HELPING KILL GOOGLE FOREVER!

What are your thoughts on a Class Action Lawsuit against Alphabet Inc. for Fraud to Defraud business whose websites were dropped in ranking or youtube videos demonitized by ML Fairness Algorythim? (upcounsel.com)

by goatboy

- comments

[–] Lord_Odious_the_Foul 9 points (+9|-0) 8.9 hours ago

I think the best option is to take their ideology, turn up the volume and direct it back at them. Label them white supremacy advocates until they get rid of whites. Label them misogynists until they get rid of the men. Ensure that they up their hiring of “woke wymxn of color”. The entire company will collapse into a thousand pieces, without need for government oversight that will undoubtedly be weaponized against people in the future.

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 4 points (+4|-0) 8.8 hours ago (edited 8.7 hours ago)

Everything you wrote should happen. Plus, the courts must take all their money, plus business damages penalties, plus emotional distress penalties, and give the money and hardware to the

millions of businesses and Youtubers that Alphabet Inc. defrauded- since they implemented ML Fairness Algorithms.

The entire corporation needs to be smashed into little pieces, every penny given to the people and businesses they defrauded and every bolt of every computer they own sold for scrap to pay the fines and damages.

- link
- parent

[–] Lord_Odious_the_Foul 4 points (+4|-0) 8.7 hours ago

Yes but timing is everything; accelerate the rot on the inside, then use the lawsuits as a killing blow. O'Keefe delivered far more damage than what we see now, because now Google doesn't know who to trust within their own walls, and a massive ideological purge is imminent. Now they're fighting a war on two fronts.

- link
- parent

2 replies

[–] Phil_McCracken 0 points (+0|-0) 5 hours ago

Sadly I think there are enough scheming jews, self-interested chinks, and traitorous whites that this won't work. They'll find people to do the work for them no matter what.

- link
- parent

[–] aaronC 7 points (+7|-0) 8.6 hours ago

There needs to be more. Imagine being a moderate or conservative company, spending thousands of dollars on promoting your brand to moderates and conservatives on Twitter, Facebook, Reddit, etc, and then having those sites unjustly target those people, banning them from the platform. If a lot of these companies paying FB, Reddit, Twitter, etc money for promotion would realize that they are wasting their money on accounts that will be banned, they could at best sue and at worst they would stop investing in those platforms.

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 4 points (+4|-0) 8.4 hours ago (edited 8.4 hours ago)

Those who pay to advertise with these subsidiaries of Alphabet Inc. are a whole other count of fraud against them. Holy shit this thing keeps getting bigger and bigger. This may be the google killer after all!

- link
- parent

[–] andrew_jackson 0 points (+0|-0) 6.7 hours ago

You're on the right track. I won't comment on this particular idea of yours, but even if you end up rolling with a different plan you're clearly headed in the right direction. The way to beat these kikes is in the courts. MAGA!

- link
- parent

[–] snafu 3 points (+3|-0) 9.8 hours ago

Unfortunately I think the TOS states that there is no guarantee ranking or monetization, so no fraud occurred as nothing was promised. I think FEC violations are probably a better legal avenue to pursue, or anticompetitive practices as they are purposely manipulating results to influence a market. Iirc individuals can sue under anti-trust laws of they can prove a company is choosing winners in a market using their own position in a market (I think that's how the railroads were broken up back in the day).

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 5 points (+5|-0) 9.5 hours ago (edited 9 hours ago)

There is a massive legal difference between not guaranteeing a service or payment and actively working with intent to prevent others from making money. In other words to defraud the other company or actively prevent them from making money through fraud.

Alphabet Inc. created the ML Fairness Algorithm with intent to manipulate facts and prevent other businesses from profiting- this is explicit fraud to defraud. It is a massive tort fuck up, if not a criminal action as well.

- link
- parent

[–] snafu 1 points (+1|-0) 9.2 hours ago

Oh I completely agree, but that wouldn't be covered under fraud, it would be covered under anti-trust laws.

- link
- parent

1 reply

[–] PewterKey 3 points (+3|-0) 9 hours ago

I would let the courts decide that. I'd really like to see how a civil trial jury would determine what the perception of google's TOS are. And there are several arguments that this could be very difficult to defend against. Then we have this lovely thing, TOS is basically has the legal history of a lawyer's paperweight. I wouldn't be surprised if google's TOS is gutted in court or even used against them.

Did google commit tortious interference by tweaking algorithms to impact conservative groups and companies? Because if a web designer has a contract with a liberal site, they might be able to optimize very easily and in turn promised similar results to a conservative site. But because google actively interfered with their algorithm to target that site (and other similar sites), it can be argued that google broke a number of business laws and possibly anti-discrimination laws (religion is protected, willing to bet churches hired someone to write their website). The contract between two parties was targeted and monetarily damaged by the company that is suppose to be a neutral messenger. That sure looks like tortious interference. If UPS took your companies products, broke them as part of company policy, then delivered them to the customer, you would have a really

good claim to sue UPS. And that is a very similar situation to google.

I think if google ends up sitting in front of a jury, a lot of the implied protections will go out the window. Because people know how they feel about google websites and TOS. They know how the sites have been marketed and will likely be hostile to some google favoring legal definitions.

What would be very interesting would be taking a peak at google's 401k and other investments and how they relate to their optimization.

Honestly this might be an attorney feeding frenzy. Google is going into discovery in a class action lawsuit with conservative employees and conservative applicants. If something in that discover leads down into a bigger rabbit hole, particularly with the P. V. video, google might be publishing a lot of evidence that opens them up to future litigation.

- link
- parent

[–] RoundWheel 1 points (+1|-0) 8 hours ago (edited 8 hours ago)

Except they promised they are a neutral party with the implication ranking is based on popularity and correctness. Turns out they use their fraudulent cover to mislead, manipulate, and craft public perception while financially injuring parties they specifically mislead to their platforms. Which is yet another fraud. Torturous interference?

There are in fact multiple fraud angles. Likewise, any and all injured by their fraud is due restitution.

- link
- parent

[–] fightknightHERO 2 points (+2|-0) 8 hours ago

nothing will come out of it, it's not like the (((govt))) will ever persecute (((silicon valley)))

it's all just smoke and mirrors, similar with the faceberg trials

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 3 points (+3|-0) 7.5 hours ago

That's what they said about the Tobacco industry...

- link
- parent

[–] kidehakki 1 points (+1|-0) 6.5 hours ago

It's still here...

- link
- parent

1 reply

[–] beesmeesmonies -1 points (+0|-1) 4.8 hours ago

google is not silicon valley.... google is an agent of shitsrael who ironically has it fully engaged in wartime propaganda aimed at

its host country...

- link
- parent

[–] fightknightHERO 1 points (+1|-0) 4.7 hours ago (edited 4.7 hours ago)

i know Faceberg HQ is located in Tel-aviv Rothschild Blvd

so it does make sense... i do know they are moving Silicon Valley staff from US to Israel because their (((diversity))) programs are losing them money

but what if their main goal isn't money but **pure** propaganda?

and what happens if their propaganda doesn't work? do they get reshuffled back to Commiefornia?

- link
- parent

1 reply

[–] ALIENS2222 1 points (+1|-0) 7.4 hours ago

I would join it ... but what would I get?! A free month of google? No one but lawyers get paid in these class actions. The class just gets coupons and shit like that.

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 3 points (+3|-0) 7.4 hours ago

Defrauding business partners is a whole other type of lawsuit and in a very different league for penalties than a simple Service failure or mischaracterization.

It's very possible Alphabet Inc and Google will be forced to break up to pay this level of fines and damages.

- link
- parent

[–] Goys-R-Us 0 points (+0|-0) 2 hours ago

You would get nothing but a coupon and the satisfaction of watching the goyim beat the jewish goliath called jewgle.

- link
- parent

[–] canbot 1 points (+1|-0) 7.4 hours ago

You should definitely start a youtuber union. Collective bargaining for better conditions.

- link

[–] kidehakki 1 points (+1|-0) 8.2 hours ago

Terms and conditions

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 2 points (+2|-0) 7.6 hours ago (edited 7.5 hours ago)

Fraud to defraud . Nothing in the T&C claim an agreement to have one's business defrauded.

- link
- parent

[–] kidehakki 1 points (+1|-0) 6.6 hours ago

How do you prove that when "offended" can be interpreted as "hate speech" ? It is all encompassing term that can be anything.

Maybe on jury trial this could be possible... But fighting the system within the system still feels futile.

- link
- parent

1 reply

[–] JimSoddell 0 points (+0|-0) 2.9 hours ago (edited 2.9 hours ago)

Are any people still using Google/Youtube, other than dumbasses?

- link

[–] RussKurtell 0 points (+0|-0) 6.2 hours ago

This MUST happen. Only way to force action.

- link

[–] Gorillion 0 points (+0|-0) 6.2 hours ago

Be prepared for the judge and lawyers and some of the more prominent claimants to get assassinated.

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 0 points (+0|-0) 5.6 hours ago (edited 5.6 hours ago)

Doesn't matter. This is big because now that the courts are involved and both civil and criminal charges are possible at such a massive level- the Military Industrial Complex can no longer aid Alphabet Inc. Officers will not risk their careers or pensions. National Security Corporations will not risk their future contracting worthiness to save a dying leviathan.

This very likely is the beginning of the end of Alphabet Inc.

- link
- parent

[–] Xax 0 points (+0|-0) 6.5 hours ago

It's a fucking search engine. I can put search terms in my PC to look for files and it doesn't demonetize me, or deplatform me, or push honk worthy degeneracy in my face.

How the fuck did these Jews make a service out of a programmable operation?

(((They))) are not needed. In fact, (((they))) make the world worse.

- link

[–] Ghetto_Shitlord 0 points (+0|-0) 7.3 hours ago

Tossed, what laws apply to your idea? Fraud, did Google guarantee any ranking? Demonitized, did they have contract guaranteeing revenue?

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 1 points (+1|-0) 7 hours ago (edited 6.3 hours ago)

There's about a million laws protecting businesses from being defrauded by other businesses. Take your pick. Torturous interference for one. Page ranking has very little to do with it. The fact Google created a sophisticated system to manipulate facts, distort the brand image of other businesses, prevented other businesses from making money, and prevented business partners (whom Google profited of those other business creative works previously) from engaging in business... that's the point.

- link
- parent

[–] OmarComin 0 points (+0|-0) 6.2 hours ago

What exactly is the fraud? Fraud has an actual legal meaning -- it doesn't just mean "I don't like what this company did." Here are the elements of a common law fraud claim:

1. a representation was made
2. the representation was false
3. that when made, the defendant knew that the representation was false or that the defendant made the statement recklessly without knowledge of its truth

4. that the fraudulent misrepresentation was made with the intention that the plaintiff rely on it
5. that the plaintiff did rely on the fraudulent misrepresentation
6. that the plaintiff suffered harm as a result of the fraudulent misrepresentation

https://www.law.cornell.edu/wex/fraudulent_misrepresentation

Can you point to specific statements Google made that it knew were false, that it intended some other business to rely on, that the other businesses did rely on and were harmed as a result?

- link
- parent

1 reply

[–] speedisavirus 0 points (+0|-0) 7.2 hours ago

The question is more about did they imply or guarantee treating content equally which they are supposed to in order to maintain their protections.

- link
- parent

[–] whambamthankyouham 0 points (+0|-0) 7.6 hours ago

Yes.

- link

[–] polygeek 0 points (+0|-0) 7.9 hours ago (edited 7.9 hours ago)

There is no right to monetization or promotion.

Prove they're de-ranking you or censoring you because of your political views could be a thing since they have claimed to be both a platform and a publisher at the same time. Platforms don't get to censor, and are therefore not accountable for the content. Publishers can be sued for content which is defamatory or libelous, so they get to take down whatever they want and claim they're protecting themselves.

If you want to be successful, you have to prove intent and damage. Do you think you can have better lawyers than the most successful information company which has ever existed? Fuck no.

It must be made eminently obvious the company is garbage and their talent will leave of it's own volition. We need to find a way to support their insiders.

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 1 points (+1|-0) 7.6 hours ago

Every business absolutely has a right to not be defrauded. Fraud to defraud is very different legally than simple demonetization or a drop in page rank.

It doesn't matter how good their lawyers are for one simple reason- lawyers will always lawyer. When the facts are not on their side, as is clearly the case here, and the potential for massive success and money on the opposite position, then the

very best lawyers will abandon ship like ths rats they are. The best lawyers on the planet are not going to let their reputations be tarnished by sticking on the losing side...

And when the States Attornies General get involved, it'll be a whole other level.

Hahahahaha

- link
- parent

[–] OmarComin 0 points (+0|-0) 6.4 hours ago

> Prove they're de-ranking you or censoring you because of your political views could be a thing since they have claimed to be both a platform and a publisher at the same time. Platforms don't get to censor, and are therefore not accountable for the content. Publishers can be sued for content which is defamatory or libelous, so they get to take down whatever they want and claim they're protecting themselves.

This is false. CDA Sec. 230 gives Internet companies immunity even if they moderate content. They can "censor" all they want. Read the language of the law. They can't be held liable for any actions they take to limit access to content they consider to be "objectionable."

> (c) Protection for “Good Samaritan” blocking and screening of offensive material (1) Treatment of publisher or speaker No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall

be treated as the publisher or speaker of any information provided by another information content provider.

(2) Civil liability No provider or user of an interactive computer service shall be held liable on account of— (A) any action voluntarily taken in good faith to restrict access to or availability of material that the provider or user considers to be obscene, lewd, lascivious, filthy, excessively violent, harassing, or otherwise objectionable, whether or not such material is constitutionally protected; or

https://www.law.cornell.edu/uscode/text/47/230

- link
- parent

[–] polygeek 0 points (+0|-0) 2.4 hours ago (edited 2.4 hours ago)

Section 230 Samaritan exception was created for small companies, not monopolies. It's being abused and the law has to change.

- link
- parent

1 reply

[–] rspix000 0 points (+0|-0) 7.9 hours ago

TOS prohibits class actions and requires individual arbitrations. This is legal BTW. Makes small theft by corps unreachable. Thanks the-best-money-can-buy politicians.

- link

[–] goatboy [S] 1 points (+1|-0) 7.5 hours ago (edited 7.5 hours ago)

Doesn't apply when the company actively and with intent defrauded their business partners. ML Fairness Algorithm is an intentional and active system used to defraud their business partners from making money or conducting business.

- link
- parent