

Assignment 4: Brief a Case

Gunnar Yonker

Case Name & Citation:

FTC v. Wyndham, 799 F.3rd 236 (3d Cir. 2015)

Facts:

The FTC filed a lawsuit against Wyndham alleging that its data security practices were unfair and deceptive, which means they were in violation of Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Wyndham moved to dismiss the complaint by arguing that the FTC lacked the authority to regulate data security practices and that the complaint had failed to state a claim upon which relief could be granted. The district court denied Wyndham's motion to dismiss, finding that the FTC had the authority to regulate data security practices and that the complaint alleged sufficient harm to Wyndham's consumers. On appeal, Wyndham renewed its arguments and contended that the FTC had not provided fair notice of what would constitute reasonable data security practices. The FTC then countered that its interpretation of Section 5(a) was supported by prior enforcement actions and policy statements. Based on this it showed that Wyndham's data security practices had led to three data breaches of consumer sensitive data that resulted in over \$10.6 million dollars in fraudulent charges. The Third Circuit Court sided with the FTC, finding that it had the authority to regulate data security practices and that Wyndham's data security practices were unfair and deceptive.

Issue:

Whether the FTC has the authority to regulate data security practices under Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Ruling:

The Third Circuit Court held that the FTC had the authority to regulate data security practices under Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Ultimately this decision meant that Wyndham's practices were unfair and deceptive. Also, the court found that the FTC had provided fair notice of what constituted reasonable data security practices through prior enforcement actions and policy statements. Finally, the Court held that the FTC's complaint had adequately alleged harm to consumers resulting from Wyndham's data security practices. As a result of these decisions, the Court reaffirmed the district court's denial of Wyndham's motion to dismiss and allowed the FTC's case against Wyndham to proceed. The effect of this ruling on lower court rulings is that it had established that the FTC has the authority to regulate data security practices under Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act, which means that companies can be held liable for inadequate data security measures that lead to consumer harm such as in this case. This opinion has been relied upon in subsequent cases involving data breaches such as the case of LabMD, Inc. v. Federal Trade Commission, 894 F.3rd 1221 (11th Circ. 2018) where the court cited the Third Court's decision in this case as support for the FTC's authority. As a result of this ruling, the Wyndham case has had a significant impact on the development of data security law in the United States.

Reasons:

The Third Circuit Court's ruling in *FTC v. Wyndham* was based on several legal and factual considerations. The court considered the scope of the FTC's authority under Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. This led to the court noting that this provision grants the FTC broad authority to regulate "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce". The court also noted that the FTC has long interpreted this provision to include the authority to regulate data security practices, as evidenced by several prior enforcement actions and policy statements.

Next, the court considered whether Wyndham's data security practices were "unfair" or "deceptive" within the meaning of Section 5(a). The court noted that the FTC has established a three-part test for determining if a practice is "unfair": First, whether the practice causes or is likely to cause substantial injury to consumers; Second, whether the injury is not reasonably avoidable by consumers; Third, whether the injury is not outweighed by countervailing benefits to consumers or competition. The court found that Wyndham's data security practices satisfied all three prongs of this test, as evidenced by the three data breaches that occurred and resulted in harm to consumers. Also, the court found that Wyndham's practices were "deceptive" within the meaning of Section 5(a) because they created a false sense of security for consumers that resulted in their sensitive data being leaked and fraudulently used.

The court also considered whether the FTC's enforcement action against Wyndham was arbitrary or capricious. The court noted that the FTC had provided guidance on what would constitute adequate data security practices and that Wyndham failed to follow this guidance. The court also noted that Wyndham suffered multiple data breaches despite being aware of the risks posed by its poor data security practices. Also, the court found that the FTC's decision to bring an enforcement action against Wyndham was based on a reasonable interpretation of its statutory authority and the facts of the case.

The court also had to consider whether the district court properly denied Wyndham's motion to dismiss. It was found that the district court had correctly concluded that the FTC had the authority to regulate data security practices under Section 5(a), and that Wyndham's data security practices were in violation of being unfair and deceptive. This meant that the court found that the district court had properly exercised its discretion in denying Wyndham's motion to dismiss as the issues raised could be more fully addressed at the trial.

The Third Circuit Court's reasoning in *FTC vs Wyndham* was based on a careful analysis of the relevant legal and factual considerations, and ultimately was grounded in the FTC's longstanding interpretation of its statutory authority to regulate the unfair and deceptive practices in trade. The court's decision has had significant implications for any companies that collect and store consumer data because it confirms the FTC's authority to regulate data security practices under Section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Opinion:

Firstly, there was a dissenting opinion in this case, one of the Circuit judges dissented from the majority's opinion by arguing that the FTC lacked the authority to regulate data security practices under Section 5

Assignment 4: Brief a Case

Gunnar Yonker

of the Federal Trade Commission Act. This judge noted that the FTC had not issued any regulations defining what constitutes adequate data security practices and that the agency's authority in this area was therefore unclear. The judge also considered that with this ruling it would give the FTC unchecked regulatory authority over a wide range of business practices that have nothing to do with fraud or deception.

I would have to say that I agree with the Third Circuit Court's ruling in *FTC v. Wyndham* that the FTC has the authority to regulate data security practices under section 5(a) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. I think that the court had a fair analysis of the situation in this case and that the data security system of Wyndham led to the data breaches which ultimately caused harm to their consumers, not the fault of the consumers. However, I do believe that the dissenting opinion that the FTC could have unchecked authority is a valid concern. While the FTC has the power to regulate unfair and deceptive trade practices, there should be clear boundaries as to what it can and cannot regulate. The potential for regulatory overreach by the FTC could be detrimental to businesses and there should be measures in place to prevent such actions. A solution for this issue could be for Congress to clearly define the scope of the FTC's authority, particularly with regards to data security practices. This would provide businesses with a clear understanding of what is expected of them and would prevent the FTC from overstepping its boundaries. Another solution would be for a new agency to be created that would deal solely with data security issues. This agency would establish the regulations needed for an organization and then ensure that the companies are implementing adequate security measures to protect consumer data, they would also have the authority to regulate these data security practices.

Overall, while I agree with the court's ruling in *FTC v. Wyndham*, I believe that there should be clear boundaries set for the FTC's authority to prevent any potential for regulatory overreach.