

EDITOR'S NOTE: BIOMETRICS AND PRIVACY Steven A. Meyerowitz

A NEW THREAT FROM AN OLD SOURCE: CLASS ACTION LIABILITY UNDER ILLINOIS BIOMETRIC INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT

William Dugan and Douglas Darch

SECOND CIRCUIT SET TO ADDRESS KEY ISSUES UNDER ILLINOIS BIOMETRIC INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT

P. Russell Perdew, Chethan G. Shetty, and Michael McGivnev

WATCH FOR THE EXPANSION OF BIPA CLAIMS TO NEW USE CASES AND JURISDICTIONS

Torsten M. Kracht, Michael J. Mueller, Lisa J. Sotto, and Daniella Sterns

BEWARE THE FINE (THUMB) PRINT:
INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR THE STORM
OF CLAIMS ALLEGING VIOLATIONS OF THE
ILLINOIS BIOMETRIC INFORMATION PRIVACY
ACT AND SIMILAR BIOMETRIC PRIVACY
STATUTES

J. Andrew Moss, David M. Cummings, Robert C. Deegan, and Michael B. Galibois

CYBERSECURITY RISKS IN THE WORKPLACE: MANAGING INSIDER THREATS

Lindsay Burke and Moriah Daugherty

CYBERSECURITY RISK MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES FOR THE MARITIME INDUSTRY

CYBERSECURITY: NEW FRONT FOR ATTACKS ON FRANCHISE MODEL

Gary R. Duvall

WHAT'S AT STAKE IN THE LATEST LANDMARK EU INTERNATIONAL DATA PRIVACY CASE? Huw Beverley-Smith and Jonathon A. Gunn

CHINA ISSUES NEW REGULATIONS TO TIGHTEN CONTROL ON INTERNET FORUMS AND ONLINE COMMENT THREADS

Barbara I

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME 4	NUMBER 1	JANUARY 2018	
Editor's Note: Biometrics Steven A. Meyerowitz	and Privacy		1
A New Threat From an O Biometric Information Pr William Dugan and Dougl	•	Under Illinois	4
Second Circuit Set to Add Information Privacy Act	lress Key Issues Under Illinois Bio		
P. Russell Perdew, Chethan	G. Shetty, and Michael McGivney	У	7
-	of BIPA Claims to New Use Case el J. Mueller, Lisa J. Sotto, and Dar	_	11
Alleging Violations of the Similar Biometric Privacy	Print: Insurance Coverage for the Illinois Biometric Information Prostatutes Cummings, Robert C. Deegan, and	rivacy Act and	15
	e Workplace: Managing Insider T		18
Cybersecurity Risk Manaş Kate B. Belmont and Jared	gement Guidelines for the Maritin Zola	me Industry	22
Cybersecurity: New Front Gary R. Duvall	for Attacks on Franchise Model		26
What's at Stake in the La t Huw Beverley-Smith and Jo	test Landmark EU International I onathon A. Gunn	Data Privacy Case?	29
China Issues New Regulat and Online Comment Th	tions to Tighten Control on Inter reads	rnet Forums	
Barbara Li			32



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission. Deneil C. Targowski at	908-673-3380 @lexisnexis.com
Customer Services Department at	(518) 487-3385 (800) 828-8341
Your account manager or	(800) 223-1940 7) 247-0293

ISBN: 978-1-6328-3362-4 (print) ISBN: 978-1-6328-3363-1 (eBook)

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print) ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online) Cite this publication as:

[author name], [article title], [vol. no.] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [page number]

(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [1] Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report [4] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2018 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. $Pratt^{TM}$ Publication Editorial

Editorial Offices 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800 201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200 www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW♦BENDER (2018–Pub. 4939)

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

EMILIO W. CIVIDANES

Partner, Venable LLP

CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA

Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

RICHARD D. HARRIS

Partner, Day Pitney LLP

DAVID C. LASHWAY

Partner, Baker & McKenzie LLP

Craig A. Newman

Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP

ALAN CHARLES RAUL

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

RANDI SINGER

Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI

Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP

TODD G. VARE

Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP

THOMAS F. ZYCH

Partner, Thompson Hine

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2018 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 718.224.2258. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report,* LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

Cybersecurity: New Front for Attacks on Franchise Model

By Gary R. Duvall*

Recent cases holding franchisors liable for franchisees' data breaches are creating a dilemma for franchisors. This article provides tips on how to help franchisees protect customer data while not unduly creating liability risk for the franchisor.

Much has been written on the growing risks of data breaches and other cyberattacks, especially after the massive security breach at Equifax in September 2017. Recent cases holding franchisors liable for franchisees' data breaches are creating a dilemma for franchisors. This article provides tips on how to help franchisees protect customer data while not unduly creating liability risk for the franchisor.

