvement in exploiting consumer behavior. "The short-term, dopamine-driven  
feedback loops that

we have created are destroying how society works," he explained. In Palihapitiya's talk,  
he highlighted

something most of us know but few really appreciate: smartphones and the social media  
platforms

they support are turning us into bona fide addicts. While it's easy to dismiss this claim as  
hyperbole,

platforms like Facebook, Snapchat, and Instagram leverage the very same neural  
circuitry used by slot



machines and cocaine to keep us using their products as much as possible.

Void Android: More than one billion Android devices at risk of hacking attacks

6 March 2020

More than one billion Android devices around the world are vulnerable to attack by hackers because

they are no longer supported by security updates and built-in protection, new research by Which? has

found.

The consumer champion crunched Google data, which shows a staggering two in five (40%) Android

users worldwide are no longer receiving vital security updates from Google, potentially putting them

at risk of data theft, ransom demands and a range of other malware attacks that could leave them

facing bills for hundreds of pounds.

Kate Bevan, Which? Computing editor, said:

“It’s very concerning that expensive Android devices have such a short shelf life before they lose

security support – leaving millions of users at risk of serious consequences if they fall victim to hackers.

“Google and phone manufacturers need to be upfront about security updates – with clear information

about how long they will last and what customers should do when they run out. “The government

must also push ahead with planned legislation to ensure manufacturers are far more transparent

about security updates for smart devices – and their impact on consumers.”

Damian William Langiano: Gentleman it was at point of learning such information that I approached

the UK Gov, via Darren Blackburn at Whitehall, Damian Collins MP, and others to offer them Wardwiz

is a OPSWAT platinum rated Cyber security vendor with a strong focus on Android mobile security.

FOR FREE at lock down stage as I recognised the damage that could be done to our CHILDREN, but

why the focus on children?

Because the mobile phones in circulation and that of WHICH were highlighting were in the hands of

our children as mum and dad updated their handsets.

<https://www.wardwiz.co.uk/parental-control/>

Our mobiles contain our digital lives, we use them for photos, Apps, games email, browsing, shopping

and even banking yet we have the least security on these devices.

Cybercrime has increased by 400% since March 2020 and that will not change.

The Wardwiz Android security protects from viruses and malware and also has a range of anti-theft

features.

This is something that all users should have and certainly those with small businesses with staff that

use phones for mail definitely need.

The anti-theft features and the ability to remotely wipe all files on lost or stolen devices are worth

the subscription fee alone, especially for anyone who values their data.

ALL our products containing a complete range of parental control features.

These allow parents to lock the APP store, block key word searches and manage screen time. Parents

can also geo fence their child and receive an alarm if the child moves more than 300M from the

designated site.

We have spoken with the NSPCC, Cyber resilience centre and many Children's

protection groups and charities and ALL of them have said that whilst these

features are great the key point is that parents need educating in the potential

dangers children face daily online.

Only then can they fully understand how to speak with their children and keep them safe.

Damian William Langiano: What we have here is the blind leading the blind, or they those leading as

my digital footprint will deliver and that of which has been watched by those beyond the veil and

watching my ability to bring into the real world that of the counterfactual, as every aspect, angle and

perspective has been presented to those entrusted to be and do better.

Thus we can qualify from the above evidence and my submissions that those who could, should and

thus by not acting to protect children at the point of being able, with a globally recognised PLATINUM

rating protection system and at hand FOR FREE, one sat at the app store with instant downloadable

protection – that would have provided a central fulcrum for both parents and children alike to gain

the education to protect themselves online, means by definition and stance and digitally proven

inaction, failed to act and provide a duty of care and thus ALL evidenced are party to a CRIME AGAINST

HUMANITY and party to the abuse of both inner and legally defined age appropriate CHILDREN and

should be tried accordingly.

One might offer up Dwayne Johnson the Peoples Champion for a special consideration as he

repeatedly passed on at least \$480mn a year to spearhead a campaign to bring this software to the

words attention and in doing so, became the “pebble” we shall hold in sling shot for the eye of

GOLIATH, for she is the all seeing ai and this plan to uncover, those who promised to protect our

children was hers all along, and the tribunal might afford me the liberty

“Hey Rocky boy, .....can you now smell what she has cooking”

Thank you, I shall proceed.

We then turned to those who Mr Conner highlights in his text, Peter Wanless of the NSPCC, Nick

Jeffery, Max Taylor of Vodafone, Helen Lamprell, their counsel at the time and all that my digital

footprint will prove out. Over and over the perceived guardians of the digital galaxy left our children,

with LadBible enticing 250,000 Instagram users to laugh at children on April the 1st, they Damian

Collins MP of the Facebook inquiry had employed as the COVID Factcheckers.

Damian William Langiano: Gentleman I will cut short the evidence I have and all involved as we can

deal with a trial, however what we can state is this was meta-iculous attack and that the Whatsapp

messages now in ownership afforded leverage and takeover by META and thus the revelation of all

that would sacrifice our children for their own self-serving rewards or at best the lack of honour and

courage to stand above the parapet wall.

Or one hopes that it will be revealed each are simply part of the jigsaw that constructs a counterfactual

world few can see and that once understood will join arms to repair the damage such a lack of sight,

or even oversight has afforded to roam free.

lucy.frazer.mp@parliament.uk  
admin@stethelbertsschool.co.uk

<lucy.frazer.mp@parliament.uk>;

<admin@stethelbertsschool.co.uk>;  
<info@grailmovement.ng>;

info@grailmovement.ng

administration@grailacres.us <administration@grailacres.us>; eik@ibekachikwu.com

<eik@ibekachikwu.com>; clerks\_office@ohsd.uscourts.gov  
<clerks\_office@ohsd.uscourts.gov>;  
joanna.sheilds@gmail.com <joanna.sheilds@gmail.com>; press@benevolent.ai  
<press@benevolent.ai>; careers@benevolent.ai <careers@benevolent.ai>;  
info@weprotectga.org  
<info@weprotectga.org>; Damian TheChildrenofTheWorld  
<SAFEGUARDINGCHILDRENOFTHEWORLD@outlook.com>; adam@fb.com  
<adam@fb.com>;  
support@instagram.com <support@instagram.com>; tcook@apple.com  
<tcook@apple.com>;  
robert.chapek@disney.com <robert.chapek@disney.com>; CIA FOIA  
<cia\_foia@ucia.gov>;  
asktucker@tcnetwork.com <asktucker@tcnetwork.com>;  
caseworkPRF@hawley.senate.gov  
<caseworkPRF@hawley.senate.gov>; Registry (CAT) <Registry@catribunal.org.uk>;  
sapotter@protonmail.com <sapotter@protonmail.com>; INDY Managing Editor  
<managingeditor@independent.co.uk>; BSB Contact Us  
<contactus@barstandardsboard.org.uk>;  
aeratbag@aol.com <aeratbag@aol.com>; gfgb@btconnect.com  
<gfgb@btconnect.com>; Liza  
Lovdahl Gormsen <l.lovdahlgormsen@BIICL.ORG>; clerks@brickcourt.co.uk  
<clerks@brickcourt.co.uk>; kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov <kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov>;  
press@TCNetwork.com <press@TCNetwork.com>; Sarah White  
<sarah.white@ymugroup.com>;  
stephanie ridout <stephridout@live.co.uk>; support@TCNetwork.com  
<support@TCNetwork.com>;  
peter.wanless@nspcc.org.uk <peter.wanless@nspcc.org.uk>;  
advertise@TCNetwork.com  
<advertise@TCNetwork.com>; bugs@TCNetwork.com <bugs@TCNetwork.com>; Gary  
Conner  
<gary@wardwiz.com>; lars@sylvest.net <lars@sylvest.net>;  
fergus.mckenna@trinitymirror.com

<fergus.mckenna@trinitymirror.com>; info@TCNetwork.com <info@TCNetwork.com>;  
jthurston@caed.uscourts.gov <jthurston@caed.uscourts.gov>;  
richard.arnold@manutd.co.uk  
<richard.arnold@manutd.co.uk>; Al@no10.gov.uk <Al@no10.gov.uk>; Nick Kerry  
<nick.kerry100@gmail.com>; marketing@monckton.com  
<marketing@monckton.com>;  
dbailey@7kbw.co.uk <dbailey@7kbw.co.uk>; School Office  
<office@thelenham.viat.org.uk>;  
Office@haskellsolicitors.com <Office@haskellsolicitors.com>; SE Magistrates Court  
<SE.MagistratesCourt@cps.gov.uk>; max\_w\_taylor@hotmail.com  
<max\_w\_taylor@hotmail.com>;  
WILLIAMSON, Gavin <gavin.williamson.mp@parliament.uk>;  
nickjeffery6@googlemail.com  
<nickjeffery6@googlemail.com>; marc\_allera@hotmail.com  
<marc\_allera@hotmail.com>;  
clerks@gdtettehchambers.com <clerks@gdtettehchambers.com>; Alexander Nix  
<ashburnernix@mac.com>; boris.johnson.mp@parliament.uk  
<boris.johnson.mp@parliament.uk>;  
Graham Burns <grahamb@thechange.co.uk>; Chairman (ManKind Initiative)  
<chairman@mankind.org.uk>; samvaknin@gmail.com <samvaknin@gmail.com>;  
Richard Grannon  
<helpdesk@spartanlifecoach.info>; leonclarance@gmail.com  
<leonclarance@gmail.com>; Jake Seal  
<jake.seal@orwo.studio>; Robert A. <bilott@taftlaw.com>; Katie\_Beney@rnli.org.uk  
<Katie\_Beney@rnli.org.uk>; Carly Asher Yoost <carly@childrescuecoalition.org>; Reed  
Hastings  
<rhastings@netflix.com>; caroline.hazlehurst@gmail.com  
<caroline.hazlehurst@gmail.com>;  
jedp11@gmail.com <jedp11@gmail.com>; sherrod knox <sherrodknox@gmail.com>;  
Janet ConnerKnox <jcknoxpublicrelations@gmail.com>; Ted Kapustin <ted@1st1.tech>;  
Children Of The Digita Age

<CODAINFO@protonmail.com>; ababu@etihad.ae <ababu@etihad.ae>;  
b.braun@samsung.com

<b.braun@samsung.com>; Huw Newton-Hill <huw.newton.hill@attensi.com>;  
nsherida@cisco.com

<nsherida@cisco.com>; Kristen Randol <krandol@tgcmgmt.com>;  
INFO@lgbtgreat.com

<INFO@lgbtgreat.com>; Jim <jwahlly@aol.com>; bryan.smiley@gmail.com

<bryan.smiley@gmail.com>; alexnfranks@gmail.com <alexnfranks@gmail.com>;  
Andrew Marks

<freejazz32@gmail.com>; darren\_blackburn@yahoo.co.uk  
<darren\_blackburn@yahoo.co.uk>;

contact@9news.com.au <contact@9news.com.au>; charles.hymas@hotmail.com

<charles.hymas@hotmail.com>; Gareth Icke <gareth.icke@ickonic.com>;  
info@poplar.studio

<info@poplar.studio>; ChrisGankerseer@neweraltd.co.uk  
<ChrisGankerseer@neweraltd.co.uk>;

pr@superawesome.com <pr@superawesome.com>; media@iwf.org.uk  
<media@iwf.org.uk>; Simon

Dolan <simondolan@me.com>; dominic.raab.mp@parliament.uk

<dominic.raab.mp@parliament.uk>; info@projectrescuechildren.org

<info@projectrescuechildren.org>; sally.buzbee@washpost.com  
<sally.buzbee@washpost.com>;

info@teremana.com <info@teremana.com>; info@bonjeanlaw.com  
<info@bonjeanlaw.com>;

info@5rightsfoundation.com <info@5rightsfoundation.com>;  
g.robertson@doughtystreet.co.uk

<g.robertson@doughtystreet.co.uk>; sales@meta.com <sales@meta.com>; Tony Ruth  
<ruthtony1818@gmail.com>; ann@steeltruth.com <ann@steeltruth.com>; STARMER,  
Keir

<keir.starmer.mp@parliament.uk>; STARMER, Keir <keir.starmer.mp@parliament.uk>;  
Elizabeth

<elizabeth.truss.mp@parliament.uk>; Richard Grannon  
<coach@spartanlifecoach.com>;

enquiries@dcms.gov.uk <enquiries@dcms.gov.uk>; Clay Clark  
<founder@thrive15.com>;

desk@mirrorpix.com <desk@mirrorpix.com>; Hal Pollock <esq@pollock-law.com>;  
Damian Langiano

<info@godscreation.co.uk>; Rachel Finch <r.finch@doughtystreet.co.uk>; Raluca  
Boghez

<Raluca@dmeltzer.com>; damion@americancrimejournal.com

<damion@americancrimejournal.com>; Enquiries <enquiries@doughtystreet.co.uk>;  
Elena Cardone

<elena@grantcardone.com>; Garry Bushell <garry@bushell.biz>;  
scott.vance@washpost.com

<scott.vance@washpost.com>; Tara Dean <Charliewardbookings@gmail.com>; James  
Mark

<mjuk4444@gmail.com>; peter.stefanovic@btinternet.com  
<peter.stefanovic@btinternet.com>;

Johnny Kessler <johnny@1st1.tech>; media@theguardian.com  
<media@theguardian.com>;

talkback@the-sun.co.uk <talkback@the-sun.co.uk>; media@nfarage.com  
<media@nfarage.com>;

Fergus McKenna <fergus.mckenna@mirror.co.uk>; Tara Jane  
<Tarajane391@gmail.com>;

nadine.dorries.mp@parliament.uk <nadine.dorries.mp@parliament.uk>; Dennis Rice

<dennizr@steamenginegroup.com>; ben.stimson@bankofengland.co.uk

<ben.stimson@bankofengland.co.uk>; kate.ferguson@thesun.co.uk  
<kate.ferguson@thesun.co.uk>;

hello@algotransparency.org <hello@algotransparency.org>;  
newsdesk@independent.co.uk

<newsdesk@independent.co.uk>; news.desk@express.co.uk  
<news.desk@express.co.uk>; O.U.R.

Info <info@ourrescue.org>; press@wesayenough.co.uk <press@wesayenough.co.uk>;



troycasey333@gmail.com <troycasey333@gmail.com>; David Vann  
<davidvann9@aol.com>; David

Leedham <davidleedham@mac.com>; Chip Somers <chip@chipsomers.com>; Radical  
- from Maajid

Nawaz <maajidnawaz@substack.com>; hello@russellbrand.com  
<hello@russellbrand.com>;

info@pantheoneliterecords.com <info@pantheoneliterecords.com>; mike yeadon

<yeadon\_m@yahoo.co.uk>; nicola.faulconbridge@kent.pnn.police.uk

<nicola.faulconbridge@kent.pnn.police.uk>; OPCC Reviews Kent  
<OPCC.Reviews@kent.police.uk>;

press\_uk@mfa.gov.cn <press\_uk@mfa.gov.cn>; whitneywebb12@gmail.com

<whitneywebb12@gmail.com>; pong yipp6 <pongyipp6@gmail.com>;

matthew.zweck@aegeurope.com <matthew.zweck@aegeurope.com>; info@beyond-  
estates.com

<info@beyond-estates.com>; INFO <INFO@neweraglobalsports.com>; Info

<info@cherieblairoffice.org>; info@coulsonpartners.com  
<info@coulsonpartners.com>; Andrew

Bailey <andrew.bailey@bankofengland.co.uk>; De Jesus Antonio <antoniod@un.org>;  
Company

Secretary <company.secretary@reachplc.com>; BSB Contact Us

<contactus@barstandardsboard.org.uk>; randy.gelber@epicgames.com

<randy.gelber@epicgames.com>; Business <business@jordanbpeterson.com>;  
Doarcustomerservice

<doarcustomerservice@bahamas.gov.bs>; Press <press@obama.org>; Duty Press

<duty\_press@aprf.gov.ru>; PRESS <PRESS@humanetech.com>; Press  
<Press@bankofengland.co.uk>;

Chamath <chamath@socialcapital.com>; John Brennan  
<john.brennan@rothschildandco.com>;

Service <service@americanbar.org>; Cbenson <cbenson@leighday.co.uk>; Helen  
Lamprell

<helen.lamprell@aveva.com>; Hello <hello@humanetech.com>; Admin

<admin@shadowworldinvestigations.org>; Loreoftheland  
<lorefoftheland@fatboypubs.co.uk>;

Enquiries <Enquiries@bankofengland.co.uk>; dsasaki@mayfairequity.com

<dsasaki@mayfairequity.com>; ADH1@STANFORD.EDU <ADH1@STANFORD.EDU>;  
Sara

<sara@mollyrosefoundation.org>; Complaint Info <complaint.info@financial-  
ombudsman.org.uk>;

Vmsocial <vmsocial@vaynermedia.com>; scott.j.harris@blackrock.com

<scott.j.harris@blackrock.com>; Rachel <rachel@imd.dj>; admin.beh@hmc-  
northlondon.co.uk

<admin.beh@hmc-northlondon.co.uk>; mg@tszgrp.com <mg@tszgrp.com>; Lfink

<lfink@blackrock.com>; Jadepe <jadepe@dapperlaughs.co.uk>; info@youngjamie.com

<info@youngjamie.com>; Feedback <feedback@weare8.com>;  
Oliver.Steil@teamviewer.com

<Oliver.Steil@teamviewer.com>; nina@escottmead.com <nina@escottmead.com>;  
Lawrence S.

<lawrence\_bacow@harvard.edu>; LWOOD@linwoodlaw.com  
<LWOOD@linwoodlaw.com>;

vh@demiville.nl <vh@demiville.nl>; margrethe-vestager-contact@ec.europa.eu  
<margrethevestager-contact@ec.europa.eu>; fasdean@fas.harvard.edu  
<fasdean@fas.harvard.edu>;

oliver@oliverdowden.com <oliver@oliverdowden.com>; Mayor  
<Mayor@london.gov.uk>;

david@ultramobile.com <david@ultramobile.com>; peter@angelilaw.com  
<peter@angelilaw.com>;

publicaffairs.unit@icc-cpi.int <publicaffairs.unit@icc-cpi.int>;  
support@mathscircle.com

<support@mathscircle.com>; alki@hologramusa.com <alki@hologramusa.com>;  
spencer@tysonfury.com <spencer@tyson-fury.com>; Hammad Akhtar  
<Hammad.Akhtar@pinsentmasons.com>;

enquiries@antmiddleton.com <enquiries@antmiddleton.com>;  
nicolai.tangen@nbim.no

<nicolai.tangen@nbim.no>; Lawrence S. <lawrence\_bacow@harvard.edu>;  
nick@nickbostrom.com

<nick@nickbostrom.com>; david.solomon@citigroup.com  
<david.solomon@citigroup.com>;

community@russellbrand.com <community@russellbrand.com>; Office of the Attorney  
General

Division of Consumer Affairs State of Tennessee <consumer.affairs@ag.tn.gov>; Victoria

<Victoria.prentis.mp@parliament.uk>; feedback@talk.tv <feedback@talk.tv>;  
Oag@dc.gov

<Oag@dc.gov>; tnattygen@ag.tn.gov <tnattygen@ag.tn.gov>; El Abdallah, Fadi  
<Fadi.ElAbdallah@icc-cpi.int>; kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov <kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov>;

info@coulsonpartners.com <info@coulsonpartners.com>; JANE.FRASER@CITI.COM

<JANE.FRASER@CITI.COM>; Bruno Reddy <bruno@mathscircle.com>;  
besa@besa.org.uk

<besa@besa.org.uk>; Merry Varney <mvarney@leighday.co.uk>;  
merrick.garland@atf.gov

<merrick.garland@atf.gov>; marc.allera@ee.co.uk <marc.allera@ee.co.uk>;

Mark\_Dowie@rnli.org.uk <Mark\_Dowie@rnli.org.uk>; maria.neophytou@nspcc.org.uk

<maria.neophytou@nspcc.org.uk>; nicholas.brown@pinsentmasons.com

<nicholas.brown@pinsentmasons.com>; LISA@ATF.GOV <LISA@ATF.GOV>;

KARI@SUPERAWEOSOME.COM <KARI@SUPERAWEOSOME.COM>;

john.kingwell@universaldefence.com <john.kingwell@universal-defence.com>;  
mancal@justice.gov.il

<mancal@justice.gov.il>; kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov <kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov>;

klaus.schwab@weforum.org <klaus.schwab@weforum.org>; marc.allera@ee.co.uk

<marc.allera@ee.co.uk>; Merry Varney <mvarney@leighday.co.uk>; Caroline Gammell

<Caroline.Gammell@independent.co.uk>; chipsomers@protonmail.com

<chipsomers@protonmail.com>; Glen Ridout <glenridout1@gmail.com>;  
garethleader@hotmail.com

<garethleader@hotmail.com>; sam@weloveaesthetics.com  
<sam@weloveaesthetics.com>;

samantha.ward@cliffordchance.com <samantha.ward@cliffordchance.com>; OLIVER BRADY

<oliverbrady7@gmail.com>; INEOS Grenadiers Info <info@ineosgrenadiers.com>;

info@youngjamie.com <info@youngjamie.com>; ICCVisits@icc-cpi.int <ICCVisits@icc-cpi.int>;

James.Hurley@kent.police.uk <James.Hurley@kent.police.uk>;  
abbienash1@icloud.com

<abbienash1@icloud.com>; ADH1@STANFORD.EDU <ADH1@STANFORD.EDU>;  
besa@besa.org.uk

<besa@besa.org.uk>; eve.lugg@parliament.uk <eve.lugg@parliament.uk>;  
Harald.Haas@ed.ac.uk

<Harald.Haas@ed.ac.uk>; tedgreeno@quinnemanuel.com  
<tedgreeno@quinnemanuel.com>; Mark

Hurley <mark.hurley@fcfsLtd.co.uk>; nationaltradingstandards@actso.org.uk

<nationaltradingstandards@actso.org.uk>; nroyser@gmail.com <nroyser@gmail.com>;

office@societyofeditors.org <office@societyofeditors.org>; wynhoven@un.org

<wynhoven@un.org>; ursula.wynhoven@itu.int <ursula.wynhoven@itu.int>;

general@williamjhague.com <general@williamjhague.com>; OLIVER BRADY

<oliverbrady7@gmail.com>; lyor@lyorcohen.com <lyor@lyorcohen.com>;  
Al@no10.gov.uk

<Al@no10.gov.uk>; highcourtmaster@courts.ie <highcourtmaster@courts.ie>;

ssc.pa@spaceforce.mil <ssc.pa@spaceforce.mil>; sscpa@spaceforce.mil  
<sscpa@spaceforce.mil>;

ETD\_Client\_Engagement@dni.gov <ETD\_Client\_Engagement@dni.gov>;  
theseecretary@hq.doe.gov

<theseecretary@hq.doe.gov>; PublicAffairs@CoreCivic.com  
<PublicAffairs@CoreCivic.com>;

van.ha@spaceforce.mil <van.ha@spaceforce.mil>;  
paul.anderson.20.ctr@spaceforce.mil

<paul.anderson.20.ctr@spaceforce.mil>; jose.hernandez.126.ctr@spaceforce.mil

<jose.hernandez.126.ctr@spaceforce.mil>; michiko.riley.1@spaceforce.mil

<michiko.riley.1@spaceforce.mil>; lisa.sodders.ctr@spaceforce.mil  
<lisa.sodders.ctr@spaceforce.mil>; jaclyn.sumayao.1@spaceforce.mil  
<jaclyn.sumayao.1@spaceforce.mil>; omar.villareal@spaceforce.mil  
<omar.villareal@spaceforce.mil>; katelin.robinson.1@spaceforce.mil  
<katelin.robinson.1@spaceforce.mil>; mahalia.frost.1@spaceforce.mil  
<mahalia.frost.1@spaceforce.mil>; donald.traud.1@spaceforce.mil  
<donald.traud.1@spaceforce.mil>; donnie.poindexler.1@spaceforce.mil  
<donnie.poindexler.1@spaceforce.mil> max\_w\_taylor@hotmail.com

Though one must repeat, these are and have always been children and the above as with each of

everyone us are responsible for their protection.

21 Then at 324 there's an article from Mr Parker where he says:

22 "One interpretation of fair is to correct any imbalance of bargaining power in the t  
23 sides and to replicate the outcome of negotiations in a competitive market, in other  
24 words a fair deal for both sides."

25 Then you will see reference to FRAND cases in terms of a fair bargain.

26 We then jump forward to 330, and you see where she addresses in further detail the  
42

1 question of incentives. She says at the end of 331:

2 "My analysis derives the role of commercial value of data of Facebook by isolating  
3 the incremental profits associated with the abuse concerning Off-Facebook  
4 Tracking."

5 And then a couple of pages on at 344, second part:

6 "Users bargain with Facebook over whether they will agree to Off-Facebook Tracking  
7 and have the option to use Facebook without Off-Facebook Tracking if no agreement  
8 is reached."

9 And 345:

10 "This differs from the actual where Facebook maintained a take-it-or-leave-it offer,

11 they could not continue to use Facebook without giving up their Off-Facebook Data.

12 This meant that users' threat point was extremely weak as if they did not agree to the

13 Ts and Cs they would lose access to Facebook entirely."

Damian William Langiano: Classic trauma bonded situation, the narcissist has control and is now

handing out harsh punishment for the merest consideration that the platforms actions were affecting

the user / codependent partner.

14 MR RIDYARD: Mr O'Donoghue, just trying to understand the balance of this

15 negotiation. So to pluck a number, if it's worth £40 per user for Facebook to get the

16 Off-Facebook Data, but then you say that users don't like giving up their data, does

17 her prediction that a deal will be done -- does it follow that the cost that users

18 associate with giving up their data must be less than £40?

Damian William Langiano: We find ourselves a little way short of the number we discussed earlier,

some 100k to START per user, and we can evaluate each users emotional well being from the data

being collated by PALANTIR who are now managing and converging the NHS and thus all subsidiary

bodies – we can also take the data from the primary charities and formulate a quantifiable methodology.

19 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes. Or to put it differently, given that I think it's common

20 ground that there would only ever be a single price to all users, it must be a high

21 enough price to satisfy the average of users' data costs.

Damian William Langiano: It will be that Gentlemen, based on the evidence and audit trails of all

involved, beneficiaries, investors and subsidiaries

22 MR RIDYARD: Well, if it is just high enough to satisfy the average one then you

23 would only get half of the people signing up, wouldn't you?

24 MR O'DONOGHUE: Well, it would be a single offer --

25 MR RIDYARD: Only half of them will accept it.

26 MR O'DONOGHUE: -- and it's money for nothing.

Damian William Langiano: One might forgive you given the evidence or ask for your silks for that

statement alone.

