

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEIJING MEISHE NETWORK
TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD.,

Plaintiff,

v.

TIKTOK INC., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-06012-SI](#)

**ORDER GRANTING IN PART AND
DENYING IN PART DEFENDANTS'
RENEWED MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFF'S THIRD AMENDED
COMPLAINT WITH LEAVE TO
AMEND**

Re: Dkt. No. 409

Before the Court is defendants’ renewed motion to dismiss plaintiff’s third amended complaint. Dkt. No. 409. Plaintiff opposes. Dkt. No. 414. The Court heard oral argument on this motion on April 5, 2024. For the reasons set forth below, the Court GRANTS IN PART defendants’ motion to dismiss with leave to amend and DENIES IN PART defendants’ motion. Plaintiff shall file its fourth amended complaint no later than **May 14, 2024**.

BACKGROUND¹

Plaintiff Beijing Meishe Network Technology Co., Ltd. (“Meishe”) filed its third amended complaint on April 20, 2023 in the Western District of Texas. Dkt. No. 235 (“TAC”). The complaint alleges seven causes of action against defendants TikTok Inc., TikTok Pte. Ltd., ByteDance Ltd., and ByteDance Inc. (collectively, “defendants”). Four causes of action remain: copyright infringement, misappropriation of trade secrets under the Defend Trade Secrets Act (“DTSA”), misappropriation of trade secrets under the Texas Uniform Trade Secrets Act

¹ For purposes of this motion to dismiss, the Court treats as true the factual allegations as stated in plaintiff’s complaint and draws all reasonable inferences in plaintiff’s favor. *See Usher v. City of Los Angeles*, 828 F.2d 556, 561 (9th Cir. 1987).

United States District Court
Northern District of California

1 (“TUTSA”), and Lanham Act false advertising.²

2 Meishe is a private company established in 2014 under the laws of the People’s Republic of
3 China with a principal place of business in Beijing. *Id.* ¶¶ 3, 10. It is the owner of a copyright in
4 Meishe software (the “Meishe app”), “a computer program that enables users to complete
5 professional-level video and audio editing processing on the mobile side through simple operations,
6 making high quality video and audio clips.” *Id.* ¶ 53. Meishe “developed the Meishe app and further
7 developed the Meishe SDK and other software that provide users with video and audio editing
8 functions.” *Id.* ¶ 54.

9 TikTok Inc. is a California corporation with a “regular and established place of business in
10 Austin, Texas.” *Id.* ¶ 11. TikTok Pte. Ltd. is a Singapore corporation with its principal place of
11 business in Singapore. *Id.* ¶ 12. ByteDance Ltd. is a Cayman Islands corporation with offices in
12 the United States and elsewhere. *Id.* ¶¶ 13, 16. ByteDance Inc. is a Delaware corporation. *Id.* ¶14.
13 ByteDance Ltd. is the parent and owner of TikTok Inc., TikTok Pte. Ltd., and ByteDance Inc. *Id.*
14 ¶ 15. ByteDance Ltd. developed the TikTok app around May 2017 and operates and controls the
15 app in the United States through its subsidiaries and affiliates, including the other defendants in this
16 case. *Id.* ¶¶ 17, 55.³ The TikTok app “allows users to create short videos, which often feature music
17 in the background and can be sped up, slowed down, or edited with a filter.” *Id.* ¶ 55. Defendants
18 operate ByteDance Ltd.’s TikTok business in the United States as a joint enterprise. *Id.* ¶ 21.

19 Meishe brings this action for copyright infringement of its registered and unregistered
20 software, all of which is “subject to copyright protection.” *Id.* ¶ 1. Meishe registered portions of its
21 software with the Copyright Protection Centre of China (“CPCC”), with Copyright Registration
22 Nos. 2015SR227927, 2018SR037747, 2018SR037751, 2018SR038324, 2018SR218096,

23
24
25 ² On February 26, 2024, the Court granted the parties’ joint stipulation dismissing the three
26 state law tort claims, unfair competition by misappropriation under Texas law, unjust enrichment
27 under Texas law, and aiding and abetting a breach of fiduciary duty under Texas law (Counts IV,
28 VI and VII), with prejudice. Dkt. No. 405.

