1 ROM BAR-NISSIM (SBN: 293356)
   Rom@HeahBarNissim.com
2 **HEAH BAR-NISSIM LLP**
   1801 Century Park East, Suite 2400
3 Los Angeles, CA 90067
   Telephone: 310.432.2836
4
   JARRETT LEE ELLZEY (*pro hac vice application forthcoming*)
5 JEllzey@EKSM.com
   TOM KHERKHER (*pro hac vice application forthcoming*)
6 TKherkher@EKSM.com
   LEIGH S. MONTGOMERY (*pro hac vice application forthcoming*)
7 LMontgomery@EKSM.com
   NATISCHA VOLPE (*pro hac vice application forthcoming*)
8 NVolpe@EKSM.com
   ELLZEY KHERKHER SANFORD MONTGOMERY LLP
9 4200 Montrose Street, Suite 200
   Houston, TX 77006
10
   Attorneys for Plaintiffs
11 TED ENTERTAINMENT, INC.
   MATT FISHER
12 GOLFHOLICS, INC.

13

14
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15
                      NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
16

17

18 TED ENTERTAINMENT, INC., MATT   Case No.: 3:25-cv-10931
   FISHER, and GOLFHOLICS, INC., each
19 individually and on behalf of all others   **CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT**
   similarly situated,
20   **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**
                Plaintiffs,
21
        v.
22
23 META PLATFORMS, INC.,

24   Defendant

25

26

27

28

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   Plaintiffs Ted Entertainment, Inc. ("TEI"), Matt Fisher, and Golfholics, Inc. (collectively,

2 where appropriate "Plaintiffs"), each individually and on behalf of all others similarly situated, by

3 and through their undersigned counsel, file this Complaint against Meta Platforms, Inc.

4 ("Defendant"), and alleges as follows:

5   **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

6   1.   This lawsuit arises from Defendant unlawfully circumventing technological

7 measures to access and scrape millions of copyrighted videos from the online video viewing

8 platform, YouTube, in order to feed, train, improve, and commercialize Defendant's large-scale

9 generative artificial intelligence ("AI") model, "Make-A-Video."

10   2.   Make-A-Video is an artificial intelligence system designed by Defendant to

11 generate video output from text input. This "text to video" system is intended to allow consumers

12 to generate videos using text prompts.

13   3.   Instead of a standalone app named "Make-A-Video," the technology is now a core

14 feature within the Meta AI assistant experience. Users can leverage this capability through features

15 like "Vibes" (a feed for AI videos) or by clicking "Animate" to turn a static image into a video

16 within Facebook, Instagram, or the meta.ai website.

17   4.   The research from Make-A-Video has paved the way for more advanced tools, such

18 as the "Movie Gen" model, a more powerful text-to-video generator capable of creating longer,

19 high-definition videos, which is being tested for future release on platforms like Instagram.

20   5.   YouTube allows the public to view audiovisual works only through controlled

21 streaming and never provides access to the underlying video files. Defendant intentionally bypassed

22 those restrictions by deploying scraping tools designed to evade YouTube's access protections.

23 Defendant used a video-downloading program combined with virtual machines that rotated IP

24 addresses to avoid detection and blocking. Defendant used Plaintiffs' and Class Members'

25 intellectual property for its own commercial gain. In doing so, Defendant has violated YouTube's

26 Terms of Service, which were intended to protect Plaintiffs and others similarly situated.

27   6.   By scraping and downloading those files in order to build Make-A-Video,

28 Defendant deliberately circumvented YouTube's access controls.

1
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   7.   Plaintiffs and the Class Members whom Plaintiffs seeks to represent are content

2   creators who upload their audiovisual content to YouTube. In doing so, the content creators are

3   authorizing and instructing YouTube to provide protection to the video content through YouTube's

4   anti-circumvention software and Terms of Service. In fact, YouTube's anti-circumvention software

5   and protective Terms of Service are a driving factor behind content creators' decision to upload

6   their video content to YouTube.

7   8.   Rather than seek permission or pay a fair price for the audiovisual content hosted on

8   YouTube, Defendant harvested content creators' protected and copyrighted videos at scale without

9   consent or compensation.

10   9.   Defendant's actions were not only unlawful, but an unconscionable attack on the

11 community of content creators whose content is used to fuel the multi-trillion-dollar generative AI

12 industry without any compensation.

13   10.   Content creators such as Plaintiffs and the Class Members will never be able to claw

14 back the intellectual property unlawfully copied and used by Defendant to train its generative AI.

