



## Supreme Court Rejects Allegations That Social-Media Companies Did Not Do “Enough” To Block Terrorist Content But Declines To Address Scope Of Section 230

***Twitter, Inc. v. Taamneh*, No. 21-1496  
*Gonzalez v. Google LLC*, No. 21-1333**

Decided May 18, 2023

Today, a unanimous Supreme Court rejected claims that social-media companies could be held liable under the Anti-Terrorism Act for allegedly not doing “enough” to remove terrorist-related content from their services. In light of that ruling, the Court declined to address whether plaintiffs’ claims were barred by Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act.

### Background:

Under the Anti-Terrorism Act (ATA) a United States national who is injured by an “act of international terrorism” may recover treble damages. 18 U.S.C. § 2333(a). Victims may also seek recovery from “any person who aids and abets, by knowingly providing substantial assistance, or who conspires with the person who committed such an act of international terrorism.” *Id.* § 2333(d)(2).

In *Twitter, Inc. v. Taamneh*, family members of a victim of the 2017 ISIS shooting at the Reina nightclub in Istanbul, Turkey, sued Facebook, Twitter, and Google under the ATA for aiding and abetting the attack. Plaintiffs did not allege that the terrorists who carried out the attack used the companies’ services or that the companies were aware of any specific ISIS accounts tied to the attack. Despite the extensive measures the companies take to block and remove terrorist accounts and terrorist content, plaintiffs alleged that the companies violated the ATA by not doing more.

The district court rejected plaintiffs’ claims, because (1) plaintiffs failed to plausibly allege that the defendants assisted committing the particular attack at issue and (2) it is not enough to allege that the defendants provided general assistance to a terrorist organization. The Ninth Circuit reversed, holding that allegations

*“[T]he fundamental question of aiding-and-abetting liability [is]: Did defendants consciously, voluntarily, and culpably participate in or support the relevant wrongdoing? ... [T]he answer in this case is no.”*

Justice Thomas,  
writing for the Court

**Gibson Dunn represented Meta Platforms, Inc. as Respondent Supporting Petitioner in *Taamneh* and Amicus in *Gonzalez*.**

Gibson Dunn  
Appellate Honors



that a defendant assisted a “broader campaign of terrorism” are enough, even absent allegations that the defendant assisted the particular attack at issue.

*Gonzalez v. Google LLC* involves substantially similar allegations asserted by family members and the estate of a victim of the 2015 ISIS attacks in Paris. The trial court dismissed plaintiffs’ claims as barred by Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1), which protects websites and other “interactive computer service” providers from claims based on third-party content, and the Ninth Circuit affirmed.

#### Issues:

*Taamneh*: Whether a defendant that provides generic, widely available services to all its numerous users and “regularly” works to detect and prevent terrorists from using those services “knowingly” provided substantial assistance under Section 2333 merely because it allegedly could have taken more “meaningful” or “aggressive” action to prevent such use.

*Gonzalez*: Whether Section 230 applies to recommendations of third-party content.

#### Court’s Holdings:

*Taamneh*: No. Section 2333 requires allegations that the defendant consciously, voluntarily, and culpably participated in the terrorist act at issue in such a way as to help make it succeed.

*Gonzalez*: Given the overlap with the allegations in *Taamneh*, the Court declined to address the Section 230 issue and instead remanded for consideration in light of *Taamneh*.

#### What It Means:

- In *Taamneh*, the Court refused to expand aiding-and-abetting liability under Section 2333(d)(2) beyond the traditional, common-law understandings of aiding and abetting.
- Liability under Section 2333(d)(2) is limited to defendants who “consciously and culpably” participate in the specific act of international terrorism that injured the plaintiffs. Although that requirement does not always demand “a strict nexus,” “the more attenuated the nexus, the more courts should demand that plaintiffs show culpable participation though intentional aid that substantially furthered the tort.”

Today’s opinion also underscores that providing goods or services to the general public should not itself give rise to aiding-and-abetting liability, even if the provider may become aware that its goods or services are being put to illicit ends. As the Court emphasized, imposing liability based on an alleged failure to act requires the plaintiff to make a heightened showing of assistance and scienter.

- The Court also concluded that “[t]he mere creation of” social-media services “is not culpable.”
- The Court’s decision to vacate and remand in *Gonzalez* without addressing Section 230 returns questions about the scope, interpretation, and application of Section 230 to the courts of appeals, which have developed an extensive body of cases construing and applying Section 230 since the statute was enacted in 1996.

---

The Court's opinion is available [here](#) and [here](#).

Gibson Dunn’s lawyers are available to assist in addressing any questions you may have regarding developments at the Supreme Court. Please feel free to contact the following practice leaders:

### **Appellate and Constitutional Law Practice**

Thomas H. Dupree Jr.  
+1 202.955.8547  
tdupree@gibsondunn.com

Allyson N. Ho  
+1 214.698.3233  
aho@gibsondunn.com

Julian W. Poon  
+1 213.229.7758  
jpoon@gibsondunn.com

Lucas C. Townsend  
+1 202.887.3731  
ltownsend@gibsondunn.com

Bradley J. Hamburger  
+1 213.229.7658  
bhamburger@gibsondunn.com

Brad G. Hubbard  
+1 214.698.3326  
bhubbard@gibsondunn.com

### **Related Practice: Litigation**

Reed Brodsky  
+1 212.351.5334  
rbrodsky@gibsondunn.com

Theane Evangelis  
+1 213.229.7726  
tevangelis@gibsondunn.com

Veronica S. Moyé  
+1 214.698.3320  
vmoye@gibsondunn.com

Helgi C. Walker  
+1 202.887.3599  
hwalker@gibsondunn.com

### **Related Practice: Media, Entertainment and Technology**

Scott A. Edelman  
+1 310.557.8061  
sedelman@gibsondunn.com

Kevin Masuda  
+1 213.229.7872  
kmasuda@gibsondunn.com

Benyamin S. Ross  
+1 213-229-7048  
bross@gibsondunn.com

### **Related Practice: Privacy, Cybersecurity and Data Innovation**

Ahmed Baladi

S. Ashlie Beringer

Jane C. Horvath

+33 (0)1 56 43 13 50  
abaladi@gibsondunn.com

+1 650.849.5327  
aberinger@gibsondunn.com

+1 202.955.8505  
jhorvath@gibsondunn.com

Alexander H. Southwell  
+1 212.351.3981  
asouthwell@gibsondunn.com

## **Related Practice: White Collar Defense and Investigations**

Stephanie Brooker  
+1 201.887.3502  
sbrooker@gibsondunn.com

Nicola T. Hanna  
+1 213.229.7269  
nhanna@gibsondunn.com

Chuck Stevens  
+1 415.393.8391  
cstevens@gibsondunn.com

F. Joseph Warin  
+1 202.887.3609  
fwarin@gibsondunn.com

© 2023 Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP, 333 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90071

Attorney Advertising: The enclosed materials have been prepared for general informational purposes only and are not intended as legal advice.  
Please note, prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

If you would prefer NOT to receive future e-mail alerts from the firm, please reply to this email with the word "UNSUBSCRIBE" in the subject line. Thank you.

Please visit our website at [www.gibsondunn.com](http://www.gibsondunn.com). | Legal Notice, Please Read.