

EDITOR'S NOTE: THE DATA

Victoria Prussen Spears

GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, DATA MINIMIZATION AND TODAY'S GOLD RUSH

D. Reed Freeman Jr.

POWER GRIDS AND POINTS OF VULNERABILITY: KEEPING THE LIGHTS ON AMID CYBERSECURITY CONCERNS

Alicia M. McKnight and Brian E. Finch

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION ADOPTS NEW RULES ON CYBERSECURITY INCIDENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE FOR PUBLIC COMPANIES

Adam Aderton, Daniel K. Alvarez, Elizabeth P. Gray, Laura E. Jehl, A. Kristina Littman, Nicholas Chanin, Erik Holmvik and Marc J. Lederer FAQS FOR BUSINESSES AS TEXAS PASSES CONSUMER PRIVACY LEGISLATION

Risa B. Boerner and Brent Sedge

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA PROHIBITS ENFORCING CALIFORNIA PRIVACY RIGHTS ACT REGULATIONS UNTIL MARCH 2024

Peter A. Blenkinsop, Reed Abrahamson and Anya L. Gersoff

META: COURT OF JUSTICE CONFIRMS THAT
COMPETITION AUTHORITIES CAN ASSESS GDPR
COMPLIANCE IN ABUSE OF DOMINANCE CASES
Flena Chutrova and Ambroise Simon

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ADOPTS ADEQUACY DECISION ON EU-U.S. DATA PRIVACY FRAMEWORK Huw Beverley-Smith, Charlotte H. N. Perowne and Jeanine F. Leahy

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME 9	NUMBER 8	October 2023
Editor's Note: The Data Victoria Prussen Spears		257
Generative Artificial Intel Gold Rush	lligence, Data Minimization and Today	S
D. Reed Freeman Jr.		259
Power Grids and Points o Cybersecurity Concerns	f Vulnerability: Keeping the Lights on A	Amid
Alicia M. McKnight and B	rian E. Finch	265
Incident Reporting and I	Commission Adopts New Rules on Cybo Disclosure for Public Companies Alvarez, Elizabeth P. Gray, Laura E. Jehl,	ersecurity
	olas Chanin, Erik Holmvik and Marc J. Le	ederer 271
FAQs for Businesses as Te Risa B. Boerner and Brent	exas Passes Consumer Privacy Legislation Sedge	on 278
Superior Court of Califor Act Regulations Until Ma	rnia Prohibits Enforcing California Priv arch 2024	acy Rights
Peter A. Blenkinsop, Reed	Abrahamson and Anya L. Gersoff	283
GDPR Compliance in Ab		
Elena Chutrova and Ambro	oise Simon	285
The European Commissio Privacy Framework	on Adopts Adequacy Decision on EU-U	.S. Data
•	lotte H. N. Perowne and Jeanine E. Leah	y 288



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact: Alexandra Jefferies at
Customer Services Department at
Your account manager or

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:

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

(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [1] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [82] (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 © 2023 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 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 **\ODER**

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

JAY D. KENISBERG

Senior Counsel, Rivkin Radler LLP

DAVID C. LASHWAY

Partner, Sidley Austin 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 2023 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, 631.291.5541. 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.

Superior Court of California Prohibits Enforcing California Privacy Rights Act Regulations Until March 2024

By Peter A. Blenkinsop, Reed Abrahamson and Anya L. Gersoff*

In this article, the authors discuss a California court's decision barring enforcement of California Privacy and Protection Agency regulations implementing the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020 until March 2024.

The Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento, Judge James Arguelles presiding, recently issued an order prohibiting the California Privacy and Protection Agency (the Agency) from enforcing regulations implementing the California Privacy Rights Act of 2020 (CPRA or the Act) until a year after those regulations were finalized.

BACKGROUND

The CPRA tasks the Agency with adopting regulations to implement the Act, providing in relevant part that "[t]he timeline for adopting final regulations required by the [A]ct adding this subdivision shall be July 1, 2022," and that "[n]otwithstanding any other law, civil and administrative enforcement of the provisions of law added or amended by this [A]ct shall not commence until July 1, 2023."

On March 29, 2023, the Agency finalized regulations in 12 of the 15 areas contemplated by the Act.² However, the Agency has not finalized regulations in the remaining three areas: cybersecurity audits, risk assessments and automated decision-making technology.³ The Agency has publicly stated that it will enforce the 12 finalized regulations, but that it will hold off on enforcing the three that have not been finalized.

The California Chamber of Commerce sued the Agency, seeking an order compelling the Agency to adopt final regulations for the three remaining areas and to refrain from enforcing all CPRA-implementing regulations until a year after those regulations were adopted. The Chamber of Commerce pointed out that "California voters intended for the Agency to issue the complete regulations covering the fifteen mandatory issues by July 1, 2022,' and that '. . . the voters intended business to have one year from the Agency's adoption of final regulations before the Agency could begin enforcement.'"

^{*} Peter A. Blenkinsop (peter.blenkinsop@faegredrinker.com) and Reed Abrahamson (reed. abrahamson@faegredrinker.com) are partners in the Washington, D.C., office of Faegre Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP. Anya L. Gersoff (anya.gersoff@faegredrinker.com) is an associate at the firm.

¹ Ca. Civ. Code § 1798.185(d).

² See Ca. Civ. Code § 1798.185(a) (listing the 15 areas).

³ See Ca. Civ. Code §§ 1798.185(a)(15)(A), (a)(15)(B), (a)(16).

The Agency responded that "the text of the Act is not so straightforward as to confer a mandatory promulgation deadline of July 1, 2022, nor did the voters intend for impacted businesses to have a 12-month grace period between the Agency's adoption of all final regulations and their enforcement."

THE COURT'S DECISION

After issuing a tentative ruling on June 29 and hearing oral argument on June 30, the court sided with the Chamber of Commerce. It reasoned first that "the Act required the Agency to have published final regulations by July 1, 2022" and second that "voters intended for enforcement not to begin for one year following the Agency's promulgation of final regulations so as to allow sufficient time for affected businesses to become compliant with the regulations."

As a result, the court concluded that "the Agency should be prohibited from enforcing the Act on July 1, 2023 when it failed to pass final regulations by the July 1, 2022 deadline" and stayed "the Agency's enforcement of any Agency regulation implemented pursuant to Subdivision (d) for 12 months after that individual regulation is implemented."

In short, the court ruled that the "Agency may begin enforcing those regulations that became final on March 29, 2023 on March 29, 2024."

CONCLUSION

In summary:

- On March 29, 2023, the Agency finalized regulations in 12 of the 15 areas contemplated by the CPRA;
- The California Chamber of Commerce sued the Agency, seeking an order compelling it to adopt final regulations for the three remaining areas and to refrain from enforcing all CPRA-implementing regulations until a year after those regulations were adopted.
- The court ruled that the "Agency may begin enforcing those regulations that became final on March 29, 2023 on March 29, 2024."