15 Once AI ingests content, that content is stored in its neural network, and not capable of deletion or

16 retraction. Defendant's actions constitute abuse and exploitation of content creators' work for

17 Defendant's profit.

18   11.   Most YouTube videos are not registered with the U.S. Copyright Office. That lack

19 of registration, however, does not render them valueless or leave them unprotected. Content

20 creators invest time, skill, and resources into producing their works, and they rely on YouTube's

21 technological protection measures to safeguard their files from unauthorized access. Because

22 copyright registration is not a prerequisite for protection against unlawful circumvention of access

23 controls, this claim is especially critical where Defendant's misconduct lies in breaking through

24 access barriers that prevent anyone from obtaining the underlying files in the first place

25   12.   Plaintiff Ted Entertainment, Inc. is an independent content creator with over 5,800

26 original videos on YouTube, with a combined total of over 4,000,000,000 YouTube views. Plaintiff

27 has additionally amassed a substantial following on YouTube of over 2,600,000 subscribers.

28 Plaintiff has invested substantial time and money into bringing awareness around his content.

1   13.   Plaintiff Matt Fisher is an individual and resident of the State of California. He is a

2 golf content creator who posts videos on YouTube, many of which are instructional. His channel

3 is @Mr.ShortGame on the YouTube platform. He has over 500,000 subscribers and hundreds of

4 millions of views. Plaintiff has invested substantial time and money into bringing awareness

5 around his content.

6   14.   Plaintiff Golfholics is a corporate entity organized pursuant to the laws of the State

7 of California. It is a golf content channel who posted videos on YouTube. The channel is

8 @Golfholics on the YouTube platform. It has over 130,000 subscribers and millions of views.

9 Plaintiff invested substantial time and money into bringing awareness around its content.

10   15.   Like Plaintiffs, the Class Members in this case are independent content creators who

11 uploaded their video content to YouTube's video platform. The video content of Class Members

12 was also part of the dataset utilized by Defendant to train its AI model.

13   16.   An essential component of Defendant's business model—powering AI features and

14 services with large-scale training data—includes the mass acquisition and ingestion of creators'

15 videos scraped from YouTube.

16   17.   Defendant has profited and will continue to profit substantially from its infringement

17 of Plaintiff's and Class Members' video content through Defendant's training of its generative AI

18 products. Defendant's financial and technological success would not have been possible without

19 the video content created by Plaintiffs and Class Members, which was intended for streaming on

20 YouTube.

21   18.   Plaintiffs brings this class action on behalf of themselves and of a nationwide

22 class of YouTube creators whose works were scraped, ingested, and trained on without

23 authorization, seeking statutory damages, injunctive relief, restitution, and all other remedies

24 allowed by law pursuant to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C.A. § 1201(a),

25 seeking an injunction and damages commensurate with the scope of Defendant's massive and

26 ongoing infringement. More particularly, Defendant's conduct violates the provisions of the

27 DMCA regarding anti-circumvention (§1201) by bypassing technological protection measures

28 that control access to and copying of YouTube videos.

1

THE PARTIES

2   19.   Plaintiff TEI is a California based media company that owns and operates the

3   YouTube channels "h3h3 Productions" and "H3 Podcast Highlights." Both channels appear

4   extensively in the dataset Defendant used to train its artificial intelligence model. H3H3

5   Productions has 146 videos in HD-VILA-100M. H3 Podcast Highlights has 285 videos in HD-

6   VILA-100M. TEI invested significant resources into producing and publishing this video content,

7   and every one of these videos was downloaded, copied, and ingested by Defendant without

8   authorization.

9   20.   TEI is the creator of the videos identified in Exhibit A, all of which were uploaded

10   exclusively to YouTube by TEI and all of which were included in the dataset used by Defendant to

11   train its generative AI models. TEI derives value from the works identified in Exhibit A through

12   viewership, advertising, sponsorships, licensing, and related monetization.

13   21.   TEI and its owners – Ethan and Hila Klein – are longtime champions of the rights

14   of YouTube creators. The Kleins helped define what constitutes fair use reaction videos and the

15   good faith belief standard for DMCA counternotifications. TEI has championed online free speech

16   and is currently helping define what reaction content does not constitute fair use to ensure YouTube

17   content creators can enjoy the fruits of their labor.

18   22.   Plaintiff Matt Fisher is an individual and resident of the State of California. He is a

19   golf content creator who posts videos on YouTube, many of which are instructional. His channel

20   is "Mr.ShortGame Golf" on the YouTube platform. He has over 500,000 subscribers and hundreds

21   of millions of views. Fisher has invested substantial time and money into bringing awareness

22   around his content. Mr.ShortGame Golf has 2 videos in the HD-VILA-100M dataset.

23   23.   Plaintiff Golfholics is a corporate entity organized pursuant to the laws of the State

24   of California. It is a golf content channel who posted videos on YouTube. The channel is

25   "Golfholics" on the YouTube platform. It has over 130,000 subscribers and millions of views.

26   Golfholics invested substantial time and money into bringing awareness around its content.

27   Golfholics has 62 videos in the HD-VILA-100M data set.

28   24.   Defendant Meta Platforms, Inc., is a Delaware corporation with its principal place

4

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1 of business at 1 Meta Way, Menlo Park, CA 94025.

2 ## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

3 25.   This is a civil action seeking damages and injunctive relief for infringement under

4 the Digital Millennium Copyright Act, 17 U.S.C. §§ 1201–1205. As such, this Court has subject

5 matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1338(a), based on federal

6 question jurisdiction.