³ The TikTok app is the international version of a Chinese application called Douyin. *Id.*
¶ 5.

1 2018SR218287, 2019SR0899912, and 2020SR0291426.⁴ *Id.* ¶¶ 1, 54. Meishe lists completion
 2 dates for the CPCC-registered copyrighted software. *See id.* ¶ 71. Meishe is also the “owner of
 3 copyrights in its source code and software, which have been fixed in tangible mediums before the
 4 filing date of this lawsuit regardless of registration, including but not limited to [a long list of
 5 software].” *Id.* ¶¶ 1, 54. Meishe “has the exclusive rights to reproduce, display, and distribute the
 6 copyrighted software,” including the registered copyrights listed above, “as well as its copyrighted
 7 source code and software regardless of registration.” *Id.* ¶ 72. Prior to filing the TAC, Meishe
 8 provided defendants with copies of the China copyright registrations and associated material and
 9 copies of other copyrighted works, and defendants’ experts “have spent several days reviewing that
 10 code.” *Id.* ¶ 1.

11 In March 2021, Meishe discovered that a “series of apps belonging to ByteDance, Ltd. had
 12 infringed Meishe’s copyright since at least 2018.” *Id.* ¶ 56. “Meishe personnel conducted an
 13 analysis between code of Meishe app and that of TikTok app [which] shows that the code used to
 14 implement video and audio editing functions in the two apps is highly similar, proving that
 15 Defendants copied Meishe’s copyright work.” *Id.*⁵

16 Defendants allegedly had access to Meishe’s source code through Meishe’s former
 17 employee, Mr. Jing Xie, who is currently working for defendants. *Id.* ¶ 58. Mr. Xie began his
 18 employment with a Meishe affiliate in 2007 and began his employment with Meishe in March 2015.
 19 *Id.* ¶ 60. As a C++ R&D engineer, Mr. Xie “directly participated in the development of Meishe’s
 20 software and the subsequent upgrades of various versions until his resignation on or around June 8,
 21 2015.” *Id.* Mr. Xie also “had access to and control over Meishe’s trade secrets, proprietary software
 22 code, and/or other confidential information” during his employment with Meishe and its affiliate.
 23 *Id.* ¶ 59. When Mr. Xie resigned on June 8, 2015, he “knowingly took copyrighted and trade secret
 24

25 ⁴ Meishe’s TAC lists eighteen copyright registrations that defendants allegedly copied. *See*
 26 TAC ¶¶ 54, 71. In a September 29, 2023 letter to defendants, Meishe withdrew the following ten
 27 registered copyrights from the case: 2019SR0899799, 2019SR0899814, 2019SR0901166,
 2019SR0901175, 2019SR0901188, 2019SR0901198, 2019SR0901209, 2020SR0572704,
 2020SR0572713, 2020SR0575533. Dkt. No. 409 at 2 n.2; Dkt. No. 414 at 7 n.4.

28 ⁵ Meishe conducted a comparison between “TikTok v8.5.0” object code. obtained from

1 Meishe code that was incorporated into subsequent software including software controlled and
2 distributed by ByteDance and its subsidiaries.” *Id.* ¶ 97, *see also* ¶ 63. Mr. Xie began his
3 employment at ByteDance as “multimedia audio and video director” around October 2017. *Id.*
4 ¶¶ 65, 98.

5 Around March 2021, Meishe audited Mr. Xie’s activities and “discovered that on or around
6 June 3, 2015, he downloaded [and copied] Meishe’s source code and/or other confidential
7 information.” *Id.* ¶¶ 94, 101. Each time Mr. Xie modified Meishe software in the “SVN system,”
8 he first had to check “the corresponding subtree of the repository to get a so-called ‘working copy.’”
9 *Id.* ¶ 61. The “SVN system recorded all relevant information in its logs,” and “[t]hese logs prove
10 that Mr. Jing Xie accessed Meishe’s source code and downloaded the source code.” *Id.* Around
11 May 14, 2021, Meishe “notarized the SVN log and checked the committed log of Jing Xie on SVN.”
12 *Id.* ¶ 101.

