

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

JUNE 2024

VOL. 10 NO. 5

PRATT'S
**PRIVACY &
CYBERSECURITY
LAW**
REPORT



LexisNexis

EDITOR'S NOTE: PRIVACY PROTECTION RULES CONTINUE TO GROW

Victoria Prussen Spears

BIDEN EXECUTIVE ORDER TO PROTECT AMERICANS' SENSITIVE PERSONAL DATA AND RELATED RULEMAKING COULD IMPOSE SIGNIFICANT RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF SENSITIVE PERSONAL INFORMATION

Jason C. Chipman, Benjamin A. Powell, David J. Ross, Arianna Evers and Ariel Dobkin

REPORTING COMPANIES UNDER THE CORPORATE TRANSPARENCY ACT BEWARE: USING SERVICE PROVIDERS TO COMPLY CREATES NEW DATA PRIVACY RISK

Mary J. Hildebrand, Robert A. Johnston Jr. and Judith G. Rubin

LESS IS MORE WHEN IT COMES TO EMPLOYEE MONITORING

Kathleen Grossman

STATE HEALTH DATA PRIVACY LAWS BRING NOVEL COMPLIANCE CHALLENGES

Wendell J. Bartnick, Angela Matney, Nancy Bonifant Halstead and Vicki J. Tankle

CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL RAMPS UP CALIFORNIA CONSUMER PRIVACY ACT ENFORCEMENT WITH DOORDASH SETTLEMENT, REINFORCES CALIFORNIA ONLINE PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT PRINCIPLES

Madeleine Findley, Daniel R. Echeverri and Ginsey V. Kramarczyk

UK'S DATA PROTECTION REGULATOR CONTINUES TO CLAMP DOWN ON THE USE OF BIOMETRIC RECOGNITION TECHNOLOGY

Rob Dalling and Tracey Lattimer

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME 10

NUMBER 5

June 2024

Editor's Note: Privacy Protection Rules Continue to Grow Victoria Prussen Spears	135
Biden Executive Order to Protect Americans' Sensitive Personal Data and Related Rulemaking Could Impose Significant Restrictions on Certain Transfers of Sensitive Personal Information Jason C. Chipman, Benjamin A. Powell, David J. Ross, Arianna Evers and Ariel Dobkin	137
Reporting Companies Under the Corporate Transparency Act Beware: Using Service Providers to Comply Creates New Data Privacy Risk Mary J. Hildebrand, Robert A. Johnston Jr. and Judith G. Rubin	145
Less Is More When It Comes to Employee Monitoring Kathleen Grossman	148
State Health Data Privacy Laws Bring Novel Compliance Challenges Wendell J. Bartnick, Angela Matney, Nancy Bonifant Halstead and Vicki J. Tankle	151
California Attorney General Ramps Up California Consumer Privacy Act Enforcement with DoorDash Settlement, Reinforces California Online Privacy Protection Act Principles Madeleine Findley, Daniel R. Echeverri and Ginsey V. Kramarczyk	158
UK's Data Protection Regulator Continues to Clamp Down on the Use of Biometric Recognition Technology Rob Dalling and Tracey Lattimer	161

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:
Deneil C. Targowski at (908) 673-3380

Email: Deneil.C.Targowski@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

Fax Number (800) 828-8341

LexisNexis® Support Center <https://supportcenter.lexisnexis.com/app/home>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3385

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3362-4 (print)

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3363-1 (eBook)

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print)

ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [page number]

(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [7] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [179] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2024 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt Publication

Editorial

Editorial Offices

630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800

201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200

www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

(2024-Pub. 4939)

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

EMILIO W. CIVIDANES

Partner, Venable LLP

CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

RICHARD D. HARRIS

Partner, Day Pitney LLP

JAY D. KENISBERG

Senior Counsel, Rivkin Radler LLP

DAVID C. LASHWAY

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

CRAIG A. NEWMAN

Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP

ALAN CHARLES RAUL

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

RANDI SINGER

Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI

Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP

TODD G. VARE

Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP

THOMAS F. ZYCH

Partner, Thompson Hine

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2024 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

California Attorney General Ramps Up California Consumer Privacy Act Enforcement with DoorDash Settlement, Reinforces California Online Privacy Protection Act Principles

*By Madeleine Findley, Daniel R. Echeverri and Ginsey V. Kramarczyk**

In this article, the authors review recent actions taken in California under the state's comprehensive data privacy laws.

California Attorney General (AG) Rob Bonta recently announced a \$375,000 settlement with DoorDash, the second-ever public enforcement action under the California Consumer Privacy Act (CCPA).¹ This follows the AG's \$1.2 million settlement with Sephora. The DoorDash settlement addresses consumer privacy violations arising from DoorDash's participation in a marketing co-operative, which the AG alleged constituted a sale of consumers' personal information without providing notice or an opportunity to opt out under the CCPA and the California Online Privacy Protection Act (CalOPPA). This action is just the latest step in California's aggressive push to uphold its comprehensive data privacy laws – and it illustrates the importance of a vigilant and proactive approach to privacy.

