1	DAVID CHIU, SBN 189542				
	City Attorney	EL ECTRONICAL I V			
2	YVONNE R. MERÉ, SBN 173594	ELECTRONICALLY			
	Chief Deputy City Attorney	FILED			
3	SARA J. EISENBERG, SBN 269303	Superior Court of California			
	Chief of Complex and Affirmative Litigation	County of San Francisco			
4	RONALD H. LEE, SBN 238720	08/16/2024			
	Assistant Chief of Complex and Affirmative Litig	ation Clerk of the Court			
5	KARUN A. TILAK, SBN 323939	BY: JAMES FORONDA			
	MIGUEL A. GRADILLA, SBN 304125				
6	DAVID S. LOUK, SBN 304654				
	Deputy City Attorneys				
7	Fox Plaza				
	1390 Market Street, 6th Floor				
8	San Francisco, CA 94102-5408				
	Telephone: (415) 355-3308 (Tilak)				
9	(415) 554-3870 (Gradilla)				
	(415) 355-3314 (Louk)				
10	Facsimile: (415) 437-4644				
	E-Mail: Karun.Tilak@sfcityatty.org				
11	Miguel.Gradilla@sfcityatty.org				
	David.Louk@sfcityatty.org				
12	2 writing out to startly and to to				
	Attorneys for Plaintiff				
13	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, acting by				
	and through San Francisco City Attorney DAVID CHIU				
14	and through built runeises enty recomey 211 (12)				
15	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA				
16	COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO				
17	UNLIMITED	JURISDICTION			
18		G N GGG 24 617227			
, ,	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,	Case No. CGC-24-617237			
19	acting by and through San Francisco City				
,	Attorney DAVID CHIU,	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT FOR			
20	71 1 100	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND CIVIL			
、	Plaintiff,	PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF			
21		BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE			
	VS.	SECTION 17200			
22					
_	SOL ECOM, INC., BRIVER LLC, ITAI				
23	TECH LTD., DEFIREX OÜ, ITAI OÜ,				
	AUGUSTIN GRIBINETS, and DOES #1				
24	through #50,				
ا ہ					
25	Defendants.				
,					
26					
27					
~					
	1				

Plaintiff, the People of the State of California (the "People"), acting by and through San Francisco City Attorney David Chiu, brings this action against Sol Ecom, Inc., Briver LLC, Itai Tech Ltd., Defirex OÜ, Itai OÜ, Augustin Gribinets, and Does #1 through #50 (together, the "Defendants"), and alleges as follows:

#### INTRODUCTION

- 1. Rapid advancements in the field of artificial intelligence ("AI") in recent years have created immense opportunities for innovation, with major implications for scientific research, healthcare, education, computing, and beyond.
- 2. Among the most significant developments is the emergence of generative AI models that have the capacity to create content, be it in the form of text, speech, images, video, or music.
- 3. Despite the potential for generative AI models to improve people's lives, they also present new and profound safety and privacy concerns. In particular, some generative AI models have been released to the public as open source with the goal of fostering innovation and collaboration, but have been adapted and misused for illegal and harmful purposes.
- 4. One disturbing form of misuse is the adaptation of open-source AI image generation models to create fake pornographic and sexual abuse content depicting real, identifiable women and girls, so-called "deepfake pornography" or "deepnudes."
- 5. These models have led to the proliferation of websites and apps that offer to "undress" or "nudify" women and girls. By exploiting open-source AI image generation models, these websites and apps manipulate images of real women and girls without their consent to create photorealistic images showing these women and girls with AI-generated nude bodies and intimate body parts.
- 6. Defendants operate some of the world's most popular websites that offer to nudify images of women and girls. The primary purpose of Defendants' websites is to create fake, nude images of women and girls without their consent. Defendants tout their ability to let users "see anyone naked." As one Defendant puts it: "[i]magine wasting time taking her out on dates, when you can just use [the website] to get her nudes." Collectively, these sites have been visited over 200 million times just in the first six months of 2024.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Coralie Kraft, *Trolls Used Her Face to Make Fake Porn. There Was Nothing She Could Do*, The New York Times Magazine (July 31, 2024), https://www.nytimes.com/2024/07/31/magazine/sabrina-javellana-florida-politics-ai-porn.html (archived at https://perma.cc/5XNQ-22RB).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Jon Healey, *Beverly Hills School District Expels 8th Graders Involved In Fake Nude Scandal*, Los Angeles Times (Mar. 7, 2024), https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-03-07/beverly-hills-school-district-expels-8th-graders-involved-in-fake-nude-scandal (archived at https://perma.cc/57AT-NMXE).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Howard Blume, L.A. School District Probes Inappropriate Images Shared at Fairfax High. More AI Abuse?, Los Angeles Times (Apr. 9, 2024), https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-04-09/student-generated-inappropriate-ai-image-of-girls-at-fairfax-high (archived at https://perma.cc/ B8CK-68E6); Bridget Chavez, No Charges as AI-Generated Nude Pictures of Female Students Circulate Around Issaquah School, KIRO7.com (Nov. 9, 2023), https://www.kiro7.com/news/local/ no-charges-ai-generated-nude-pictures-female-students-circulate-around-issaquahschool/MCQTOKWRVREPTK3K2IAQWTRR6U/ (archived at https://perma.cc/84CJ-WQXL); Hannah Fry, Laguna Beach High School Investigates 'Inappropriate' AI-generated Images of Students, Los Angeles Times (Apr. 2, 2024), https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2024-04-02/laguna-beach-high-school-investigating-creation-of-ai-generated-images-of-students (archived at https://perma.cc/S4EG-KUY7); Josh Haskell, Calabasas Teen Says Classmate Not Disciplined For Sharing Real and Fake Nude Images of Her, ABC7.com (Mar. 14, 2024), https://abc7.com/calabasashigh-school-student-accuses-classmate-sharing-real-and-fake-nude-photos/14521422/ (archived at https://perma.cc/S68X-8V9B); Anthony Johnson, Call for Action at Westfield High School After AI Used to Make Fake Pornographic Images of Girls, ABC7NY.com (Nov. 3, 2023), https://abc7ny.com/nj-westfield-high-school-artificial-intelligence-pornographic-images/14009286/ (archived at https://perma.cc/G9XZ-4D3G); Liz Landers et al., A 15-year-old's Prom Picture was Altered into AI-created Nudes, Scripps News (May 22, 2024), https://www.scrippsnews.com/politics/ disinformation-desk/high-schools-nationwide-are-facing-a-new-problem-ai-generated-nudes (archived at https://perma.cc/HSV8-X56K).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> James Vincent, *Blackmailers are Using Deepfaked Nudes to Bully and Extort Victims, Warns FBI*, The Verge (June 8, 2023), https://www.theverge.com/2023/6/8/23753605/ai-deepfake-sextortion-nude-blackmail-fbi-warning (archived at https://perma.cc/9E4N-DDHX).

- 8. Victims have little to no recourse, as they face significant obstacles to remove these images once they have been disseminated. They are left with profound psychological, emotional, economic, and reputational harms, and without control and autonomy over their bodies and images. As one victim explained, "I felt like I didn't have a choice in what happened to me or what happened to my body." Another emphasized that she and her family live in "hopelessness and perpetual fear that, at any time, such images can reappear and be viewed by countless others."
- 9. Given the widespread availability and popularity of Defendants' websites, San Franciscans and Californians face the threat that they or their loved ones may be victimized in this manner.
- 10. Defendants' conduct violates state and federal laws prohibiting the creation, possession, disclosure, and distribution of AI-generated NCII and similar forms of sexual abuse and harassment.
- 11. The People bring this case to hold Defendants accountable for creating and distributing AI-generated NCII of women and girls and for aiding and abetting others in perpetrating this conduct.