13 In addition to the allegations already detailed, Meishe alleges the following with respect to
14 its copyright infringement claim. “On information and belief, the TikTok app consists of Plaintiff’s
15 proprietary information, trade secrets, and/or reproduced software code” registered with the CPCC,
16 “as well as its copyrighted source code and software regardless of registration.” *Id.* ¶ 73. More
17 specifically, defendants’ software, including TikTok, “includes portions of code that are copyrighted
18 and owned by TikTok” and subjected to copyright registrations and portions of plaintiff’s software
19 code that were never made public. *Id.* ¶ 74. Defendants infringed on plaintiff’s copyright in its
20 software by reproducing Meishe’s copyrighted works, preparing derivative works based on
21 Meishe’s copyrighted works, and distributing the copyrighted works. *Id.* ¶ 75. Defendants also
22 profited by inducing users to download and use the TikTok app. *Id.* Additionally, “[u]pon
23 information and belief, on or around April 2020, Defendants took steps to obfuscate its software
24 code in order to conceal its infringement.” *Id.* ¶ 76.

25 Defendants were aware of the incorporation of Meishe’s copyrighted source code into at
26 least the TikTok app and were aware of the use of Meishe’s copyrighted source code by users of at
27 least the TikTok app. *Id.* ¶ 77. Defendants also knowingly provided false copyright management
28 information and/or distributed or imported false copyright information for distribution and/or

1 “intentionally removed or altered Meishe’s copyright management information from the software []
2 copied and distributed for importation.” *Id.* ¶¶ 77, 160. Meishe previously filed lawsuits against
3 ByteDance and other defendants in China, including an April 30, 2021 lawsuit, where, according to
4 a National Law Review article, Meishe alleged that “version 3.0 and later of Douyin released on
5 November 1, 2018, copied video and audio editing and processing software code from Meishe
6 Technology’s copyrighted beauty photo software. Further, six other apps by Bytedance have traces
7 of code plagiarism, many of which have the same function names and even misspelled code copied
8 from Meishe source code.” *Id.* ¶ 79.

9 Plaintiff further alleges the following with respect to its misappropriation of trade secrets
10 claims under the DTSA and TUTSA. “Plaintiff is the owner of trade secrets that include, but are
11 not limited to proprietary, independently-developed software code that allows for video and audio
12 editing, video and audio processing, video and audio release, personalized audio and video
13 recommendations, webcasting, and other confidential business information.” *Id.* ¶¶ 87, 119.
14 “Plaintiff’s trade secrets are not generally known or readily ascertainable nor could they be properly
15 acquired or duplicated by others,” and plaintiff’s copyrighted source code has never been made
16 publicly available. *Id.* ¶¶ 88-89, 120-121. Meishe “has taken reasonable and extensive efforts to
17 maintain the secrecy of its source code through the use of employment agreements and other
18 measures. All of Plaintiff’s trade secrets are stored on secure servers and are password-protected.”
19 *Id.* ¶¶ 89, 121. Defendants wrongfully acquired Meishe’s proprietary software code from Mr. Xie
20 and knew or had reason to know that the software code was improperly acquired. *Id.* ¶¶ 102, 131.
21 Defendants also obtained other trade secret information from Mr. Xie, including “information about
22 which portions of Meishe’s software were most likely to be popular if incorporated into video
23 editing features in smart phone applications.” *Id.* ¶ 103. Defendants induce users to download and
24 use its products and services that include Meishe’s software code. *Id.* ¶¶ 105, 133.

25 Meishe further alleges the following with respect to the Lanham Act claim. TikTok “informs
26 users that it owns and has proper rights to the code it uses in its applications.” *Id.* ¶¶ 158-159.
27 Meishe provides examples of this in the TAC. *See id.* Through the described conduct, defendants

28 misrepresented to their consumers “the nature, characteristics of their product and commercial

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.