EXHIBIT TWENTY-FIVE

Portfolio Media. Inc. | 101 Park Avenue 24th Floor | New York, NY 10178 | www.law360.com
Phone: +1 646 783 7100 | Fax: +1 646 783 7161 | customerservice@law360.com

Meta Flaunts 'Abuse' Of Atty-Client Privilege, Judge Told

By **Dorothy Atkins**

Law360 (September 22, 2026, 10:14 PM EDT) -- A California federal judge ordered Meta on Tuesday to rereview privilege designations on 300 documents in social media addiction litigation, after plaintiffs' lawyers cited a "culture of privilege abuse" epitomized by Instagram swag hats embroidered with "a/c priv" — the shorthand used to log withheld documents.



Documents unsealed in the social media addiction MDL on Monday revealed that in September 2024, Instagram's legal team signed off on its Teen Accounts team's order for company swag hats embroidered with "a/c priv," which honored the company's practice of labeling internal documents as attorney-client privileged. (Court documents)

U.S. District Judge Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers ruled from the bench in Oakland during the latest case management conference in the sprawling multidistrict litigation, which includes consolidated claims by personal injury plaintiffs, school districts and Native American tribes who seek to hold social media companies liable for harms caused by kids' use of their platforms.

Earlier this month, Meta Platforms Inc.'s counsel filed a brief telling the judge that the company would voluntarily review its privilege redactions in light of her recent rulings in the first bellwether trial in the MDL, which was held last month.

That trial was over claims by 29 states that the Facebook and Instagram owner violated the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act and state consumer protection laws by prioritizing profits over safety and hiding the risks of teen social media use. But Meta's attorney-client privilege designations took center stage after the judge warned Meta its in-house counsel had **described the wrong legal standard** in the document, although the document itself was properly privileged.

On the fourth day of trial, the judge also **ordered Meta to unseal** a partially redacted document, revealing that Meta's in-house counsel removed data from a presentation showing teen social-media-use harm in an attempt to limit the Instagram CEO's litigation exposure. The next day, Meta **abruptly settled** the states' dispute midtrial for **$17.1 billion**.

In response to Meta's offer after trial to rereview its privilege designations, the personal injury plaintiffs asked Judge Gonzalez Rogers to **appoint a special master** to review its privilege designations in the MDL. The plaintiffs argued that Meta can't be trusted to review its own privilege findings in light of the judge's rulings that some of its exhibit redactions in the trial were "entirely inappropriate."

On Monday, the parties filed more documents that unsealed their briefs on the dispute. Among those filings, plaintiffs' exhibits revealed that in September 2024, Instagram's legal team signed off on the teen accounts team's internal order for company swag hats embroidered with "a/c priv."

In their brief, the plaintiffs argued that while Meta's counsel has defended its attorney-client privilege practices before the court, internally, the company has promoted a culture of overdesignating documents as privileged for years.

"Perhaps nothing better illustrates the culture of privilege abuse at Meta than the swag purchased by members of the Teen Accounts team, aka 'Project Nido' — hats emblazoned with 'a/c/priv,'" the plaintiffs argued in their brief.

They suggested that they identify an initial list of 300 Meta priority privilege log entries and redactions for review by a special master.

During the hearing Tuesday, Judge Gonzalez Rogers kept the discussion on the parties' privilege dispute short. She agreed that the plaintiffs could select 300 of the "most important" Meta privileged documents that they want rereviewed. She gave the plaintiffs about a week to produce a list, and Meta must then rereview those 300 documents and provide any newly unsealed documents to opposing counsel by Oct. 7.

The judge set a hearing for Oct. 9 at which the parties can bring her any disagreements over Meta's rereviewed documents.

"You can tell me if there's a problem or not, and I can figure out if there's something I can do about it," she said.

During the hearing, Judge Gonzalez Rogers also heard arguments on whether she should transfer or remand dozens of other personal injury and product liability cases against Roblox, X Corp. and Discord Inc., which have been consolidated in the MDL alongside the litigation against TikTok,

Snapchat, YouTube and Meta.

The judge didn't rule, but she appeared open to sending the cases against Roblox and Discord to another judge given the differences in the gaming platforms. Judge Gonzalez Rogers also said that separating those cases from the MDL would avoid slowing down the Meta, Snap, TikTok and YouTube litigation, and that she assumes that the parties would want to start litigating them in the appropriate forum as soon as possible.

However, the judge also appeared skeptical of X's arguments that cases by school districts, including the Los Angeles Unified School District, should be transferred to Texas because of a forum selection clause in X's terms of use. Judge Gonzalez Rogers observed that the school district's claims against X are not about the district's own particular use of social media, it's about students' use of social media.

She doubted that the company could "bootstrap" terms that the school district's social media account accepted to claims by the district over students' use of the social media platform X, formerly Twitter.

At the end of the hearing, the judge didn't rule on those motions, and she took the arguments under consideration.

The personal injury plaintiffs were represented during the hearing by Lexi Hazam of Lieff Cabraser Heimann & Bernstein LLP.

Meta was represented by Ashley M. Simonsen of Covington & Burling LLP.

The MDL is In re: Social Media Adolescent Addiction/Personal Injury Products Liability Litigation, case number 4:22-md-03047, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

--Editing by Brian Baresch.

Clarification: The headline has been updated to more precisely describe the plaintiff's allegations regarding of Meta's treatment of attorney-client privilege.

All Content © 2003-2026, Portfolio Media, Inc.