#### **PARTIES**

- 12. Plaintiff, the People of the State of California, acting by and through San Francisco City Attorney David Chiu, prosecutes this action pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 17200 *et seq*.
- 13. Defendant Sol Ecom, Inc. ("Sol Ecom") is a corporation organized under the laws of the state of Florida with its principal place of business at 610 South Main Street, Apartment 730, Los Angeles, California, 90014. Sol Ecom owns and operates the website which produces AI-generated NCII of adults.
- 14. Defendant Briver LLC ("Briver") is a corporation organized under the laws of the state of New Mexico with its principal place of business at 530-B Harkle Road, Suite 100, Santa Fe, New

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Coralie Kraft, *supra* n.1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Charles Toutant, *An AI Took Her Clothes Off. Now a New Lawsuit Will Test Rules for Deepfake Porn*, Law.com (Feb. 5, 2024), https://www.law.com/njlawjournal/2024/02/05/an-ai-took-her-clothes-off-now-a-new-lawsuit-will-test-rules-for-deepfake-porn/?slreturn=20240704180530, (archived at https://perma.cc/7ENN-Y6VH).

- 21. Defendant Doe #3 owns and operates the website which produces AI-generated NCII of adults and children. The People are not currently aware of the true identity of Doe #3, and therefore sue this Defendant under a fictitious name. The People will seek leave to amend this complaint to allege Doe #3's true identity when that information is ascertained.
- 22. Defendant Doe #4 owns and operates the website which produces AI-generated NCII of adults and children. The People are not currently aware of the true identity of Doe #4, and therefore sue this Defendant under a fictitious name. The People will seek leave to amend this complaint to allege Doe #4's true identity when that information is ascertained.
- 23. Defendant Doe #5 owns and operates the website which produces AI-generated NCII of adults. The People are not currently aware of the true identity of Doe #5, and therefore sue this Defendant under a fictitious name. The People will seek leave to amend this complaint to allege Doe #5's true identity when that information is ascertained.
- 24. The People are not aware of the true names and capacities of Defendants sued as Does #6 through #50, inclusive, and therefore sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Each fictitiously named Defendant is responsible in some manner for the violations of law alleged. The People will seek leave to amend this complaint to allege their true names and capacities when that information is ascertained.
- 25. Whenever this Complaint refers to "Defendants," such reference shall include Does 1 through 50 as well as the named Defendants.
- 26. Whenever this complaint refers to any act of any corporate defendant, such allegation shall be deemed to mean that such corporate defendant did the acts alleged in the complaint through its officers, directors, agents, employees, and/or representatives while they were acting within the actual or ostensible scope of their authority.
- 27. On information and belief, each Defendant owns and operates other websites that produce AI-generated NCII of adults and/or children. The People will seek leave to amend this complaint to identify these additional websites when that information is ascertained.

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 28. The San Francisco Superior Court has jurisdiction over this action. Upon information and belief, Defendants are engaging in unlawful and unfair business practices in San Francisco, and the San Francisco City Attorney has statutory authority to prosecute this case on behalf of the People.
- 29. Venue is proper in this Court because, upon information and belief, the unlawful conduct occurred in San Francisco and elsewhere in California.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### I. The Development and Misuse of Open-Source AI Image Generation Models

- 30. Among the most significant recent developments in AI is the advent of highly sophisticated generative AI models. While the specific computing techniques used in these models differ, in general these models are fed vast quantities of data and are trained to detect patterns and generate new content that mimics the information they have ingested.
- 31. Several companies have deployed this technology to develop AI models specifically designed to generate images or edit existing images based on text prompts from users. These models are trained on enormous datasets consisting of hundreds of millions of images and associated text from the Internet, and learn to recognize features of these images and the text descriptions associated with such features.
- 32. Several such models are made available to the public as "open-source" models. With an open-source model, any member of the public can adapt and train a specific implementation of that model on additional images in order to hone (or "fine tune") its ability to generate specific kinds of content. These models can be modified and adapted by anyone for almost any purpose.

  Consequently, these open-source models have been adapted and trained to create new fine-tuned versions that are highly effective at generating pornographic content. Even where the creators of these open-source models subsequently incorporate safeguards into new releases of the model, earlier

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Will Knight, *This Uncensored AI Art Tool Can Generate Fantasies—and Nightmares*, Wired (Sept. 21, 2022), https://www.wired.com/story/the-joy-and-dread-of-ai-image-generators-without-limits/ (archived at https://perma.cc/7MBU-CHRV); Lydia Morrish, *The Dark Side of Open Source AI Image Generators*, Wired (Mar. 6, 2024), https://www.wired.com/story/dark-side-open-source-ai-image-generators/ (archived at https://perma.cc/CUN9-VHMA).

releases—and fine-tuned versions trained to generate pornographic content—continue to circulate online.