7 26.   The Court has supplemental jurisdiction over related state-law claims, if any, under

8 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

9 27.   Personal jurisdiction is proper because Defendant's principal place of business is in

10 Menlo Park, California, and because Defendant transacts business nationwide, purposefully avails

11 itself of this forum, and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims

12 occurred or were directed here.

13 28.   Venue lies in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1) and/or 1400(a)

14 because Defendant resides in, is found in, or may be sued in this District, and a substantial part of

15 the events giving rise to the claims occurred here.

16 ## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

17 *A.   Content Creators, YouTube and Technological Protection Measures*

18 29.   As noted above, Plaintiffs and the Class Members are independent content creators

19 of audiovisual content.

20 30.   Plaintiff TEI is the creator of the videos listed in Exhibit A.

21 31.   Plaintiff Matt Fisher is the creator of the videos listed in Exhibit B.

22 32.   Plaintiff Golfaholics, Inc. is the creator of the videos in Exhibit C.

23 33.   Plaintiffs and the Class Members create video content and upload their video content

24 onto YouTube's video sharing platform.

25 34.   YouTube's "users"—the individuals who view the digital content available on

26 YouTube—can watch and listen to music videos for free on YouTube's ad-supported service, but

27 YouTube does not give users access to or allow downloading of the digital files for the content

28 viewed by the user.

1   35.   YouTube deploys technological protection measures ("TPMs") designed to control

2 access to the underlying video files and prevent direct downloading outside permitted channels

3 (e.g., streaming-only delivery, application programming interface ("API") usage limits, and access

4 controls).

5   36.   YouTube's Terms of Service expressly prohibit scraping, unauthorized

6 downloading, bulk extraction, or other forms of data mining of audiovisual content except through

7 expressly permitted features or licensed APIs.[1] These contractual restrictions operate together with

8 TPMs to prevent unlicensed access to creators' videos.

9   37.   According to YouTube's Terms of Service, Content creators such as Plaintiffs who

10 upload content onto YouTube grant license to YouTube for certain uses as well as to other users of

11 YouTube to access content through YouTube's services; however, the license makes clear that it

12 "does not grant any rights or permissions for a user to make use of [the] Content independent of

13 the Service."[2]

14   38.   This language confirms that end users are not given access to the file itself, only the

15 ability to view (i.e., stream) through YouTube's controlled environment. YouTube's Terms of

16 Service reflect YouTube's intent to restrict access to the digital files underlying the videos that

17 YouTube's users are allowed to stream through YouTube's platform.

18   39.   Streaming through YouTube and downloading permanent copies provide the user

19 with different value propositions—watching and listening for free but seeing ads, versus possessing

20 a permanent digital copy.

21   40.   Accordingly, scraping or bulk downloading is not merely copying material already

22 provided; it is an act of unauthorized access to data files that YouTube affirmatively withholds

23 from public download.

24   41.   In order to enforce its prohibitions on downloading content, YouTube does not

25 provide a downloading option that is readily available to users.

26 [1] "Terms of Service," YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/t/terms (last viewed December 10, 2025) (prohibiting "access[ing] the Service using any automated means (such as robots, botnets or scrapers) except (a) in the case of public search engines, in accordance with YouTube's robots.txt file; or (b) with YouTube's prior written permission").

27

28 [2] *Id.*

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   42.   Although YouTube does offer downloading options to customers who subscribe and

2   pay for YouTube's "Premium" plan, YouTube also employs TPMs to prevent access for Premium

3   customers. Specifically, YouTube prohibits all downloading audiovisual content except to the

4   YouTube app. Further, the "download" option only makes audiovisual content available for offline

5   streaming—it does not provide the Premium customer with access to the audiovisual files.

6   Accordingly, the audiovisual files cannot be transferred to any other device, but remain only for

7   streaming on the app. Finally, the files are only available for offline streaming for a limited amount

8   of time, at which point they will become available only for online streaming once again.

9   43.   For users who do not have a "Premium" plan, the "download" option on YouTube's

10   player page is non-functional.

11   44.   In order to further enforce its prohibitions on downloading content, YouTube uses

12   technological processes and tools to detect and block unauthorized downloading. For example,

13   YouTube occasionally updates APIs, which operate to interfere with downloaders utilizing the non-

14   updated API to extract files. As another example, YouTube monitors downloading activity and may

15   block IP addresses that make too many download attempts in a specified time period.

16   45.   YouTube's refusal to provide users with a readily available downloading option,

17   along with the processes and tools YouTube employs operate to restrict users' ability to access

18   audiovisual material, are part of the TPMs that YouTube has employed to prohibit access to

19   audiovisual files.

20   46.   Content creators, including Plaintiff and Class Members, rely on the TPMs

21   contained in YouTube's Terms of Service in deciding to upload their audiovisual content to

22   YouTube. Content creators, including Plaintiffs and Class Members, expect that their works will

23   not be copied at scale without consent and that any authorized uses will retain CMI so their

24   identities and rights are preserved.