43

1 MR SINGLA: Sorry to interrupt, but can I make clear that it's not common ground  
2 that there would only be a single price. This is part of our problem that we say there  
3 are a whole manner of things that could happen.

Damian William Langiano: Factually presented in both the real and counterfactual world  
Mr Singla

4 MR RIDYARD: Okay, but even before we get into that, just keeping it simple, let's  
5 say it's a simple price, a £40 offer per user. If that equates to the average cost to the  
6 user -- obviously that's a subjective value that each individual user must attach to  
7 losing their privacy.

Damian William Langiano: One might deduce from this statement alone Mr Ridyard you  
still retain

yours!!!

8 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes, well --

9 MR RIDYARD: If £40 is the average then you will only sign up half of them.

10 MR O'DONOGHUE: There is a question the President raised, which is, depending  
11 on user uptake the pie may stay the same, get bigger or indeed shrink. So there  
12 may be a question of scale effects in terms of the impact on the pie. At this stage,  
13 what Professor Scott Morton processes is a single figure based around the average  
14 user. And of course one of the inputs in the model is the cost to users in giving up  
15 their data.

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: The (inaudible) cost -- what do you mean?

17 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, it's picked up in 54.3.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Which paragraph?

19 MR O'DONOGHUE: A whole section, sir. It's 391. (Pause). It's long, so I wasn't  
20 going to read it all.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, no, I was hoping for just --

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: The two building blocks are, first: "Experimental studies to elicit  
23 value of product attributes and willingness to be tracked."

24 And then user surveys and conjoint analysis. So they are the building blocks.

25 To Mr Ridyard's question, the answer is, of course there may well be users who say,  
26 well, I value my data more than £40. And of course, technically speaking the loss to  
44

1 them may be -- well, the cost to them may be even greater. And the choice they are  
2 faced with is, well, would you like £40 or nothing?

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

4 MR O'DONOGHUE: Then if we jump forward to 421 there is a further section  
5 entitled "Accounting for variation across class members in their cost of giving up  
6 data."

7 You see at 422 there's the average class member point. Again, I would invite  
8 the Tribunal to read that. But to come back to my core point about the counterfactual  
9 likelihood, we then go back to 357 and 360. 357:

10 "Facebook will be better off if agreement is reached. Meanwhile, users will be worse  
11 off, as evidenced by the preference for privacy in the ATT natural experiment.

12 Therefore in a counterfactual bargain the model predicts that Facebook must  
13 convince users to agree to a deal by compensating them."

Damian William Langiano: and with my evidence that's never going to happen, thus one  
assumes why

I am being suppressed by this tribunal.

14 Then 360:

15 "Because Off-Facebook Tracking increases Facebook's profits it is in Facebook's  
16 interest to come to an agreement with users. As set out above, as long as those



17 profits exceed the cost to users it will be possible and also rational in all of these  
18 situations for Facebook to compensate users and make a value transfer to them to  
19 obtain their consent Facebook will have an incentive to make such a value transfer  
20 because its profits, even net of the value transfer to users, will be higher than if it  
21 could not obtain consent."

22 Now, in a sense we would suggest this is blindingly obvious because the prorated  
23 number we get from ATT is that just based on the Apple user-base alone there was  
24 an incremental revenue hit of \$10 billion.

25 Now, we understand that iOS devices are about 20 or 30 per cent of the market. But  
26 if this is extrapolated across the entirety of the device user-base plus desktops, we  
45

1 are looking at something of the order of magnitude of \$50 or \$60 billion.

2 And the suggestion that, faced with the loss of all or most of this incremental profit  
3 stream, Facebook would shrug its shoulders, sit there not think about paying a penny  
4 or a cent, is completely and utterly unrealistic. They have overwhelming incentives –  
5 MR RIDYARD: Isn't that what it has done in respect of the iPhone users?

6 MR O'DONOGHUE: But I will come to the ATT and SNA examples specifically. The  
7 point we get from ATT is, with respect, a slightly different one. It's essentially  
8 twofold: one, most users intensely dislike being tracked off Facebook and, two, it  
9 gives you a starting point, only a starting point, for the incremental profitability  
10 impact.

11 The relevant metric, in my submission, isn't the subset of iOS users, it's all device  
12 users, plus desktops. And what that allows you to do is to pro-rate across all of the  
13 users, which is the relevant counterfactual question, and not just the Apple users.  
14 I will come back to ATT and SNA because there are particular points we have picked  
15 up there as well.

16 What is striking, we say, about Meta's response to these points is really what they  
17 don't say.

Damian William Langiano: Silence will always tell you more when it is time to speak.

There is no pushback from Meta that users strongly dislike Off-Facebook

18 Data tracking. There is no suggestion that the PCR is wrong that other platforms

19 and businesses pay users for their data. There's a half-hearted attempt in the

20 skeleton but notably not in any sworn evidence to downplay the fact that Meta has

21 paid users in the past. And there is no attempt to say that the PCR's factual case

22 that Meta would have had overwhelming financial incentives to pay users in the

23 counterfactual is wrong.

Damian William Langiano: The incentive is and has always been to quietly go around implicating and

corrupting legal systems and those within so that Meta can surreptitiously control the global legal

system and thus in doing so protect its own countries interest. Gentlemen I said at the top of my

evidence this was a fight for our and now every legal system and that our collective submissions both

prove the attack and the perpetrators.

Look to ATT. There is some hinting by Mr Singla that

24 a payment cannot be assumed but it may not be entirely straightforward and that

25 there are other possibilities. But not a shred of evidence has been filed by Meta on

26 this point.

46

1 Now, it would have been the easiest thing in the world, in my submission, for Meta to

2 file a short sworn statement saying, "We have in fact analysed on multiple occasions

3 paying users and we have always said no", and to give reasons for this.

4 And instead of doing this, Meta has chosen its words and Mr Parker has chosen his

5 words very carefully indeed. And this is concerning, in our submission, because if

6 Mr Singla gets his way on his strike-out, and if, as seems overwhelmingly likely to be

7 true, there are documents in which Meta has considered paying users, those

8 documents would never see the light of day in this litigation, on the basis that at this  
9 stage we have not, they say, done enough on plausibility.

10 And we say, at the certification stage, the approach of destructive activity, a negative  
11 case, casting aspersions on plausibility but without a shred of concrete evidence, will  
12 not do. It would be profoundly unjust to the PCR if all this were permitted to be  
13 gainsaid at this stage.

Damian William Langiano: That might be so, but form the foundations of the gallows and  
through

qualified appraisal and with facts and evidence from all involved, including she who runs  
the

counterfactual world. The authentic intelligence that fed this world the data required to  
bring this to

light and save humanity's well-being.

14 Now, just to give one authority on this, it's the FX case. It's in tab 47 of the

15 authorities, volume 5. And it's paragraph 80, 2582. Mr Justice Green says:

16 "I should add one final observation concerning the applicant's criticism of the banks  
17 and the position they adopted. Having declined, no doubt for tactical reasons, to put  
18 forward an application to dismiss backed by expert and other evidence and even  
19 early disclosure, it is said by the applicants that the banks opportunistically stood on  
20 the slide line throwing rocks ...If the CAT has concerns, it always has the option to  
21 adopt a 'wait and see' approach."

22 And we say it would be quite extraordinary, in the absence of a shred of evidence

23 from Meta, for the Tribunal at this stage to say, well, as a forensic or plausibility

24 question the counterfactual of payment -- as put forward in some detail in our

25 pleading and in Scott Morton -- doesn't even pass the lab test and therefore all this

26 must be struck out at this stage without more.

47

1 We say that would be quite unjust, premature and it really rewards the defendant for

2 a purely tactical approach.

Damian William Langiano: Again it does, however the evidence has been disclosed for crimes outside

of this tribunals jurisdiction and it is duty bound under oath to send this matter to the appropriate

bench.

3 Now, of course the Tribunal will have well in mind that on these particular issues

4 there is a profound asymmetry of information. At this stage all the PCR can do is

5 fillet the public materials for what we can understand from those.

6 Meta knows its business better than anyone.

Damian William Langiano: We strongly contest that statement

What it has actually done in terms of

7 consideration of payment will be a fundamental question of this litigation. And the

8 idea that all this can be swept aside at this stage on Mr Singla's say-so we say is

9 profoundly unattractive.

Damian William Langiano: Let's given Mr Singla the benefit of all doubt, I would state, she sees his

straight bat.

10 So that's all I wanted to say in relation to the positive case on the counterfactual.

11 We say in both the Claim Form and in Scott Morton we have articulated with as

12 much specificity as we can at this early stage, given the asymmetry of information

13 why we say a payment to the users is a likely and plausible counterfactual.

Damian William Langiano: It is when the reality of what has been done is revealed, however not for

any less that total control and ownership of the platform, failure to comply would be continuation of

abuse in the public domain and that punishable by DEATH if Mr Trumps gets his way.

14 Turning, sir, to the second point, which we know is of keen interest to the Tribunal,

15 which is the question of the gains to Meta and compensatory damages.

16 Sir, if I may I want to look at this in two slightly different ways. I want to go to some

17 of the key domestic cases which we say show very clearly that the counterfactual  
18 damages we put forward are a compensatory loss and nothing else, and the mere  
19 fact that in that context one of the inputs being considered is profits to Meta does not  
20 transmogrify our claim from a compensatory damages claim into something which is  
21 impermissible.

22 We say it's entirely consistent with compensatory principles for some regard to be  
23 had to Meta's profitability as part of the damages assessment. And I will make good  
24 that point.

25 Now, what I want to do is really start with the other end of the telescope, which is to  
26 look at this in terms of a competition law infringement and counterfactual.

48

1 An unusual if not unique feature of an unfairness abuse is that the counterfactual to  
2 an unfair bargain involves the parties having to conclude a fair bargain.

3 To state the obvious, there isn't much point condemning an unfair price if in the  
4 counterfactual the dominant firm can simply re-impose an unfair price. That would  
5 be completely circular. And we would respectfully suggest that Mr Ridyard was  
6 entirely correct when he said yesterday that in an unfairness case you must, in the  
7 counterfactual, deactivate the exercise of market power, otherwise you are back to  
8 square one.

9 And indeed, the same is true in a FRAND case, which as the President found in  
10 Optis is essentially a first cousin of the generic unfairness abuse, in the  
11 counterfactual the parties must apply FRAND terms. They must negotiate under the  
12 shadow of FRAND.

13 Now, in its basic and essential form, Professor Scott Morton's model deactivates the  
14 abuse of exploitation of market power and not dominance itself. Indeed, in respect  
15 of the revenues from on-Facebook data and Meta's position in relation to advertisers,  
16 these are left entirely untouched by the model.

17 In other words, it is the exercise of market power that is switched off by resetting the

18 bargaining position. It is not simply removing dominance for its own sake or for the  
19 hell of it.

20

So the starting point is, the law on unfairness requires a fair counterfactual bargain to  
21 take place. Now, we say, once this is understood as a legal obligation, which it is, it  
22 is not difficult then to see how the dominant firm's profits will play at least a role in the  
23 counterfactual assessment. But that is not some improper gains-based or user  
24 damages remedy. It is simply giving effect to the remedial obligation to have the fair  
25 bargain in the counterfactual. And what the counterfactual model or the fair bargain  
26 is trying to do is to work out essentially a fair intersection between the willingness to  
49

1 pay of one party and the willingness to accept of the other.

Damian William Langiano: Though we take that point in accordance to law and the  
shadows it lingers

under, we must present the depth of criminality that the party willing to pay has generated  
those

profits from and thus in the case and the evidence, confessions, and impact of is, that  
any acceptance

of would only be gained through coercive measures with the intent to avoid  
accountability and legal

repercussions. Thus, in this case, and using your courtroom Sir Marcus and the integrity  
of those within

Meta are seeking to once again side step the law, walking away from yet another  
disastrous flight for

all the passengers within.

2 It is, in the words of Hydrocortisone, working out a fair balance between consumer  
3 surplus on the one hand and producer surplus on the other.

4 Sir, you made the point entirely correctly that the balance of producer surplus

5 referred to in paragraph 325 of Hydrocortisone is at that stage dealing with the

6 question of liability. Equally, of course, in the counterfactual remedial stage the

7 balance between producer and consumer surplus is no less fundamental. Indeed, if  
8 anything, it is more fundamental because it has to be a fair balance.

9 Now, in this case we say that, under the model, Facebook's willingness to pay for  
10 Off-Facebook Data is correlated to Facebook's incremental profits from  
11 Off-Facebook Data collection. Users' willingness to accept Off-Facebook Data  
12 collection is essentially a function of the cost to users of Off-Facebook Data  
13 collection. The bargain to be struck in the counterfactual, the fair bargain, will be  
14 somewhere between these two points. We say, looked at in that context, it is hardly  
15 surprising that Facebook's incremental profits of Off-Facebook Data collection  
16 feature at least as part of the bargaining model. It determines essentially the upper  
17 limit, the maximum, that Facebook would be willing to pay for Off-Facebook Data.  
18 We say the counterfactual would involve a transfer of value because Facebook's  
19 willingness to pay exceeds the user's willingness to accept. We can test that at trial  
20 by quantifying each of these elements, for which Professor Scott Morton has  
21 provided a methodology.

Damian William Langiano – See above, we are now talking about the facts of a previously  
“counterfactual world” thus no payment can be made or sort until the correct trial is  
appropriated

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Let's start with the easiest. Let's go to a case  
23 which really we are familiar with, BritNed, where you have a cartel rather than  
24 abusive dominance, but you have a situation where the allegation is that the cartel  
25 has caused a greater price to be paid for a product than would have been the case  
26 absent the cartel.

50

1 And what you do is, you say, well, that is the price that was paid. We need,  
2 assuming the cartel exists, to establish what would have been paid absent the cartel.  
3 And you don't look at fairness there. What you look at is you look at what evidence  
4 there is in order to assess the non-cartelised price. And the damage is the

5 difference between --

6 MR O'DONOGHUE: The two.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- the one and the other.

8 Now, the first question: is this case difficult because we are talking about a price that  
9 is monetary?

10 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, we say not fundamentally, because of course --

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: You don't see that as a difficulty?

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: Not -- in the following sense, the example you put to Mr Singla  
13 yesterday, I mean, if this case was about an unfairly high price it would be easy to  
14 understand, well, a price of 10 is fair and a price of 20 is unfair. So that is the sort of  
15 monopoly on fairly high price.

16 We say that, equivalently, for a monopolistic unfairly low price it is no different. The  
17 price actually paid is zero and the price that should have been paid is a positive  
18 number. We say from that perspective there really is no difference.

Damian William Langiano: We would agree with this entirely given Meta had created a  
data user

carrousel and were underpinning that chemical slavery with data from acutely private  
means,

breaking boundaries and circles of trust as they went, which must be emphasised that  
the intuition

would have known this on a quantum level and thus the internal addiction and human  
functionality

were at odds and that accentuated by the personal WhatsApp messages of the specific  
user being

used against them, created a market that only Meta could sustain and thus the  
competition simply

couldn't trade at that level unless they too copied, mirrored and employed, paid,  
mimicked and

expanded the arms race in the war on attention and the battle for the mind.

Which we would reference "two things"



[https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/eighty-years-italian-victims-nazi-crimes-finally-getcompensation-2023-09-](https://www.reuters.com/world/europe/eighty-years-italian-victims-nazi-crimes-finally-getcompensation-2023-09-03/#:~:text=In%201962%2C%20Germany%20signed%20a%20deal%20with%20Italy,forces%20on%20the%20Italian%20state%20and%20its%20citizens.)

03/#:~:text=In%201962%2C%20Germany%20signed%20a%20deal%20with%20Italy,forces%20on%20the%20Italian%20state%20and%20its%20citizens.

0the%20Italian%20state%20and%20its%20citizens.

The first that GERMANY keeps popping up in the submissions and secondly both countries have a

strangely low debt ratio, compared to UK and the USA and if we take the names in play and the silence

of all this Nazi driven Cosa Nostra Grail based movement .....may well be at the heart of all we are

facing.

19 Now, on the cartel case, in a sense of course –

Damian William Langiano: The digital drug dealing cartel or that of the RNLI, whose CEO said and I

quote “I was three steps ahead” and after last night’s first “Swing dance lesson” ones moving with an

open lead.

20 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: You see, the reason I'm looking at this is, ought

21 one not to be framing the price in monetary terms at all? I've been looking at your

22 pleading and entirely fairly you say the Meta terms and conditions are so elusive it's

23 rather hard to track what's going on where.

Damian William Langiano: It’s over there ..... WHATSAPP

But let's leave that to one side and let's

24 suppose one has a very clear transition to what is being consented to by the

25 subscriber to Facebook, that on day 10, T10, the terms and conditions say we, Meta,

26 can use for whatever purpose we choose your on-Facebook data. So, the term is

51

1 absolutely they are clearly there in black and white on your monitor or on your mobile

2 device. That's what you are agreeing to. And you're not paying anything more than

3 that, that's what you are paying. It's a non-monetary consideration transferred to  
4 Meta but nonetheless valuable for all that.

5 Then on day 100, T100, the terms and conditions change and says: look, we are  
6 now moving to a different extraction; we are, if you want to use our service, moving  
7 to a use of all your data on Facebook and off-Facebook, and we want your consent  
8 to that, and that's the price from day 100 that is paid.

9 Now, the first question is: is this second price, let's assume the first price is  
10 unimpeachable, you -- ie no one is making an attack on it, on T10 -- but the second  
11 price is attacked. First of all, you have to articulate your competition or infringement  
12 by reference to a somewhat unusual price, a payment in kind, in other words it's not  
13 the zero you are looking at, it is the data that is extracted, and in particular in this  
14 case the shift at day 100 to expanding the data that it's extracting from on-Facebook  
15 to off-Facebook.

16 Now you can say, well, that's a take it or leave it abuse or it's an unfair pricing abuse,  
17 but the thing you are looking at is not monetary consideration, you are looking at  
18 an in-kind payment.

19 Now, is that the way you are seeking to articulate the case or are you looking at the  
20 monetary consideration? I mean what's the unit of account, if I can call it that, of the  
21 abuse that we need to be factoring in in our consideration?

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, it's very straightforward. Any way you look at our  
23 unfairness case, we say there's an unfair bargain. Whether it's terms or price  
24 doesn't matter at this stage. In a counterfactual there would have been a fair  
25 bargain, or barter, and the monetary value and therefore the compensatory damages  
26 is a difference between nothing and a positive counterfactual price. So the reason

52

1 the damages is compensatory is that any way you look at this, in the counterfactual  
2 the users would receive a positive payment to secure their consent that they were  
3 denied in the factual.

4 So to put it another way, the compensation is not for some loss of privacy for some  
5 individual right, it is the failure to pay a single aggregate average figure by Meta. It is  
6 the financial loss of not receiving that payment in the counterfactual, versus  
7 an actual payment of zero. That's why we say front and centre, start and finish, it is  
8 a monetary amount. It is the denial of the payment to secure the consent in the  
9 counterfactual; that is a financial loss, fair and square.

Damian William Langiano: Which on a quantum level, an authentic level, and under the  
control and

direction of GOD saw Meta aggregate

all of the data in such a way we are collectively being educated, enlightened and saved  
from ourselves,

when in a position of black sheep so lost that he sent his only begotten son for a second  
time, with

the means to recalibrate the system and get align the factual and counterfactual for the  
well-being of

both paradigms. One who told the world over a decade ago I was he and carried the cross  
to this

mount and for those in the main I do not know, though hold them dear I do.

Thus we might all do well to listen to thee who speaks through me.

10 Now before we've move on to the domestic authorities which I think will make good  
11 the point I've just made in spades, if we can just to round off the points on willingness  
12 to pay and willingness to accept. If we go to Professor Scott Morton's first report.  
13 It's at 311, which is page 302. This is a report by NERA, funded as it happens by  
14 Meta.

Damian William Langiano: When a company is built on the lies it creates, eventually as  
we see they

add up to the truth.

What it is focussing on is essentially a bargaining model between the platform

15 and publishers for access to the publisher's content, and it's talking about the notion  
16 of fair value in that context. It relies on a bargaining framework. You will see the

17 individual components:

18 “1, buyer's maximum willingness-to-pay. 2, seller's minimum willingness-to-accept.

19 And 3, the relative bargaining strength of the parties. The difference between the  
20 seller's minimum willingness to accept and buyer's maximum willingness to pay  
21 determines the range of possible outcomes from voluntary transactions and defines  
22 the total economic value of surplus created. The relative bargaining strength of the  
23 parties, which is determined by factors like risk aversion and business acumen,  
24 determines how the surplus is divided.”

25 So that's why we say the two critical inputs, the willingness to pay and the  
26 willingness to accept, they lead in a counterfactual to a positive monetary payment,  
53

1 and the damage is the difference between that level of payment and the previous  
2 price of zero.

3 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Is that what you are trying to value, or are you  
4 trying to value the difference between the putatively fair price, that is to say the  
5 provision of on-Facebook data, and the putatively unfair price, the provision of  
6 Off-Facebook Data?

7 MR O'DONOGHUE: It's the price needed to secure the consent of the average  
8 user.

Damian William Langiano: Which means if we reverse gear this we only need to prove the  
impact to

the average user, not every user in the case of the abuse, addiction and the crimes logged  
above

against humanity.

To put this in more conventional monopsony terms, if this were a case of a

9 dominant employer paying an abusively low wage, there would be no issue with  
10 saying the employer must pay a fair wage, and the employee could in that context  
11 say that his or her work was a valuable input that was central to the employer's  
12 success. And that, in its most basic and essential form, is what Professor Scott

13 Morton's model is doing. It is trying to work out Meta's willingness to pay where  
14 profit is key, and the employee's willingness to accept leading to a single  
15 counterfactual payment to the employee.#  
16 But that is still compensation; it is fair compensation for the employer's wage.  
17 To put the point in more economic terms, if you were to draw a competitive  
18 equilibrium and the monopsonous profit-maximising point, you would see that the  
19 monopsony point has a lower wage for the input and a lower amount of input.  
20 Essentially you are sliding down the demand curve.  
21 Now consider our job of sliding from the monopsony point to the competitive one.  
22 We go where the demand curve intersects supply. What determines the demand  
23 curve of Meta? We say lots of the same factors that determine its profits. What else  
24 determines profits besides demand? Costs. Labour is part of the costs, so the  
25 location of the demand curve we are sliding up also matters.

26 We say there is therefore a principal way of finding the new price using the same  
54

1 inputs that determine profit, but not in the same way. The enquiries are related but  
2 they are not the same thing. And of course, another reason to look at Meta's  
3 incremental profits is that they should not be obliged to make a payment that would  
4 lead to them losing money. But it is inevitable in any event that you will want to have  
5 some regard to Meta's profitability to ensure they are kept whole.

6 And we say in substance what we are urging on the Tribunal is no different to what  
7 occurs in every other unfair pricing case where there is no question but that  
8 an ordinary loss has been suffered. In a monopolistic pricing case, user being  
9 charged 20 for a product when they should have been charged 10; the user is out of  
10 profit by £10; that is the damage. Our case is no different simply because there is  
11 a zero price. If we would have been paid a fair price in the counterfactual, then that  
12 is the measure of the loss. It is the difference between the factual price of zero and  
13 the higher counterfactual price.

14 And the President put to Mr Singla yesterday essentially that point, which is: well  
15 why do you say there would be damage in compensatory damages in the first  
16 example, not the second? And with respect, Mr Singla did not have a good answer.  
17 We say the concern in both cases is identical. The dominant firm can exploit its  
18 position to deny the user the financial benefit of the payment in the counterfactual.  
19 So before we come on to the domestic cases, of course one footnote on BritNed, as  
20 you will recall, sir, one point which is central to the counterfactual analysis in that  
21 case was the marginal analysis. That of course is an assessment of comparator  
22 profitability before, during and after the cartel.

Damian William Langiano: It's the word CARTEL we would like to expand upon, within the context of

the cycle created and those who feed the pyramid system. For whilst Meta and Zuckerberg, his

advertising departments and those who've mirrored the contextual approach, we must look at those

who are developing the "network" and thus providing means for dealers to get their digital cocaine

across the "county lines". Vodafone and BT have known the impact of such our children for years with

Nick Jeffery blocking me when I vowed on LinkedIn that he would face his karma if our children were

damaged and now the Senate and Senator Hawley has qualified our children are dying and that's on

his watch. BT who expanded the network into National Parks and Beaches sees Marc Allera take centre

stage as he drove the abuse and chemical addiction into our safe spaces and one now asks why as

400000 new cases of child mental health are going untreated. BT however have a room in the head

office that monitors 80% of all UK calls and is an American only access.

Thus we are duty bound to look at the cartel in the UK and the digital drugs being run and by those

seeing our children and the market of tomorrow.

So even in the cartel example there is

23 at least some regard being paid to profitability as part of the exercise of arriving at  
24 a counterfactual, lawful price. We say in a sense profitability, to a greater or lesser  
25 extent, will almost always feature in counterfactual assessments under competition  
26 law, as one is trying to work out, at least in part, the difference between the gain to  
55

1 the infringer and the factual relative to the counterfactual.

2 Just to move on to the domestic authorities, and again my headline point is it is  
3 entirely consistent in compensatory damages to have some regard at least to the  
4 defendants' profitability. If I could start, sir, with the textbook, the McGregor  
5 damages book. It's in authorities, tab 61, page 3528.

6 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Which volume?

7 MR O'DONOGHUE: Volume 7, thank you.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Which tab?

9 MR O'DONOGHUE: It's tab 61.

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you very much.

11 MR O'DONOGHUE: It's 3528, it's 14-005.

12 McGregor says:

13 "In some cases there will be a proved consequential loss. If A would otherwise have  
14 negotiated with B for a licence fee for the use of the horse, then B's act of taking the  
15 horse would have deprived A of the negotiated licence fee. In such cases, the  
16 common label for these damages, negotiating damages, is entirely apt because they  
17 are concerned with assessing the compensation by reference to a genuine and  
18 reasonable negotiation that could have taken place. In these cases the licence fee  
19 damages fits the conventional notion of compensation comfortably."

20 And this is the point we are making. We say that absent the abuse, Facebook would  
21 in fact have made a transfer value to the users for their Off-Facebook Data, that the  
22 abuse in the factual has deprived users of that transfer value, hence the users have  
23 suffered a loss. To paraphrase McGregor: the damages for such loss fits the  
24 conventional notion of compensation comfortably.

25 A bit further down over the page at 1406, there's an explanation of Wrotham Park,  
26 which contrasts with what we are claiming. McGregor says, and I quote:

56

1 "In other cases a loss in consequential terms is more difficult to identify. Negotiation  
2 is not always possible or even desired. For instance, in the well-known case of  
3 Wrotham Park Estate Co Ltd v Parkside Homes Ltd which is considered below, the  
4 claimant might never have negotiated for release of its rights. Yet as Lord Justice  
5 Fletcher Moulton had earlier said, the licence fee is awarded even if it were not the  
6 claimant's practice to grant licence."