- 33. These highly popular fine-tuned versions generate not only pornographic content involving fictitious AI-generated individuals, but also manipulate images of real people to produce fictional pornographic content that depicts those individuals. The models are able to recognize clothing and body features in an image of a person, and can be further conditioned to manipulate the image to generate a fake, photorealistic image that maintains the person's face, but replaces their clothed body with a nude body—thus appearing to "undress" the person and display their intimate body parts. These models "undress" or "nudify" not only adults, but also children.
- 34. These manipulated intimate images are generated without the consent of the persons depicted, resulting in the creation and dissemination of AI-generated NCII of these individuals.
- 35. The availability of these fine-tuned versions designed to create AI-generated NCII has spawned the development of websites dedicated to creating "nudified" images of women and girls. These websites offer user-friendly interfaces for uploading clothed images of real people to generate realistic "nudified" versions of those images. These websites require users to subscribe or pay to generate nude images. Some websites give users a "free trial," allowing them to create a limited number of free images as a way of enticing them to pay for additional images.

## II. Defendants Operate Popular Websites Used to Nudify Images of Women and Girls

36. Defendants operate some of the world's most popular websites specifically designed to generate and distribute AI-generated NCII of women and girls.

#### **Sol Ecom**

- 37. Sol Ecom owns and operates the website had over 12 million visits in the first six months of 2024.
- 38. Users can access by signing in using their Google, Discord, or X accounts.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Santiago Lakatos, *A Revealing Picture*, Graphica (Dec. 8, 2023), https://graphika.com/reports/a-revealing-picture (archived at https://perma.cc/5BCN-G4R3).

26

46.

that its technology "can undress any photo you upload." Briver likewise claims that the

website provides the "Best Undress AI Tool" to "Nudify Anyone in Seconds."

as a tool to "See Anybody Nude for FREE" and claims

Briver promotes

is to create

1	47.	Users can access and by signing in using their Google	
2	accounts.		
3	48.	Users can upload an image of a clothed woman to and and , and the	
4	sites will create fake nude images of the subject.		
5	49.	Because Briver has failed to deploy available technology to detect images of minors,	
6	users can upload an image of a clothed girl under 18 years old to and and and and the		
7	sites will create fake nude images of the subject.		
8	50.	Briver allows users to generate a limited number of nudified images for free, after	
9	which users must purchase credits (or "gems") in order to generate additional images. On information		
10	and belief, us	sers can purchase credits from Briver using their credit cards, PayPal, or cryptocurrency.	
11	51.	While the and websites purport to require users to obtain	
12	consent for tl	he images they use, Briver in fact accepts any image that a user wants to nudify and does	
13	not verify that the depicted individual has consented to the nudification of her image. Indeed, both		
14	websites emphasize that they can be used to "see anybody nude" and "nudify anyone."		
15	52.	Briver knows that the primary purpose of websites like and is	
16	to create AI-generated NCII of identifiable women and girls.		
17	53.	Briver intentionally creates and distributes to, or otherwise knowingly encourages,	
18	enables, and facilitates the creation and distribution of, nonconsensual nude images of identifiable		
19	women and girls to users with the knowledge that these images will traumatize and cause severe		
20	emotional distress to the depicted individuals if disclosed.		
21	<u>Itai Tech</u>		
22	54.	Itai Tech owns and operates a number of websites that offer to nudify images of clothed	
23	people, inclu	ding, but not limited to, , and , and .	
24	55.	In the first six months of 2024, had 26.6 million visits,	
25	nearly 15.5 n	had 14.4 million visits, and had 133,924 visits.	
26	56.	Itai Tech promotes the website as a way to "[s]ee anybody nude for free."	
27	Similarly, on	, Itai Tech claims that users can "[s]ee anyone naked with the most realistic	
28	undress AI app." On the website, Itai Tech displays a visual depiction of how the		

using cryptocurrency.

or cryptocurrency.

which users must purchase credits in order to generate additional images. On information and belief,

users can purchase credits from Doe #4 using cryptocurrency.