25   **B.   *Defendant Improperly Obtained Millions of YouTube Videos to Train Its***

26   ***Foundational AI Model***

27   47.   As noted above, Defendant is the creator, owner and operator of the AI video

28   generator, Make-A-Video.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   48.   In order to feed, train, improve, and commercialize Make-A-Video, Defendant

2   requires significant amounts of data, as a "large quantity of data is important to learn representations

3   of more subtle, less common concepts in the world."[3]

4   49.   Make-A-Video was not a research tool or isolated project; it is Defendant's

5   generative AI video model that specifically envisions "creators and artists" as its target market.[4]

6   According to Defendant, "Make-A-Video sets the new state-of-the-art in T2V generation."[5]

7   50.   Because Make-A-Video is intended to target consumers in an already competitive

8   field of AI text to video models, Defendant had an overwhelming incentive to acquire training data

9   on an unprecedented scale. Rather than negotiate for lawful licenses, Defendant broke through

10   YouTube's access protections to obtain the massive dataset necessary to fuel Make-A-Video and,

11   by extension, Defendant's success in the field of AI text to video models.

12   51.   Defendant has invested in its Make-A-Video product and has also fundamentally

13   collaborated on improving its generative capabilities. Particular to the current case, Defendant has

14   sought to develop Make-A-Video so it is capable, among other things, of turning language prompts

15   into audiovisual content. In other words, Defendant has sought to, and has had some success with,

16   creating an AI product that accepts language instruction and produces a video based on that

17   instruction.

18   52.   In order to adequately train its generative AI model, Defendant requires vast

19   amounts of data—the more data, the better the AI product.

20   53.   Defendant obtained datasets from a variety of sources, including academic

21   repositories, research compilations, and other large-scale video collections created by universities,

22   corporations, and independent researchers. These datasets were treated by Defendant as raw

23   material for Make-A-Video, even when the datasets were expressly licensed for academic or non-

24   commercial use and prohibited commercial exploitation, redistribution, or any use that would

25   [3] Uriel Singer, Adam Polyak, Thomas Hayes, Xi Yin, Jie An, Songyang Zhang, Qiyuan Hu, Harry Yang, Oron Ashual, Oran Gafnli, Sonal Gupta, Yaniv Taigman, Meta AI; "Make-A-Video: Text-To-Video Generation Without Text-Video Data" (hereinafter referred to as "Meta AI Paper"), p. 1,
26   Sept. 29, 2022, available at https://arxiv.org/abs/2209.14792 (last viewed December 5, 2025).
27   [4] Meta, "Introducing Make-A-Video: An AI system that generates videos from text," Sept. 29, 2022, available at https://ai.meta.com/blog/generative-ai-text-to-video/ (last viewed December 5, 2025).
28   [5] Meta AI Paper, p. 2.

8
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   involve downloading the underlying copyrighted works

2   54.   In order to acquire high-quality text-to-video generation, Defendant, directly and

3   through agents, contractors, and affiliates, intentionally accessed large volumes of YouTube videos

4   by scraping and/or using tools and workflows that bypass or evade YouTube's TPMs and usage

5   restrictions, and then reproduced those videos to assemble training corpora for Defendant's AI

6   models and services.

7   55.   "Scraping" content involves downloading audio and video files from a website, in

8   this case YouTube, using an automation of some type.

9   56.   When Defendant scraped audio and video files from YouTube, Defendant did not

10   simply download those files onto the YouTube app for offline streaming, as envisioned by

11   YouTube's Premium plan. Instead, Defendant improperly accessed the actual audio and video files

12   and downloaded those files into Defendant's own system, where Defendant had control over the

13   files and where Defendant could store them indefinitely. These actions are inconsistent with

14   YouTube's Premium plan.

15   57.   To fuel its scraping activities, Defendant obtained the HD-VILA-100M dataset.

16   58.   The HD-VILA-100M does not contain the actual videos or clips but instead provides

17   pointers such as video identifiers and timestamp boundaries for approximately 100 million clips

18   drawn from 3,098,462 unique YouTube videos.

19   59.   Upon information and belief, the HD-VILA-100M dataset was obtained through

20   GitHub—a publicly available online code-sharing platform.

21   60.   Upon information and belief, the license agreement for the HD-VILA-100M dataset

22   restricts the dataset to "academic use only," such that any use for commercial purposes would be

23   unauthorized.

24   61.   In addition, upon information and belief, the GitHub license agreement prohibits

25   distribution, reproduction, modification, or exploitation of the dataset content without the

26   permission of the copyright owner, thus recognizing that copyright ownership resides with the

27   original creators of the source material, including YouTube content creators such as Plaintiffs and

28   the Class Members.

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   62.   Defendant was aware that the HD-VILA-100M dataset was for research purposes

2   only but used the dataset for commercial development (i.e., "training") of its generative AI model.