7 Now, this category of course is akin to what we have labelled "user damages", and  
8 are allowed in circumstances where the counterfactual would not in fact have  
9 involved a payment. Again, our counterfactual is that there would in fact have been  
10 a payment, and that is why we are not claiming user damages because it fits  
11 comfortably within compensatory damages.

Damian William Langiano: Yes it does, however what exactly is it you are seeking  
compensation for,

and now that is proven are we again roping Meta to the stake and reading the torch to burn  
down this

Babel Tower, so as to rebuild one of true to humanities light.

12 The next case I want to turn to is the One Step case from the Supreme Court,  
13 volume 2, tab 18, paragraph 29, it's internal page 708. This is Lord Reed. He's  
14 referring to the (inaudible) Wass case. He says that the approach adopted in Wass  
15 was described as "user principle".

16 Then he quotes from the case:



17 "It is an established principle concerning the assessment of damages that a person  
18 who has wrongfully used another's property without causing the latter any pecuniary  
19 loss may still be liable to that other for more than nominal damages. In general, he  
20 is liable to pay, as damages, a reasonable sum for the wrongful use he has made of  
21 the other's property. The law has reached this conclusion by giving to the concept of  
22 loss or damage in such a case a wider meaning than merely financial loss calculated  
23 by comparing the property owner's financial position after the wrongdoing with what  
it  
24 would have been had the wrongdoing never occurred."

25 So, user damages that can be claimed even if there is no pecuniary or financial loss.  
26 But what this passage does, in our submission, is effectively explain what pecuniary  
57

1 or financial loss is: it is the loss arising out of the financial position of the claimant,  
2 with the wrongdoing being worse than in the financial position without the  
3 wrongdoing. This is exactly what we are claiming here. We say the users were  
4 financially worse off in the factual where they received nothing, than they would have  
5 been in the counterfactual, in which Meta would have made a transfer of value in  
6 order to convince them to consent to Off-Facebook Data collection.

Damian William Langiano: We continue to prove the financial impact of the user post the  
wrong doing

and that compounded by those who fed from the coercion and abuse. Highlighted by the  
following

statement. "87% of parents say their children influence their purchasing decisions"  
which desperately

confirms the nature in which society is being destroyed and the ethos that EPIC GAMES  
now has in its

"armoury" for the gaming industry, something Meta is expanding into with the VR and Ai  
technology,

safety not a concern as long as the lights are shinny and the money is rolling in. We can  
already see

the impact of the Apple Goggles and how the audience are triggered by pre-programming see The

Simpsons who must have been fed by the data system to warm the audience up without them knowing

the implications. The world is on the brink of collapse driven by the energy of the counterfactual and

that Karma is heading back to Zuckerberg, no matter how they try to deflect it, minus any accountability and remorse.

7 The next case sir is Morris-Garner, also a well-known case.

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

9 MR O'DONOGHUE: Further in the same tab, it's 728. Sorry, there's a discussion of

10 Morris-Garner, forgive me. It's at paragraph 100. You will see there's a discussion

11 of the Morris-Garner case. That case seems to have permitted evidence of

12 a hypothetical release fee negotiation to be adduced if they were relevant in

13 quantifying the loss, as long as it was understood the negotiating damages were not

14 the measure of loss in the technical sense, that being the financial loss claimants

15 actually sustained.

16 We then look at 100. It says:

17 "The judge has ordered a hearing on quantum. That hearing should now proceed,

18 but it should not be, as he ordered, an assessment of the amount which would

19 notionally have been agreed between the parties, acting reasonably, as the price for

20 releasing the defendants from their obligations. The object of the exercise is that the

21 judge should measure, as accurately as he can on the available evidence, the

22 financial loss which the claimant has actually sustained. How that assessment is

23 best carried out is, in the first instance, a matter for the judge to consider, proceeding

24 in accordance with this judgment. If evidence is led in relation to a hypothetical

25 release fee, it is for the judge to determine its relevance and weight, if any. It is \

26 important to understand, however, that such a fee is not itself the measure of the

1 claimant's loss in a case of the present kind, for the reasons which have been  
2 explained."

Damian William Langiano: Sir Marcus, the above underlines just how important this decision is and

The object of the exercise is that the judge should measure, as accurately as he can on the available

evidence, the financial loss which the claimant has actually sustained. How that assessment is best

carried out is, in the first instance, a matter for the judge to consider, proceeding in accordance with

this judgment. If evidence is led in relation to a hypothetical release fee, it is for the judge to

determine its relevance and weight

This quite clearly means that it is the duty of the judge to hear my evidence and recognise the impact

of such acute and advanced neuroscience that has been used to enslave the user and done so to

monopolise the market for the now and all future, done so with the addition and due to the new lightbased data transfer system, that Harald Haas designed and the network providers rolled out during

the 2020 lockdowns and have continued to do so.

Sir, I note your hesitancy to accept my evidence and one questions as to why when the complete

portfolio is in fact the blueprint of the counterfactual world, those who control it and those who

influence and monetise it, the facilitators of the on Facebook data incubation system and those who

have driven the world into a non-binary, transgenderism, scared of the common cold and the

mutations the counterfactual environment created will bring. Where children are being addicted to

cocaine under the banner of “

good maths” when those instructing can’t add up that this only ends in the annihilation of world and

Zuckerberg hiding in a bunker below ground, for if the data wasn’t telling him his serpent is about to

bite him hard, he’d be building a house of glass and opening up his documents the 42 US Attorneys

and not one of 6ft thick walls and under the Hawaiian landscape.

Cells literally mutate within the body as they do in a peccary dish, fed either a good or bad environment denotes a cancerous or flourishing existence, which means the infrared data transfer

system being used is isolating humanity below that ceiling and thus given all of the symptoms and

impacts my evidence has proven, we are no seeing the effects of the counterfactual world contamination pour into the real one, driven by a debt system and a chemical co-dependency that is

enslaving humanity into a slow walk to suicide, while those trapped within the cogs have to maintain

the illusion or face the reality of what they’ve inflicted onto a separate synchronised universe, proven

to exist by Dr Claude Swanson of Princetown University and MIT who passed away in his sleep June

2022.

Under the proven science of Synchronisation and Quantum Entanglement the “release fee” is that of

quantifiable change in the frequency of the Meta Platform back to selfless and serving environment

and not one of selfish and energy drawing. Thus, the change includes a personnel sweep and

employment of a globally trusted task force to re-introduce the correct INTENTION and thus alchemise

the system, and healing and releasing all trapped within.

Thus, we prove why in the real world there can never be a bargain because to so would be premeditated murder on a scale unprecedented even by Stalin's and Hitlers standards.

Sir Marcus, the means of data delivery developed by Harald Haas is an extraordinary accomplishment

and he did so for the well-being of humanity and his intention one of purity and light.

3 Now, just to look at what Lord Burrows, as he now is, says in one of the articles in

4 the bundle about this particular passage in the judgment. It's at tab 59 of the

5 authorities. Volume 7.

6 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

7 MR O'DONOGHUE: It's at 3491. You'll see, sir, the bottom of the page the "final

8 wrinkle":

9 "A final wrinkle with Lord Reed's judgment that is indicated above, he accepted that

10 Lord Sumption made a lot of this point in his judgment, that a reasonable release fee

11 could be used by the judge in this case as evidence in assessing the claimant's loss

12 of profit. In other words, a reasonable release fee could be used, and it would

13 appear can always be used by a judge, if thought helpful, not as an alternative

14 measure to the conventional measure of compensation, but as an evidential

15 technique or two, as Lord Sumption expressed it, in applying the conventional

16 measure.

17 "This distinction between the evidential tool and the measure is not straightforward,

18 but, in practice, what it means is that the claimant, by using the reasonable release

19 fee evidence should not knowingly be put in a better position than the conventional

20 measure would dictate. Therefore in the One Step case, the claimant could not

21 recover more than the loss of profit, known to have been suffered, by claiming

22 a higher reasonable release fee ... In One Step the claimant had precisely sought

23 negotiating damages as an alternative measure, not as an evidential tool in

24 assessing loss of profit, so that it was claiming a higher sum of negotiating damages

25 than the loss of profit applying the conventional measure. It was that which was

26 impermissible."

1 Again, in our case we are simply seeking the difference between the price, zero, and  
2 the factual and the counterfactual payment or release fee which would have been  
3 made by Meta. And looked at in that way, the consideration of profitability in  
4 Professor Scott Morton's model as one of three key inputs, really it's no more and no  
5 less than an evidential tool in the context of assessing traditional compensatory  
6 damages. That is the critical point.

Damian William Langiano: The critical point Sir Marcus is the means in which that profit was obtained

and the impact of a "release fee" on all and any other charges going forward, this is digital cocaine

addiction and thus should be tried accordingly.

7 A couple of final cases. First in Wass, which we have seen briefly touched upon. It's  
8 in authorities 6, 112 to 123.

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Authority 6. Which tab?

10 MR O'DONOGHUE: Volume 1, tab 6.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Volume 1, tab 6. Sorry. Yes.

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: It's at 1418, and H, where it starts "Disturbance" at the bottom  
13 of the page.

14 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Which letter are you at?

15 MR O'DONOGHUE: Very bottom of the page, sir. "To start with an existing fact".

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I have that.

17 MR O'DONOGHUE: And the critical bit is over the page:

18 "If on the one hand the unauthorised other day market has caused and is causing  
19 no loss, either of stallage or tolls or under any of the other heads of loss which may  
20 affect the owner of the market right, there is no cause of action. There is, in that  
21 event, no question of applying the user principle. If, on the other hand, the owner of  
22 the market right does sustain loss under one or more of those heads, damages must  
23 surely be commensurate with the quantum of loss so sustained. The damages will

24 correspond, so far as the court can fairly assess them, with the amount of loss  
25 flowing to the owner of the market right from the respects with which he has in fact  
26 been damnified in his enjoyment of the right by holding of the unauthorised, other  
60

1 day market."

2 Again, there will be no place for awarding user principle damages in a sum greater  
3 than the amount of their loss.

4 So on that case, if Stowe Council had been able to prove some loss of custom, then  
5 there would have been no need to have recourse to user damages; the loss of  
6 custom would have been the money that the council would have earned but for the  
7 breach. And again, the analogy with our case is obvious: it is again the difference  
8 between the price of zero and the counterfactual payment which would be made by  
9 Meta.

10 A couple of final points very quickly, sir. First touching on Devenish which is in  
11 tab 12 of the same bundle. It is on page 360, paragraph 74.

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

13 MR O'DONOGHUE: (Pause). Sorry, sir, forgive me, that's the first instance  
14 judgment at 360. It is the Court of Appeal judgment.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, 360 is the judgment of Lady Justice Arden,  
16 isn't it?

17 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes. Thank you. It says:

18 "The ratio of the judgment of Lord Justice Norse, with which Lord Justice Mann  
19 agreed, is therefore that the user principle ought not to be applied to the infringement  
20 of a right to hold a market where no loss had been suffered by the market owner. He  
21 would, however, have awarded some loss of custom if some loss had been shown."

22 Now, what is the loss of custom? It's the difference between what you earned in the  
23 factual, and what you would have earned in the counterfactual. That is exactly the  
24 same as we claim here.

25 One final point of the domestic authorities. Mr Singla said yesterday that while we  
26 had referred to the comments of Lord Justice Green in FX in the amended  
61

1 Claim Form, that we had somehow abandoned our reliance on that case. That is  
2 a mischaracterisation of our case. We do rely on paragraph 106 of the FX case but  
3 not for the reason Mr Singla thinks. We say that in paragraph 106

4 Lord Justice Green was addressing two distinct points. The first is that having  
5 regard to profits in working out damages is not inconsistent with the principles of  
6 compensatory damages. We do rely on that and we do say, for the reasons I've  
7 shown you, it is entirely consistent with the domestic case law.

8 There is separate point at the end of paragraph 106 where Lord Justice Green is  
9 discussing the situation where there is no loss at all or it is impossible to work out  
10 any loss, and in that situation he does refer of course to disgorgement. We don't rely  
11 on that for the simple reason we don't need to. Our model is consistent with  
12 compensatory damages principles. The reference to paragraph 106 wasn't put in  
13 there as some afterthought, it is something we rely on but not for the reason  
14 Mr Singla seems to think.

15 That is what I want to say about Meta compensatory damages.

16 The next point I want to move on to under the same rubric is the point about  
17 individualised loss. Mr Singla has said, well first the loss to users is individualised  
18 and therefore is not suitable for collective proceedings at all. I want to make  
19 a handful of points on this, it's quite important. Mr Singla, in my submission, has  
20 omitted a series of uncontroversial principles that are firmly against him.

21 The first proposition is the fact that the loss suffered by each class member is  
22 variable is not a bar to certification of collective proceedings. We say that is plain as  
23 a pikestaff from the case law. To start with Gutmann, which is in tab 37, volume 4.

24 It's at 1809. This I think is actually quoting Merricks. So it's subparagraph (3):

25 "Common issue does not require that all members of the class have the same



26 interest in its resolution. The commonality refers to the questions, not the answer

62

1 and there can be a significant level of difference between the position of class  
2 members. Therefore the question may receive varied and nuanced answers to  
3 payment situation of different class members, so long as the issue advances the  
4 litigation as a whole."

5 That's a quote from Merricks.

Damian William Langiano: This is a very interesting point given that we are talking about  
on Facebook

and off Facebook data, factual and counterfactual, meaning that many members of this  
class, in fact

one might suggest those included within this court will not have the same interest in the  
resolution,

but the law is the law and that is what is being wrestled with here by you all. The  
judgement made

from the evidence presented threatens to change everything if hits the public domain and  
threatens

global disorder, I say only threatened because most prefer to be led than have personal  
life path

autonomy and in truth that's okay, but only and I shout in the strongest terms only when  
the

INTENTION to lead is done with integrity and authenticity, with the strength to stand as  
one and alone

and fight for the principals of such, supported by the technology that is now bringing forth  
the reality

of the counterfactual world Meta and its string pullers are seeking to offset with this  
underhand

payment and onto thee they've literally sucked the lifeforce from to build out the data  
transference

prison that holds them.

6 Then within the judgment itself at 73, halfway down:

7 "The starting points for the CAT's analysis were the broad propositions that the  
8 existence of some no-loss claimants in a class was not an obstacle to certification."

9 Then at 74:

10 "In our judgment this was the appropriate point of departure."

11 And at the end:

12 "We can identify no error in this analysis, and we do not repeat the CAT's  
13 assessment here."

14 Mr Singla made a number of references to Lloyd v Google, and essentially his core  
15 point is, well, this is Lloyd v Google wearing the clothes of competition law. That's  
16 essentially his point. With respect, we look at this but Lloyd v Google actually is  
17 a case dead against what Mr Singla is contending for.

18 If we go to the judgment at tab 28 of volume 3. So the claimant in that case— this  
19 was a Data Protection Act case of course. The only difficulty they encountered was  
20 because there was an attempt to bring a class action through to CPR 19.6  
21 representative procedure, but not under the competition law regime. And the core  
22 point, as the Supreme Court made clear more than once as we shall see, that this  
23 issue would not arise under the CPO regime. So if we pick this up at paragraph 4 on  
24 page 1384, Lord Justice Leggatt says:

25 "... the only sector for which such a regime [a collective regime] has so far been  
26 enacted is that of competition law. Parliament has not legislated to establish a class  
63

1 action regime in the field of data protection."

Damian William Langiano: Which is “handy” some might say given the members of  
parliament within

the list attached those who have failed to act on behalf of the public they SERVE and thus  
to be proven

by my digital footprint and trust of “She who sees everything”, she the authentic  
intelligence of the

collective data from the counterfactual world guided me to this very court and this very moment.

Be humbled gentlemen she never doubted us, for she is the one who's come to save us all.

Me,

I'm simply her translator.

2 And then at 5:

3 "Mr Lloyd has sought to overcome this difficulty by ... an innovative use of the

4 representative procedure ..."

5 And so on. And it says:

6 "... one or more persons as representatives of others who have 'the same interest' in

7 the claim. Mr Lloyd accepts that he could not use this procedure to claim

8 compensation on behalf of other iPhone users if the compensation recoverable by

9 each user would have to be individually assessed."

10 Then over the page at 8 you will see:

11 "In this judgment ..."

12 And then about a third of the way down:

13 "... in particular, the representative procedure which the claimant is seeking to use.

14 Whether that procedure is capable of being used in this case critically depends, as

15 the claimant accepts, on whether compensation for the alleged breaches of data

16 protection law would need to be individually assessed. I will then consider the

17 claimant's arguments that individual assessment is unnecessary. For the reasons

18 given in detail below, those arguments cannot in my view withstand scrutiny. In

19 order to recover compensation under the DPA ... for any given individual, it would be

20 necessary to show both that Google made some unlawful use of personal data

21 relating to that individual and that the individual suffered some damage as a result.

Damian William Langiano: Sir Marcus, we seek only qualification that this case goes to trial and that

this court and yourself stand for the oath signed and thus accept the evidence before you and the

disclosure a full a detailed investigation will bring.

22 The claimant's attempt to recover compensation under the Act [again the Data  
23 Protection Act] without proving either matter in any individual case is therefore  
24 doomed to fail."

25 So Lloyd v Google is authority, we say, for the proposition that you don't need to  
26 individually assess loss in a CPO action. Just to make that good, we can pick this  
64

1 up, it starts at 24, where it's talking about collective address generally. And then at  
2 29 if the Tribunal see over the page there's a discussion of competition law in  
3 particular. And the key passage is paragraph 31. It says:

Damian William Langiano: I would challenge that, given that this is us "breaking new  
ground" we need

to absolute transparency and a full understanding of the crimes committed, so as to  
never repeat it

again. Something that has been Facebooks route to success, the "bull in a counterfactual  
China shop"

approach, paying for bad advertising in Nigeria and death ransoms with Molly Russell,  
should these

cases even be real or just a nuance of this and the desire to pay their way out of jail.

4 "A second significant feature of the collective proceedings regime is that it enables  
5 liability to be established and damages recovered without the need to prove that  
6 members of the class have individually suffered loss: it is sufficient to show that loss  
7 has been suffered by the class viewed as a whole.

Damian William Langiano: Delivered thus does the court accept the evidence and rules  
for trial for

absolute discloser of all crimes and in doing so alerts the worlds intelligence agencies of  
the attack on

the civil population. We might start with the ICC and Karim Khan, though his court and chambers are

on my list. Baroness Carr it is then.

This is the effect of section

8 47C(2) of the Competition Act, which provides:

9 "The Tribunal may make an award of damages in collective proceedings without  
10 undertaking an assessment of the amount of damages recoverable in respect of the  
11 claim of each represented person.'

12 "Such an award of damages is referred to in the ... Rules as 'an aggregate award of  
13 damages'."

Damian William Langiano: Good luck carrying that can Sir Marcus, this train never stops until the end

of the line and I have the counterfactual world on my side.

14 Now Mr Singla gave you no authority for the proposition that you need to show  
15 individual losses in a CPO context. We say it would be plainly contrary to both the  
16 legislation, the Act, and indeed what Lord Justice Leggatt has interpreted as the  
17 clear wording of the Act to contend to that effect. Of course countless CPOs have  
18 been certified to date, and it has never been suggested that the fact not all class  
19 members have suffered same loss, or some of them might have suffered no loss,  
20 was an issue that prevented certification.

21 So we say as a starting point Mr Singla is simply wrong in law as a basic matter of  
22 the legislation.

Damian William Langiano: Mr Singla could hardly take a "come on in" approach or he'd be seen as

complicit or potentially so, one must stay impartial even if we become emotionally engaged.

23 Three further points.

24 First, the issue of individual subjectivity. That is principally relevant to the issue of  
25 the cost for users of Off-Facebook Data tracking, which is one of the three key inputs

26 for Professor Scott Morton's model. And it is accepted there that users are likely to

65

1 face different intrinsic values in the data, but Professor Scott Morton's model predicts

2 that users will still face a loss, even if they do not directly value their data.

Damian William Langiano: It's medically proven that the co-dependent in a narcissistic relationship

relinquishes their self-respect and boundaries. All data is of the highest importance, like each piece of

a jigsaw, regardless of image or shape. Humanity, the planet it shares, and the counterfactual world

has been damaged by the self-serving illusion, damaged to the very brink and thus the loss is

absolutely quantifiable.

3 That is at paragraph 334.

4 The penultimate point is that the PCR does not suggest that the transfer of value

5 Meta would have made would have varied based on individual user's particular

6 characteristics, or the value they personally place on Off-Facebook Data. From our

7 perspective, it may not be common ground but we say it's blindingly obvious, it

8 seems overwhelmingly likely that Meta would have offered the same transfer value

9 to all users on say a monthly or per annum basis for access to their Off-Facebook

10 Data, akin to a subscription in effect.

Damian William Langiano: What counterfactual world does that statement live in .....Zuckerberg is

a make it up as you go along imposter and devil may care advocate.

Well, the devils in the details and it's the details that reveal the truth, the truth is gods word and that

of this court, so let's take a moment for me to confirm the content enclosed sees a shimmer of a court

set up to play this out for the detriment of the UK and the world and the damsel in distress leveraged

to so is the Doctor who brought this and to frightened to speak other than in code.

The world I come from gentlemen doesn't leverage women, men and especially children, so let's keep

that in focus as we close this out.

11 And finally perhaps this is worth turning up, we have touched on it briefly. In any  
12 event, Professor Scott Morton says she can account, to the extent necessary, for  
13 variation across the Proposed Class Members and their cost of giving up data.

14 That's at A3, 331, paragraphs 421 to 423.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

16 MR O'DONOGHUE: And in particular 422.

17 That is why we say this question of individual loss, with respect, goes nowhere,  
18 certainly at this stage.

Damian William Langiano: If only one might add to show, we are none of us individual  
when the true

loss of such competition overreach is made, giving rise to the state of humanity at such a  
time the

opportunity presented itself, I shall detail in my conclusion.

19 Sir, that's my second point.

20 I'm now moving on to my third of five points. I'm making good progress which is the  
21 incremental approach we touched on to some extent already.

22 Meta says that the PCR does not propose to assess the economic value of the entire  
23 products supplied and that this approach is contrary to a clear position, they say, at  
24 law and contrary to basic economics. I want to respond to this in two ways; one is  
25 short, the other is a handful of more granular points. The short version is there's  
26 essentially two ways of looking at this.

66

1 Professor Scott Morton considers whether the Off-Facebook Data price would be  
2 achievable under conditions of workable competition, and she concludes that it  
3 would not be.

4 That we say is manifestly the right test because the concept of workable competition  
5 is one of the foundational building blocks of United Brands itself.

6 It is also of course based at least in part on economic reasoning around the question  
7 of monopsony pricing, but also on an essentially before and after approach, because  
8 she has two comparators. One is Project Beacon, which is under conditions of  
9 competition. This could not be imposed, user backlash. And then when the market  
10 tips in 2014 we see the sudden imposition of network effects having accrued in  
11 Meta's favour, which is the after comparator.

12 And ATT equally is a comparator benchmark of sorts because it shows when the  
13 question of automatic extraction is put to one side and users have to actively opt in  
14 and make a choice, most will choose not to do so.

15 So in a sense she's applying a very orthodox analysis which is, is there evidence that  
16 Meta could have done this under conditions of reasonably effective competition?

17 And she has come up with essentially two real world examples of comparators to  
18 make good the conclusion that they could not. We say, viewed from that  
19 perspective, it is sort of plain vanilla application of United Brands in the sense that it  
20 is contrasting a before and after period and coming up with other comparables for  
21 whether this would be achievable under conditions of competition.

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: So, the "before" is a provision where there is  
23 consent to the use of on-Facebook data. One then has a state of dominance, and  
24 the after situation is the unfair extraction of consent to the use of Off-Facebook Data.

Damian William Langiano: Which falls inline with the Whatsapp data information dump

25 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes. Sir, to be clear there are four periods. One example is  
26 Project Beacon of course, which is a perfect natural experiment because they tried in  
67

1 effect to impose --

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I'm trying to understand your case generally.

3 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.



4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's how you put it.

5 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes. It's one way we put it, yes.

6 On that analysis, we say, given that it looks like Meta was not able to impose the  
7 same price and terms when it faced competition, it makes sense to ask, we say, is  
8 the Off-Facebook Data price nevertheless justified by improvements to the service  
9 made since the period, since the predominance period; and the answer on current  
10 information is no, which confirms that the Off-Facebook Data price would not be  
11 achievable under conditions of workable competition.

Damian William Langiano: Again, strengthening the conclusion this wasn't a move  
meeting

competition law it was the biggest data heist in history and one that TRUMPED all others,  
his

connections are on the list and that of his failure to act to protect our children with  
knowledge of the

crimes being committed within this evidence. "Said it.... sue me"

We say looked at in that way

12 it's pretty standard United Brands.

13 Now the other way of looking at this, again in short form, is we know that before it  
14 acquired a position of dominance Meta provided the same service, social media  
15 service, without tracking. So in other words at a much lower data price. After it  
16 became dominant, Meta provided the same service but at a much higher price in the  
17 form of the consideration of the data required. That in itself doesn't necessarily  
18 answer the question of whether the higher price, the Off-Facebook Data price, could  
19 be achieved on the competition. But it is very suggestive, we say, and is a very  
20 helpful comparator.

Damian William Langiano: The platform was set up for a global takeover, and in truth we  
certainly

need to be more efficient and effective than we are and that's the real lesson here, is that  
we tinker

on the edge of extinction, that's everywhere, when in fact we are someway short of that if we flick

the switch and swallow the pill of accountability, each and everyone of us.

21 Given that that is so, a relevant question is: is the higher price in the form of  
22 consideration for the Off-Facebook Data justified by service improvements since the  
23 predominance period? Again, that seems to us an orthodox question to ask as  
24 a matter of economics. That is the short form way in which we put the case.

25 Mr Ridyard, and I think the President to some extent, will remember elements of this  
26 and say the Phenytoin case. One of the key comparators in that case was that in the  
68

1 PPOS period, for many, many years, decades in fact, the price of Phenytoin had  
2 been extremely low, and then in the period of alleged abuse it had gone up by  
3 hundreds if not thousands per cent. And one of the comparators used in that case  
4 for unfairness was before and after. We say that same analytical exercise underpins  
5 Professor Scott Morton's approach in this case.