26

27

Apple Pay, Cash App, Venmo, Wise, AliPay, and cryptocurrency.

- 142. While the website purports to require users to obtain consent for the images they use, Doe #5 in fact accepts any image that a user wants to nudify and does not verify that the depicted individual has consented to the nudification of her image. In fact, makes clear that it will "undress any photo."
- 143. Doe #5 knows that the primary purpose of websites like is to create AI-generated NCII of identifiable women.
- 144. Doe #5 intentionally creates and distributes to, or otherwise knowingly encourages, enables, and facilitates the creation and distribution of, AI-generated NCII of identifiable women to users with the knowledge that these images will traumatize and cause severe emotional distress to the depicted individuals if disclosed.

#### **CAUSES OF ACTION**

# FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION VIOLATIONS OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE 17200

#### AGAINST ALL DEFENDANTS

- 145. The People incorporate by reference the allegations contained in each paragraph above, as if those allegations were fully set forth in this cause of action.
- 146. California Business and Professions Code section 17200 prohibits any "unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice."
- 147. Defendants have engaged in and continue to engage in unlawful business acts and practices in violation of section 17200. Such acts and practices include, but are not limited to, the following:
  - a. Defendants have violated California Civil Code section 1708.86(b)(1) prohibiting the creation and intentional disclosure of nonconsensual sexually explicit images, or aided and abetted violations of California Civil Code section 1708.86(b)(1) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
  - Defendants have violated California Civil Code section 1708.85(a) prohibiting the intentional distribution of nonconsensual depictions of intimate body parts, or aided and

- abetted violations of California Civil Code section 1708.85(a) by their acts and practices set forth herein.
- c. Defendants have violated California Penal Code section 647(j)(4) prohibiting the intentional distribution of nonconsensual depictions of intimate body parts of an identifiable person, or aided and abetted violations of California Penal section 647(j)(4) in violation of California Penal Code section 31 by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- d. Defendants have violated 15 U.S.C. § 6851(b)(1) prohibiting the knowing or reckless disclosure in interstate commerce of intimate visual depictions of identifiable persons, or aided and abetted violations of 15 U.S.C. § 6851(b)(1) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- 148. Defendants have engaged in and continue to engage in unfair business acts and practices in violation of section 17200. Defendants' acts and practices of creating nudified images constitute unfair business practices because they offend established public policy, the harm they cause to consumers greatly outweighs any benefits associated with those practices, and they are immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous and/or substantially injurious to consumers.

### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

# VIOLATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE 17200 AGAINST DEFENDANTS BRIVER LLC, ITAI TECH LTD., AUGUSTIN GRIBINETS, DOE #1, DOE #2, DOE #3 & DOE #4

- 149. The People incorporate by reference the allegations contained in each paragraph above, as if those allegations were fully set forth in this cause of action.
- 150. California Business and Professions Code section 17200 prohibits any "unlawful, unfair, or fraudulent business act or practice."
- 151. Defendants Briver LLC, Itai Tech Ltd., Augustin Gribinets, Doe #1, Doe #2, Doe #3, and Doe #4 are engaged in and continue to engage in unlawful business acts and practices in violation of section 17200. Such acts and practices include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated California Penal Code section 311.3(a) prohibiting the knowing development of nonconsensual obscene images of persons under the age of 18 years, or aided and abetted violations of California Penal section 311.3(a) in violation of California Penal Code section 31 by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- b. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated California Penal Code section 311.2(a) prohibiting the knowing distribution of obscene images, or aided and abetted violations of California Penal section 311.2(a) in violation of California Penal Code section 31 by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- c. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated California Penal Code section 311.2(b) prohibiting the knowing distribution for commercial gain of obscene images depicting persons under the age of 18 years engaged in sexual conduct, or aided and abetted violations of California Penal section 311.2(b) in violation of California Penal Code section 31 by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- d. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated California Penal Code section 311.2(c) prohibiting the knowing distribution to adults of images depicting persons under the age of 18 years engaged in sexual conduct, or aided and abetted violations of California Penal section 311.2(c) in violation of California Penal Code section 31 by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- e. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 1465 prohibiting the knowing production of any obscene images with the intent to distribute by interactive computer service, or aided and abetted violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1465 in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- f. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 1466 prohibiting engaging in the business of distributing, or knowingly producing with intent to distribute, any obscene images by interactive computer service, or aided and abetted violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1466 in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.