3   63.   The HD-VILA-100M dataset is made up entirely of YouTube source material that

4   must be downloaded from YouTube to be used for AI training. This dataset utilized by Defendant

5   does not contain the videos themselves. A video dataset functions only as an index file that lists

6   pointers such as URLs, YouTube IDs, or similar location identifiers, sometimes with limited

7   metadata attached. A dataset contains no audiovisual files. To use any such dataset, a company

8   must retrieve the actual video files by downloading them directly from YouTube. Doing so requires

9   new copying of each copyrighted work and requires bypassing YouTube's technological

10   restrictions, terms of service, and licensing limitations. The dataset merely identifies where the

11   videos are located. All copying, downloading, and circumvention is performed by the user.

12   64.   The HD-VILA-100M dataset used by Defendant list thousands of specific

13   timestamps within those videos that are designated as clips. A single YouTube video can be divided

14   into many such clips, and each clip is treated as a separate training sample. As a result, the scraping

15   process requires repeated retrieval of the same underlying video for each clip. This means the same

16   copyrighted work is copied multiple times, from different starting and ending points, for the

17   purpose of extracting each designated clip.

18   65.   To obtain any clip listed in the HD-VILA-100M dataset used by Defendant, the user

19   must newly copy the underlying YouTube video at the specific timestamp identified for that clip.

20   Each clip requires a separate retrieval of the source video, which results in a distinct act of copying.

21   Because YouTube provides no lawful mechanism for downloading these works, every retrieval

22   requires the user to circumvent YouTube's technological restrictions, terms of service, and

23   licensing limits. The dataset provides only the video location and the start and end times for each

24   clip. All downloading, copying, and circumvention occurs on a clip-by-clip basis, and each instance

25   constitutes its own violation.

26   66.   The HD-VILA-100M dataset is comprised entirely of YouTube videos and contains

27   3,098,462 source videos that were divided into roughly 100 million clips. Each clip represents a

28   distinct segment of the original work. The dataset was compiled by Microsoft Research Asia and

10

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   published in 2021 for research involving video-based AI models. It lists pointers to YouTube videos

2   and includes subtitle information extracted from YouTube's closed captioning system.

3   67.   The HD-VILA-100M dataset does not provide the video files themselves. Any user

4   of the dataset must download each referenced clip directly from YouTube. Defendant did so at

5   scale, which triggered millions of separate acts of unauthorized access and copying.

6   68.   The usage license on the HD-VILA-100M dataset states it was created "solely for

7   Computational Use for non-commercial research. This restriction means that you may engage in

8   non-commercial research activities (including non-commercial research undertaken by or funded

9   via a commercial entity), but you may not use the Data or any Results in any commercial offering,

10 including as part of a product or service (or to improve any product or service) you use or provide

11 to others."

12   69.   These limitations on the dataset's usage license is an implicit acknowledgment that

13 the HD-VILA-100M dataset is comprised of protected, copyrighted works obtained without

14 license, permission, or authorization.

15   70.   Defendant was aware that the dataset was for research purposes only but used the

16 HD-VILA-100M dataset and other datasets for commercial development (i.e., "training") of its

17 generative AI model.

18   71.   The HD-VILA-100M dataset consists of location identifiers that point to millions

19 of YouTube videos or clips. The dataset does not contain the underlying audiovisual files. To use

20 the audiovisual files in training, a company must retrieve and download every referenced video

21 directly from YouTube. By targeting this dataset, Defendant initiated millions of individual

22 downloads of protected YouTube content, all without authorization, all in violation of YouTube's

23 access restrictions, and all for the commercial purpose of building its artificial intelligence video

24 model.

25   72.   Defendant used the HD-VILA-100M dataset as the foundation for its own refined

26 dataset known as HD-VILA-10M. To create this reduced version, Defendant selected only three

27 clips from each of the 3,098,462 unique URLs in HD-VILA-100M. Meaning Defendant still had

28 to download every underlying YouTube video in the HD- VILA- 100M dataset, likely multiple

11

1   times, listed in the original HD-VILA-100M dataset in order to extract those clips.[6]

2   73.   Defendant used the HD-VILA-10M dataset to scrape audio and video content from

3   YouTube without the knowledge or consent of YouTube or the creators of the content.

4   74.   Defendant also obtained its own separate audio and video datasets directly through

5   its own independent scraping of YouTube's video sharing platform without the knowledge or

6   consent of YouTube or the creators of the content.

7   75.   The scraping activities Defendant conducted on YouTube's video sharing platform

8   required Defendant to use processes to defeat protections that YouTube put in place to prevent

9   unauthorized access to the digital files underlying the audiovisual content. The processes used by

10   Defendant to scrape audiovisual files from YouTube are not used in the ordinary course of

11   YouTube's operations from the point of view of an ordinary consumer.

12   76.   Upon information and belief, Defendant used tools and processes such as the open-

13   source YouTube video downloader "yt-dlp" combined with virtual machines that refresh IP

14   addresses to access audiovisual content from YouTube's platform. Such tools and processes are

15   necessary for Defendant to avoid being blocked by YouTube.