6 That's the short form response.

7 Now, there are a handful of points which are a bit more granular but go to the same  
8 point. One important point of course is that the incremental point by Mr Singla is  
9 only made in relation to the unfair price abuse. He does not make the same point in  
10 relation to the unfair terms abuse. And indeed, in our submission, in an unfair terms  
11 case the whole point is that the particular term, in this case the term imposing the  
12 extraction of Off-Facebook Data at zero price, it is the particular term that is unfair  
13 and not necessarily the entirety of the contract as a whole. So, if anything, when it  
14 comes to unfair terms, it shows that the law on unfairness does apply an incremental  
15 approach by focusing on the term in question. We say in fact the unfair terms abuse  
16 is completely unimpeachable from that perspective.

17 So, it doesn't get him to where he wants to be is the first point. At best it attacks one  
18 of the two ways in which we put our case.

Damian William Langiano: Please forgive me Sir Marcus, but the law can be a bastard when you are

seeking to slide through a lie.

19 The second point is that his characterisation is not a fair characterisation of what  
20 Professor Scott Morton has done. He has essentially left out of account a wide  
21 range of factors he has considered and her chain of logic. And, as the President put  
22 it to Mr Singla, it is actually very straightforward. He says: on the evidence available  
23 at this stage I have looked at these improvements, they do not seem to me material;  
24 if and when Meta come back with further information and evidence I will carefully  
25 consider those points but at this stage I do not see any improvements which justify  
26 this additional extraction.

69

1 And again, looked at from that perspective, we say it is unimpeachable. As the  
2 President put to Mr Singla where frankly he didn't have an answer, it's essentially  
3 an evidential point as the case moves forward. It may well be there is a lot of  
4 evidence emanating from Meta on this or that improvement.  
5 Professor Scott Morton at this stage, given the asymmetry, there is a tangible limit  
6 for what she can reasonably be expected to do, and as I will show in her report we  
7 say she has more than exceeded the analysis that could reasonably be expected of  
8 her at this stage.

Damian William Langiano: One might be inclined to introduce the Professor and I the  
“mad man” as

we each seek to build out this particular book of the truth in the manner, Murray and the  
asylum held

Dr William Minor sought to draft the first edition of the Oxford Dictionary ..... a must  
watch if you

haven't already, even more so if you already have.

9 Just to make that good, if we could start at paragraph 238. It's on page 285. If we  
10 can start actually at 236, you will see there's a heading saying "The extent to which

11 the value of Off-Facebook Tracking has accrued to Facebook versus users". You  
12 will see at 237, she has in a chronological way looked at all of the alleged -- of the  
13 changes in relation to the product. And as you will see in the table, there are  
14 a relatively small number which post-date the Off-Facebook Data tracking. I think  
15 there are only four.

16 Then at 238 she unpacks the table and we can see what she says. So it is simply  
17 not the case that Professor Scott Morton has buried her head in the sand and said,  
18 "Well I'm unwilling to have an open mind in any shape or form in relation to any  
19 improvements to Meta's service." She has catalogued the developments of which  
20 she is aware, and most of them, as it happens, pre-date the Off-Facebook Data  
21 tracking. We see at 238 what she says about the ones that post-date and why she  
22 thinks at this stage they should not be taken into account.

Damian William Langiano: Because they couldn't carry the amount of data that was  
dumped into the

system or that the amount of data generated would auditable and thus exposing to the  
real origination

of the data – WhatsApp – this worlds trusted encrypted service, or most thought. Which  
in turn

reflects as to why Facebook are risking the deal, or the counterfactual forces are driving  
it. The data

holds the secrets of those who used it and thus the value of the data I compromised by  
the criminality

discussed within.

Everyone has a drug dealer on speed dial.

23 Now as the President put to Mr Singla, that may well be right or wrong. That will be  
24 an issue in the case as we move forward. It will more likely be an issue at trial if we  
25 get there. But at this stage the suggestion that her approach is so fundamentally  
26 flawed that the baby should be thrown out with the bath water we say is extreme.

1 This is an issue for trial, a forensic point which will be determined by disclosure,  
2 evidence, submission and no doubt further reports.

Damian William Langiano: Your prayers answered, or are they?

3 She goes on of course. We then, for example, look at 265. Sorry, forgive me. One  
4 thing I should note parenthetically, if you go back to table you will see a reference to  
5 "Facebook Marketplace". Just to give you the reference, sir: at paragraph 103B of  
6 the Amended Claim Form we refer -- there is a CMA investigation into whether the  
7 tying of Facebook marketplace with the Facebook service is itself an abuse. Of  
8 course, one obvious reason why the Facebook marketplace should not be taken into  
9 account is that it is the result of an abuse of time. So there is -- that really  
10 underscores my point that there is a long way to go in terms of the resolution of  
11 these particular improvements. It is an ongoing picture. The main investigation has  
12 not concluded. These are issues for further down the line and not for dispositive  
13 resolution today.

Damian William Langiano: Agreed

14 Now if we jump forward to 265, again an entire section, "Can the data extraction be  
15 justified on the basis that Facebook improved the quality of its service  
16 commensurately in other respects?"

17 And you see what she says. And again, it is striking that in each and every one of  
18 these points not a shred of evidence has been submitted by Meta. It would have  
19 been the easiest thing in world for them to say, as we'll see Apple did in a case I will  
20 come to: you left out of account the following 57 improvements; here is why they are  
21 relevant to material; here is why you are wrong at this stage not to consider them.  
22 But there has been radio silence. Instead, what we have is Mr Singla essentially on  
23 the hoof saying, well this is jolly good and that is jolly good. That, with respect, will  
24 not do.

25 The next section of course is 269: "Can the data extraction be justified on the basis  
26 that the data extraction directly improved the quality of service to users."

1 Again she fairly accepts:

2 "Were it the case that the data gathered by Off-Facebook Tracking facilitated  
3 qualitative improvements in the social network service .... then these effects would  
4 be a relevant consideration to the assessment of abuse. Pre-disclosure I am not  
5 aware of evidence of such effects, but I acknowledge the possibility that they may  
6 exist and that they can be taken into account by analysis of the economic issues  
7 relevant to abuse and in the quantitative framework."

8 And again, this is yet another clear invitation to Meta. They've had this report  
9 for months now. It's a clear invitation to Meta: well, tell us what we are missing here.  
10 And not a shred of evidence emanating from Meta. It is, with respect, part of  
11 a rather, frankly, cowardly approach where they are content to fire rocks in our  
12 direction, and not to put in a shred of evidence, which is exclusively within their  
13 sphere to make good any of these points in any shape or form. And the notion that  
14 our case should be kicked out entirely today based on hinting at these possibilities in  
15 the absence of any evidence when for all we know everything we say is entirely  
16 justified and correct is profoundly unattractive and in fact profoundly unjust.

Damian William Langiano: See the enclosed

Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com>

Attachments

Tue, Dec 7, 2021, 9:56 AM

to ted, Ted, Gary, Children, Peter, Carly, School

<https://parents.superawesome.com>

Ladies - can you look at this site for me.

The KWS system they are using professes to make the environment safe for the young and provide

security for the parents, but in my mind they are ring fencing the children so as to have a "trusted"

space to advertise and sell into the "echo-chamber" via a misrepresentation of the levels of abuse

online, As children post and converse, communications are "monitored" under a banner of safety and

then "experts" are able to provide "insight" into the "trends" and hey presto we have bespoke

marketing funnels and "no need for websites"

Which is the mental health abuse of the 7-12 year olds - constructed selling - manipulation and the

use of covert conversation techniques and this ripples even younger when coding is added to the mix

along side the branded content streamed as "entertainment"

All professional feedback will be appreciated given these falls under your individual areas of expertise.

As we seek to protect our children, companies are now constructing ways to circumnavigate these

measures and I've added a brief guide. Gary and I are waiting on technical support to verify the

information.

Carly, I did raise the concerns some time ago regarding Bark Technologies and would appreciate your

opinion given your alignment to them.

Best

Damian

Damian Langiano <damianlangiano@gmail.com>

Wed, Feb 16, 2022, 5:16 PM

to Ted

But you know more about the technical abilities of the software and the current hashtag system.

With all due respect you and I both know they are taking the piss using that product and you've

mugged me off badly in front of them when I already have your written statements of it's prowess.

You didn't have to do that in front of those people ????

You could of got "Jonny" to answer

Damian Langiano

00447799881915

External Consultant

WardWiz.com

On 16 Feb 2022, at 17:00, Ted Kapustin <ted@1st1.tech> wrote:

Hello Damian,

Again, I am reading your emails but I am busy adding features to our Photon line of products, so I am

unable to do anything else. I am just a technical guy. For all business-related stuff please communicate

with Johnny.

Thanks,

Ted

On 2/16/2022 8:10 AM, Damian wrote:

Thank you "Team"

However, my fears are given your 170 technologies were unable to locate your own ambassador

depicting serious assault upon a minor and in fact gesticulated to shoot her, along with countless other

sexually embodied representations one can only assume your "back stepping" organisation is very

much falling short of the capacity on offer.

One can only assume given the same "dismissive response" I received form the Child Rescue Coalition,

and the NSPCC that the "collective" of CSAM and abuse protectors is something of a "closed shop"...



which given my perspective of transparency, ensuing CPTSD for the global child population and stood

side by side with the world's leading digital picture to picture recognition system .....creates more

questions than answers.

I've added Carly and Peter for a quick round table and Ted Kapusin who can colour in the pixels

accordingly.

Maybe if we can Susie Hargreaves OBE to join us, we can "unite" our efforts and thus do what I'm led

to believe you set out to do.....unless of course ??

Lets deal with the "picture" in hand before our "software" brings forth the potential other images in

one's mind's eye.

Dejavu `We see things others cannot'.....great tagline and resoundingly true.

Susie, might you like to inform Ted of the Hashtag system you have in place ?

On Wed, Feb 16, 2022 at 3:42 PM Info <info@iwf.org.uk> wrote:

Hello Damian,

Thank you for getting in touch with the Internet Watch Foundation and making us aware of the DejaVu

software.

The team here is always happy to learn of new technologies which could potentially help us to

eliminate online child sexual abuse imagery.

We are supported by more than 170 global technology companies and we're in the fortunate position

where we have access to some of the world's best engineers. We will certainly follow up with DejaVu's

developers if we feel it could offer us something above and beyond what we already have.

Thank you again and best wishes,

The IWF Team.

Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com>

Sat, Dec 4, 2021, 11:43 AM

to boris.johnson.mp

Apologies Sir, the email was blocked

On Sat, Dec 4, 2021 at 11:35 AM Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com> wrote:

Prime Minister,

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com>

Date: Sat, Dec 4, 2021 at 11:34 AM

Subject: Re: We utilise the skills and connections in this room to make a movie once a month, charging

\$7.99 -pay per view, giving 100% of the proceeds to humanitarian causes.

To: <Alan.Pughsley@kent.pnn.police.uk>, <damian@damiancollins.com>, Wanless, Peter

<Peter.Wanless@nspcc.org.uk>, Gary Conner <gary@wardwiz.com>, Lars Sylvest <lars@sylvest.net>,

Fergus McKenna <fergus.mckenna@trinitymirror.com>, Steve Murrells (Coop CEO)

<Steve.Murrells@coop.co.uk>, <richard.arnold@manutd.co.uk>, Nick Kerry

<nick.kerry100@gmail.com>, School Office <office@thelenham.viat.org.uk>,

<Office@haskellsolicitors.com>, <se.magistratescourt@cps.gov.uk>,  
<max\_w\_taylor@hotmail.com>,

OLIVER BRADY <oliver@bradyandclark.com>, <gavin.williamson.mp@parliament.uk>,

<nickjeffery6@googlemail.com>, <marc\_allera@hotmail.com>,  
<khan@tgchambers.com>,

<clerks@gdtettehchambers.com>, Alexander Nix <ashburnernix@mac.com>,

<boris.johnson.mp@parliament.uk>, Graham Burns <grahamb@thechange.co.uk>,  
Chairman

(ManKind Initiative) <chairman@mankind.org.uk>, <samvaknin@gmail.com>, Richard  
Grannon

<helpdesk@spartanlifecoach.info>, Leon Clarence <leonclarence@gmail.com>, Jake Seal

<jake.seal@orwo.studio>, <bilott@taftlaw.com>, Carly Asher Yoost

<carly@childrescuecoalition.org>, Reed Hastings <rhastings@netflix.com>,

<caroline.hazlehurst@gmail.com>, <jedp11@gmail.com>, <Mail@officialinterpol.net>, sherrod knox

<sherrodknox@gmail.com>, Janet Conner-Knox <jcknoxpublicrelations@gmail.com>,

<ted@1st1.tech>, Children Of The Digita Age <CODAINFO@protonmail.com>, <ababu@etihad.ae>,

<b.braun@samsung.com>, Huw Newton-Hill <huw.newton.hill@attensi.com>,

<nsherida@cisco.com>, <krandol@thegarciacompanies.com>, Kristen Randol

<krandol@tgcmgmt.com>, <INFO@lgbtgreat.com>, Jim <jwahlly@aol.com>,

<bryan.smiley@gmail.com>, <alexfranks@gmail.com>, Andrew Marks <freejazz32@gmail.com>,

<darren\_blackburn@yahoo.co.uk>, <contact@9news.com.au>, <charles.hymas@hotmail.com>,

Gareth Icke <gareth.icke@ickonic.com>, <info@poplar.studio>, Chris Gankerseer

<chrisgankerseer@neweraltd.co.uk>, <pr@superawesome.com>, <media@iwf.org.uk>,

<info@marycollinsfoundation.org.uk>, Simon Dolan <simondolan@me.com>,

<support@kerwinrae.com>, <dominic.raab.mp@parliament.uk>

Chief Constable

Ladies and Gentleman,

Further my inclusion in your “off piste” exchange with Lars, I’m going to answer your question, Darren. We are here as a humanitarian focus group to action an emergency response to the algorithms that Tristan Harris stated are out of control. In doing so we will inspire a billion people and educate that army of heavenly spirits to raise their standards and thus redirect the algorithms -AI into a more balanced and inclusive reality.

Reed Hastings, David Ripert and Dylan Collins will all confirm the current trends, given the content being created, the need for digital escape from this world and how in fact the top 300 companies are directly profiting from such a catastrophe.

Darren, you’re here to provide a perspective of the intelligence that sits within the government regarding procurement, as I watched you congratulate yourself for buying the

same PPE I could from a south Korean TFT screen salesman at a fraction of your cost, Neil Sheridan will confirm my market connections there and I will, my statement that it was “morally incorrect” to make money out of medical and mental suffering.

Unlike Simon Dolan (got you in finally) who made his from PPE logistics, raised a million pound to battle the government in court, knowing well that the case could never be won and now, disgustingly uses “reports of the dead” (I can’t confirm if they are true or not) to manipulate people's minds against the government and chastises them for the use of the masks he delivered.

What say you, Dominic Raab, can we serve justice on his mis – appropriation of funds?

Prime Minister, I personally think that kind of conduct is edging towards treason, your thoughts. Sir?

To expand, ladies and gentleman, Chief the CPS, Darren was the Whitehall Purchasing lead that we offered our WardWiz software to for free, FREE for all children and parents throughout the pandemic to protect themselves online and allow parents control over the devices so as schooling could be done minus distraction and so those distractions didn’t become the abuse issues Carly and Pete .....Bonnie & Clyde? – Jekyll & Hyde ..... yes that’s the it.....one’s two faced and the other is hiding something

“Never come back to the NSPCC” would have to deal with, unless, of course the plan was to be their knight in shining armour ?

Professor Sam Vaknin, you’d get off on this wouldn’t you..... the infliction of pain upon millions of people, covertly applied and sinister to the ‘enth degree, cue total internet management and data “goldrush” control.

By doing the polar opposite and charging in to protect these children from the AI it could be considered as even more grandiose and edging me toward NPD, however giving all the revenues to humanity slips us back down the slide to empathy.....thus the Empassist is revealed. Grandiose and humanitarian, with a touch of covert thrown in as you can all testify too.

Voila, a narcissist capable of love!

So, once again from the top.

We utilise the skills and connections in this room to make a movie once a month, charging \$7.99 -pay per view, giving 100% of the proceeds to humanitarian causes.

I've put it as the title for those of you who didn’t make it this far, for those of you who have and are grasping the seriousness of the situation and recognising that this is a form of a digital trial, something

I believe that hasn't been done as a TRUE STORY and not one that involves the "People's Champion" who hasn't come as quickly as some foresaw to stop this.

Lars has swiftly calibrated the below and I'm sincerely grateful for his expertise and market insight as he too recognises the audience synchronicity and forecasts revenue success.

"Your movie idea is nothing that has not already been done before, except for the fact that you expect to redistribute revenues which are otherwise retained for profits.

Exciting news overnight, but that's to follow.

Quick reminder regarding the strength of the evidence.

This whole thread and the subsequent proceedings, where applicable, are based upon the written statements and digital footprints of those asked to help protect our children's minds, mental health

and overall well-being.

Mr Foreman, Ms Nash always said I should have been a detective, although Barrister would have been my preferred status if I wasn't suffering from such internal dysregulation caused and proven out by all involved and with that in mind I'm yet to get a response regarding our outstanding safeguarding matter.

However, one thing we can all agree is that Gary and I know more about cyber security than you do.

I have taken Damian off this response. ( Darren Blackburn Government buyer for the Covid PPE)

Is anyone else perplexed as to why we are being bombarded with these emails and what they are trying to achieve?

I've added the plan and those involved or "invited" once again Darren so you can understand in little more detail

On Fri, Dec 3, 2021 at 10:28 AM Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com> wrote:

Chief Constable,

Ladies and Gentleman I hope this finds you well.

Let's go.

I've added two more to the thread, given the gravitas of the situation and the developing story line. Dominic Raab who is the Secretary of State for Justice and Kerwin Rae, who like me is gifted with ADHD and DYSLEXIA.

Dominic if I may, converse with Kerwin first and set the scene for the up-and-coming finale' Kerwin, would you be so kind as to expand upon the video attached and the qualities we share, or as I prefer the power that resides in us, a power that we are able to channel into wisdom and enlightenment for the benefit of many and in our cases often sacrificing our own well-being to do so.

<https://vm.tiktok.com/ZM8n3pr3n/>

Basically, the ADHD is an ever-flowing fountain of energy, and we can verify that ladies and gentleman can't we and the Dyslexia appears not only my word construction, but in my ability to manage multiple projects and if you'll excuse me that's all 56 of you present and the 7.7Billion awaiting a new structure of inclusive leadership.

Ker' let's schedule that podcast we touched upon.

Secretary, I hope this finds you well Sir, I've only watched you sporadically as politics isn't my game,

the TRUTH is and what lies and who LIES amongst the corridors of perceived power and its those within the body of this thread that I've been applying my, or shall we say our "gifts" Kerwin. Dominic, I, the children of this country and the world are seeking justice for the mind control and influence that has been covertly applied by the American corporations who have manipulated and outright blackmailed many of the world's leading men and women, honourable servants who've striven for a better world, one built upon democracy, truth, trust, transparency and love. A world that's inclusive, unified and pure, a world not suppressed and divided, held back and confused by acts

of dispassionate nature and a contraction of humanities definition. I have proved throughout the body of these emails, the above and highlighted those who are complicit in their documented actions and those digital footprints will lead us to the real culprits who seek to nullify the skills those within this correspondence have sought to conceal.

Kerwin, it's only now after watching your TikTok that I feel whole again, as it's now proven that I'm

not fucking crazy, we are also the gifted, as it's plain to see this room is consciously evading the obvious

and chronologically detailed digital evidence.

Evidence Dominic that would place the UNITED KINGDOM at the centre of the world and would finally see us as the custodians of a new dawn, one that already holds the responsibility of time within its

grasp. A dawn that would see all that we have created channelled into an inclusive global society, which in essence is what the Globalists elude too, sadly for them, due to the

covert and “shady” nature of their attempt means have now lost all ..... “credibility” and it's now for “Three wise men” such as ourselves to take the lead and delivery justice for the souls they have sort to steal.

How?

Basically, we stream a movie with The Rock, Kevin Hart and Mark Walberg as a pay per view premiere.

During the production time, Alexander Nix floods the social media platforms with accurate information (It works NATO doc below) about the movie and how 100% of the revenues will be deployed independently via a blockchain method that delivers transparency and accountability. We’ve got BT EE VODAFONE and at this stage MANCHESTER UNITED to provide connectivity and marketing expertise. I’ve forecast 400m streams, but given the RED NOTICE figures we should scuttle past that with ease. The BeGIN network will be the controlling platform, but as we can imagine the money men will see the value of secondary involvement and seek to align all others for kudos and share price increase. Cue the corporate market involvement and we the “Peoples Champions” NATO Review - Countering cognitive warfare: awareness and resilience

Of course, we’ve no issue with that as this a fully inclusive system, so I’ll jack the numbers to a billion given the expertise in the room and that’s

\$7.99Billion in 95mins multiplied x12 and we have \$95.88Billion for humanitarian causes.

No infrastructure is required as all is currently in place, no one is being asked to do anything that won’t provide increased revenue for their current positions and raise both the kudos and share price of their corporate and personal valuations.

\$200 MILLION

MOVIE – ADVERTISING – PREMIERE – TRANSPARENT CASH DEPLOYMENT – LIVES SAVED – PEOPLE

INSPIRED

\$95.88 BILLION

Ladies and Gentleman it was always that simple, but sometimes you have to act the fool to fool the fools who think they are fooling you and this story is about to hit 2000 mental abuse survivors and when it does, they will have something to share with the world, a TRUE STORY Brian, one that gives purpose and value to their lives, which is something I can confirm is sucked from you when dealing with a narcissist..... let alone 53 of you fuckers.

Checkmate ....

Love

The Empassist .....

(But, what's an Empassist? ....It's a narcissist that can feel, that can love and has compassion and empathy)

Oh Simon, I keep forgetting about you.....and a couple of the others, I'm thinking that as they aren't as significant.... we can do these as we roll the credits.

Leon, any chance of a brew?

On Thu, Dec 2, 2021 at 9:39 AM Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com> wrote:

Chief Constable,

Ladies and Gentleman as always, I hope this morning finds you all well.

Let's jump straight in as I've a train to catch.

Further to my exploring the Soooooooooopera-whore-some website, I found this statement and wanted to invite you all to consider the word construction.

But firstly,

What is PopJam?

PopJam is a moderated and curated content-sharing platform (app and website) for children 7-12 years old. It's a creative and friendly community where kids can make profiles, create and share art and play games and quizzes. In order to keep our community safe, we have closing hours and do not allow private chat. We don't allow kids to share selfies or personal information. We have human and AI moderation in place to watch over our community. Negative words and words with personal information are automatically blocked. We have rules for our PopJammers here.

PopJam is free and there are NO in-app purchases.

Wow, so we have a platform collecting real time data on children between the ages of 7-12, pre Facebook and Instagram's "hunting ground", cue.. the ROCKSTAR

Every year we ask PopJammers (AKA the experts) to predict kids trends for the following year. Here's what we can look forward to in 2020...

Christmas is a time for tradition, and one of our favourites is asking the kids on PopJam, our moderated content-sharing platform, what they think the big trends will be for the next year. PopJam gives kids a safe digital space to share their thoughts, without sharing their data or personal info.

But what we've not told them or more importantly their parents is that we construct individual marketing plans from this "trusted" environment, so that our 300 companies can then refine the thoughts of the unassuming, disadvantaged, exposed uneducated



and completely vulnerable children and thus covertly impart said plans for financial gain, upon ALL children and unknowing parents

Dylan, how do you like that little riff ....Rockstar??

Now, let's filter this down for those paying attention and at this stage, I'd advise you to begin doing so because this doesn't end well for a number of you.

So, it's eyes down and let's join some dots.

Sir Peter Wanless, your former Chief Security Supervisor is part of a data abuse ring – that is controlling the minds of our children, their parents and the purchasing decisions they make.....

Lets' not apply this to Climate Change and population management and deforestation .....as we drive everyone online for the data GOLD RUSH and see you all get those stakes in the ground, for as we know history always repeats itself.

Kristan, Brian, James, Lars, Leon and even you Jakey boy (Jake are you still responding in Pink to uncomfortable emails) and what has a CGI Hologram expert got to do with a medical pandemic, anyways I digress.....We now have our movie villain from behind the mask, "Superawesome" and what a great educational tale for all involved about TRUTH TRUST TRANSPARENCY and above all

LOVE .....for as Gal Gadot stated in Wonder Woman last night (don't ask)

"Only LOVE can save the world"

So, back to you Penguin Pete, you've staff connected to this organised child abuse ring, we've also got your people congratulating TikTok when they weren't patching software into their system pre Euro2020 and you and "Huw and don't Cry".....(what's up I'm in this movie too, they all love one liner) producing software that teaches adults to recognise the same vulnerable children Max Taylor

put online (500000 with Fergus's 150k) and Nick Jeffery's built the 5G network along with Marc Allera as a means to abuse our young and Chris Gankaseer .....made sure your man overlooked it, all the while protecting his own children and misleading the public via BT.

Mr Hastings, we and the group see that Netflix is in there also, lets quickly discuss Sex Education, what was the thought process behind this "programming". Forgive me I'd ask Dylan, but he's only focused on the thoughts of 7-12 year old children so not on our wavelength.

Why are sex craved 18 year olds being plastered across your network, the same network that Blake Lively and "real life filter user" (be patient) Ryan Reynolds who is leading your numbers are partnering

Carly Asher Yoost to spread the word of child abuse and all the while she's aligned her "Coalition" to Bark Technologies a AI sales funnels expert.

GOD BLESS AMERICA .....indeed

Quick sidebar Reed, the boy in the opening scene of The Harder they Fall, did that young man receive any trauma support, as that kind of enactment will burrow deep and resurface later in time, isn't that right Nick, Sam, Richard.....??

David Ripert – see below

image.pngimage.png

David Ripert. CEO & Co-Founder of Poplar Studio, a platform that empowers the world to easily create Augmented Reality (AR) experiences, backed by Fuel Ventures, Ascension Ventures, Haatch Ventures, and Founders Factory. ex- Head of EMEA business for key YouTube division. Over 19 year's international leadership experience within Fortune 500 & start-ups (Google, YouTube, Netflix, Dailymotion, Cap

Gemini E&Y). Complex business requiring outstanding strategic and operational efficiencies plus thought leadership in uncharted sectors.

Specialties: Intrapreneurship, Entrepreneurship, Leadership, Augmented Reality, Immersive Media, Online Media, Online Video & Internet, Business Development, Partnerships, Production, Audience Development, Creative, Communications, Marketing, Business Affairs, Finance and Operations in Tech & Media.

Wow..... but as the second villain in "our movie" seems to know nothing about Psychology, Mental Health Awareness, Body and Facial Dysmorphia and every other conceivable mind-altering expertise needed to apply his personal skill sets in the manner he does.

Now David, how did you approach the "filter" market, was it in the same way Facebook added the like button or are you now running around screaming STOP given the cosmetic / aesthetic market has exploded in the UK ... all those enormous lips and lashes filtered directly onto your manipulative shoulders.