- g. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 1466A(a)(1) prohibiting the knowing distribution of, or production with intent to distribute, obscene depictions of minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct that were produced by computer, or aided and abetted violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1466A(a)(1) in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- h. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 1466A(b)(1) prohibiting the knowing possession of obscene depictions of minors engaging in sexually explicit conduct that were produced by computer, or aided and abetted violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1466A(b)(1) in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- i. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(1) prohibiting the knowing distribution of any child pornography by computer, or aided and abetted violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(1) in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- j. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2) prohibiting the knowing receipt or distribution of any child pornography or materials containing child pornography by computer, or aided and abetted violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(2) in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- k. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(4)(B) prohibiting the knowing sale of any child pornography by computer, or aided and abetted violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(4)(B) in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- 1. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(5)(B) prohibiting the knowing possession of child pornography that was produced or distributed by computer, or aided and abetted violations of 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(5)(B) in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.
- m. Each of the above-named Defendants has violated 18 U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(7) prohibiting the knowing production or distribution of any adapted or modified images of child pornography of identifiable minors by computer, or aided and abetted violations of 18

U.S.C. § 2252A(a)(7) in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2(a) by the acts and practices set forth herein.

152. Defendants Briver LLC, Itai Tech Ltd., Augustin Gribinets, Doe #1, Doe #2, Doe #3, and Doe #4 are engaged in and continue to engage in unfair business acts and practices in violation of section 17200. Each of the above-named Defendants' acts and practices of creating nudified images of children constitute unfair business practices because they offend established public policy, the harm they cause to consumers greatly outweighs any benefits associated with those practices, and they are immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous and/or substantially injurious to consumers.

#### PRAYER FOR RELIEF

The People respectfully request that the Court enter judgment in favor of the People and against Defendants, jointly and severally, and grant the following relief:

- 1. Enjoin all Defendants, their successors, agents, representatives, employees, and any and all other persons who act in concert or participation with Defendants by preliminarily and permanently restraining them from performing or proposing to perform any acts in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200 as set forth above, including but not limited to ceasing operation of all websites they own or operate that are capable of creating AI-generated NCII of identifiable individuals.
- 2. Order that any domain-name registrars, domain-name registries, webhosts, payment processors, or companies providing user authentication and authorization services or interfaces who are provided with notice of the injunction, shall take all actions necessary to restrain Defendants from performing or proposing to perform any unlawful or unfair business practices in violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200, including but not limited to ceasing to facilitate access to any websites owned or operated by Defendants that are capable of creating AI-generated NCII of identifiable individuals.
- 3. Order each Defendant to pay a civil penalty of \$2,500 for each violation of California Business and Professions Code section 17200.
  - 4. Order Defendants to pay the costs of suit; and

1	5.	Provide such further and addi	itional relief as the Court deems just, proper, and	
2	equitable.			
3	Dated: August 16, 2024			
4			DAVID CHIU City Attorney	
5			YVONNE R. MERÉ Chief Deputy City Attorney	
6			SARA J. EISENBERG Chief of Complex and Affirmative Litigation	
7			RONALD H. LEE Assistant Chief of Complex and Affirmative Litigation	
8			KARUN A. TILAK	
9			MIGUEL A. GRADILLA DAVID S. LOUK	
10			Deputy City Attorneys	
11		By:		
12			KARUN A. TILAK	
13			Attorneys for Plaintiff PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, acting by	
14			and through San Francisco City Attorney DAVID CHIU	
15				
16				
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27	I			