16   77.   The use of virtual machines to refresh IP addresses is necessary because YouTube

17   uses programs to monitor the activity from IP addresses for downloading activity and block those

18   IP addresses from accessing audiovisual data on the YouTube platform. Refreshing the IP addresses

19   operates to defeat YouTube's monitoring programs.

20   78.   The yt-dlp downloader is a tool used for downloading videos and audio from online

21   platforms such as YouTube. The yt-dlp downloader can be used to automatically merge separate

22   audio and video streams and download entire playlists, among other tasks, and Defendant used the

23   yt-dlp downloader for these very purposes in downloading files from YouTube.

24   79.   To use yt-dlp, Defendant first had to install the program, which can be downloaded

25   from the official yt-dlp page on GitHub, along with other programs necessary to effectively

26   download files, such as programs for merging video and audio files. Once installed, yt-dlp can be

27   used to download individual files or entire playlists by adding the Uniform Resource Locator

[6] Meta AI Paper, p. 7.

28

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   ("URL"), which is essentially a web address and mechanism for retrieving a specific file, for each

2   desired video to the yt-dlp program.

3   80.   Defendant used programs such as yt-dlp to improperly access and download files

4   and merge data in order to feed complete audiovisual packages to its generative AI model for

5   training purposes.

6   81.   Processes such as these allowed Defendant to bypass YouTube's player page and

7   avoid YouTube's monitoring systems in order to scrape content from YouTube, and feed content

8   directly to its generative AI model.

9   82.   Defendant did not obtain the consent of YouTube, Plaintiffs or other creators of the

10   audiovisual content to conduct its scraping activities.

11   83.   On information and belief, and based on the sheer volume of video data included,

12   the dataset of videos that included YouTube videos were scraped without permission from

13   YouTube and in violation of YouTube's Terms of Service.[7]

14   84.   The scraping and acquisition processes used by Defendant were inconsistent with,

15   and in violation of, YouTube's Terms of Service, which forbid scraping and mass downloading of

16   videos.[8]

17   85.   In fact, YouTube's CEO, Neal Mohan has stated that, "From a creator's perspective,

18   when a creator uploads their hard work to our platform, they have certain expectations. One of

19   those expectations is that the terms of service is going to be abided by," Mohan said. "It does not

20   allow for things like transcripts or video bits to be downloaded, and that is a clear violation of our

21   terms of service. Those are the rules of the road in terms of content on our platform."

22   86.   The automated system used by Defendant to access video content from YouTube

23   was intentionally designed and utilized to circumvent YouTube's TPMs.

24   87.   To be clear, Defendant's generative AI model is not "watching" YouTube in order

25   to be trained. Rather, data improperly accessed and downloaded from YouTube is being uploaded

---

[7] "Terms of Service," YouTube, https://www.youtube.com/t/terms (last viewed December 5, 2025) (prohibiting "access, reproduce, download, distribute, transmit, broadcast, display, sell, license, alter, modify or otherwise use any part of the Service or any Content except: (a) as expressly authorized by the Service; or (b) with prior written permission from YouTube and, if applicable, the respective rights holders;").
[8] *Id.*

1 into Defendant's generative AI model in order to develop and improve Defendant's products.

2 88.   Defendant knew or should have known its conduct contravened YouTube's rules

3 and the TPMs that enforce them.

4 89.   Despite its knowledge, Defendant continued its program of improperly accessing

5 YouTube data and using the audiovisual content it improperly accessed to train its generative AI

6 model.

7 *C.   Defendant's Actions Were At All Times Commercially Driven*

8 90.   Defendant's efforts to train its generative AI products, including Make-A-Video,

9 were not merely for "research" purposes, but rather primarily served Defendant's own commercial

10 and financial interests.

11 91.   As noted above, Make-A-Video was not a research tool or isolated project, but rather

12 is Defendant's generative AI video model that specifically envisions "creators and artists" as its

13 target market.

14 92.   Defendant has numerous financial interests related to its generative AI products,

15 such as Make-A-Video.

16 93.   Defendant is the owner of Facebook, a social media platform that allows users to

17 network through posts that include text, photos and reels. Reels are video segments that individual

18 users can post.

19 94.   Defendant is also the owner of Instagram, a photo and video-sharing platform that

20 allows users to post images and video segments.

21 95.   Defendant maintains a website at https://meta.ai, which allows users to enter text to

22 create video segments using a text-to-video process such as that described in the Meta AI Research

23 Paper.

24 96.   Defendant's effort to train its generative AI product is commercially-driven.

25 97.   Defendant has at all times intended to create a well-trained generative AI product

26 that Defendant can integrate into its existing technology and social media-based business structure,

27 that will give Defendant an advantage in competition against its competitors in technology and

28 social media spheres, and that Defendant can leverage for commercial purposes in order to increase

1   its own profitability.