THE AARON'S CASE

In *Michael Peterson, et al v. Aaron's, Inc., et al.*, ¹ a franchisor was held liable for breach of consumer privacy by its franchisees. Aaron's and its franchisees rent equipment, including computer equipment. Aaron's franchisees installed computermonitoring software in computers available for rent to consumers. According to the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") press release, the software "surreptitiously tracked consumers' locations, captured images through the computers' webcams" and captured users' login credentials, all without the knowledge of the consumer. The software allowed the franchisees to disable a computer remotely. According to the complaint, "Aaron's franchisees used this illicitly gathered data to assist in collecting past-due payments and recovering computers after default."

The FTC found that Aaron's—by "enabling their franchisees to use this invasive software"—was itself in violation of the consumer's rights, and had violated the FTC rules against deceptive practices, even though this software was not used in any of the company-owned stores. While Aaron's did not use this technology in its company-owned stores, the FTC determined that Aaron's "knowingly assisted its franchisees" in implementing and using this software. Specifically, Aaron's: (1) allowed its franchisees to access the software designer's website to use the software; (2) used its server to transmit and store content from the monitoring: (3) provided franchisees with software technical support. The FTC Consent Order prohibited Aaron's, among other things, from collecting or using customer data without their consent.

^{*} Gary R. Duvall is a partner at Dorsey & Whitney LLP preparing franchise, hotel management, license, and distribution documents and counseling clients in dispute resolution. He may be reached at duvall.gary@dorsey.com. His colleagues Chris Koa and Josh Piper can be reached at koa.chris@dorsey.com and piper.josh@dorsey.com, respectively.

¹ U.S. District Court, N.D. Georgia, ¶15,562, (Jun. 4, 2015).

This case illustrates that "bad facts make bad law." This monitoring software seemed to have clearly violated consumer privacy expectations. The franchisor did more than specify a third party supplier, it participated in support for the software. Therefore, the case also stands for the proposition that a franchisor is liable for the acts of a franchisee where the franchisor participates. Of course, a franchisor should just say no when it learns of franchisee practices that are clearly illegal or wrong. However, franchisors must be careful to not have too much involvement in a franchisee's privacy and security policies, to avoid being held liable for franchisee-caused problems. Best practices are summarized at the end of this article.

Accordingly, franchisors may wish to review their policies related to privacy and security, and their instructions and principles for franchisees, including any ongoing monitoring and auditing. Moreover, a franchisor should use a privacy officer or outside consultant with adequate expertise and training to assess information gathering activities of both the franchisor and the franchisees to reduce the risks of non-compliance with laws and of data breaches.

THE WYNDHAM CASE

FTC v. Wyndham Worldwide Corporation, et al.,² is another case in which a franchisor was alleged to be liable for technology practices of franchisees, in this case data security breaches. However, unlike Aaron's the underlying practices were not obviously wrongful.

Wyndham's franchisee was hacked in Phoenix in 2008, by sophisticated criminal hackers, who obtained hotel level consumer credit card numbers. Wyndham's systems were accessed, but information was lost only from the franchisee. Wyndham had an incident response plan that involved immediately hiring forensic experts, notifying affected employees, franchisees, customers, credit card companies, and government agencies. The credit card companies offered consumers credits for any fraudulent charges, so no consumer was harmed.

However, in April 2010 the FTC began to investigate, alleging that the franchisor had unreasonable practices, and alleging that the franchisor was taking responsibility for all 7000 franchisees' data practices. In July 2010, Wyndham refused to sign the FTC's proposed consent order, so the FTC filed a lawsuit. The FTC cited Wyndham for nine practices that did not meet the FTC's standards.

All of the consumer information was stolen at franchisee level. The FTC wanted to hold the franchisor liable for the alleged information security deficiencies of the franchisee. The franchisor's defense was that it had no duty for franchisee's security breach.

² U.S. Dist. Ct., D. N.J., ¶15,249, 10 F. Supp. 3D602 (Apr. 7, 2014).

The U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit decided against Wyndham on two ancillary matters, but agreed that there needed to be more than inconvenience to consumers. Thereafter, Wyndham and the FTC settled in 2015, and signed a Consent Order. The FTC dropped its theory of liability of the franchisor for franchisee data breach in this Consent Order. In the Consent Order Wyndham must maintain certain standards for payment card data security.

DOS AND DON'TS FOR FRANCHISORS

- Do say no when a franchisor learns of franchisee privacy and data security practices that are clearly illegal or wrong.
- Do provide third party training and support to franchisees related to privacy
 and data security from competent and reputable experts. For example, a franchisor can refer franchisees to third party trainers and cybersecurity experts to
 maintain payment card compliance.
- Don't have too much involvement in a franchisee's privacy and security policies, to avoid being held liable for franchisee-caused problems. Only if the franchisor has the expertise (or hires it) should it try to manage a franchisee's data collection and protection.
- Do provide franchisees with information on what they must do if there is a data breach, and have in place a franchisor data breach incident response plan as well. Such plans are governed by state and federal law, so consult a privacy lawyer to implement such a plan.