

No. 20-297

---

---

In the Supreme Court of the United States

---

TRANSUNION LLC, PETITIONER

v.

SERGIO L. RAMIREZ

---

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

---

BRIEF FOR THE UNITED STATES AS AMICUS CURIAE  
SUPPORTING NEITHER PARTY

---

MARY MCLEOD  
*General Counsel*  
JOHN R. COLEMAN  
*Deputy General Counsel*  
LAURA M. HUSSAIN  
*Assistant General Counsel*  
RYAN COOPER  
*Counsel*  
*Consumer Financial*  
*Protection Bureau*  
*Washington, D.C. 20552*

ELIZABETH B. PRELOGAR  
*Acting Solicitor General*  
*Counsel of Record*  
BRIAN M. BOYNTON  
*Acting Assistant Attorney*  
*General*  
MALCOLM L. STEWART  
*Deputy Solicitor General*  
NICOLE FRAZER REAVES  
*Assistant to the Solicitor*  
*General*  
CHARLES W. SCARBOROUGH  
JACK STARCHER  
*Attorneys*  
*Department of Justice*  
*Washington, D.C. 20530-0001*  
*SupremeCtBriefs@usdoj.gov*  
*(202) 514-2217*

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether all members of the plaintiff class in this case suffered an Article III injury-in-fact when petitioner willfully violated 15 U.S.C. 1681e(b) by producing consumer reports that erroneously designated the class members as individuals who are barred from engaging in transactions in the United States, without following reasonable procedures to ensure the accuracy of those designations.

2. Whether all class members suffered an Article III injury-in-fact when petitioner willfully failed to disclose upon request all information in each of their consumer files, in violation of 15 U.S.C. 1681g(a)(1), and willfully failed to provide a summary of each class member's rights with every written disclosure, in violation of 15 U.S.C. 1681g(c)(2)(A).

3. Whether the certification of a statutory-damages class under 15 U.S.C. 1681n(a) violated the typicality requirement of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 23(a)(3) when the class representative incurred, and testified to the jury concerning, injuries that were different from the injuries suffered by other class members.

(I)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Interest of the United States.....	1
Statement .....	2
Summary of argument .....	9
Argument:	
I. All members of the certified class in this case have Article III standing to bring reasonable-procedures, disclosure, and summary-of-rights claims under FCRA.....	11
A. All class members have standing to assert reasonable-procedures claims under 15 U.S.C. 1681e(b) .....	13
B. All class members have standing to assert disclosure and summary-of-rights claims under 15 U.S.C. 1681g(a)(1) and (c)(2) .....	21
II. When a putative class representative has suffered injuries not borne by other class members, a court must carefully consider Rule 23’s typicality requirement when determining whether to certify a statutory-damages class.....	27
A. In a case where the jury will have significant discretion to consider plaintiff-specific facts when selecting an appropriate statutory-damages award, a court must carefully consider whether the typicality requirement is satisfied .....	27
B. The court of appeals’ typicality analysis was incomplete .....	32
Conclusion .....	34
Appendix — Statutory provisions.....	1a

(III)

IV

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases:	Page
<i>Beaudry v. TeleCheck Servs., Inc.</i> , 579 F.3d 702 (6th Cir. 2009), cert. denied, 559 U.S. 1092 (2010).....	30
<i>Broussard v. Meineke Disc. Muffler Shops, Inc.</i> , 155 F.3d 331 (4th Cir. 1998).....	29
<i>Bryant v. Media Right Prods., Inc.</i> , 603 F.3d 135 (2d Cir.), cert. denied, 562 U.S. 1064 (2010).....	31
<i>Department of the Army v. Blue Fox, Inc.</i> , 525 U.S. 255 (1999).....	12
<i>Doe v. Chao</i> , 306 F.3d 170 (4th Cir. 2002), aff’d, 540 U.S. 614 (2004).....	29
<i>Electronic Privacy Information Ctr. v. Presidential Advisory Comm’n on Election Integrity</i> , 878 F.3d 371 (D.C. Cir. 2017), cert. denied, 139 S. Ct. 791 (2019) .....	25, 26
<i>FAA v. Cooper</i> , 566 U.S. 284 (2012).....	12
<i>FEC v. Akins</i> , 524 U.S. 11 (1998).....	21, 22, 23
<i>Frank v. Gaos</i> , 139 S. Ct. 1041 (2019).....	2
<i>General Tel. Co. of the Sw. v. Falcon</i> , 457 U.S. 147 (1982).....	27
<i>Gertz v. Robert Welch, Inc.</i> , 418 U.S. 323 (1974).....	16
<i>Llewellyn v. Allstate Home Loans, Inc.</i> , 711 F.3d 1173 (10th Cir. 2013).....	30
<i>Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife</i> , 504 U.S. 555 (1992).....	11
<i>Murray v. GMAC Mortg. Corp.</i> , 434 F.3d 948 (7th Cir. 2006).....	32
<i>Omega SA v. 375 Canal, LLC</i> , 984 F.3d 244 (2d Cir. 2021).....	31
<i>Public Citizen v. United States Dep’t of Justice</i> , 491 U.S. 440 (1989).....	10, 21, 22, 23
<i>Raines v. Byrd</i> , 521 U.S. 811 (1997) .....	13

Cases—Continued:	Page
<i>Robins v. Spokeo, Inc.</i> , 742 F.3d 409 (9th Cir. 2014), vacated and remanded, 136 S. Ct. 1540 (2016) .....	13
<i>Safeco Ins. Co. of Am. v. Burr</i> , 551 U.S. 47 (2007).....	3, 4
<i>Spokeo, Inc. v. Robins</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1540 (2016) .....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Stearns v. Ticketmaster Corp.</i> , 655 F.3d 1013 (9th Cir. 2011), cert. denied, 566 U.S. 962 (2012).....	29
<i>Stillmock v. Weis Markets, Inc.</i> , 385 Fed. Appx. 267 (4th Cir. 2010).....	31, 33
<i>Summers v. Earth Island Inst.</i> , 555 U.S. 488 (2009).....	13
<i>Thorley v. Kerry</i> , (1812) 128 Eng. Rep. 367 (C.P.) .....	16
<i>Town of Chester v. Laroe Estates, Inc.</i> , 137 S. Ct. 1645 (2017) .....	11
<i>Tyson Foods, Inc. v. Bouaphakeo</i> , 136 S. Ct. 1036 (2016) .....	2
<i>Vermont Agency of Nat. Res. v. United States</i> <i>ex rel. Stevens</i> , 529 U.S. 765 (2000).....	17
<i>Wal-Mart Stores, Inc. v. Dukes</i> , 564 U.S. 338 (2011).....	27
<i>Warth v. Seldin</i> , 422 U.S. 490 (1975) .....	13
Constitution, statutes, regulations, and rules:	
U.S. Const. Art. III .....	<i>passim</i>
Copyright Act of 1976, Pub. L. No. 94-553, 90 Stat. 2541 .....	31
17 U.S.C. 504(c)(1).....	30
Digital Millennium Copyright Act, Pub. L. No. 105-304, 112 Stat. 2860 .....	30
17 U.S.C. 1203(c)(3).....	30
Fair Credit Reporting Act, 15 U.S.C. 1681 <i>et seq.</i> .....	1
15 U.S.C. 1681(a) .....	32

# 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.