2   **D.   *Defendant's Actions Caused Harm to Plaintiff and Class Members***

3   98.   At no time did Defendant seek or obtain Plaintiffs' or Class Members' authorization

4   to access and use the videos Defendant used to train its generative AI models

5   99.   At no time did Defendant seek or obtain Plaintiffs' or Class Members' authorization,

6   nor did Defendant compensate Plaintiffs or the Class Members for the access, copying, ingestion,

7   and use of their YouTube videos in AI training and related workflows.

8   100.   Plaintiffs and Class Members used YouTube as their platform of choice to upload

9   their video content in substantial part due to YouTube's terms and service that prohibit the type of

10   scraping, unauthorized accessing and downloading, bulk extraction, and other forms of data mining

11   of audiovisual content utilized by Defendant to obtain Plaintiffs' video content.

12   101.   Defendant intentionally violated Plaintiffs' and Class Members' intent and rights to

13   their content by accessing Plaintiffs' and Class Members' video content to train Defendant's

14   generative AI model.

15   <u>**CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS**</u>

16   102.   Plaintiffs bring this action on behalf of themselves and on behalf of all other persons

17   similarly situated.

18   103.   Plaintiffs propose the following Class definition, subject to amendment as

19   appropriate:

20   **All persons and entities in the United States who uploaded**

21   **original videos to YouTube and whose videos (or material**

22   **portions thereof) were included in the HD-VILA-10M dataset**

23   **scraped and downloaded by Defendant.**

24

25   104.   Excluded from the Class are Defendant's officers and directors, and any entity in

26   which Defendant has a controlling interest; and the affiliates, legal representatives, attorneys,

27   successors, heirs, and assigns of Defendant. Excluded also from the Class are Members of the

28   judiciary to whom this case is assigned, their families and Members of their staff.

1   105.   Plaintiffs reserve the right to amend or modify the class definition with greater

2   specificity or division after having an opportunity to conduct discovery. The proposed Class meets

3   the criteria for certification under Rule 23 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

4   106.   Numerosity. The Members of the Class are so numerous that joinder of all of them

5   is impracticable. The exact number of Class Members is unknown to Plaintiffs now, but Plaintiffs

6   estimate that there are thousands of Class Members.

7   107.   Commonality. There are questions of law and fact common to the Class, which

8   predominate over any questions affecting only individual Class Members. These common

9   questions of law and fact include, without limitation:

10   a.   Whether Defendant used an automated tool to download or otherwise obtain video

11   content created and uploaded by Plaintiffs and Class Members onto YouTube;

12   b.   Whether Defendant's downloading of the video content was intended to bypass the

13   TPMs put in place by YouTube without the authorization of Plaintiffs and Class

14   Members;

15   c.   Whether Defendant used Plaintiffs' and Class Members' content for purposes of

16   training its generative AI models;

17   d.   Whether Plaintiffs and Class Members suffered damages from Defendant's

18   misconduct;

19   e.   Whether Plaintiffs and Class Members are entitled to damages, civil penalties,

20   punitive damages, and/or injunctive relief.

21   108.   These issues are common to the Class, and their resolution would advance matter

22   and the parties' interests therein.

23   109.   Typicality. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of those of other Class Members because

24   Plaintiffs' video content, like that of every other Class Member, was made available on YouTube

25   and improperly altered and used by Defendant to train Defendant's generative AI models for

26   commercial purposes. Plaintiffs' claims are typical of those of the other Class Members because,

27   among other things, all Class Members were injured through the common misconduct of

28   Defendant. Plaintiffs are advancing the same claims and legal theories on behalf of himself and all

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   other Class Members, and no defenses are unique to Plaintiffs. Plaintiffs' claims and those of Class

2   Members arise from the same operative facts and are based on the same legal theories.

3   110.   Adequacy of Representation. Plaintiffs will fairly and adequately represent and

4   protect the interests of the Members of the Class. Plaintiffs' Counsel are competent and experienced

5   in litigating class actions.

6   111.   Predominance. Defendant has engaged in a common course of conduct toward

7   Plaintiffs and Class Members, in that Plaintiffs' and Class Members' video content was unlawfully

8   downloaded, altered and used by Defendant in the same way. Defendant's conduct was uniform

9   across the Class: every video unlawfully accessed from YouTube was ingested into the same core

10   model that underpins Defendant's product ecosystem. This commonality further demonstrates the

11   predominance of shared legal and factual issues among Class Members. The common issues arising

12   from Defendant's conduct affecting Class Members set out above predominate over any

13   individualized issues. Adjudication of these common issues in a single action has important and

14   desirable advantages of judicial economy.