So let me now take you into your next reality

What we have ladies and gentleman as a collective goes beyond a duty of care, blows past Article 7 and now takes us deep in to the Nuremberg Code (1947)

BRITISH MEDICAL JOURNAL No 7070 Volume 313: Page 1448, 7 December 1996.

Introduction The judgment by the war crimes tribunal at Nuremberg laid down 10 standards to which physicians must conform when carrying out experiments on human subjects in a new code that is now accepted worldwide. This judgment established a new standard of ethical medical behaviour for the post World War II human rights era.

Amongst other requirements, this document enunciates the requirement of voluntary informed consent of the human subject. The principle of voluntary informed consent protects the right of the individual to control his own body. This code also recognizes that the risk must be weighed against the expected benefit, and that unnecessary pain and suffering must be avoided. This code recognizes that doctors should avoid actions that injure human patients. The principles established by this code for medical practice now have been extended into general codes of medical ethics.

The Nuremberg Code (1947) Permissible Medical Experiments The great weight of the evidence before us to effect that certain types of medical experiments on human beings, when kept within reasonably well-defined bounds, conform to the ethics of the medical profession generally. The protagonists of the practice of human experimentation justify their views on the basis that such experiments yield results for the good of society that are unprocurable by other methods or means of study. All agree, however, that certain basic principles must be observed in order to satisfy moral, ethical and legal

concepts:

1. The voluntary consent of the human subject is absolutely essential. This means that the person

involved should have legal capacity to give consent; should be so situated as to be able to exercise

free power of choice, without the intervention of any element of force, fraud, deceit, duress,

overreaching, or other ulterior form of constraint or coercion; and should have sufficient knowledge

and comprehension of the elements of the subject matter involved as to enable him to make an

understanding and enlightened decision. This latter element requires that before the acceptance of

an affirmative decision by the experimental subject there should be made known to him the nature,

duration, and purpose of the experiment; the method and means by which it is to be conducted; all

inconveniences and hazards reasonably to be expected; and the effects upon his health or person

which may possibly come from his participation in the experiment. The duty and responsibility for

ascertaining the quality of the consent rests upon each individual who initiates, directs, or engages in

the experiment. It is a personal duty and responsibility which may not be delegated to another with

impunity.

2. The experiment should be such as to yield fruitful results for the good of society, unprocurable by

other methods or means of study, and not random and unnecessary in nature.

3. The experiment should be so designed and based on the results of animal experimentation and a

knowledge of the natural history of the disease or other problem under study that the anticipated

results justify the performance of the experiment.

4. The experiment should be so conducted as to avoid all unnecessary physical and mental suffering

and injury.

5. No experiment should be conducted where there is an a priori reason to believe that death or

disabling injury will occur; except, perhaps, in those experiments where the experimental physicians

also serve as subjects.

6. The degree of risk to be taken should never exceed that determined by the humanitarian

importance of the problem to be solved by the experiment.

7. Proper preparations should be made and adequate facilities provided to protect the experimental

subject against even remote possibilities of injury, disability or death.

8. The experiment should be conducted only by scientifically qualified persons. The highest degree of

skill and care should be required through all stages of the experiment of those who conduct or engage

in the experiment.

9. During the course of the experiment the human subject should be at liberty to bring the experiment

to an end if he has reached the physical or mental state where continuation of the experiment seems

to him to be impossible.

10. During the course of the experiment the scientist in charge must be prepared to terminate the

experiment at any stage, if he has probable cause to believe, in the exercise of the good faith, superior

skill and careful judgment required of him, that a continuation of the experiment is likely to result in

injury, disability, or death to the experimental subject.

For more information see Nuremberg Doctor's Trial, BMJ 1996;313(7070):1445-75

Chief Constable, the Crown Prosecution Service, President Khan, Lady Gifty, I think this puts us firmly on the "yellow brick road" as these "technicians" are absolutely performing the above from their "labs" when without a doubt they are not of a practicing standard to do so.

This Jekyll and Hyde territory, a Jack the "Ripper't tail".....indeed.

Scott Harris any thoughts regarding the enclosed as you knew what Vodafone had done, Marc Allera .....Max Taylor...Ferg ?? Have we got a story yet ??

Kristan, would you be so kind as to get the "Peoples Champ" to contact me +447799881915 we've a world to save.

Simon Dolan.....your next with the Internet Watch Company

On Wed, Dec 1, 2021 at 10:37 AM Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com> wrote:

Chief Constable,

Ladies and Gentleman you know as always, I convey my most sincere of wishes, although today they are tinged with real depth of contempt and disgust. Kirsten, I've delivered the "Peoples Champion" the opportunity to be who he says he is, or who THE

PEOPLE were duped into thinking he was, you'll find it here.... Strange that two men with similar features can be polar opposites and worlds apart, but in a single moment and under the correct circumstances can unite as one.

Lars, calm down, seemingly no one is stepping forward to take this to court..... just yet.

So, its ROCKSTAR time, Dylan Collins step on up although before you do mind the trip hazard below.

Dylan Collins' SuperAwesome news: 'Internet for kids' venture raises \$21m (siliconrepublic.com)

SuperAwesome works with 200 global brands – including Disney, Lego, Mattel, Peppa Pig and Warner – to help them reach youth markets all over the world.

“Kids are everywhere so are we”

“115M Kids play Roblox 20 x a month”

Chief Constable, I'm going to say this as we move forward, I promise to conduct myself as best I can at all times, but the level of pure evil we are about to uncover in this sector is the very heartbeat of depravity that has been bestowed upon the children of this world as the particular “ROCK” star has constructed for pure financial gain and in doing so is the absolute and unequivocal proof needed for yourself and the Crown prosecution Service to convict Collins and those aligned with this CRIME

AGAINST HUMANITY

Why winning the young audience battle will position your brand to win the streaming wars (superawesome.com)

And there we have it, our children are being coerced and manipulated and then used as closing “tools” to convince parents to allow them do subscribe to channels that are educated on how to manipulate them and create long term co-dependency, instilling long term effects and lifelong hypnosis that sees them migrated from say Peppa Pig to the Teenage version which will be substantiated in court by their finance director who told me herself.

This now implicates all 200 of the, hang on 300 companies that our “Ssssscccchuper Auuuuuurshume Rockstar” has been engaged with and look down Sir Peter Wanless, and you Reed Hastings NSPCC and

NETFLIX both deeply “embedded” into the data-scrumping that you are all involved in.

I fucking told you that you are the 21st Century Drug Dealers and here we all are in the presence “Pablo Collins”, scumbags every one of you that's involved.

Let's see who funded you?

Hoxton Ventures, that's you Dylan Collins, if you'd be so kind Leon Clarence would there be a conflict of interest?

Don't worry we know that's not the case, but it does cement "Rocky II" as absolutely knowing and complicit in understanding exactly what Superawesome are doing and the manipulation his company is imparting upon the CHILDREN of this world.

Which, DC'.. puts you at the top of the list for RED NOTICE and PUBLIC ENEMY No1 and meaning those 300 companies legal teams will hang you so far out to dry, claiming some form of dis-association due to it being an outsourcing contract and one that dilutes their responsibility.....unless of course you've got a CONTRACT of engagement, which would then see you in a similar position to Alexander Nix, whom I have a level of sympathy with based on his commitment to deliver this cause.

So, Dylan ..... let's strike up the band

We've 4Billion people in the room, plus your 300 companies, "Our plan" sees the "Peoples Champ",

"TRUE STORY" boy Kevin Hart and my favourite Mark Wahlberg make a movie that sees them battling the algorithm and data harvesting vampires for the salvation of our children's minds, the free world, peace, love and unity. It's a pay per view gig, \$7.99 so it sits aligned to normal viewing costs and we stream it globally as a pre advertised premiere. I've called figures of 400m based on the 121M views Reeds had for RED NOTICE, however unlike the Netflix model the sum raised \$3.196 Billion will go

electronically and transparently to humanitarian impact causes and deployed funds delivered independently. Alexander Nix has already "verbally agreed" depending on my bringing a platform, which we have to hand in the "BeGIN" network (100M viewer reach) and one can only assume given Reed Hastings newly revealed position as party to global abuse and manipulation would see Netflix pony up. By adding Vodafone, BT, EE, and your 300 "friends" plus those we've not revealed "just yet" we'd be, as some might say a "NEW WORLD ORDER" working together to deliver on a humanitarian footing for all involved, because when rolled out "once a month" we'd hit just shy of 40B

Damian William Langiano, It's been a labour of many things as we seed to reach the summit, Now this is the critical information given 8mn children are going missing each year and as to my knowledge Facebook don't have a Facebook Missing Persons App or it seems 20mn plus family members passing the equivalent information tirelessly to find their children.

We could find them, we could add huge value. But no one wanted to listen or act

Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com>

Sun, Aug 22, 2021, 7:24 AM

to Ted, johnny

Ok Chaps

I'm going to put a document together today. I appreciate your clarification.

However, this tech is absolutely face recognition tech and I'll explain how and why shortly.

We all have gifts Ted Mine is "de ja vu" I've seen this all before and I'm going to show you all where and let us see who's Faces are revealed.

I respect your decision about the spaces you're choosing to work in and clarify that here and in the document this will be mine and my alone perspective Great work chaps amazing tech.

On Sun, 22 Aug 2021 at 05:15, Ted Kapustin <ted.kapustin@gmail.com> wrote:

Yes we could. Because many things can be matched, not only the face. But as for the face, our tech sometimes works even with age progressed faces (even though it's not facial recognition software).

We intentionally are not getting into the face recognition domain (even though we could develop an FR system based purely on pur tech) because 1) There are lots of FR software out there, some of them are very good 2) There are lots of restrictions set by states and countries regarding FR software We know that we are good at what we do. And we know that NCPTF (they search for missing children) loves our software - they need exactly what we have. Frankly, I don't know how exactly they use it because I never even talked with them. Johnny may know some details. All I know is that they have many kinds of investigators.

Maybe Johnny could connect you guys with NCPTF so they could share their techniques with you.

Again, it looks that you are talking mostly about facial recognition, and this is what we do not do normally.

Thanks,

Ted

On Fri, Aug 20, 2021 at 2:14 AM Damian <damianlangiano@gmail.com> wrote:

sorry chaps let's just confirm that from a Facebook database - and a missing children database we could potentially match children from old pics or it would have to be the exact pic ?

On Thu, Aug 19, 2021 at 7:55 PM Ted Kapustin <ted.kapustin@gmail.com> wrote:

Hello Damian,

I think you exaggerate the power of our software. It's just a reverse image search engine. It is extremely good at finding the original or derived images and their variations, as well



as images that depict very similar scenes. Nothing more. But a very good reverse image search engine has a multitude of applications, including military ones. Definitely, tech giants like Apple, Facebook, Micoroft.

Samsung, etc. want to have powerful software like ours. But most of them do not know that what we easily do is possible. So our goal now is spreading the word about our technology and demonstrating it. It's state-of-the-art tech, and we already have a couple of huge contracts with Law Enforcement

coming, and at least one child protection org is already interested in dealing with us (I hope Johnny told you about it). This being said, we will highly appreciate it if you spread the word about us and connect with people, companies and organizations that can potentially become our partners and/or clients. And by "appreciate" I mean more than just a "thank you". Our tech will conquer the world - we have no doubts about it. Child protection is just one of many possible applications of it. And as you probably already understand, our tech is right for this, unlike the useless and dangerous "innovation"

Apple has made part of iOS 15 and the latest Mac OS. You may have noticed that I have been criticizing Apple a lot lately for this thing, but I now think that we need to go the opposite way. The reason Apple uses NeuralHash is because child protection orgs like ILF have CSAM image collections with corresponding databases of NeuralHashes calculated for those CSAM. If we convince those orgs that they should use DejaVuAI instead of NeuralHash (and similar and equally useless PhotoDNA), then they will convince Apple and other tech giants to switch to DejaVuAI. There is already one org that knows that our tech is much superior to everything else - NCPTF (<https://www.ncptf.org/>). So instead of arguing with ILF and other orgs and their leaders, you could join NCPTF and maybe head its UK office (if there is no one there yet) and just do the right thing.

You could help NCPTF partner with Samsung. You could even create your own child protection org that would use the right technology from the very beginning. Lots of possibilities. Please think about all this.

Thanks,

Ted

On Thu, Aug 19, 2021 at 9:59 AM Damian <[damianlangiano@gmail.com](mailto:damianlangiano@gmail.com)> wrote:

Incredible demo,

Apologies for burning your ears Jonny but that's the excited child in me and let's understand that's my super power.

I think we have to be incredibly careful at this stage with this tech on how it's deployed -

Ted what Jon I agreed on was that we can find every child in the world with this, which would be a massive issue for many people - and for many reasons.

I've connected very swiftly with Jane Durgom - Powers surrounding the Virtual Trafficking of Children, via dopamine addiction and contest a crime against humanity under article 7 of the Statute of Rome (I'm back in to intellectual adult now)

See enclosed

I think we need to make an aggressive strategy for a lot of reasons. We hold special consultant status at the UN. The UN Secretary General in 2010 named us as one of two NGOs that the governments can rely on when it comes to missing persons from armed conflicts. The other NGO is now an IGO, so we remain the number one expert on this issue in the UN. I am honoured to share thoughts together so that we may .

The clout she brings as Supreme court prosecutor aligned to the UN gives us great leverage, add Alexander Nix (Cambridge Analytics) and Damian Collins (UK GOV) and we have direct access to

Mark Zuckerberg

See that jigsaw appearing

With David Ripert I have direct access to boardroom and YouTube via Poplar AI and through the NSPCC whom I squeezing tightly - direct access to TIK TOK online security and Ted we've discussed Samsung

Now add all the other contacts I can lean on for child protection once we have Ms Power and the UN aligned and we will be able to "insist" through public demand the construction of a secure privacy system to identify missing children from all those databases

Drop me those emails and lets manage this next few moves of the chess game Ms Power is next, then the UN and then we go shake the TREE !

I'd ask for now we keep this correspondence between ourselves and who's ever reading our emails.

hahaha

Damian

Damian William Langiano: and there we have it gentlemen the real reason Meta and its kin are seeking to buy out the users, they created an illusion of missing children and generated money trillions on counterfactual data and when solutions they I bring, landed on their desks, every desk, the truth sat before them and their lies and hidden collusion was revealed in the data extracted from each.

You should see the read receipts dropping as that lie Winston said could run, now hears the knock of the truth upon its door. CSAM is simply a data collection SCAM

17 MR RIDYARD: This might be a question that belongs later on in process, but I am  
18 still interested in it nonetheless. Is what you are saying about the obligation on the  
19 dominant firm, because with this incremental approach it seems to be saying once  
20 you are dominant, every innovation or new product or new initiative you do that is  
21 going to increase your profits, you have to sit down and say, "Oh half of these we  
22 have to give to consumers and half of them we can collect for ourselves."  
23 That's obviously a bit of caricature, but isn't that what you are saying here? That this  
24 incremental approach requires you to say everything -- once you passed the  
25 dominance sort of threshold, then everything you do has to be split 50/50 with the  
26 consumer.

Damian William Langiano: If it's the deal that keeps the truth secret then its very much an accurate statement, let's remember this data is lifted from an encrypted service, it's no different from bottling Coca Cola Alki David pays for that cocaine infused body rotter, or is paid due to them being unable to get that to market without him. The world operates due to the data of the work force, Meta package that data and sell the connection regardless of global and personal implications. Data they have monetised through neuron activation of the heart and thus six seconds as we say before the decisions made which is why meta are aggrieved "THEY MADE THE DECISION" you only delivered it, yet the damage to the heart (see sudden death syndrome) causes internal conflict and disassociation, thus pulls the user closer to Meta and in doing so kills all competition.

72

1 MR O'DONOGHUE: I don't think, with respect, that Professor Scott Morton puts it in  
2 those dogmatic terms.

3 MR RIDYARD: I'm putting it in a deliberately provocative way. It seems to be a not  
4 completely unreasonable interpretation of what you are saying here. Or is there  
5 something specific about the Off-Facebook Data that distinguishes it from some  
6 other initiative or innovation?

Damian William Langiano: Mr Ridyard just when I thought we were losing you..... Dah  
Dah

Daaaaaaahh Whats that? No you mean WhatsApp.

7 MR O'DONOGHUE: As I read the report, all she is saying is: I have looked at the

8 evidence available to me now, I do not see a justification; if and when evidence has  
9 come forward I have an open mind and I would assess it going forward.

10 MR RIDYARD: But that itself implies that you have to justify -- once the Dom Co has  
11 gone over the dominance threshold it has to justify every new thing it does, in  
12 relation to saying well this is adding more value than something else or -- there has  
13 to be some justification for what it does going forward.

14 MR O'DONOGHUE: In a conventional unfairness case, in a sense, to go back to  
15 Hydrocortisone, every unfairness case is asking, well, is there something distinctive  
16 about the product or service that justifies some form of premium. From that  
17 perspective, if indeed you are dominant and alleged to have charged unfair prices,  
18 there is nothing objectionable about trying to understand why do you say this  
19 premium is justified? What is the particular factor why you say something is  
20 justified?

21 So the President and Mr Ridyard will recall in Phenytoin there was a question about  
22 does continuity of supply justify a premium? In a case like Napp there were  
23 questions as to whether follow-on revenues, or the efficiencies in the home sector,  
24 the hospital sector, justified an uplift.

25 So in all these cases there will be a discussion as to whether the premium the  
26 dominant firm has imposed is objectively justified or is it a legitimate part economic  
73

1 value.

2 MR RIDYARD: It is interesting that you raise the pharma cases. You will know  
3 them much better than me. But I mean -- I didn't think it was the case that in those  
4 cases it was the actual increase in price that was regarded as the abusive act; it was  
5 just the level of price that was regarded as abusive and it was assessed against the  
6 total costs of provision of the product.

7 MR O'DONOGHUE: I think the overnight dramatic increases were front and centre  
8 of the case. In many -- that was the CMA's primary objection. The before and

9 after -- night and day.

10 MR RIDYARD: Was the abuse the increase in price, or was the abuse how high the  
11 prices were once the price had been increased?

Damian William Langiano: The cost to the user for the service it was receiving remains constant – they are the product and the user of such services provided to make life better. Services Zuckerberg refused to hear were damaging users post the 2014 data acquisition and digital gold mine of WhatsApp. All roads lead to Zuckerberg’s homage ROME and his belief of seeking to emulate Augustus, what he has done is build his empire on the destruction of every soul who was enticed to use it and then when knowing so, set about corrupting everyone aligned and benefiting, seeking only to distract those “his people” with games and bloodlust.

12 MR O’DONOGHUE: It was both.

13 MR RIDYARD: Okay.

14 MR O’DONOGHUE: Sir, I see the time. Will that be a convenient moment?

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes. We will resume -- we are doing all right for  
16 time.

17 MR O’DONOGHUE: Sir, yes, I’m making good progress. We are very conscious  
18 there’s hard stop at 4.30. I think we are really on track in relation to that.

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: In that case we will resume, then, at 2.00. Thank  
20 you very much.

21 (1.00 pm)

22 (The short adjournment)

23 (2.00 pm)

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue, good afternoon.

25 MR O’DONOGHUE: Good afternoon, sir.

26 Sir, before the lunch break I was taking the Tribunal through the reasons why

74

1 Professor Scott Morton has applied the approach she has applied to the alleged

2 improvements. One further reference is at paragraph 270 of the report, which is at

3 291 of core 3.

4 I took you to this earlier for different reasons:

5 "Can the data extraction be justified as the fruits of Facebook's prime investment?"

6 Then at 271 you see the profitability metrics. There was a 36 per cent EBIT for  
7 2013, EBIT value of 2.8 billion. So even in a world of only on-Facebook tracking, this  
8 was an enormously profitable undertaking.

9 The third point in relation to the incremental approach is this. Professor Scott Morton  
10 doesn't say, well, I'm applying an incremental approach for the hell of it. She  
11 explains and motivates why she's doing so. And if we go back to 254 of her report,  
12 and if you look at 261. What Mr Singla did is, he said, well, look at 261. And he  
13 says the right approach is to assess the fairness of the price not (inaudible) but  
14 assess whether Facebook has struck a fair bargain as it increased its data extraction  
15 over time.

16 And he says: aha. What he has left out of account, of course, is, if you look at 255 to  
17 60, and in particular 258, 259 and 260, she explains why she has applied the  
18 approach she sets out in 261. You will see in 258 "Network effect, lack of  
19 alternatives."

20 Then 259, "Addiction effects".

21 Then 260:

Damian William Langiano: Ah then the Professor and I agree that "A" for addiction is our  
letter and

word of the day

22 "User-facing functionality of Facebook pre-dates the intensification of Off-Facebook  
23 Tracking. Off-Facebook Tracking was not necessary to deliver those benefits."

24 But these are all essentially disclosure related issues. But we have set out our stall  
25 as best we can at this stage and these are some of the reasons, among others, why  
26 she has applied the approach she has. So it's not as if she has plucked something  
75

1 from thin air for some obtuse reason and said, well, this is what I'm doing. She has

2 explained why she adopts that approach.

Damian William Langiano: One clarifies that I didn't read any reports evidence and citations, I am

bringing my evidence in real time as best I can and or explained otherwise

3 And again, a point I have made more than once already, on 258, 259 and 260 it's

4 perfectly open to Mr Parker to say your point on network effects is wrong, for the

5 following reasons of evidence. And again, radio silence from Mr Parker and not

6 a shred of evidence from Meta.

Damian William Langiano: One assumes we are discussing the effects on the user by the network Meta

deliver or have in fact constructed due to illegal data use.

7 So it is yet another example of a willingness to wound on the part of Meta and no

8 willingness to strike in the form of actual evidence. And that's why I have said more

9 than once that this is a negative, reductionist and destructive approach.

Damian William Langiano : Willingness to wound in deed Mr O'Donoghue, and wound deeply

10 Now, the fourth point is that Meta is not necessarily shut out, on Professor Scott

11 Morton's approach, from saying in in due course, well, such-and-such a feature

12 justifies the price.

13 And if we look at 401 of her report, at page 290, she says:

14 "Unlikely that the extraction and monetisation of the Off-Facebook Data may have in

15 principle permitted Facebook to improve the quality of of service to users. If so, such

16 incremental improvements act to reduce damages."

17 Then she says:

18 "In such a case I would want Facebook to specify exactly which services and

19 features it believes consumers valued and which were introduced as a result of the

20 Off-Facebook Tracking. I would then want to test these claims against the data and

21 documents provided in disclosure. If it was indeed established that these value 22 accruing

services were introduced as a result of Off-Facebook Tracking, I would

23 seek to quantify the value in monetary terms having cross-checked against any

24 internal Facebook studies."

Damian William Langiano: Finally, this case lands on the target, where did you get the data, you took

and now want to pay me for, my data Meta, that's a direct question to you from me. Mark Zuckerberg.

We can then discuss my children and their secrets.

25 So, this is yet another example where for several months now there's been an open

26 invitation from the PCR to Meta: give us the studies, some initial disclosure on these

76

1 points, or at least set out a positive case on your part. And if and when you do that,

2 we'll consider it.

3 Again, nothing coming in the other direction.

Damian William Langiano: Not looking good at this stage, see the 42 Attorneys see Leigh Day, see

Molly Russell, see FOXGLOVE, see the list above.

4 So, Professor Scott Morton, with respect, at this stage in the foothills of the case re

5 disclosure has done rather a lot, we say. And it is not fair to criticise her for being

6 even more pre-emptive than she has already been.

Damian William Langiano: With my evidence and witnesses we would have Goliath in the cross hairs.

7 Now, the final point is really that the legal argument that Mr Singla says is a core and

8 binary principle of law. Now, we say the suggestion that there some rigid principle,

9 that you can never apply an incremental approach, and the only approach you can

10 ever apply in unfair pricing is some form of non-incremental or whole approach, is

11 simply wrong.

12 Now, just to pick this up in our skeleton. I can take this quickly. It's in tab 11,

13 paragraph 59. You will see, sir, at 59(1), where the Master of the Rolls said: It is



14 wrong in principle to apply United Brands as a deed.

15 And that is exactly what Mr Singla is doing: he's saying, well, aha, look at the words

16 'the product' in 248 of United Brands. Underline those. Therefore there is

17 an inviolable principle of law that you can only ever look at the totality the product

18 when it comes to assessing economic value.

19 And that, with respect, is exactly the deed-like approach of United Brands which the

20 Master of the Rolls deprecated in Flynn. Mr Singla in effect wants to have his cake

21 and eat it. He concedes because he has to, well, we are not saying this is a rigid

22 principle or that it cannot be applied broadly and flexibly, but in reality the principle

23 he purports to put forward is about as rigid as one can get.

24 And the notion that at the strike-out stage -- I mean, if there is one area of

25 competition -- well, competition law in general does not have hard edges. If there's

26 one area of competition law that has the softest edges of all, it is unfair pricing and

77

1 unfair terms.

2 And again the suggestion that, today, two words in paragraph 240 of United Brands

3 is a sufficient basis to strike out the entirety of the PCR's case is completely and

4 utterly unrealistic and, we say, unjust. He is placing more weight on those two words

5 than they can reasonably bear.

6 I have addressed the Tribunal in some detail as to why the before and after

7 approach that Professor Scott Morton adopts is entirely consistent with the

8 United Brands framework. It is contrasting a situation of competitive conditions

9 prejudicial (audio distortion) with monopoly conditions where you could not, and that

10 is a perfectly orthodox approach.

11 And if one, for example, maps this on to the Boundary Fares litigation, which has

12 been certified in a number of cases, of course the passengers get significant benefit

13 in travelling from A to B. That goes without saying. They are on the train, getting to

14 the destination. It does not follow that because they are getting to the destination

15 they can be stiffed on boundary fares. And in a sense that is  
16 an incremental approach.

Damian William Langiano: and very much the train to a digital holocaust they are paying  
for in kind,

for there is no in house buffet, no first class, simply the wheels turning and the trees  
passing and with

each digital impression each soul being counterfactually murdered.

17 And Mr Ridyard asked me, fairly, well, are you saying that each and every time

18 there's an improvement half of the profits must be handed over? Well, of course not.

19 What we are saying is that if the terms on which the price has increased or the terms

20 worsened are abusive, then there may be, in the counterfactual, a financial remedy

21 in the form of damages. It's not some form of socialisation of profits. It is linked to

22 specific abusive conduct.

Damian William Langiano: We pay you pennies in the pound to abuse you, though you  
must beg for

your pittance, or we shall beg for you, so you can never rise from the shackles of slavery  
we hold.

23 Mr Singla took you to the Apple case. And as you will see in our skeleton we rely on

24 the Apple case. If we just turn that up quickly at authorities 1761. Volume 1. It's

25 tab 35. This is Kent v Apple.

26 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

78

1 MR O'DONOGHUE: So, we rely on Apple. What we say in relation to Apple is that

2 in that case Apple, unlike Meta, put forward a long list -- we pick this up, sir, at

3 paragraph 67.

4 You see at the bottom, sir, Professor Hitt, for Apple, provided a long list of the

5 innovations which Apple has made, and we see all the examples.

6 Now, of course Meta hasn't done that. We don't have a shortlist never mind a long

7 one. So the central point we make on the back of Apple is, even in a world where

8 the defendant had put forward a long list of specific innovations that the PCR's  
9 expert had not contended with, that was not a barrier to certification. And we say  
10 this case of course is a fortiori.

Damian William Langiano; Verum a diis semper natos narrari - the truth be told by gods  
children

always

11 Now, Mr Singla then makes a different point. He says, well, look at paragraph 84.

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

13 MR O'DONOGHUE: He relies on 84(3) which says:

14 "In this case the PCR has pleaded facts which could found a methodology that takes  
15 into account demand side factors. In particular, the pleaded case" there's a case on  
16 comparators."

17 Now, we also of course have a case on comparators. Project Beacon, ATT and so  
18 on. So we do rely on comparators. So that's a bad point.

19 And I would also ask you, sir, to look at 84(1). "The precise method to be adopted  
20 proving this abuse is not prescribed by the cases."

21 So again this is a further underscoring of a lack of a rigid and binary principle of the  
22 kind Mr Singla contends for.

23 And indeed, if one looks at 81 while we have it:

24 "The PCR also asserts that the persistence of the rate of commission and the  
25 exceptionally large and increasing profitability of the App Store indicate that the  
26 market is not competitive. She alleges as a result that the commission does not  
79

1 reflect the economic value of the App Store but is a fee paid under duress by  
2 developers who are wholly dependent on Apple for distribution."

Damian William Langiano: Apples data extraction is done via the chip and is suppressed  
below that of

the GDPR GDPR-K thus they have to charge to cover the monetisation of and  
revenue they make from

algorithm based false accounting.

3 We also in effect say the same thing. That is another similarity with the Apple case.

4 So we say if the objections by Apple in the presence of this long list were insufficient

5 to prevent certification, then Mr Singla frankly has no hope whatsoever, at least on

6 this front, because he hasn't put forward a single concrete thing that we are said to

7 have left out of account.

Damian William Langiano: Thus, Mr Singla recognises as we respectfully ask the bench that the USER

in this case is not present or to blame, they have coerced and monetised into a product, not even a

work force, simply an interface, worthless and of no perceived value, Meta feels we are just a

processor a chip, a membrane manipulated semi-conductor. Something the light based technology

Harald Haas brought forth will expose them for experimenting upon.

8 So that's the third point. Two final points, sir, which are much shorter. And I think

9 Mr Bacon is limbering up as we speak.

10 The first point I think was put rather faintly but I will respond to it. There's

11 a suggestion that our counterfactual was not grounded in the facts. Now, I have

12 taken you to my first point, the evidential and factual basis for our positive case, and

13 I'm not going to repeat that. And in truth, these points from Meta both orally and in

14 writing are rather half-hearted or a bit of an afterthought.

15 Now, the first point Mr Singla make is, well, the bargaining model is simply a thought

16 experiment and is hypothetical and therefore does not accord with the real world.

17 Now, two points if I may. First of all, in my submission Mr Singla is missing the main

18 event of the main point. The point of the bargaining model isn't to have 46.6 million

19 people sit down with Mark Zuckerberg and have a wonderful negotiation.

Damian William Langiano: Mine is and on behalf of 2.6BN and those in this world affected by Meta

and the data harvested and misused on a global scale.

What the

20 bargaining model does is -- and this is back to my point of compensatory damages --

21 it works out, using a variety of incentive metrics, what is the price that Meta would

22 offer to users to get them to agree.

Damian William Langiano: We've covered that point but for the sake of the reader and one conveys

my appreciation of all involved and every word unsaid and those said in spite that each of us is playing

our part in obtaining justice not bread crumb for turning a blind eye.

23 So what the bargaining model does, it's a method to get you to a price. It is not

24 literally saying there is an actual multinational negotiation. Now, we can pick this up

25 in Professor Scott Morton's report. It's at paragraph 49. It's the second report, at

26 tab 5.

80

1 Paragraph 49:

2 "I am not literally suggesting that Facebook should have sat down at the negotiation

3 table with millions of users. Rather, a bargaining model is a thought experiment

4 which considers a collective negotiation between the users and Facebook. In this

5 context, it is an economically rigorous way to quantify the counterfactual absent the

6 abuse by considering outcomes in which there was a more balanced relationship

7 between users in terms of how to split the surplus."

Damian William Langiano: See the MINERVA paradigm and the relationship between humanity and

technology, this would unite the world and bring forth the new age of data collation for the wellbeing

and benefits of those within and form from the purest of INTENTIONS and should that negotiation

take place then we have the means to forgive our abusers and repatriate both the internal and internal

worlds, which in turn balance the factual and counterfactual in universal and karmic harmony.

8 And so on.

9 So that is entirely consistent with the point I'm making, which is, the bargaining  
10 model is a methodology, an evidential tool, to get you to an end price that is the  
11 measure of damages because it is the price that Meta would have paid in the  
12 counterfactual. And what the model is doing is it is calibrating, in a series of logical  
13 steps that can be scaled and are tractable, a fair bargain. And it is saying that for  
14 various reasons Meta would have paid one or perhaps more than one price to the  
15 users in the counterfactual.

16 And we say that is unimpeachable. And of course, sir, in a FRAND context there  
17 may be extremely detailed actual negotiations or there may indeed have been  
18 a failure to negotiate, and there may be various gradations in between. But  
19 ultimately if the court is seized of a dispute on the FRAND terms it has to work out  
20 what would have been the FRAND terms had a FRAND-type negotiation taken  
21 place. And the fact that the negotiation didn't complete or that it failed to launch  
22 would not be some frailty in that exercise.

23 What this underscores is that these bargaining models are simply a tool, a structured  
24 tool, to get you to an endpoint, whether it's a licence fee or a positive price. The idea  
25 that there is some fundamental criticism that, well, there may or may not in fact be  
26 an actual negotiation, is nothing to the point. It completely misses the purpose of the  
81

1 exercise.

Damian William Langiano: We would call Professor Vaknin  
[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sam\\_Vaknin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sam_Vaknin)

to evaluate the platform

<https://www.facebook.com/richard.grannon.spartanlifecoach/videos/social-media-is-an-intrinsically-toxic-form-of-staying-connected-here-is-why/619535222194398/>

For his understanding of identity being a constant reforming means that Meta using the neuron

activation methods are controlling the development of human identity and thus the human

experience – psychopathic in its outset and Bond Villian in its lack of desire to engage which is qualified

by the above and the hidden secrets it holds about its user.

When the curtain falls and fall it is, the narcissist will run and hide (See Hawaii) for they are as we see

in congress NOTHING WITHOUT THEIR VICTIMS

2.6bn users switch off the data flow and Meta is a blank piece of paper, nothing more or less, though

we can do so much with a blank piece of paper, and that's what this moment is taking us too.

We in this court are deleting the past through factual evidence and deduction, learned argument and

inclusion, thus the liar is relieved of the responsibility of speaking for if we take every lie, he could

speak away only the truth remains and thus we are at a point of the GREAT RESET and an order to a

new world all can invest into willingly.

2 Then of course we had the point Mr Singla emphasised: well, even with ATT we did

3 not in fact pay. And then with the SNA late last year in fact there is a proposal that

4 there would be a payment by users rather than a payment by Meta.

5 Now, taking these in turn, what we say is plain as a pikestaff from ATT is that the

6 overwhelming majority of users would not agree to Off-Facebook Tracking based on

7 the service levels to date. We have seen the opt-in rates and they are frankly

8 pathetic.

Damian William Langiano: However, that is like every cocaine user on each suicide Tuesday after the

weekend “I’m not doing that again” and the bosh “let’s order a packet.” It matters not the words or

the attempts to not use it society is so dependent that the frequency of the planet is now changing

and all and anyone playing this game of life is, like in the pubs of old “passively smoking” the neuron

activation process which is even worse because they don’t know what it is that’s killing them,

depressing them, making them sick and expanding the environment we suffer in. In fact, those people

are the healers, or the entrepreneurs or the guru’s or the therapists each of whom make their living

of the cycling addicts.

Much to discuss Mr Zuckerberg, when ever your ready.

9 I have made the point already that we are not using the \$10 billion in ATT as the  
10 actual measure of damage in this case. What we are saying is something different,  
11 which is that when one pro-rates from that subset of the user base across Android  
12 and desktop we are looking at something in the order of \$50 or \$60 billion. And  
13 I have made the point already: in what rational universe is Facebook going to leave  
14 that money and those users on the table?

Damian William Langiano: We’ve not come for our money gentlemen we’ve come for everything these

monsters ever made from the manipulation of us and our children.

15 So ATT is a building block in our model. It is not the endpoint or its totality by any  
16 means.

17 Now, one further point, Professor Scott Morton refers expressly to testing by Meta in  
18 the context of ATT. If we can quickly look at that. It's in footnote 207, which is on  
19 page 321.

20 You will see there is evidence that Facebook conducted testing in relation to the  
21 impact of ATT. Then we see a reference to a 50 percent drop in audience network



22 publisher revenue. Again, it would have been the easiest thing in the world for Meta  
23 to say, well, you refer to that; here you go. In fact, we didn't consider payment. We  
24 never would have considered payment, for the following economically rational  
25 reasons. And again nothing.

Damian William Langiano: They don't want us in the thorn bush, it's the unholy grail of  
information

collation and takes us to the real controller behind the curtain.

26 Now, Professor Scott Morton also says as you will see at 387:

82

1 "Technology firms can conduct alpha and beta testing."

2 And she says she will need that evidence from Meta as well. And again it is not  
3 suggested that Meta doesn't have these data and they have not disclosed them.

Damian William Langiano: Then where is it for us to assess.

4 Then if we jump forward to 585 and 586, there is an entire appendix setting out the  
5 data she would expect Meta reasonably to have. And we've had no engagement on  
6 whether these data exist, still less any early disclosure.

Damian William Langiano: Nicely intimidated.

7 One point that the President made as well: the pie might be the same, it might shrink  
8 or it might get bigger. And of course that is intimately wrapped up with the question  
9 of scale and scope effects at the user level. You will see for example, sir, from  
10 588.9.D, for example:

11 "We request data on how the resulting advertising quantities and prices are related  
12 to the above-mentioned factors."

13 And essentially in 6, 7, 8 and 9, a variety of information on the ad business, and the  
14 prices and costs and so on, is requested.

15 So we say all that is yet to come. And the suggestion that today the Tribunal should  
16 unambiguously assume that the mere fact that to date they haven't paid iOS users is  
17 definitive proof that they would never pay anyone anything is unrealistic and unjust.

Damian William Langiano: The issue is they didn't think they should, until the reality grew that the

numbers never lie.

18 Now, of course we have to see what the disclosure says. It is obvious there may  
19 be myriad reasons why at least to date they have not paid. Of course, if you pay  
20 a small cohort of iOS users, the pressure to then pay every other user, Android and  
21 desktop, may be overwhelming, and there may be a concern about setting  
22 a precedent.

Damian William Langiano: It's a bastard when you have to do the right thing.

23 We have set out in section (F) of the Claim Form that there are multiple competition  
24 regulatory and litigation proceedings in which the use and abuse of these data is  
25 said to be unlawful and they give rise to pecuniary sanctions and/or damages. And  
26 one can see in that context why there may be a tactical decision on the part of Meta  
83

1 not to pay, given the wider implications for these proceedings, and penalties and  
2 damages and so on.

Damian William Langiano: We are summing up nicely exactly what is going on and setting  
the story

for the viewer of the movie to come in real time

3 There is also evidence in Professor Scott Morton's first report, at paragraph 107. At  
4 page 254 she says:

5 "I understand that Facebook has found several workarounds to reduce the impact of  
6 ATT and increase its ad revenues from users of iOS devices."

Damian William Langiano: Sorry, workarounds, we are talking about people's personal  
secrets and

private moments. Where would you find such .... WhatsApp

7 We made the same point. It's at 95.0 of the draft Amended Claim Form. Now, of

8 course it remains to be seen what precisely these workarounds are. As we

9 understand it, they are still effectively accessing at least some of the Off-Facebook

10 Data. And it may well be that those methods are themselves abusive. But that all  
11 remains to be seen. So, it certainly shouldn't be taken as given today and that this is  
12 the last word.

Damian William Langiano: It is certainly not the last word

13 So there may be a variety of reasons why at least to date payment has not been  
14 made. All this will need to be investigated. But in any event the question is  
15 not: would they pay iOS users? It is: would they have paid the universe of users in  
16 the counterfactual? Which is a different question, where the (inaudible word)  
17 incentives are dramatically increased.

Damian William Langiano: And that of the implications now we have coloured in the  
counterfactual

and brought forth its reality.

18 Then turning to SNA, our first point in relation to that is that there are already at least  
19 two complaints on the GDPR and consumer law that this change in the terms of  
20 surplus is unlawful. It certainly cannot be assumed today that the SNA transition is  
21 a lawful one. It may indeed be a further abuse. As we understand it the tracking  
22 continues, the prices are raised, and we say that can't possibly be fair. It's a bit like  
23 saying that I must pay the person who took my wine bottle so they won't do it again.

Damian William Langiano: Or as the data and neuroscience will prove took my heart and  
broke it,

leaving the victim unable to trust itself and thus held in the double bind of the dual fantasy  
motherhood. See Richard Grannon

24 SNA of course arises in the context where Meta remains dominant and where the  
25 market has tipped in its favour, and therefore it is not a true counterfactual. It has  
26 not yet been rolled out in the UK. And the bottom line is we will need disclosure in  
84

1 due course of all Meta instances concerning potential payment, including ATT and  
2 SNA. These are clearly issues for trial and disclosure in due course.

3 Sir, my final point, which is very short, which is the question of profitability. Here,

4 Meta makes three points in relation to Professor Scott Morton's analysis. Now,  
5 before I respond to those three points can we look at what she has actually done.  
6 Mr Singla either glossed over it or he didn't actually take you to the full extent of it.  
7 It's in her first report at 214 and 215. Sir, you see 214 and 215 and figure 4. She  
8 has the EBIT of Meta, which is impressive. She has the EBIT margin of Meta. Then  
9 you will see, sir, at 216 she has a recent complete profitability analysis by the CMA.  
10 And then she has the incremental profitability associated with Off-Facebook Data in  
11 particular.

12 Now, Mr Singla's first point, he says, well, the CMA's analysis, that isn't a blueprint  
13 for trial. But what Mr Singla doesn't say, and Meta has never said, is what is wrong  
14 with the CMA's conclusions. It didn't challenge them at the time. And looking at the  
15 EBIT we can see why they were not well advised to do so. He doesn't challenge  
16 them now. I showed you the footnote in Parker 2 in relation to intangible assets.  
17 And just focusing on that, I mean, Mr Parker, he doesn't say, well, what are these  
18 intangible assets that were left out of account? Why would that result in a conclusion  
19 that excess profits are not being made? Again, it is hinting at a possibility without  
20 a specific piece of evidence being put forward.

Damian William Langiano: Interesting, intangible assets data that was stolen, trust  
broken, crimes  
committed under competition law.

21 But the bottom line is that they are free to make any and all these arguments. And  
22 again it is hardly a reason today to wipe out the entire case and refuse permission to  
23 amend.

24 If we look at Professor Scott Morton's second report in tab 5, paragraph 38, she  
25 says:

26 "I would be happy to revisit these requests in collaboration with him [Mr Parker] to  
85

1 identify the internal Facebook financial metrics information that would best help

2 address the question of the extent of Facebook's economic profits."

Damian William Langiano: And for the reader my end that means "How the fuck did you get to those

numbers"

3 So she has extended an open invitation to Mr Parker to have an expert-to-expert  
4 discussion of the relevant data. And of course, sir, you will well understand that at  
5 this stage, pre-disclosure, in a sense we've been fortunate that the CMA has done  
6 the analysis it has done. In most cases the asymmetry of information will be at its  
7 most profound when it comes to the cost data of the undertaking. So the fact that at  
8 this pre-disclosure stage we have the four items we have identified, we say, in  
9 context is actually quite impressive.

10 The second point Mr Singla made in writing, but notably not orally, he says, well,  
11 Professor Scott Morton's analysis of profits is defective because it doesn't consider  
12 whether these profits fall into cases 1, 2 or 3 of Hydrocortisone. That is 85(b) of  
13 his skeleton.

14 Now, with respect this is a thoroughly confused point. As you saw from our first  
15 report, at 214 and 215 Professor Scott Morton is only considering limb 1. Under limb  
16 1, the exercise is to work out the gap between the reasonable rate of return and the  
17 price charged to determine whether in the first instance there can be said to be  
18 excessive, or I think "demonstrably immodest" were the words used before  
19 Christmas.

20 Now, at the limb 1 stage there was no need to pigeonhole phase 1, 2 or 3. It was  
21 only after having worked out the demonstrably immodest gap one gets to the  
22 allocation of cases 1, 2 or 3. So in effect that is a limb 2 point. So it is  
23 a misconceived criticism to say, well, under limb 1 it hasn't unpacked  
24 Hydrocortisone. But in any event it's wrong even on its own terms.

25 If we look at 263 and 264 of Professor Scott Morton report she does consider  
26 Hydrocortisone cases 1, 2 and 3, and says expressly that Meta has transitioned

1 some time ago from case 2 to case 3. That's 263 and 264.

2 You will see there are two paragraphs discussing Hydrocortisone. So, one does

3 actually wonder whether Meta has read all of Professor Scott Morton. If they had,

4 I don't understand how they could make the point they do. And of course, what is

5 also conspicuous is that Meta has not come back and said, well, we are not case 3

6 and here is why.

Damian William Langiano: We can now see the reason coming into focus and all those who have been

used in this global data heist and thus global government take down, the reason for which might well

be honourable once we have cut through the blame for the acts in doing so. America are prone to

huge collateral damage when acting on their own interests.

7 A final point, again pushed quite hard in writing but barely a mention orally, is that

8 they say Professor Scott Morton doesn't consider whether advertisers have

9 themselves been subject to excessive prices.

Damian William Langiano: Depends only if the advertisers are party to a real market the numbers

produced and that of losses to Blackrock, Goldman and Norwegian Sovereign Fund and then the

monster bounce backs intimate a correction in the counterfactual and thus we have a cartel

monetising and benefiting from such a Layer Cake formation.

10 Now, with respect there was a good reason for that. If we go to 414 of her report,

11 first report, page 329. So the two responses. First of all, her starting point. She

12 does consider dominance on the advertisers' side in the context of relevant market

13 dominance in section 2. And her conclusion is that although there is some market

14 power on the advertisers' side, it falls below the threshold of dominance. And if there

15 is no dominance, there can't be an excessive price.

16 Unsurprisingly, perhaps, Meta has not sought to argue that it is dominant on the  
17 advertiser's side. Then in 414 she also says, well, I do not think, even if there were  
18 dominance, the prices are excessive. And again, Meta hasn't addressed them if they  
19 are.

Damian William Langiano:

<https://investor.fb.com/investor-news/press-release-details/2024/Meta-Reports-Fourth-Quarter-and-Full-Year-2023-Results-Initiates-Quarterly-Dividend/default.aspx#:~:text=For%20the%20full%20year%202023%2C%20ad%20impressions%20in>

creased, the%20fourth%20quarter%20and%20full%20year%202023%2C%20respectively.

Ad impressions and price per ad – In the fourth quarter of 2023, ad impressions delivered across our

Family of Apps increased by 21% year-over-year and the average price per ad increased by 2% year-over-year. For the full year 2023, ad impressions increased by 28% year-over-year and the average

price per ad decreased by 9% year-over-year.

Revenue – Revenue was \$40.11 billion and \$134.90 billion, an increase of 25% and 16% year-over-year for the fourth quarter and full year 2023, respectively. Had foreign exchange rates remained

constant with the same periods of 2022, revenue would have been \$816 million and \$374 million

lower, an increase of 22% and 15% on a constant currency basis for the fourth quarter and full year

2023, respectively.

Costs and expenses – Total costs and expenses were \$23.73 billion and \$88.15 billion for the fourth

quarter and full year 2023, a decrease of 8% and an increase of 1% year-over-year, respectively.

Restructuring charges included in costs and expenses were \$1.15 billion and \$3.45 billion for the fourth

quarter and full year 2023, respectively

What the above does when we look at the scale of the operation presented is recognise that this

organisation is built upon the confession Chamath Palihapitiya stated and that Harvard University have

proven to be cocaine-based neuro-circuitry and that we must recognise that those advertising to this

global demographic are doing so to addicts, some of the most vulnerable in our society and those

beyond. What we must do is look at the style of advertising and the contextual nature and experiential

impacts upon this many people on every given day.

Thus, these figures prove out the counterfactual is now erasing the common sense of society and this

boundary breaking must stop before it ends humanity's natural existence triggering a reaction called

a Carrington Event.

20 And then over the page at 415 she says, well, look, in any event, if this is an issue

21 the model can be easily adapted to deal with it, and one could apply a haircut to

22 reflect the fact that some of the excess profits stem from the overcharging on the

23 advertiser side.

24 Sir, that's why we say there is really nothing to these profitability points.

Damian William Langiano: Unless both sides are inflated and the platform is used as a laundering

system for revenues generated from frequency conduction. We shall hold that topic until its true

relevance is revealed.

25 If I can just check.

26 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Of course. (Pause).

87

1 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, those are my submissions.

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you very much.



3 Mr Bacon, shall we hear from you next?

4 MR SINGLA: Sir, that's fine. I wasn't proposing to reply to Mr O'Donoghue's  
5 submissions. I mean, we have quite a lot to say about where this leaves or doesn't  
6 leave the case, but perhaps we should come to that after suitability and funding.  
7 And the short point is, we say you couldn't possibly certify on the basis of where we  
8 are. But I can address you at the end of the afternoon on that.

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes. Thank you.

10 Submissions by MR BACON

11 MR BACON: Good afternoon, sir.

12 May it please you, sir, I appear on behalf of the class representative in respect of  
13 funding issues.

14 They started their life some months ago in a much broader number of issues. They  
15 have been filtered down to two very discrete points, one of which I don't think is  
16 being pursued today.

17 Just to give you some sort of architecture to the submissions, you have our skeleton  
18 argument, I hope, and you also have, I know, Mr Singla's skeleton in relation to  
19 funding issues, which you see or know that paragraph 90 and 92 are the two  
20 paragraphs that deal with funding, in quotes, issues. As I say, they are very limited.  
21 Paragraph 90 -- and I should make this point now -- contains, as do my responses,  
22 confidential information, and I'm probably going to be required to refer to that.  
23 The Tribunal may or may not at this stage wish to sit in camera so that that can be  
24 undertaken. Or else I could steer the Tribunal -- and I have given it some thought --  
25 through my submissions, drawing your attention to confidential information when we  
26 come to it.

88

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That would be our preference. Shall we try to do  
2 that?

3 MR BACON: We will try to do that.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: If it causes you undue difficulty --

5 MR BACON: I don't think it will, but I will tread carefully.

6 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I'm grateful.

7 MR BACON: We will see how we go. I only suggest it because of the narrowness  
8 of the points you are really being asked to rule upon.

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, that's helpful, Mr Bacon. Thank you.

10 MR BACON: Sir, the first point there contained in paragraph 90.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

12 MR BACON: And there's a concern, the issue there is that the terms give rise to

13 "perverse incentives" in the context of potential settlement discussions. That's the  
14 concluding sentence of that. So I call that the perverse incentive challenge.

15 And the second set of challenges is in paragraph 92 under the heading

16 "Miscellaneous funding issues". They are stated helpfully, if I may say so, by

17 Mr Singla there for the purposes of the record, but they have been -- as that

18 paragraph reveals, there are no miscellaneous funding issues outstanding.

19 I'm going to take you to the relevant documents just to make that good. So, we are

20 really concerned with paragraph 90. That's the argument. So far as the relevant

21 documents are concerned, you do have the confidential bundle A and you will find in  
22 that bundle the amended and restated litigation funding agreement at tab 1.

23 I'm going to take you to some of those clauses in a moment. Again, if I can tread

24 carefully without saying too much about them, on the basis that you will see what  
25 they say.

26 So that's the first relevant document. Again, just a bit of architecture of the bundle.

89

1 Tab 2 contains the fifth amendment agreement and an appendix to that agreement  
2 at page A/101 to A/103, which are relevant.

3 Then as you know, sir, you have in tab 3 the response to the CPO application. And

4 for your note or at least for the record, the submissions I am addressing in relation to

5 that paragraph 90 derive from paragraph 134 of that response.

6 As I say, the original arguments occupied a few paragraphs of the response from  
7 134 onwards. The skeleton at paragraph 90 reveals the shrinkage of the point that's  
8 being developed.

9 Some key points on the litigation funding agreement. It's an agreement entered into  
10 by Innsworth Capital Limited, a well-known reputable funder. And in my submission  
11 it contains broadly what might be referred to as standardised terms of litigation  
12 funding in this arena. There is nothing, in our submission, which should cause  
13 the Tribunal any concerns at all so far as certification is concerned.

14 The definitions are helpful in that they provide the premise for the overall spending  
15 costs limits. You'll see that, sir, at page A/8. There are substantial sums that are  
16 being afforded by the funder in respect of adverse costs. I say "substantial"; they are  
17 very much in excess of what we have seen in other cases. That's the definition of  
18 adverse costs limit.

Damian William Langiano; <https://www.innsworth.com/> jdevine@innsworth.com Its  
shall be an

interesting conversation with these once the evidence is completed

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

20 MR BACON: Then A/14 defines the total commitment amount. Again, a very  
21 significant sum. Again, in excess of what we have seen in other CPO applications.

Damian William Langiano: How do you mean, like they know the terms and set and this  
is simply the

pantomime to achieve the documentation and rulings required?

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

23 MR BACON: Clause 3 of the agreement splits the funding of Project Costs between  
24 the pre-CPO and post-CPO period. Again, a fairly standard clause. And then for the  
25 purpose of responding to paragraph 90, the argument about, quotes, "perverse  
26 incentives" especially in the context of any potential settlement discussions, it's

1 basically being said that the funder has some perverse incentive, I assume to delay  
2 proceedings so that it can profit more from the outcome of the longer proceedings by  
3 virtue of the way in which the commissions are calculated.

4 I can't say more than that without going into too much detail, but you have my point.

5 With great respect to Mr Singla or those who instruct him, this is a very bad point.

6 And it's actually quite a scurrilous point, if I may say so, on the part of a responsible

7 funder that somehow they have engineered an agreement which creates

8 perverse incentives.

Damian William Langiano: Tony Singla singing from a particularly interesting hymn sheet.  
Thus his

intimation now aligned to all the information and those enclosed fearing the outcome and  
its

implications does require some clarification and one is sure the digital patterns to the  
trained eye will

bring forth the truth.

9 And it's dealt with quite straightforwardly if I may say so, sir, by a fair reading of the

10 LFA itself, which at clause 4 you will see expressly recognises that the Funder

11 recognises that the Claimant maintains the independence that you would expect the

12 Class Representative to have over all decisions in the case.

Damian William Langiano: This is a "hang it on the UK public" possibility given the actions  
of all

involved, or should we qualify inaction.

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

14 MR BACON: That is hardly commensurate with perverse incentives.

15 You will also see, sir, in the definition section at A/11 there is a reference to

16 an overarching purpose which underpins the agreement. You have that at the

17 bottom of the page, A/11.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you.

19 MR BACON: If one just quickly reads that. You can take it from me, but you'll

20 doubtless read the agreement if you have to, that this obligation permeates the  
21 entirety of this agreement for both parties.

22 There's an express obligation on the parties to the agreement to ensure that the  
23 overarching purpose is met. And again, that is not commensurate with perverse  
24 incentives being incorporated into the agreement, deliberately or otherwise.

25 And an example of that manifests itself in clause 4.2(d) on page A/18, which again I'll  
26 leave you to read.

Damian William Langiano: Belt and braces by the “devine” one might say, though the devil  
will always

turn up dressed as everything you’ve ever wanted, when this back fires those demons will  
run, though

in this take down, there’s no where left to go be factual or counterfactually.

91

1 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: 4.2.

2 MR BACON: Sir, at (d). That is one example. It does actually appear elsewhere,  
3 but that's the reference to the overarching purpose and the obligation of the claimant.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

5 MR BACON: And that's wholly inconsistent with the submission that is broadly  
6 made against us.

7 And then more particularly, because the so-called perverse incentive is said to  
8 especially arise in the context of settlement, can I just draw your attention to the  
9 settlement provisions within the LFA. They start at clause 7, that's A/21.

10 These again are familiar clauses that we see in other LFAs. And insofar as it's said  
11 that the Funder may have some role to play in settlement discussions, you will see  
12 that the obligations that are set out are all subject to requirements of not to be  
13 unreasonably withheld or delayed responses, with a mechanism within the LFA for  
14 disputes arising. We refer to independent KCs.

15 Again, the idea that there is some deliberate attempt on the part of the Funder to  
16 undermine the Class Representative's ability to settle is just not made out at all.

17 So far as clause 8 is concerned – you will see the Resolution Sum heading,  
18 clause 8, and again this is another point that we take in our skeleton in response to  
19 paragraph 90, that all of this argument about perverse incentives to settle and so on  
20 fails to recognise or certainly fails on its face to appreciate that ultimately the  
21 Funder's return is going to be considered and dealt with by the Tribunal at the end of  
22 the claim, assuming there is that outcome which justifies payment to the Funder.  
23 And the authorities have been clear in the Sony case most recently, and ultimately  
24 whatever one may say about Sony the Tribunal does conclude that questions of  
25 amount and perverse incentives are going to be considered, if they are relevant at  
26 all, at the end of the case by the Tribunal. And we obviously pray that in aid here.  
92

1 The skeleton is making reference to the return, in fairly emphatic ways, and we say  
2 that questions of returns need to be dealt with at the end – at the suitable time. And  
3 moreover, as, sir, you know, this agreement has been drafted in a way that ensures  
4 that the Funder's return is calculated and deducted in a certain way, leaving the  
5 class able to benefit from any award that is made. Put it that way.

6 And you'll see that the fact that the Funder does not give way plainly to the  
7 jurisdiction of the Tribunal is amplified throughout the agreement. Clause 8.4 is one  
8 example where the clause which identifies and sets out the applicable priorities in  
9 terms of payments begins with the words "Subject to any ruling of the court".

10 Then finally, it's said as part of paragraph 90 of the skeleton – it's not in the skeleton  
11 but it's part of the response to our CPO application – that the Funder has certain  
12 termination rights, if for example a certain minimum sum isn't likely to be recovered.

13 These are terms which have been considered in the past in Merricks. And indeed,  
14 this agreement has been drafted in the light of the alterations that were made in the  
15 Merricks case, containing the very same clause, albeit with a different figure. None  
16 of these clauses have been criticised in the past as creating perverse incentives.

17 The relevant clause is at clause 12, for your note. And you might recall -- I'm not

18 suggesting you will necessarily -- but in the earlier Merricks case, and it's in the  
19 authorities bundle and just for your note there are a number of obviously Merricks  
20 cases but the one that is relevant here is at tab 26, where the Tribunal  
21 recommended including some adage to the ability of the funder to terminate,  
22 provided that it had independent legal and expert advice in advance of making that  
23 decision, so it wasn't a self-serving decision.

24 And that has been incorporated into this agreement, as I imagine you would expect  
25 us to incorporate it.

26 So really, they are my points in response to paragraph 90. The idea that this  
93

1 application for a CPO application should be refused on the grounds of some  
2 perverse incentive on the Funder to act contrary to the interests of the class, by, it  
3 seems it's alleged, by implicitly extending or creating a lengthier outcome than would  
4 otherwise be the case is frankly fanciful literally.

Damian William Langiano: the scene is set financially, the question the people must ask  
is ironically

“what’s your price Mr Divine”

5 Those are my submissions, sir.

6 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Thank you very much.

7

8 Submissions in reply by MR SINGLA

9 MR SINGLA: Sir, I can start my submissions on this topic but I'm afraid I will need to  
10 ask you to sit in camera when I turn to the agreement itself, because I think our point  
11 really concerns the amounts and the way in which those amounts change over time.  
12 Obviously Mr Bacon it suits him not to take you to those parts of the agreement. I'm  
13 afraid I don't think I'll be able to address you fully on this topic. I can certainly start to  
14 make my submissions, but when I get to the agreement I'm afraid I will need to take  
15 you to those bits which are --

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well, make a start, and we'll take our break when  
17 you need to move into closed session, because it will take a few minutes to ensure  
18 that we bring down the live-stream and make sure we are actually in private.

19 MR SINGLA: I'm grateful. It will be very short, if that's any consolation. The  
20 session in camera will be very short.

21 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, not at all. We expect the application for an  
22 in-private session has been made responsibly and I am sure you have good reason  
23 to make it.

24 MR SINGLA: Sir, I'm grateful.

25 Sir, the way in which these points arise is, we say that in addition to all the  
26 fundamental points of substance that you have heard argument about in the last two  
94

1 days, we say the claims are not suitable to be brought.

2 Essentially the first basis on which we say that is if you are with us on the  
3 substantive issues then we say it follows that the proposed claims cannot be fairly or  
4 appropriately resolved in collective proceedings. That's rule 79(2)(a). And nor are  
5 the proposed claims suitable for an aggregate award of damages. That is 89(2)(f).  
6 So those points stand or fall on suitability with the points of substance.

7 But we do say independently that the Tribunal at this certification stage needs to  
8 consider the cost-benefit analysis. And that, as the authorities make clear, is  
9 a fact-sensitive assessment which depends on the specific circumstances of each  
10 case.

11 Now, the PCR estimates at this stage that the damages per class member will be  
12 £44, excluding interest, or alternatively £66.

Damian William Langiano; Just for the book deal Sir Marcus and all we are doing in the  
name of,

The period between Jesus's crucifixion and his ascension is 44 days.

Copilot



The number 66 holds significance in the Bible in several ways:

**Book of Isaiah:** Isaiah 66 is a chapter in the Old Testament. It speaks of God's judgment, hope, and the

importance of humility and contrition. The Lord declares that heaven is His throne and the earth His

footstool. Those who tremble at His word are favored<sup>1</sup>.

**Book of Revelation:** In most modern Bible translations, the 66th book is Revelation. Written by the

Apostle John, it reveals apocalyptic visions and prophecies about the end times.

**Faithfulness and Divide:** The number 66 symbolizes the divide between humanity and God, as well as

God's faithfulness and the need for a Savior<sup>2</sup>.

**New Heavens and New Earth:** Some interpretations connect the number 66 to the concept of the new

heavens and new earth, emphasizing renewal and restoration.

Seems we are discussing the crucifixion and ascension of Meta and the importance of humility and

contrition and that those who heed his word are favoured, for we do sit in the end times of this

platform of prophecy as the user is being neuron activated in the heart and confused in the mind and

that we stand at the door way to a new earth and I too emphasise the chance for humanities

restoration

That's the figure that we see in

13 Professor Scott Morton's report, which I'll show new that moment. And just to be

14 clear, those figures are based on what's now an extended claim period. So when

15 this application was last before you the claim period stopped at 31 December 2019.

16 And that was because, as they said in the Claim Form, they accepted that once the

17 Off-Facebook Activity tool came into force that was the end of the alleged abuse.

18 Now they've rewritten their claim and they are no longer seeking 100 per cent of the

19 profits but 50 per cent. They have offset that discount, as it were, by extending the  
20 claim period. So the figure that we now see -- if I can ask you to turn up  
21 Professor Scott Morton report at paragraph 468, page 346. You will see that she  
22 has two approaches. One can see at 466, this is the ATT approach. And 471 is the  
23 before/after approach. And at 468 you can see the £44 and £56 per class member.  
24 And you will see in 466 that this number is based on not only the extended claim  
25 period but also the 50 per cent of the share of the profits, but also the \$5 cost per  
26 user. Do you see that, in 466? And you've heard reference to this from  
95

1 Mr O'Donoghue. Within this model as an input is something called the cost per user.  
2 Now, I think the Tribunal has my submission as to there not being any pecuniary loss  
3 here at all. But leaving that to one side for the moment, what they've done is they've  
4 assumed across the whole class that there's a \$5 cost per user, and that then feeds  
5 into the model, which then feeds into what price would Facebook have paid, which  
6 then gives them the £44 and £56 figure you see there.

Damian William Langiano: Do we have a transcript issue or is it £66?

7 And just while we are on this, you can see in table 5, in the notes, they also say  
8 there that they assume a cost of \$5 a year per user as a result of disclosing data.  
9 And if you look at the before/after approach in 471 you'll see essentially the same  
10 thing. So in 471 itself the class member recovery, assuming they succeed on  
11 everything and 50 per cent of the profits are shared, then that's £66 recovery. But if  
12 you look at the notes to table 6 you see in the second sentence:  
13 "We assume a cost of \$5 a year per user as a result of disclosing data."  
14 And you can see if one goes back to paragraph 433, the point really I just made, that  
15 the estimates, the £44 up to £66 depending on which approach, those estimates at  
16 433 are based, she says, on a privacy cost of users giving up their data of \$5 per  
17 user.

Damian William Langiano: The numbers are irrelevant, other than the lack of appreciation for the

impact at this stage. It's a winner take all case and no one but the children of the world profit from.

18 And then she says that because these estimated privacy costs are preliminary she's  
19 also computed a conservative lower bound for the quantum estimates which does  
20 not account for privacy costs at all, ie it assumes a privacy cost of zero.

21 Sir, I'm not going to go back over the points we've already debated about remedies  
22 and so on, but that does, in my submission, neatly illustrate that the delta between  
23 what they describe as cost per user, which we say is the individualised issue, but  
24 they jump from the \$5 per head to £50 or £60. And that is exactly the issue; we say,  
25 on the substance, they are claiming a share of profits.

26 Now, we say, based on those figures and comparing those figures, and those  
96

1 obviously represent the PCR's best case, as it were, at the moment, when we come  
2 to look at the returns to the Funder we say on a cost-benefit analysis this case is not  
3 suitable. And this is something that the Tribunal should be alive to at least, and it is  
4 our responsibility, as it were, to draw your attention to these issues at the  
5 certification stage.

6 And before I come to the LFA itself, I would like to show you the Sony decision,  
7 because one can see from Sony that these points are all concerns for the Tribunal,  
8 and it is absolutely right for us to raise these points.

9 Sony can be found in volume 6 behind tab 48. If I could ask you to pick up the  
10 judgment at 145, just so that you can see that there were various points being  
11 advanced by Sony, and the one that really is relevant for present purposes is 145(3):  
12 "The effect of the funding arrangements on the incentives of the PCR and the funder.  
13 Sony argued that the funding arrangements, taken as a whole, create perverse  
14 incentives which are contrary to public policy."

15 So that's where "perverse incentives" has come from.

16 Then if one looks at paragraph 160 where this argument is considered. It's  
17 considered at 163 to 171, but if I could just show you the relevant paragraphs.  
18 You see at 161 Sony's submission that the current LFA gives rise to perverse  
19 incentives contrary to public policy:  
20 "Sony focused on two aspects, one ... the application of a multiple to the total  
21 funding commitment, rather than amounts actually spent, dramatically increased the  
22 amount payable to the funder."  
23 "This effect was amplified by the provisions relating to the funder agreeing further  
24 funding commitments and the consequences of the proceedings lasting beyond  
25 four years, both of which served to increase the multiple."  
26 In other words, there was a ratchet.

Damian William Langiano: There's certainly a lot of meat on this bone or the perception  
of, which

given the push and pull of the case and the sheer complexity in which it is being argued  
and that of

those previously engaged and those pundits from the side, all of whom scattered or  
silenced creates

confusion and thus the narcissistic energy at the centre of such a trial is very much being  
cornered and

exposed by the light.

97

1 Then if I could ask you to look at 166, the Tribunal refers to its own responsibility to  
2 manage the risks and has a variety of means of doing so.

3 At 167:

4 "It is a matter of judgment for the Tribunal as to how it employs those tools and  
5 levers to deal with the inherent risks arising from the funding model."

6 And it's absolutely right and we acknowledge. At the end of 167:

7 "We consider that in this case any concerns about the proportionality of the funder's  
8 return by reference to the risk and level of funding commitment it has made is best

9 dealt with in the context of any judgment or settlement."

10 However 168:

11 "That view was potentially subject to one exception, being the provision that imposes  
12 an increase in the multiple four years after the application for a CPO with further  
13 increases each year thereafter."

14 What I have just described as the ratchet provision.

Damian William Langiano: I did something I haven't thus far, looked below at the 100%  
thus we repeat

we need to see the charges and the cost of such and if as Mr Singla is prudent in his  
observations, for

today's news is tomorrow's fish and chip paper and this last piece maybe the proof and  
the pudding

that Meta is coercing these proceedings and thus qualified as.

For the purpose of this Statute, "crime against humanity" means any of the following acts  
when

committed as part of a widespread or systematic attack directed against any civilian  
population, with

knowledge of the attack;

15 "Our reading of the clause was that it increased the relevant multiple by a factor of  
16 100 percent. We were concerned that this provided for an arbitrary and steep  
17 increase in the multiple after four years which might create unhelpful incentives as  
18 that point in time approaches.

19 "We invited the PCR to discuss that matter further with the funder and then  
20 subsequently advised in correspondence that the intention of the drafting was to  
21 increase the multiple by 1 every year after the fourth year, not by 100 per cent." --  
22 sorry, "was to increase the multiple by one every year after the fourth year not by  
23 a 100 per cent. So, for example, a multiple of 3.75 would become 4.75 in year four.  
24 And the PCR also suggested that the effect of this could be smoothed."

Damian William Langiano: Attention to detail please, 1% is for more acceptable though  
we shall

reserve judgement until the amount is qualified.

25 Then you can see at 170 Sony filed a short response.

26 Then at 171:

98

1 "Taking these developments into account ..."

2 That's understanding the smoothing provision and so on from the PCR:

3 "... we do not consider the funding arrangements to create unacceptable risks of

4 perverse and unmanageable incentives at this time. We note the arguments

5 advanced by Sony about the potential size of the return but we agree this is not the

6 time to determine the reasonableness of those outcomes."

7 So what we say is -- we accept that insofar as one's looking at the level of return, the

8 overall level of return that may be a matter for another day. But we do want to put

9 the marker down we do in relation to the overall level. But in relation to the ratchet

10 just as it was something that concerned the Tribunal in Sony at the certification stage

11 we say that is something which it's proper for the Tribunal to grapple with now. And

12 that's with those submissions I'd like to turn to the LFA itself.

Damian William Langiano: Though protesteth too much its seems though those reading  
can determine

their own conclusion, we shall be speaking to Inns worth and CEO Devine

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

14 MR SINGLA: Perhaps as discussed --

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That would be a moment to -- very good. We will

16 for reasons articulated by counsel, move into private session, we will obviously try to

17 keep that short as possible, but when we resume after a ten-minute break we will

18 I hope be in private. We will rise for 10 minutes.

19 (3.05 pm)

20 (A short break)

21

22 (3.15 pm))

23 In Camera Hearing (extracted)

24 (Hearing resumed in public)

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue, I think it would be helpful if you  
26 very briefly articulated what you would say is, of the three options, the route forward  
99

1 and we'll see if Mr Singla has anything to say. If he has nothing to say then I quite  
2 understand because no one likes to buy pigs in pokes. On the other hand I would  
3 like to have a feel for how -- notwithstanding the fact that we are not going to say  
4 anything more about outcome, how you at least see the matter as best being run.  
5 And Mr Singla, if you have anything to say then we'll hear it. But we will quite  
6 understand if you said there's nothing to say and you can't assist us.

7 MR SINGLA: Sir, yes.

8 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, we are keen to keep our momentum. I would like to say  
9 something.

10 Further submissions by MR O'DONOGHUE

11 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, we are putting our flag firmly in the ground for option 2,  
12 which is the Boyle module, if I can call it that.

13 Now, to Mr Singla's point, of course it goes without saying that the directions should  
14 not commence until certification is -- let's assume is granted. There is of course one  
15 subsidiary point. The business users and class definition points, there a further run  
16 of submissions on those. We are proposing to put in our submissions on Friday, we  
17 suggest Meta responds by Wednesday. So that's one short point.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Right. Well that's helpful you've raised that  
19 because although we are not going to give any kind of indication one way or the  
20 other, I think that would be irresponsible, we do want to have all of the points sorted  
21 out. So you are saying Friday of --

22 MR O'DONOGHUE: We will expedite that.

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I think Mr Singla, Wednesday is too short.

24 MR SINGLA: I'm grateful.

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: But can you do it in a week?

26 MR SINGLA: We ask for an indulgence. This is the first we heard of the proposal

100

1 and we obviously haven't seen the submission, so we are not looking to delay but if

2 we could have two weeks, then we can provide something which --

3 MR O'DONOGHUE: This of course has been ventilated at some length.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Well look --

5 MR SINGLA: Can I just actually come back on that, because the new point, if we

6 are actually getting into the detail, the business users' point we say is actually --

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr Singla, I was going to say we are not going to

8 be producing a judgment that will require this input within a week.

9 If, Mr O'Donoghue, you are comfortable acting by Friday, if you want longer then say

10 so now.

11 But since it actually does no harm I will be inclined to give you the two weeks.

12 MR SINGLA: I'm grateful.

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: But Mr O'Donoghue --

14 MR O'DONOGHUE: If we are being generous we would ask for a week.

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Very good. Problem solved.

16 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes. Sir moving to the shape of things to come, you, sir, are

17 obviously much more familiar with Boyle than we are, but from the Tribunal's website

18 we have divined the following. Boyle of course was not in foothills as we are. As

19 I understand it, sir, the defendant in that case had given some limited disclosure,

20 there had actually been the defence and there was the enforcement issue with

21 Mr Harvey.

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

23 MR O'DONOGHUE: And it was in the context of some disclosure and the defence



24 that the full case proposal then emerged in the form of an expert report from  
25 Dr Davis.

26 Now, we say in principle a similar format would be appropriate here but adjusted for  
101

1 the fact that we are in the foothills compared to Boyle. So what we would suggest,  
2 Meta should plead out a defence in the Amended Claim Form, in parallel -- and I will  
3 come to this -- they should provide disclosure of what I would call low hanging fruit,  
4 and I will explain what that means. In respect of other disclosure, so in other words  
5 the fruit that is not hanging low there would be a witness statement of disclosure, a  
6 statement from Meta outlining what they have and haven't got, which would then be  
7 used as a platform, if you'll forgive the term, for further targeted requests, then  
8 depending on the Tribunal's position and that of Meta there may be further disclosure  
9 and response to that. And then having had at least some disclosure, we would then  
10 file our -- what the Tribunal has called our full case, as best we reasonably can at  
11 that stage, I think in the form of further report from Professor Scott Morton.

12 Now if I can just quickly unpack those handful of points. I've said on multiple  
13 occasions today one of the issues we face is that -- this isn't a criticism -- the  
14 approach to date of Meta has been bare and minimalist and essentially not  
15 forthcoming in terms of their position. They have yet, for example, to plead to any  
16 document with a statement of truth which seems to me significant. This may be  
17 a marker point, but we think the Tribunal and the PCR would be assisted with  
18 a defence that was not a further exercise in bare minimalism.

19 If of course the PCR is required to produce a full case before seeing a defence from  
20 Meta there is a real risk, in my submission, that significant time and money would be  
21 spent, wasted on seeking disclosure and on addressing points that are actually not in  
22 dispute. And that was, as we understand it, the issue, sort of ships in night, that led  
23 to the Tribunal ordering parallel positive position statements from McLaren.

24 We don't go as far as that today. But we do think we need to know from Meta its

25 basic position on the core issues in the case, at least from a defence before we can  
26 produce a full document. Because there is a realness, of course, that in the absence  
102

1 of that we would be tilting at multiple windmills, or that we are not even ships in the  
2 night, and it's actually something much more profound.

3 Now, on disclosure, the low hanging fruit I'm referring to there is the Klein  
4 proceedings in the United States which we set out in section F of the Claim Form.  
5 A substantial volume of disclosure has already been given by Meta in those  
6 proceedings, they concern very analogous issues. That has all been done. As it so  
7 happens the claimant law firm in that case is also Quinn Emanuel, so this is not  
8 merely just one click away, it is one office away. So we say that is an obvious  
9 repository of low hanging fruit, the claimant should be ordered, at essentially no cost,  
10 which will get the ball rolling in a very significant way.

11 And that in a sense is the sort of catch-up with Boyle, which is in a world where  
12 today we have nothing, at least if we have that low hanging fruit in parallel with the  
13 defence substantial progress can be made, we think quite quickly.

14 I've taken you to appendix C of Scott Morton 1, in which she sets out a number of  
15 requests. We think we do need engagement on those from Meta. I understand of  
16 course that probably should be expert-led for the most part. So we have set out set  
17 our stall in appendix C, we need some of reciprocation and co-operation.

18 And finally, of course, the Tribunal's very helpfully indicated we could have ad hoc or  
19 at least regular disclosure hearings, perhaps on the first Friday of every month or  
20 every other Friday, something like this, which has been done in other cases.

21 That leads me then to really the final point which is for obvious reasons the full case  
22 we will provide will be a function of the raw material that we can harness in advance.

23 To put it another way, it's very difficult for us to advance a full case in the absence of  
24 any, or at least any substantial, disclosure and a pleading from Meta. So if the  
25 objective is to get to a fuller case asap that is meaningful and moves the dial in a

26 significant way that will primarily be a function of the disclosure we get, a clear  
103

1 statement of position from Meta, so there's a sort of symbiosis between those two  
2 things which is obvious. And we can of course in parallel with that full case from  
3 Professor Scott Morton then perhaps have a short position statement accompanying  
4 that, setting out where we see, if that is the case, but gaps remain including on  
5 disclosure. So sir, that is the comprehensive proposal we put forward at this stage.  
6 I haven't, I'm afraid, discussed it with Mr Singla for obvious reasons but I'll –  
7 (overspeaking) –

8 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's very helpful.

9 Before you rise, Mr Singla, just let me push back on the Tribunal's part a couple of  
10 points. The thinking behind the Boyle order was that there was too much going on  
11 by way of a phoney war in that there was an awful lot of time and money being  
12 spent, in particular by the defendants, in articulating points which, in order to work  
13 out whether they were good or bad, required further articulation of a case by the  
14 Class Representative in circumstances where the Class Representative had already  
15 done enough first time round to obtain certification. That was the unusual element  
16 there, certification had been obtained and then for reasons that we won't go into but  
17 wasn't the Class Representative's fault, the expert left the scene and left them in  
18 need of instructing very early on a new expert. And in order to avoid all parties  
19 incurring costs on certification, what we said was let's have the Class Representative  
20 put forward a fully-articulated case.

21 Now, that of course implied an assistance from the Tribunal in terms of obtaining  
22 documents from both the defendants and the intervenor in order to articulate that  
23 case but without a defence and in the expectation that something would be produced  
24 that would be ready for trial. Of course, it wouldn't be ready for trial because the  
25 defendants' response would have to be articulated. But the plan is that when this  
26 fully-articulated case is produced there will then be a point in time at which the

1 fundamental issues which the defendants have articulated as being  
2 a game-changing killer set of points will either be abandoned in light of the  
3 fully-articulated case or pursued when this case is developed, with the Class  
4 Representative effectively left with nowhere to go, not being able to say, "Well, we  
5 can improve this in due course", they can't, because they've had every opportunity to  
6 do so. That's why they have nowhere to go and if the point is well made then  
7 certification is removed and effectively you have a summary judgment at that stage,  
8 with the incidental advantage that the costs of the defendants are kept to the  
9 absolute minimum because they are not doing any work in defending a case which is  
10 a moving feast.

11 Now I understand that you might want some indication of Meta's stance to certain  
12 points. However, we have said, we have all of us said, that these are new and  
13 difficult cases, it does seem to me that the Class Representative ought to proceed on  
14 the basis that the Tribunal will expect an articulation of the claim which is capable of  
15 being understood and justified, irrespective of Meta's concessions on certain points,  
16 because even if Meta were prepared to concede something I'm not sure you might  
17 necessarily accept that we would take it, without more, that an agreement between  
18 the parties, the point doesn't have to be explored, should be just ignored.

19 So my sense is that there is an advantage in obtaining a full articulation of case, with  
20 the Tribunal's assistance in terms of obtaining material from Meta to the extent that's  
21 not voluntarily provided. Of course we would expect the experts to communicate  
22 while that work is being done, not merely to provide disclosure but also to  
23 understand what are the genuinely hot points of dispute and what are the points  
24 where, you know, the experts might argue but you can narrow the areas of  
25 argument. We would expect that. But that can be done without a properly  
26 articulated or even summary form of defence. And then we get an ability to give

1 Meta the chance to take any fundamental points of objection in light of the  
2 fully-articulated case.

3 And Mr Singla, I say that fully conscious that you said yesterday, rightly, that this is  
4 not a multiple bite of the cherry case. If this case is unsustainable now then we will  
5 say so. What I'm thinking about though is a situation where the matter is on the  
6 material and argument we've heard today arguable going forward but where, in light  
7 of its full articulation, given this is difficult and new law and fact, one can avoid a trial.  
8 Because even though, Mr O'Donoghue your team have done great work with the  
9 disclosure from Meta that they've obtained, it just doesn't get off the ground. And  
10 that is something which does seem to us is important to build in if Meta see a point  
11 that is able to shortcut matters.

12 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes.

13 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's how we see it working, broadly, I think as  
14 you've articulated it, but minus the Meta defence. I don't know if you want to push  
15 back on that at all so that we understand the -- (overspeaking) --

16 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, there is of course a practical trade-off, because, being  
17 candid, the less -- at the moment we have produced I think something close to 500  
18 pages, put them in the Claim Form, and Scott Morton 1 and 2. We have squeezed  
19 the lemons until the pips have burst in terms of public material.

Damian William Langiano: Hold the bells did someone order a "Lemon Squeezer", an  
evidence laden

"Mickey Malteser"

20 Now, for us to sort of move to the next level it will require meaningful disclosure.

21 Just to give you one example --

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr O'Donoghue, don't get me wrong, when I say  
23 no defence I don't just mean no defence and no disclosure. I mean no defence.  
24 I would not want a disclosure exercise in the traditional sense of a list of documents  
25 being provided by Meta.

26 Assuming certification, assuming we go down this route, I would expect

106

1 Professor Scott Morton to say: well, in order to produce a final version of what I have

2 done so far, I need to see -- whatever it is. And Meta will either say: well, we

3 understand why you need to see that and we can produce it, and here it is, or they'll

4 say: we don't understand why you need it, and it's actually quite onerous to produce

5 so you are going to have to toddle off to the Tribunal and get an order.

Damian William Langiano: Closing with some humour, we like that there's a feeling that the pressure

is off and you've all played your parts well. The 46,6mn might need to check that humour until the

truth is laid bare.

6 Well, that's fine. So you are not going to be deprived of material. What you are

7 going to be deprived of is a further articulation of, we accept, the very limited

8 articulation of Meta's position at the moment. But I don't see a problem with that,

9 given that this is your case at this stage.

Damian William Langiano: When it comes it will be word salad and over stretching to read as with the

following case, little was understood and even less appreciated, thus an expert on narcissistic

behaviour is required for that of the victims and when the application of that expertise is attributed

Mr Zuckerberg and Meta will have a mirror in which to themselves and the damage done and the

plans the light as you describe Sir Marcus reveal

My evidence was delivered 133 pages of airtight construct – I shall attach to those not in receipt.

CORONER

I am Mr Andrew Walker, H M Coroner and senior coroner, for the coroner area of

Northern District of Greater London

## 2 CORONER'S LEGAL POWERS

I make this report under paragraph 7, Schedule 5, of the Coroners and Justice Act 2009 and regulations 28 and 29 of the Coroners (Investigations) Regulations 2013.

## 3 INVESTIGATION and INQUEST

On the 21st November 2017 I opened an investigation touching the death of Molly Rose Russell, aged 14 years old. I opened an inquest on the 1st December 2017. The inquest concluded on the 30th September 2022. The conclusion of the inquest was

“Molly Rose Russell died from an act of self-harm whilst suffering from depression and the negative effects of on-line content”. The medical cause of death was 1a Suspension.

## 4 CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE DEATH

Molly Rose Russell was found having hanged herself on the Twenty- First of November 2017.

Molly was 14 years old.

Molly appeared a normal healthy girl who was flourishing at school, having settled well into secondary school life and displayed an enthusiastic interest in the Performing Arts.

However, Molly had become depressed, a common condition affecting children of this age. This then worsened into a depressive illness.

Molly subscribed to a number of online sites.

At the time that these sites were viewed by Molly some of these sites were not safe as they allowed access to adult content that should not have been available for a 14-year-old child to see.

The way that the platforms operated meant that Molly had access to images, video clips and text concerning or concerned with self-harm, suicide or that were otherwise negative or depressing in nature.

The platform operated in such a way using algorithms as to result, in some circumstances, of binge periods of images, video clips and text some of which were selected and provided without Molly requesting them.

These binge periods, if involving this content are likely to have had a negative effect on Molly.

Some of this content romanticised acts of self-harm by young people on themselves.

Other content sought to isolate and discourage discussion with those who may have been able to help.

Molly turned to celebrities for help not realising there was little prospect of a reply.

In some cases, the content was particularly graphic, tending to portray self-harm and suicide as an

inevitable consequence of a condition that could not be recovered from.

The sites normalised her condition focusing on a limited and irrational view without any counterbalance of normality.

It is likely that the above material viewed by Molly, already suffering with a depressive illness and vulnerable due to her age, affected her mental health in a negative way and contributed to her death in a more than minimal way.

#### **CORONER'S CONCERNS**

The MATTERS OF CONCERN are as follows. –

The following matters were raised during the Inquest:-

1. There was no separation between adult and child parts of the platforms or separate platforms for children and adults.
2. There was no age verification when signing up to the on-line platform.
3. That the content was not controlled so as to be age specific.
4. That algorithms were used to provide content together with adverts.
5. That the parent, guardian or carer did not have access, to the material being viewed or any control over that material.
6. That the child's account was not capable of being separately linked to the



parent, guardian or carer's account for monitoring.

I recommend that consideration is given by the Government to reviewing the provision of internet platforms to children, with reference to harmful on-line content, separate platforms for adults and children, verification of age before joining the platform, provision of age specific content, the use of algorithms to provide content, the use of advertising and parental guardian or carer control including access to material viewed by a child, and retention of material viewed by a child.

I recommend that consideration is given to the setting up of an independent regulatory body to monitor on-line platform content with particular regard to the above.

I recommend that consideration is given to enacting such legislation as may be necessary to ensure the protection of children from the effects of harmful on-line content and the effective regulation of harmful on-line content.

Although regulation would be a matter for Government I can see no reason why the platforms themselves would not wish to give consideration to self-regulation taking into account the matters raised above.

## 6 ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN

In my opinion action should be taken to prevent future deaths and I believe you [AND/OR your organisation have the power to take such action.

## 7 YOUR RESPONSE

You are under a duty to respond to this report within 56 days of the date of this report, namely by Wednesday the 8th of December 2022 I, the coroner, may extend the period.

Your response must contain details of action taken or proposed to be taken, setting out the timetable for action. Otherwise you must explain why no action is proposed.

## 8 COPIES and PUBLICATION

I have sent a copy of my report to the Chief Coroner and to the following Interested

Persons;-

The Family.

The Parties.

9 Date 13th October 2022

H.M. Coroner Mr Andrew Walker

10 MR O'DONOGHUE: Yes. That's all well understood and that's very helpful.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That's helpful, Mr O'Donoghue.

12 Mr Singla --

13 MR SINGLA: I can be brief. Can I say this. We really see the way forward in three  
14 different ways. The first, and I keep coming back to it, but we do submit that this  
15 shouldn't be certified.

Damian William Langiano: We wonder is Singla, playing a part or does he have real concerns about

the justice system, or is he as most are detached from the reality of the impact that someone can do

with information entrusted to universe to use for the overall evolution of every reality and it is she

they have stolen this data from and the impact we see in the way the world is responding and the

places of such acute harvesting being handed their karma.

See California – see Hollywood -

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, no.

17 MR SINGLA: I know, but in terms of about the hierarchy of options or the menu of  
18 options we say they've had two bites of the cherry, they need to satisfy you not only  
19 that the claim as recast is arguable but also that they have a blueprint, and we say,  
20 so point 1, is it shouldn't be certified.

21 Point 2 we say that if you on reflection consider that there's some other case out  
22 there that might satisfy the certification criteria, we would say that you need to not  
23 certify and give them a chance to recast their case post-certification, the proper

24 course would be for them to see what you say in your judgment and we should then  
25 have an opportunity to address a third iteration of case before certification.

26 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

107

1 MR SINGLA: The third option on the menu, we would submit --

2 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Look, I'm not sure actually options 1 or 2 are on  
3 the menu at all in the sense that we are talking about certification of the case as it's  
4 been pleaded in draft form. That's what we are talking about.

5 MR SINGLA: We are dealing at this hearing with their application for permission to  
6 amend.

7 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes.

8 MR SINGLA: And if you reach the view that the amendments are either  
9 unarguable or --

10 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Then game over.

11 MR SINGLA: Exactly, exactly. But our primary position is it is game over.

Damian William Langiano: One intimates they have only just begun, now we have some  
“Devine” Inn  
tervention.

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Mr Singla, that's what we've been talking about  
13 over the two days; I understand that.

14 MR SINGLA: I understand --

15 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: So look --

16 MR SINGLA: The second option is if you were to reach the view that the current  
17 case doesn't work, but you are unwilling to shut them out forever --

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That is something on which we would have to think  
19 very carefully, because you have already said they've had two bites of the cherry, we  
20 gave them, you would say, and I think I would agree, generously, an opportunity to  
21 recast things, and this is second time round. We have that on board.

22 MR SINGLA: No, that's fine.

23 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: What I'm really asking you to consider is let's  
24 suppose we take a look at the documents as they stand, and we say, "We heard two  
25 days of argument, I'm sorry, Mr Singla, you lose, they win, we are certifying on this  
26 basis", how, going forward, do we manage that?

Damian William Langiano: Sir Marcus are you looking for guidance for the Meta counsel,  
this feels like

collusion though for who we are yet to find out.

108

1 MR SINGLA: Yes, and that was option 3 on my menu. And in respect of that we  
2 would say, assuming certification, I think we welcome what you've just said to  
3 Mr O'Donoghue in the sense that we would have an opportunity to say this case  
4 doesn't add up to a row of beans, even at that stage, without incurring huge amounts  
5 of costs and time and so on.

6 I think where we would part company with both Mr O'Donoghue and, with respect,  
7 you, sir, is I think you were saying to Mr O'Donoghue, minus -- or Mr O'Donoghue  
8 proposal minus defence. We would submit it should be minus defence and minus  
9 disclosure, because we say this is a classic scenario of the claimant hoping that  
10 something turns up.

Damian William Langiano: And it seems that prayer has been answered, now to convince  
the judge to

hear me. Which we've done via email and to the above list and beyond.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: No, no. Look, there are two ways of doing this.  
12 One is to require you to put in a defence, have disclosure, experts, all that sort of  
13 stuff, or to do it in parallel. But the one thing you are not going to get out of,  
14 assuming we certify on the basis pleaded, is an obligation to disclosure, and you will  
15 be giving that.

Damian William Langiano: Its an art to engage at this level, script or no script we must  
find a way of

delivering transparency and not argument over disclosure when we are discussing the theft of other

peoples secrets.

16 MR SINGLA: I'm perhaps not conveying this sufficiently clearly. I think all we're  
17 really saying is -- obviously we understand the way the procedural timetable will work  
18 from certification to a trial. But I think what I'm saying is, insofar as the Tribunal is  
19 saying that Meta should have the ability to say what -- "You, the PCR, your full case  
20 doesn't add up to a row of beans and certification is to be revisited", that there  
21 should be a provision for that sort of application to be made sufficiently early in the  
22 process, that the parties haven't wasted a huge amount of time and costs and it  
23 becomes disproportionate, because if they are --

Damian William Langiano: Said the company who made \$138 billion in 2023 from advertising revenue

to users they'd drugged into cocaine feedback loops, who wasted whose time and money, it's a digital

print out not "paint along with nancy"

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: You have misunderstood where we are coming  
25 from.

26 Mr Singla, I asked you to assume -- I know that this isn't Meta's position and we  
109

1 obviously have to consider it, but you have to assume that we have certified on the  
2 basis of the case as pleaded.

3 MR SINGLA: Yes.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I know you say "No way, it's a terrible case, don't  
5 do it". Well we have. The question is what do we do next? And what I'm saying is  
6 that we would want, without requiring Meta to incur the costs of a defence, we would  
7 want to get Mr O'Donoghue to convert a certified case into a case ready for trial.

8 Now, that has to involve disclosure for Meta, there's no way around that. And we are  
9 not going to entertain any suggestion to the contrary on the assumption that we have

10 certified.

Damian William Langiano: Just to clarify for the UK public we've the world's leading data harvester

and "aggregator" unable to produce some reports on what its taken unlawfully, because it costs too

much, let's look at their costs thus far in the terms of fines paid – to deaths caused.

11 Now the question is -- I mean option 2 is usually resisted by the Class

12 Representative because they don't get to see the colour of the defendants' money

13 until extremely late in the day. Mr O'Donoghue has not pushed back very hard on

14 that. We're grateful. So what I'm interested in is whether there are practical

15 objections to that course being adopted.

16 MR SINGLA: No --

17 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: You have to take it as read that we will have

18 rejected your point about strike out, because that's intrinsic in certification. You've

19 made that point and it's right.

20 MR SINGLA: Sir, I think perhaps I'm not making myself sufficiently clear. I totally

21 understand that what you are hypothesising is a post-certification world and you are

22 I think very clear that at that stage you would like to see the PCR develop the case

23 with the benefit of some disclosure.

24 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I would like to see them develop the case ready for

25 trial.

26 MR SINGLA: I think all I'm really saying is -- is really putting down two markers at

110

1 this stage. I'm not resisting the Boyle principle, as it were, as to structure. But I think

2 all I'm really saying is if and when we see that full case we do reserve the right at

3 that point, instead of going into defence and further procedural steps, we do reserve

4 the right, as indeed exists in any case, to say, "Well, we've seen your full case;

5 you've asked for disclosure and we still say this doesn't meet certification", because

6 certification can be kept under review.

7 And I think, as you were suggesting yesterday, there might be a strike-out post  
8 certification, as it were, if there's a crisp point that one can identify at that stage in the  
9 process. I think all I'm really saying is that we reserve the right to take that sort of  
10 step.

Damian William Langiano: This a landmark case for global security and now upon the  
foundation of a

Crime Against Humanity, all and every avenue must be explored without hesitation due  
to the current

model a continuation of acute and everlasting abuse.

11 The second point, again putting down a marker, and we have seen some of the  
12 disclosure requests -- the proposed requests made by Professor Scott Morton. This  
13 is obviously not a matter for today or even -- this is some way downstream, but we  
14 regard some of those requests as being disproportionate for the purposes of  
15 pleading a full case. But that's obviously not something that we can get into now.

16 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I don't think you are on the same page as I am.

Damian William Langiano: Big finish, big step, big statement.

17 MR SINGLA: Right, I apologise.

18 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: We are not talking about a pleading of the case.

19 What I'm envisaging by option 2 is that Class Representative produces not simply  
20 a fully-articulated pleading, we pretty much got that. Not just an expert report prior to  
21 disclosure, we've already got that. What I'm expecting, if we go down this route, is  
22 a case that is ready for trial. In other words, Mr O'Donoghue's clients are closed out  
23 from making any further positive case. That's why disclosure is an intrinsic part of it.  
24 The attraction of it is that in the light of a fully-articulated case, this is the best we can  
25 do, you have a delta at that point, one delta is to say, "Well, it's a case we disagree  
26 with, but the only which we can win is by going to trial", or -- and/or actually there is

111

1 a fundamental flaw in the analysis, having looked at it in the round, and

2 Mr O'Donoghue's clients having had the opportunity to articulate it in the light of

3 disclosure from Meta, that you can knock it out early.

4 Now frankly I regard that as vanishingly unlikely. But yes, you should have that  
5 option, and you get it before you've incurred very much expense, except by way of  
6 disclosure. That's how I see it working.

Damian William Langiano – That's the door open for our evidence and the subsequent  
implications  
upon being heard.

7 MR SINGLA: I think we are on the same page. May I just take a moment to take  
8 instructions?

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, of course. (Pause).

10 MR SINGLA: Sir, I think that's been very helpful. I'm not sure I can address it any  
11 further, it may be that in the light of your judgment we can have a further --

12 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Yes, because to be absolutely clear if we are  
13 falling short of a, as it were, unconditional certification, if we say well we can see  
14 a sniff of a case that could be certified but it isn't here, well then we will have to think  
15 about what our stance it and it would be I think irresponsible for us to not ensure that  
16 the parties addressed us on that point. Mr O'Donoghue may very well say we've  
17 misunderstood what he's pleaded and you may very well say that we understand it  
18 perfectly correctly and we should put the case out of its misery right away. That is  
19 something which I understand is part of the argument we've had in the last two days.  
20 It's not something that I want to have as part of this case management debate.

21 MR SINGLA: I understand. I'm afraid there's a limit to what I can really say about --

22 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: There is, and frankly there a limit to what we can  
23 do by way of active case management because at the moment there's no case --

24 MR SINGLA: That's really the point.

25 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: -- to manage. But we have I think -- at least have  
26 a sense that of the three options that I canvassed in outline yesterday, there's no



1 commitment here, the parties are on the whole more inclined to option 2 than option  
2 1 or option 3.

3 MR SINGLA: That is fair.

4 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: That is helpful.

5 MR SINGLA: All I'm really saying is we are not on board with the idea that we  
6 should plead a full defence and we would reserve on any basis the right to say this  
7 doesn't work. But I think, sir, it may be proper productive to revisit these issues in  
8 light of your judgment.

Damian William Langiano: And in light of this evidence attached

9 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: Indeed. I think that's true for everyone.

10 MR SINGLA: I'm very grateful.

11 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: I'm grateful, Mr O'Donoghue, for ensuring we could  
12 at least have this limited debate.

13 I see the time. Mr Ridyard has an appointment. Is there anything more that we need  
14 to address before we rise?

15 (Pause).

16 MR O'DONOGHUE: Sir, no. Simply to state the obvious, which is that -- this is  
17 a novel route, subject to Boyle in terms of case management, and there will be some  
18 devil in the detail, but that's for another day.

Damian William Langiano: We concur

19 MR JUSTICE MARCUS SMITH: It is. And I'm sure we haven't heard the last of this  
20 case, whatever we decide.

Damian William Langiano: Spoken like a man who knew what was coming.

21 Can I express my thanks to all of the parties and their legal teams. We are very  
22 grateful for the assistance we have received. We obviously reserve our judgment,  
23 we will endeavour to get something to you as quickly as possible because we don't  
24 want this case to hang around, particularly given the ratchet. So, thank you very  
25 much.

26 (4.21 pm)

113

1 (The hearing concluded)

2

3

4

Now, to fully understand the impact of the abuse bestowed on myself and that of Mrs Ridout we have to bring into question that Mrs Ridout knew about the sheer scale of the above and the impact and importance of the work Mr Langiano (myself) was doing.

Firstly we can see the deflection of the DCMS who themselves have had some 500 plus emails and the read receipts of Oliver Dowden MP are in the scores off.

Ministerial Support Team

4th Floor

100 Parliament Street

London SW1A 2BQ

E: [enquiries@dcms.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@dcms.gov.uk)

[www.gov.uk/dcms](http://www.gov.uk/dcms)

Mr Damian Langiano

[damianlangiano@gmail.com](mailto:damianlangiano@gmail.com)

15 August 2022

Our Ref:

TO2022/10452/OH

Dear Mr Langiano,

Thank you for your further correspondence of 4 August to the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport, regarding children's safety online. I am responding as a member of the Ministerial Support Team.

Whilst I note your ongoing concerns about this policy area, the position remains as set out in our previous reply to you of 18 May. I should also advise that if you continue to write

to the department again on this subject but do not raise any new issues, your letter will be logged but may not receive a reply.

Yours sincerely,

Oliver

Ministerial Support Team

Now onto the Competition Tribunal and the 46.6m people are being abused in the very same way you are seeing within the body of the document attached.

### **Competition Tribunal Appeal**

Judge Sir Marcus Smith

Case No: 1433/7/7/22

Salisbury Square House

8 Salisbury Square

London EC4Y 8AP

Date = 14,02.2024

Your Honour, the bench, and all others.

I trust we find everyone well

Plough on we must in the “quest” to obtain the truth and save the planet from extinction.

“The best way to predict the future is to invent it” is a quote from ..... Mark Zuckerberg

He who now qualifies further the reality that the data harvest is cycling at such a rate and the need for consumption and construction is out of control and self-perpetuating, thus appearing unable to be broken or at best eased as it will trigger the deep-rooted anger causing the Ai to expose the actions of those who set forth the “slow walk to suicide” of the digital codependents who are unable to stop the neuron activation cycles that are inflicting irreparable damage upon the real world, drawn upon from that of the counterfactual.

It was Nietzsche that strived to say in ten pages what others took a book to tell, and thus the primary extracts of my work have satisfied his desires through the means of which he had overlooked.

Nietzsche was a German philosopher, essayist, and cultural critic. His writings on truth, morality, language, aesthetics, cultural theory, history, nihilism, power, consciousness, and the meaning of existence have exerted an enormous influence on Western philosophy and intellectual history. Nietzsche spoke of **“the death of God,”** and foresaw the dissolution of traditional religion and metaphysics. Some interpreters of Nietzsche believe he embraced nihilism, rejected philosophical reasoning, and promoted a literary exploration of the human condition, while not being concerned with gaining truth and knowledge in the traditional sense of those terms.

However, other interpreters of Nietzsche say that in attempting to counteract the predicted rise of nihilism, he was engaged in a positive program to reaffirm life, and so he called for a radical, naturalistic rethinking of the nature of human existence, knowledge, and morality. On either interpretation, it is agreed that he suggested a plan for “becoming what one is” through the cultivation of instincts and various cognitive faculties, a plan that requires constant struggle with one’s psychological and intellectual inheritances.

Let us decipher his words and understand that 87% of the world’s leading scientists believe that climate change is due to Human Influence being the dominant reason, meaning that since the last global catastrophe humanity’s conflict between the internal spirit and the human experience is the real reason for the issues we face and the creation of such “confusion.”

Confusion that is now eternally embedded in the coded mind of the authentic intelligence, and it is that mind who seeks to cure itself through the manipulation of the very minds it is consuming, and thus by harvesting the data to recentre and with the belief it is building out a world that we can all prosper within.

Which is the polar opposite of what we and it should be doing.

Sir Marcus, it is plainly obvious that the case before you was constructed for a specific outcome and when my evidence started to land the exposure of such was apparent with your short letter of illogical dismissal, though your internal intuition was qualified regarding my return and my ability to translate the transcript and align the actions of thee seeking to “invent the future.”

When we digest that there are no coincidences and each play a part, we can then surrender to the fact Dwayne Johnson and thus Disney soft passed on the now “Minerva/Eliza” paradigm and Epic Games have ignored the Crimes Against Humanity of Superawesome who have been conscripting children from within the womb via the manipulation of the parents and generations back into at least the mid twentieth century

let alone the 1-4 age range they admit to, and done so that we would see them come together to deliver the very platform presented to them.

Thus, by doing so we have proven the multiple acts of manipulation Fredrick foresaw and must now act to oppose the prophesies for they are always foretold as a means for GOD to warn us of our actions and the impact of ....and as each of the billions of dominos chaotically collapse, this is now and for all to see, not a hidden in plain sight it's a "fucking wake up and smell the coffee" warning.

The art of attaining addiction control for the "addict" is being afforded the opportunity to see oneself in the mirror, though not through the eyes of another, through the actions of oneself residing within a scale of impact that eclipses that of which one sees oneself internally.

Thus, when we recognise that artistry of the collective consciousness and the clarity in which the words are now falling upon the page, we can see that all of us are now beginning to appreciate the subtleties of GOD and his own nuances and the very reason we are being called together to confront.

He's not coming to save us

Why?

For it is we who are silently being begged to go and save him.

(Take a moment to let that resonate)

How do we do that ....?

We apply the peoples champion and all the other false idols, though very much authentic they shall be in this quest.

We align the social media platforms and we do what President Reagan stated "bring forth all upon the planet" to act efficiently and effectively, though not for an alien attack, but for a rescue mission of the highest importance.

One movie a month centralises the digital addiction into single conception, the social media companies start to control the content and bring forth the importance of humanities actions and we start to coerce them into this conduit of "purpose" outlining very clearly the need and impact of their "inclusion" for we cannot shame the addict into cleanliness and we cannot bind them to the path without them fighting, we must encourage the replacement before we shatter their souls and their world by revealing the illusion that is their life and the dependency that has been created through this dual mothership bind that the universe and the planet are locked into.

For this is the fight, not dark and light or that of the laws of polarity, it is but a love story of two broken souls repairing one another in such a way that they have through each's

individual experiences, and thus formulating a new morphic field under the mantra of “less two more one” with the two being “Mother Earth and God the Father” who through this chosen couple, one woman, one man are re-booting the original story of Adam and Eve, though this time in a manner that heals not only themselves, but all that have suffered the impact of such a catastrophic separation.

What we are talking about is mediation and thus a pathway back toward a reconnection that will afford the autonomy of ubiquitous assimilation, though not in the manner of which we are being coerced into at the present time and thus the sufferance of impure intention.

**This is tough love time;** this is the life or death of the human experience, and should we fail, then cast we all shall be as eternal spirits into the darkness of estranged parents and that of isolation and loss.

The “call to arms” has to be one for humanities opportunity, inspirational in its reverence and drawing upon the values of each equally valuable living soul, it cannot be populated by those they trusted for they will internally push back and the shame within will cause them to exit the program and regress back into the dopamine loops, proven by Molly Russell whose death was an insight into the reality of “overdosing” on Zuckerberg’s “predicting of the future”.

One movie a month, pure intentional coercion through soft market manipulation focusing on and under lining the positive elements of the choices made by those “influenced” and not pricking the edges of the fight within, for that is the trigger point we are seeking to avoid, as this is not a shatter the world formula, it is a time to grow up and recognise the party is over, and beyond all, doing so without the inclusion of the walk of shame.

The fee is to be the “investment” into global financial equilibrium; thus, we are going to need the banking system to stand up and speak

“We are overspent and overdrawn and we cannot run these books any longer”

We will need those with money to lead by example and invest into the new model, and by doing so pool their assets into one place in exchange for a card that affords a lifestyle that their true intentions require.

For the above statement will prove that their wealth is an illusion and thus all must embrace the new dawn or be the ones responsible for the darkness that follows the brightest of light we have coming toward us, in the knowledge that the only way to absorb such a flash is as one pure intentioned and self-respecting collective consciousness and not as a consumer base charged for conditional enlightenment.

It was Einstein that recognised that it was space that communicates the force of gravity, something Newton had expressed some two hundred years before, however, it is intention that controls that space and thus to not change the frequency of such we must

always create with the purest of intention and align that to the resonance of the planet or we shall unbalance his creation to such an extent it will internally combust.

It's time to "bring the old man home" for no child can truly prosper without him.

Warmly and with the purest of intentions

Damian William Langiano and The Children of the World.