

Morrison & Foerster Client Alert.

September 1, 2011

California Court Finds That Song-Beverly Credit Card Act Does Not Apply to Online Transactions

By Purvi G. Patel and Megan T. Low

Following the California Supreme Court's decision in *Pineda v. Williams-Sonoma Stores, Inc.*,¹ more than 200 lawsuits have been filed against retailers doing business in California. These cases have been brought under the Song-Beverly Credit Card Act of 1971 (the "Act"), which prohibits businesses from requesting cardholders to provide "personal identification information" during credit card transactions and then recording that information.² Although the lawsuits have primarily been directed against brick-and-mortar retailers, several online retailers, including Amazon.com, PayPal, Craigslist, StubHub, and Ticketmaster have also been sued. This has raised significant questions about whether the Act extends to online transactions. Fortunately, the San Francisco Superior Court has offered some good news for online retailers.

On August 24, 2011, the San Francisco Superior Court dismissed a Song-Beverly Act lawsuit against Craigslist, finding that the Act "on its face does not apply to online transactions" and that "the applicable case law, legislative intent and public policy indicate that such transactions are not, and should not be, encompassed by [the Act]."³

This order breathes new life into a federal district court case decided before *Pineda* — *Saulic v. Symantec Corporation* — that also concluded online transactions were outside the scope of the Act.⁴ After *Pineda*, however, it was unclear whether California courts would come to the same conclusion as the

Beijing

Jingxiao Fang 86 10 5909 3382
Paul D. McKenzie 86 10 5909 3366

Brussels

Joanna Łopatowska 32 2 340 7365
Karin Retzer 32 2 340 7364

Hong Kong

Gordon A. Milner 852 2585 0808

London

Ann Bevitt 44 20 7920 4041
Deirdre Moynihan 44 20 7920 4164
Anthony Nagle 44 20 7920 4029

Los Angeles

Michael C. Cohen (213) 892-5404
David F. McDowell (213) 892-5383
Purvi G. Patel (213) 892-5296
Russell G. Weiss (213) 892-5640

New York

Madhavi T. Batliboi (212) 336-5181
John F. Delaney (212) 468-8040
Sherman W. Kahn (212) 468-8023
Mark P. Ladner (212) 468-8035
Michael B. Miller (212) 468-8009
Suhna N. Pierce (212) 336-4150
Marian A. Waldmann (212) 336-4230
Miriam H. Wugmeister (212) 506-7213

Northern Virginia

Daniel P. Westman (703) 760-7795

Palo Alto

Anna Ferrari (650) 813-5681
Christine E. Lyon (650) 813-5770
Bryan Wilson (650) 813-5603

San Francisco

Roland E. Brandel (415) 268-7093
Jim McCabe (415) 268-7011
James R. McGuire (415) 268-7013
William L. Stern (415) 268-7637

Tokyo

Daniel P. Levison 81 3 3214 6717
Gabriel E. Meister 81 3 3214 6748
Jay Ponazacki 81 3 3214 6562
Toshihiro So 81 3 3214 6568
Yukihiro Terazawa 81 3 3214 6585

Washington, D.C.

Nicholas A. Datlowe (202) 887-1590
Richard Fischer (202) 887-1566
D. Reed Freeman, Jr. (202) 887-6948
Julie O'Neill (202) 887-8764
Obrea O. Poindexter (202) 887-8741
Cynthia J. Rich (202) 778-1652
Kimberly Strawbridge Robinson (202) 887-1508
Robert A. Salerno (202) 887-6930
Andrew M. Smith (202) 887-1558
Nathan David Taylor (202) 778-1644

¹ The *Pineda* case found that a retailer who requests and records a customer's ZIP code during a credit card transaction violates the Act. *Pineda v. Williams-Sonoma Stores, Inc.*, 246 P.3d 612, 614 (Cal. 2011). Please see [here](#) for additional background about the Song-Beverly Act and *Pineda* decision.

² Cal. Civ. Code § 1747.08(a).

³ *Gonor v. Craigslist, Inc.*, No. CGC-11-511332.

⁴ *Saulic v. Symantec Corp.*, 596 F. Supp. 2d 1323 (C.D. Cal. 2009). Before the *Craigslist* order, *Saulic* was the only case addressing whether online transactions were covered by the Act.

Morrison & Foerster Client Alert.

federal district court in *Saulic*. Although the *Craigslist* order quells some of the doubts regarding the viability of *Saulic*'s conclusion in a post-*Pineda* world, there are a number of other cases pending in California state and federal courts that involve online transactions, leaving the issue far from settled.

About Morrison & Foerster:

We are Morrison & Foerster—a global firm of exceptional credentials in many areas. Our clients include some of the largest financial institutions, investment banks, Fortune 100, technology and life science companies. We've been included on *The American Lawyer's* A-List for seven straight years, and *Fortune* named us one of the "100 Best Companies to Work For." Our lawyers are committed to achieving innovative and business-minded results for our clients, while preserving the differences that make us stronger. This is MoFo. Visit us at www.mofo.com.

Morrison & Foerster has a world-class privacy and data security practice that is cross-disciplinary and spans our global offices. With more than 60 lawyers actively counseling, litigating, and representing clients before regulators around the world on privacy and security of information issues, we have been recognized by *Chambers* and *Legal 500* as having one of the best domestic and global practices in this area.

For more information about our people and services and the resources we offer such as our free online Privacy Library, please visit: <http://www.mofoprivacy.com>.

Because of the generality of this update, the information provided herein may not be applicable in all situations and should not be acted upon without specific legal advice based on particular situations.