DOORDASH'S ALLEGED VIOLATIONS AND SETTLEMENT

The action against DoorDash stems from allegations that the company failed to adequately inform its users about their right to opt out of the sale of their personal information, specifically related to DoorDash's participation in two marketing co-ops, starting in 2018, in which participating businesses contributed customers' personal information in exchange for the ability to advertise their products to other co-op participants' customers. In January 2020, DoorDash transmitted personal information of its California customers, including names, addresses, and transaction histories, to the marketing co-op. The information was then sold downstream to other companies. At least one DoorDash customer subsequently received marketing materials by mail from third party businesses because of this disclosure.

The complaint² alleged that the disclosure of personal information to the marketing co-op was a "sale" under the CCPA. It also asserted that DoorDash failed to inform customers that it was disclosing personally identifying information about them to third

* The authors, attorneys with Jenner & Block LLP, may be contacted at mfindley@jenner.com, decheverri@jenner.com and gkramarczyk@jenner.com, respectively.

¹ <https://oag.ca.gov/news/press-releases/attorney-general-bonta-announces-settlement-doordash-investigation-finds-company>.

² <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/DoorDash%20Complaint.pdf>.

parties and did not identify the categories of third parties to which it was disclosing such information, in violation of both CCPA and CalOPPA.

The settlement³ requires DoorDash to pay \$375,000 in penalties, comply with the CCPA and CalOPPA regarding privacy disclosures and consumer privacy opt-out rights, and implement and maintain a privacy compliance program for three years. Specifically, the compliance program requires DoorDash to:

- Assess and monitor if it is selling or sharing personal information, including for marketing services or “to providers of analytics or measurement services”;
- Evaluate whether it is effectively providing consumers with required privacy disclosures, in its privacy policy and notice at collection, and providing the right to opt-out;
- Document its compliance program in writing, including specific policies and procedures and technical and operational controls for:
 - Reviewing contracts with service providers and contractors to ensure compliance with CCPA requirements;
 - Documenting technical and operational controls implemented for service provider and contractor risk assessment and diligence under the CCPA;
 - Maintaining an inventory of marketing co-ops in which the business participates and any contracts with those co-ops;
 - Explaining – with respect to the sale or sharing of personal information with providers of marketing services or analytics or measurement services – where in its privacy policies and notices at collection it discusses any sale or sharing of personal information and the methods for consumers to opt-out of such sale or sharing; and
- Annually certify compliance for three years.

COMPARISON WITH SEPHORA SETTLEMENT

There are notable differences from the previous CCPA enforcement action against Sephora:

- *Penalty Amount:* DoorDash’s settlement involved a \$375,000 penalty, significantly lower than the \$1.2 million fine imposed on Sephora. This difference likely reflects the nature and scope of the alleged violations, including that DoorDash stopped participating in marketing co-ops in 2020.⁴

³ <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/attachments/press-docs/DoorDash%20Stip%20Judgment%20.pdf>.

⁴ <https://about.doordash.com/en-us/news/statement-on-settlement-california-attorney-general>.

- *Compliance Period:* DoorDash is required to implement and maintain a compliance program and certify its compliance for a period of three years. Sephora's compliance program was only in effect for two years. This extended compliance period signals an increase in oversight and ongoing engagement with the AG's Office and emphasizes the importance of maintaining adherence to CCPA requirements.

KEY TAKEAWAYS FOR BUSINESSES

1. *Transparency and Communication:* Ensure clear communication with consumers about data collection practices and their rights under CCPA, including selling or sharing of personal information to third parties, the categories of such third parties, and the right to opt-out of the sale or sharing of personal information, including regular review of privacy practices to ensure accurate and transparent disclosures in the business' privacy policy and notice at collection.
2. *Understand When a Disclosure Is a "Sale":* The DoorDash settlement underscores the sweeping definition of "sale" under CCPA – including, specifically, the disclosure of information to providers of marketing services or analytics and measurement services. The Sephora action signaled the AG was interpreting the definition broadly; this action against DoorDash confirms it.
3. *Manage Service Provider Privacy Risk:* Businesses should evaluate their service provider and contractor relationships – particularly with marketing, analytics, and measurement providers – to identify and mitigate any privacy risks. This includes ensuring appropriate contractual terms are in place to limit the use or disclosure of personal information.
4. *Proactive Compliance and Monitoring:* Establish and maintain a comprehensive privacy and data governance program for CCPA compliance. This includes regular reviews of data sharing agreements and marketing practices responsive to regulatory changes and enforcement trends.
5. *Engage with Regulators:* The DoorDash and Sephora settlements highlight the importance of engaging in good faith with regulators and enforcement entities. Demonstrating a commitment to privacy and engaging responsively can impact the outcome of enforcement actions and penalties.

CONCLUSION

The DoorDash settlement provides a reminder and a warning to businesses: of the importance of ongoing compliance with evolving privacy laws like CCPA and older privacy laws like CalOPPA. As privacy regulations evolve, businesses must stay vigilant, ensuring their privacy practices continue to meet existing requirements while adapting to incorporate new and expanding obligations.