15   112.   Superiority. A Class action is superior to other available methods for the fair and

16   efficient adjudication of the controversy. Class treatment of common questions of law and fact is

17   superior to multiple individual actions or piecemeal litigation. Absent a class action, most Class

18   Members would likely find that the cost of litigating their individual claims is prohibitively high

19   and would therefore have no effective remedy. The prosecution of separate actions by individual

20   Class Members would create a risk of inconsistent or varying adjudications with respect to

21   individual Class Members, which would establish incompatible standards of conduct for

22   Defendant. In contrast, the conduct of this action as a class action presents far fewer management

23   difficulties, conserves judicial resources and the parties' resources, and protects the rights of each

24   Class member.

25   113.   Defendant has acted on grounds that apply generally to the Class as a whole, so that

26   class certification, injunctive relief, and corresponding declaratory relief are appropriate on a Class-

27   wide basis.

28   114.   Ascertainability. Finally, all members of the proposed Class are readily

17
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   ascertainable. Defendant used a dataset that contain the full lists of URLs and video identifiers for

2   every YouTube video incorporated into the training pipeline. Those identifiers allow the parties to

3   determine exactly which videos were used and to match each video to its creator through

4   YouTube's public channel and authorship information. Because the dataset provides a complete

5   map of the videos Defendant downloaded, the identities of the affected creators are identifiable

6   through straightforward reference to the URLs and corresponding channel data.

7   **CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**

8   **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

9   *Violation of the DMCA (Anti-Circumvention) 17 U.S.C. § 1201(a)*

10   115.   Plaintiffs repeat, reallege, and incorporate the allegations contained in the previous

11   paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

12   116.   YouTube's Terms of Service prohibit scraping, unauthorized downloading, bulk

13   extraction, or other forms of data mining of audiovisual content. These restrictions operate together

14   with TPMs to prevent unlicensed access to the underlying video files, not simply reproduction of

15   content.

16   117.   Plaintiffs and Class Members uploaded their original video content to YouTube's

17   video sharing platform due in substantial part to YouTube's Terms of Service and TPMs prohibiting

18   bulk downloading of creators' videos.

19   118.   Content creators, including Plaintiffs and Class Members, expect that their works

20   will not be accessed at the file level and copied at scale without consent.

21   119.   YouTube's Terms of Service and associated access controls constitute "effective

22   technological measures" within the meaning of 17 U.S.C. §1201.

23   120.   Defendant used automated tools for the sole purpose of circumventing YouTube's

24   access barriers and extracting files never made available to the public. In doing so, Defendant

25   improperly obtained millions of videos from YouTube's platform.

26   121.   This distinction is critical: viewing a YouTube video through YouTube's platform

27   does not provide access to the underlying file. Defendant's circumvention tools broke through that

28   access barrier, triggering liability under §1201.

                                            18

1   122.   Defendant accessed, downloaded, stored and utilized those videos to assemble

2 training corpora for Defendant's AI models and services.

3   123.   Each act of circumvention constitutes a separate violation of §1201. Plaintiffs and

4 the Class Members are entitled to statutory damages, injunctive relief, impoundment, and attorneys'

5 fees and costs under 17 U.S.C. §1203.

6   124.   Each of Defendant's acts of infringement is a willful violation as Defendant

7 specifically utilized automated tools designed to evade YouTube's TPMs.

8   **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

9   WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs respectfully request a judgment in their favor and against

10 Defendant as follows:

11   A.   For a declaration that Defendant has willfully circumvented the copyright

12   protection systems of YouTube intended to protect Plaintiffs' and the Class

13   Members' audiovisual content.

14   B.   For statutory damages (up to the maximum allowed by law per violation),

15   injunctive relief, and attorneys' fees and costs under 17 U.S.C. §1203;

16   C.   For such equitable relief under Title 17, Title 28, and/or the Court's inherent

17   authority as is necessary to prevent or restrain infringement of Plaintiffs' and

18   the Class Members' copyright-protected content, including a preliminary

19   and permanent injunction requiring that Defendant and its officers, agents,

20   servants, employees, attorneys, directors, successors, assigns, licensees, and

21   all others in active concert or participation with any of them, cease

22   infringing, or causing, aiding, enabling, facilitating, encouraging,

23   promoting, inducing, or materially contributing to or participating in the

24   infringement of any of Plaintiffs' or the Class Members' exclusive rights

25   under federal law, including without limitation in the content identified in

26   Exhibit A;

27   D.   For an award of Plaintiffs' costs and disbursements in this action, including

28   reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. § 505;

19
CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT

1   E.   For an award of pre-judgment and post-judgment interest, to the fullest

2   extent available, on any monetary award made part of the judgment against

3   Defendant; and

4   F.   For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

5   **JURY DEMAND**

6   Plaintiff demands a trial by jury on all claims for which trial by jury is proper.

7   Dated: December 23, 2025   **HEAH BAR-NISSIM LLP**

8

9   By /s/ ROM BAR-NISSIM
                                        ROM BAR-NISSIM

10   **ELLZEY KHERKHER SANFORD**
                                    MONTGOMERY LLP
11

12   JARRET LEE ELLZEY
                                    TOM KHERKHER
                                    LEIGH S. MONTGOMERY
13   NATISCHA VOLPE

14

15   Attorneys for Plaintiffs

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT