

1 PAUL HOFFMAN #71244
2 JOHN WASHINGTON #315991
3 Schonbrun, Seplow, Harris,
4 Hoffman & Zeldes LLP
5 200 Pier Avenue, Suite 226
6 Hermosa Beach, CA 90254
7 T: (424) 297-0114
8 F: (310) 399-7040
9 hoffpaul@aol.com

*Counsel for all Plaintiffs**

**See Signature Page for Complete List of
Plaintiffs*

CARRIE DECELL**
JAMEEL JAFFER**
ALEX ABDO**
STEPHANIE KRENT**
EVAN WELBER FALCÓN**
Knight First Amendment Institute
at Columbia University
475 Riverside Drive, Suite 302
New York, NY 10115
T: (646) 745-8500
F: (646) 661-3361
carrie.decell@knightcolumbia.org

*Counsel for all Plaintiffs**

***Application for Admission Pro Hac Vice
To Be Filed*

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION**

15 CARLOS DADA, SERGIO ARAUZ,
16 GABRIELA CÁCERES GUTIÉRREZ, JULIA
17 GAVARRETE, ROMAN GRESSIER,
18 GABRIEL LABRADOR, ANA BEATRIZ
19 LAZO ESCOBAR, EFREN LEMUS,
20 CARLOS MARTÍNEZ, ÓSCAR MARTÍNEZ,
21 MARÍA LUZ NÓCHEZ, VÍCTOR PEÑA,
22 NELSON RAUDA ZABLAH, MAURICIO
23 SANDOVAL SORIANO, and JOSÉ LUIS
24 SANZ,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NSO GROUP TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED
and Q CYBER TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED,

Defendants.

Case No. _____

COMPLAINT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

INTRODUCTION

1
2 1. Defendants NSO Group Technologies Limited and Q Cyber
3 Technologies Limited develop spyware—malicious surveillance software—and sell
4 it to rights-abusing governments. With Defendants’ technology and assistance, these
5 governments surveil journalists, human rights advocates, and political opponents,
6 often in the service of broader campaigns of political intimidation and persecution.
7 As the U.S. Department of Commerce observed last year when it added NSO Group
8 to its “Entity List,” Defendants’ spyware has enabled authoritarian governments to
9 “conduct transnational repression”—to reach across borders and stifle dissent. In
10 recent years, the supply of spyware to authoritarian and other rights-abusing
11 governments, by Defendants and other mercenary spyware companies, has become
12 a grave and urgent threat to human rights and press freedom around the world.

13 2. Defendants’ signature product, usually sold under the name “Pegasus,”
14 is a particularly sophisticated and insidious type of spyware. Defendants and their
15 clients can install Pegasus on a target’s smartphone remotely and surreptitiously,
16 without any action by the target. Once installed, Pegasus gives its operators
17 essentially full control of the device. They can covertly extract contact lists, calendar
18 entries, text and instant messages, notes, emails, search histories, and GPS locations.
19 They can turn on the smartphone’s microphone to record surrounding sounds. They
20 can activate the smartphone’s camera to take photographs. They can also copy
21 authentication keys to gain access to cloud-based accounts. Defendants highlight
22 these and other capabilities in their marketing materials.

23 3. Defendants developed Pegasus, and deploy it, by repeatedly accessing
24 computer servers owned by U.S. technology companies, including Apple Inc., a
25 company based in Cupertino, California. As relevant to this case, Defendants
26 accessed Apple servers to identify and exploit vulnerabilities in Apple software and
27 services, to enable the delivery of Pegasus to targets’ iPhones, and to allow Pegasus
28 operators to extract data from their targets’ iPhones and their targets’ cloud-based

1 accounts. On information and belief, some of the Apple servers that Defendants
2 abused to facilitate the delivery and operation of Pegasus in this case are located in
3 California. In November 2021, Apple sued Defendants in this district, asserting that,
4 through their development and deployment of spyware, they had exploited Apple's
5 software and services, damaged its business and goodwill, and injured its users.

6 4. Plaintiffs in this case include journalists and others who write, produce,
7 and publish El Faro, a digital newspaper based in El Salvador that has become one
8 of the foremost sources of independent news in Central America—in the words of
9 the International Press Institute, a “paragon of investigative journalism . . . with its
10 fearless coverage of violence, corruption, inequality, and human rights violations.”
11 El Faro has a broad readership not only in Central America, but also in the United
12 States, and particularly here in California. Plaintiffs include Carlos Dada, El Faro's
13 co-founder and director; Roman Gressier, an El Faro reporter who is a U.S. citizen;
14 Nelson Rauda Zablah, a former El Faro reporter who currently lives in the United
15 States; José Luis Sanz, the Washington correspondent for El Faro, who also currently
16 lives in the United States; and eleven other El Faro employees.

17 5. Between June 2020 and November 2021, at least twenty-two people
18 associated with El Faro, including Plaintiffs, were the victims of Pegasus attacks.
19 Their devices were accessed remotely and surreptitiously, their communications and
20 activities monitored, and their personal data accessed and stolen. Many of these
21 attacks occurred when they were communicating with confidential sources,
22 including U.S. Embassy officials, and reporting on abuses by the Salvadoran
23 government. The journalists and others who were the victims of these Pegasus
24 attacks learned of them only much later. When they came to light, the attacks were
25 condemned by human rights and press freedom groups around the world. For
26 example, a coalition of civil society groups from Central America and the United
27 States issued a joint statement in January 2022 denouncing the attacks and decrying
28

1 “[t]he lack of accountability for such egregious conduct by public authorities and
2 private companies.”

3 6. The Pegasus attacks have profoundly disrupted Plaintiffs’ lives and
4 work. The attacks have compromised Plaintiffs’ safety as well as the safety of their
5 colleagues, sources, and family members. The attacks have deterred some sources
6 from sharing information with Plaintiffs. Some Plaintiffs have been diverted from
7 pressing investigative projects by the necessity of assessing which data was stolen,
8 and of taking precautions against the possibility that the stolen data will be exploited.
9 Plaintiffs have also had to expend substantial resources to protect their devices
10 against possible future attacks, to ensure their personal safety, and to address serious
11 physical and mental health issues resulting from the attacks. The attacks have
12 undermined the security that is a precondition for the independent journalism that El
13 Faro strives to provide its readers, as well as the ability of El Faro’s readers,
14 including those in the United States, to obtain independent analysis of events in
15 Central America.

16 7. Defendants’ development and deployment of Pegasus against Plaintiffs
17 was unlawful. It violated the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030, and
18 the California Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud Act, Cal. Penal
19 Code § 502, and it constituted trespass to chattels and intrusion upon seclusion. This
20 is a suit for injunctive and declaratory relief, as well as compensatory and punitive
21 damages.

22 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

23 8. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’ federal causes of action
24 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

25 9. This Court has jurisdiction over Plaintiffs’ state law causes of action
26 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367, because these claims arise out of the same nucleus of
27 operative fact as Plaintiffs’ federal statutory claims.

28

1 10. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants because
2 Defendants have purposefully availed themselves of California as a forum and have
3 purposefully directed their tortious activities at California. A court in this district
4 exercised personal jurisdiction over Defendants based on substantially similar facts
5 in *WhatsApp Inc. v. NSO Group Technologies Limited*, 472 F. Supp. 3d 649 (N.D.
6 Cal. 2020).

7 11. Alternatively, this Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendants
8 pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(k)(2), because Plaintiffs' claims arise
9 under federal law; if Defendants are not subject to jurisdiction in California, then
10 they are not subject to jurisdiction in any state's courts of general jurisdiction; and
11 exercising jurisdiction over Defendants is consistent with U.S. law and the U.S.
12 Constitution.

13 12. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) or,
14 alternatively, 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(3).

15 **DIVISIONAL ASSIGNMENT**

16 13. Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-2(e), this case may be assigned to the
17 San Jose division because a substantial part of the events giving rise to Plaintiffs'
18 claims occurred in Santa Clara County, where Apple is located.

19 **PARTIES**

20 ***Plaintiffs***

21 14. Plaintiff Carlos Dada is the director of El Faro, which he co-founded in
22 1998. His reporting focuses on corruption and violence, and he has reported from
23 numerous conflict zones, including in Guatemala, Honduras, Iraq, Mexico, and
24 Venezuela. In 2011, he won the Maria Moors Cabot Prize for Latin American
25 Reporting. In 2022, he was honored by the International Press Institute and
26 International Media Support with a World Press Freedom Hero award, which
27 recognizes "journalists who have made significant contributions to promote press
28 freedom, particularly in the face of great personal risk." He also won the 2022

1 International Center for Journalists’ Knight Trailblazer Award for “his hard-hitting
2 investigative reporting, lyrical writing and visionary leadership.” He lives in San
3 Salvador, El Salvador.

4 15. Plaintiff Sergio Arauz is the deputy editor-in-chief of El Faro, where he
5 has worked since 2001. His reporting focuses on politics and human rights. He lives
6 in San Salvador.

7 16. Plaintiff Gabriela Cáceres Gutiérrez is a reporter for El Faro, where she
8 has worked since 2018. In 2021, she, along with Plaintiffs Carlos Martínez and Óscar
9 Martínez, undertook one of El Faro’s most significant investigations, revealing
10 secret negotiations held in maximum security prisons between the Bukele
11 Administration and incarcerated members of El Salvador’s three main gangs: Mara
12 Salvatrucha (“MS-13”), Barrio 18 Revolucionarios, and Barrio 18 Sureños. She lives
13 in San Salvador.

14 17. Plaintiff Julia Gavarrete is a reporter for El Faro, where she has worked
15 since 2021. She has more than a decade of experience reporting in El Salvador and
16 Central America, and her reporting focuses on vulnerable communities in Central
17 America, on women’s rights, and on environmental issues. She currently lives in
18 Berlin, Germany while on a four-month fellowship with Reporters Sans Frontières.

19 18. Plaintiff Roman Gressier is a reporter for El Faro, where he has worked
20 since November 2019. He writes El Faro’s English-language newsletter and has
21 reported extensively on Central American politics, human rights, and press freedom.
22 He is a dual citizen of the United States and France.

23 19. Plaintiff Gabriel Labrador is a reporter for El Faro, where he has
24 worked since 2011. He has been a reporter for more than eighteen years, and he has
25 reported extensively on criminal justice and public corruption, including on a
26 Salvadoran Supreme Court magistrate’s ties to the MS-13 gang, on the political and
27 policymaking roles of President Bukele’s brothers, and on detentions during El
28 Salvador’s recent “state of exception.” He lives in San Salvador.

1 20. Plaintiff Ana Beatriz Lazo Escobar is a marketing manager for El Faro,
2 where she has worked since 2015. She lives in Tamanique, El Salvador.

3 21. Plaintiff Efren Lemus is a reporter for El Faro, where he has worked
4 since 2011. He has written about gang violence and El Salvador's attempts to curtail
5 it, about the treatment of detainees during El Salvador's state of exception, and about
6 accusations of wrongdoing and corruption within the governing Nuevas Ideas party.
7 He also co-wrote an in-depth profile of the MS-13 gang for The New York Times.
8 He lives in San Salvador.

9 22. Plaintiff Carlos Martínez is a reporter for El Faro, where he has worked
10 since 2004. He is one of the founding members of Sala Negra, El Faro's investigative
11 journalism team. His reporting focuses on gang violence and official misconduct.
12 He has worked on some of El Faro's most important stories, including an
13 investigation into the Bukele Administration's secret negotiations with incarcerated
14 gang members, and co-wrote an in-depth profile of the MS-13 gang for The New
15 York Times. He lives in La Libertad, El Salvador.

16 23. Plaintiff Óscar Martínez is the editor-in-chief of El Faro, where he has
17 worked since January 2007. A founding member of Sala Negra, he reports on issues
18 of gang violence, migration, and official misconduct. He has been awarded the
19 Fernando Benítez National Journalism Award in Mexico, the José Simeón Cañas
20 Central American University in El Salvador Human Rights Prize, and the Maria
21 Moors Cabot Prize. He lives in San Salvador.

22 24. Plaintiff María Luz Nóchez is a reporter and the Opinion editor for El
23 Faro, where she has worked since 2011. She reports on arts and culture, violence
24 against women and the LGBTQ community, and the rights of Indigenous people.
25 She lives in Santa Tecla, El Salvador.

26 25. Plaintiff Víctor Peña is a photojournalist for El Faro, where he has
27 worked since 2016. He contributes photography and other audiovisual and graphic
28

1 material to El Faro, focusing on issues relating to women's rights, inequality,
2 pollution, and migration. He lives in San Salvador.

3 26. Plaintiff Nelson Rauda Zablah worked as a reporter and hosted a twice-
4 weekly radio show for El Faro from 2015 to August 2022. He has a decade of
5 experience covering corruption, crime, the justice system, politics, migration, and
6 human rights. His work has also been published in The New York Times, The
7 Washington Post, the Los Angeles Times, ProPublica, the BBC, and El Diario. He
8 previously served as secretary to the Board of Directors of the Asociación de
9 Periodistas de El Salvador (APES), the Salvadoran journalists' association. He
10 currently lives in New York City while pursuing a master's degree at Columbia
11 Journalism School.

12 27. Plaintiff Mauricio Ernesto Sandoval Soriano is the general
13 administrator of El Faro, where he has worked since 2018. He lives in Antiguo
14 Cuscatlán, El Salvador.

15 28. Plaintiff José Luis Sanz is the Washington correspondent for El Faro,
16 where he has worked since 2001. He was the director of El Faro from 2014 to
17 December 2020. A founding member of Sala Negra, he previously reported on issues
18 of violence, gangs, and organized crime in Central America. He now reports on
19 human rights, migration, and corruption. He currently lives in Washington, D.C.

20 *Defendants*

21 29. Defendant NSO Group Technologies Limited is a limited liability
22 company that was incorporated in Israel on January 25, 2010. NSO Group develops
23 highly sophisticated spyware; sells that spyware to government clients around the
24 world, including to governments associated with grave abuses of human rights;
25 trains those clients in the use of the spyware; and assists those clients in its
26 deployment. NSO Group is a subsidiary of Q Cyber Technologies Limited, and, on
27 information and belief, it sometimes operates under that name.

1 30. Defendant Q Cyber Technologies Limited is a limited liability
2 company. It was originally incorporated in Israel on December 2, 2013 under the
3 name L.E.G.D. Company Limited, but changed its name to Q Cyber Technologies
4 on May 29, 2016. Q Cyber is the parent company of NSO Group and a subsidiary of
5 OSY Technologies SARL.

6 31. As discussed further below, Defendants have purposefully directed
7 their tortious activities at the State of California. They have also purposefully availed
8 themselves of the United States, and the State of California in particular. For
9 example, for most of the past decade, NSO Group has been principally funded and
10 controlled by California-based companies, including Francisco Partners and
11 Berkeley Research Group. In addition, Q Cyber established a U.S. sales arm called
12 Westbridge Technologies, Inc. to market Defendants' spyware to law enforcement
13 agencies across the United States. Omrie Lavie, one of the three co-founders of NSO
14 Group, co-founded and served as the CEO of Westbridge. Defendants and
15 Westbridge hired U.S.-based firms to help market Defendants' spyware and oversee
16 their public relations in the United States. Defendants and Westbridge endeavored
17 to sell Defendants' technology to U.S. government agencies, including the Central
18 Intelligence Agency, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and the Secret Service,
19 as well as to local law enforcement agencies, including the Los Angeles and San
20 Diego Police Departments. In 2019, Defendants sold a version of Pegasus to the
21 Federal Bureau of Investigation and trained FBI agents as they tested and evaluated
22 the spyware. The FBI ultimately paid Defendants roughly \$5 million in fees.

23 32. On information and belief, at all times material to this case, each
24 Defendant was the agent, partner, alter ego, subsidiary, parent, and/or co-conspirator
25 of and with the other Defendant, and the acts of each Defendant were within the
26 scope of that relationship; each Defendant knowingly and intentionally agreed with
27 the other to carry out the acts alleged in this Complaint; and in carrying out the acts
28

1 alleged in this Complaint, each Defendant acted with the knowledge, permission,
2 and consent of the other, and each Defendant aided and abetted the other.

3 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

4 *Pegasus*

5 33. Defendants develop highly sophisticated spyware; sell that spyware to
6 government clients around the world, including to governments associated with
7 grave abuses of human rights; train those clients in the use of the spyware; and assist
8 those clients in its deployment.

9 34. Defendants' signature product is called Pegasus. Plaintiffs use the term
10 "Pegasus" throughout this Complaint to refer to any of the products that Defendants
11 market that are identical or substantially similar to Pegasus.

12 35. Pegasus enables its operators to take full control of a target's
13 smartphone remotely and surreptitiously. According to Defendants' marketing
14 materials, Pegasus can be used to remotely and covertly surveil and extract contact
15 details, text messages, instant messages, notes, emails, web-browsing activity, files,
16 and passwords. It can be used to monitor phone calls and VoIP calls, as well as user
17 activity on different applications, including WhatsApp, Facebook, and Skype. It can
18 be used to track and log a device's GPS location. And it can be used to activate the
19 device's microphone to record surrounding sounds, and to activate the device's
20 camera to take photographs.

21 36. Pegasus can also give its operators access to data stored in the cloud.
22 According to news reports, Pegasus allows its operators to copy the authentication
23 keys that smartphones use to access U.S.-based cloud services such as iCloud,
24 Google Drive, and Facebook Messenger. Pegasus operators can use those keys to
25 gain access to data stored on those cloud servers—including documents and
26 photographs—without the knowledge of the smartphone's user.

27 37. It is practically impossible for individuals to protect themselves against
28 Pegasus attacks. Pegasus can be installed surreptitiously, without the smartphone

1 user’s involvement or awareness, through “zero-click” attacks. It can be installed
2 remotely, eliminating the need for physical proximity to a target’s smartphone as
3 well as any reliance on local mobile network operators. It can also circumvent
4 ordinary security measures—such as the use of encryption—because it allows its
5 operators to access an infected device as though they were the device’s user. In
6 addition, it is designed to subvert safeguards that would otherwise alert the target to
7 its presence. On iPhones, for example, Pegasus disables crash reporting to Apple,
8 and many of the malicious processes that Pegasus runs on a device following an
9 infection have been given names similar to those of legitimate iOS system processes.

10 38. Independent security researchers at the Citizen Lab, Access Now, and
11 Amnesty International—all organizations that have conducted in-depth
12 investigations of spyware attacks around the world—have concluded that Plaintiffs
13 in this case were targeted through zero-click attacks directed at their iPhones.
14 Investigations by these researchers indicate that Defendants carried out these attacks
15 in the stages described below. On information and belief, the Pegasus attacks against
16 Plaintiffs required Defendants to interact extensively with Apple’s U.S.-based
17 servers, many of which are in California.

18 39. First, Defendants identified vulnerabilities in Apple software and
19 services that could be used in the process of infecting targeted iPhones with Pegasus.
20 Defendants created Apple ID accounts specifically for the purpose of identifying
21 these vulnerabilities. Ordinarily, Apple ID accounts are used by Apple to
22 authenticate its customers when they use Apple services. In contrast, Defendants
23 used their Apple ID accounts to discover vulnerabilities in Apple’s software, to
24 probe Apple’s servers and services, and to test the software that Defendants
25 developed to infect iPhones with Pegasus.

26 40. Second, Defendants and their clients exploited the vulnerabilities that
27 they identified to infect targeted iPhones with Pegasus. To initiate a zero-click
28 attack, Defendants and their clients used the target’s Apple ID or other information

1 to confirm that the target was in fact using an iPhone, and then Defendants used their
2 own Apple ID accounts to send malicious data to the device by leveraging the
3 communications between Apple’s services and the targeted iPhone. The malicious
4 data caused the device to retrieve Pegasus (and other malicious data precipitating the
5 Pegasus infection) through a network of servers operated and/or maintained by
6 Defendants. In this case, Plaintiffs’ iPhones were infected using zero-click exploits
7 known as KISMET and FORCEDENTRY. Defendants and their clients appear to
8 have executed both of these exploits by using Apple ID accounts to send malicious
9 data through Apple’s iMessage service. In the case of at least FORCEDENTRY, the
10 Pegasus file was stored temporarily, in encrypted form, on one of Apple’s iCloud
11 servers before delivery to a target’s iPhone.

12 41. Third, Pegasus operators used command-and-control servers to exploit
13 the Pegasus infection, taking control of the infected iPhone. The operators could use
14 these servers to issue commands to each infected device—for example, to exfiltrate
15 data, to enable location tracking, or to record audio and take photographs using the
16 device’s microphone and camera. If a Pegasus operator extracted authentication keys
17 from an infected iPhone, the operator could use those keys to access and extract data
18 from the targeted individual’s cloud-based accounts. Pegasus infections were
19 sometimes short-lived (allowing operators to hack their targets’ iPhones, exfiltrate
20 data of potential interest, and then attempt to cover their tracks by deleting traces of
21 the infection) and sometimes prolonged or “active” (allowing operators to conduct
22 ongoing surveillance, albeit at greater risk of discovery). Even when Defendants’
23 employees were not themselves the Pegasus operators at this stage of the attacks,
24 Defendants remained involved by configuring and maintaining the operators’
25 command-and-control servers, ensuring that infected devices were running the latest
26 version of the Pegasus software, and providing ongoing technical assistance to the
27 operators. Defendants also offered extensive customer support, including on-the-
28 ground support during the initial deployment and/or continued operation of Pegasus,

1 technical support by email and phone, and engineer support through remote desktop
2 software and/or a virtual private network.

3 42. In July 2021, Amnesty International concluded that Defendants were,
4 at that time, able to remotely and covertly compromise all recent iPhone models and
5 versions of Apple's mobile operating system using the process described above or
6 one similar to it.

7 ***The Threat Pegasus Poses to Press Freedom and Human Rights***

8 43. Defendants have sold Pegasus to authoritarian and rights-abusing
9 governments around the world, and many of those governments have used the
10 spyware to target journalists, human rights activists, and political opponents.

11 44. According to the Pegasus Project, a collaboration of more than eighty
12 journalists from seventeen media organizations in ten countries, at least 180
13 journalists from twenty countries have been the victims of Pegasus attacks directed
14 by authoritarian or rights-abusing governments. For example, Saudi authorities used
15 Pegasus to surveil family members and close associates of journalist Jamal
16 Khashoggi—whom Saudi agents brutally murdered in 2018—as well as other Saudi
17 activists, an Amnesty International researcher, and an American New York Times
18 journalist who has reported extensively on the country. Morocco used Pegasus to
19 spy on journalist Omar Radi. Mexican officials used Pegasus to surveil journalists
20 and lawyers investigating corruption and human rights abuses in the country.
21 Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orbán also used Pegasus to surveil journalists,
22 lawyers, and social activists.

23 45. Prominent human rights activists, diplomats, and political opposition
24 figures, too, have been frequent victims of Pegasus attacks. For example, in 2021
25 alone, Defendants' clients used Pegasus to surveil U.S. diplomats working in
26 Uganda; Carine Kanimba, a dual U.S.–Belgian citizen who was targeted while she
27 was campaigning for the release of her father, Hotel Rwanda hero Paul
28 Rusesabagina, from detention; Lama Fakih, a prominent Lebanese activist and

1 Human Rights Watch director; at least four members of the civic youth movement
2 “Oyan, Qazaqstan” (“Wake Up, Khazakhstan”); and at least thirty pro-democracy
3 protesters and activists in Thailand. In 2020, more than sixty pro-Catalonian
4 independence activists were the victims of Pegasus attacks. And in 2019, at least
5 three human rights activists in India were surveilled with Pegasus while they were
6 advocating for the release of other imprisoned activists, and Polish senator Krzysztof
7 Brejza was surveilled with Pegasus while he was running a parliamentary election
8 campaign.

9 46. The supply of spyware to authoritarian and rights-abusing regimes, by
10 Defendants and other mercenary spyware manufacturers like them, is now widely
11 understood to present an urgent challenge to press freedom around the world.

12 47. In November 2021, the U.S. Department of Commerce added NSO
13 Group to its “Entity List” based on evidence that it had “supplied spyware to foreign
14 governments that used” the spyware “to maliciously target government officials,
15 journalists, businesspeople, activists, academics, and embassy workers,” as well as
16 to target “dissidents, journalists and activists outside of their sovereign borders to
17 silence dissent.” The Commerce Department described the designation of NSO
18 Group as part of a broader effort to “stem the proliferation of digital tools used for
19 repression” and to “improv[e] citizens’ digital security, combat[] cyber threats, and
20 mitigat[e] unlawful surveillance.” In June 2022, the Biden Administration opposed
21 U.S. government contractor L3Harris Technologies’ bid to acquire NSO Group,
22 observing that Pegasus had been “misused around the world to enable human rights
23 abuses, including to target journalists, human rights activists, or others perceived as
24 dissidents and critics.” And in its October 2022 National Security Strategy, the Biden
25 Administration pledged “to counter the exploitation of American’s [sic] sensitive
26 data and illegitimate use of technology, including commercial spyware and
27 surveillance technology,” and to “stand against digital authoritarianism.”
28

1 48. Congress has also begun to act against the threats posed by spyware.
2 On July 27, 2022, the Chair of the U.S. House Permanent Select Committee on
3 Intelligence called the widespread availability of spyware like Pegasus a “game-
4 changer for autocratic regimes that are looking for new means to surveil, intimidate,
5 imprison, or even kill dissidents, journalists, and others who they view as a threat.”
6 The Committee subsequently approved legislation that would empower the Director
7 of National Intelligence to prohibit the U.S. intelligence community from buying
8 and using foreign spyware, and that would authorize the President to impose
9 sanctions on foreign firms and individuals that sell, purchase, or use spyware.

10 49. Digital security researchers and human rights advocates have also
11 expressed increasing alarm about the implications of spyware for privacy, free
12 speech, and other human rights. Ronald Deibert, Director of the Citizen Lab at the
13 University of Toronto’s Munk School of Global Affairs & Public Policy, has warned
14 that “[a]dvanced spyware is to surveillance [what] nuclear technology is to
15 weapons—it represents a quantum leap forward in sophistication and power.” David
16 Kaye, former UN Special Rapporteur on freedom of expression and opinion, has
17 explained that “spyware with the characteristics of Pegasus—the capability to access
18 one’s entire device and data connected to it, without discrimination, and without
19 constraint—*already* violates . . . international human rights law,” concluding that
20 “[n]o government should have such a tool, and no private company should be able
21 to sell such a tool to governments or others.” Dr. Agnès Callamard, Secretary
22 General of Amnesty International and former UN Special Rapporteur on
23 extrajudicial, summary or arbitrary executions, has explained that “[w]e are
24 witnessing a global spyware crisis in which activists, journalists and lawyers are
25 targeted with invasive surveillance as a means to silence and intimidate them.”

26 *The Pegasus Attacks on El Faro*

27 50. Between June 2020 and November 2021, Defendants and their clients
28 surreptitiously installed Pegasus on the devices of at least thirty-five individuals

1 working in and around El Salvador. These Pegasus attacks targeted independent
2 journalists and media organizations, as well as leaders of prominent civil society
3 organizations.

4 51. No organization was more profoundly impacted by the Pegasus attacks
5 than El Faro. A digital newspaper based in El Salvador, El Faro is one of the
6 foremost sources of independent journalism in Central America. It is dedicated to
7 investigative and in-depth reporting on issues including corruption, violence,
8 organized crime, migration, inequality, and human rights. Since its founding in 1998,
9 it has become a regional benchmark for independent, transparent, and reliable
10 journalism. Defendants and their clients subjected at least twenty-two of El Faro's
11 thirty-five employees to repeated Pegasus attacks. These attacks went undetected at
12 first, but subsequent analyses identified 226 Pegasus infections between June 2020
13 and November 2021 on devices used by El Faro employees. The attacks—which
14 intensified around El Faro's publication of major stories—damaged devices used by
15 employees for both professional and personal purposes and resulted in the
16 exfiltration of sensitive data to Defendants and their clients.

17 52. For example, beginning in June 2020, Defendants and their clients
18 hacked the device of Plaintiff Carlos Martínez, an El Faro reporter, at least twenty-
19 eight times, and his device was actively infected with Pegasus for at least 269 days.
20 At the time, Mr. Martínez was the lead El Faro reporter investigating the secret
21 negotiations between the Salvadoran government and the MS-13 gang. His device
22 was still actively infected with Pegasus when he provided it to security researchers
23 at the Citizen Lab for forensic analysis in November 2021.

24 53. In September 2020, when El Faro first published its reporting on the
25 MS-13 negotiations, Defendants and their clients hacked the devices of nine El Faro
26 employees, including Plaintiffs Carlos Dada, Sergio Arauz, Gabriel Labrador,
27 Carlos Martínez, Óscar Martínez, Mauricio Sandoval Soriano, and José Luis Sanz.

28

1 The devices of El Faro’s employees were infected with Pegasus for approximately
2 149 cumulative days that month.

3 54. At least one El Faro employee’s device was actively infected with
4 Pegasus every day in October 2020. The devices of at least four El Faro employees—
5 Carlos Dada, Gabriel Labrador, Carlos Martínez, and Mauricio Sandoval Soriano—
6 were actively infected for at least twenty days that month.

7 55. Defendants and their clients continued to hack El Faro employees’
8 devices throughout the end of 2020 and beginning of 2021, most frequently targeting
9 Carlos Dada, Carlos Martínez, Óscar Martínez, and José Luis Sanz.

10 56. The Pegasus attacks increased in intensity. In April and May 2021,
11 Defendants and their clients hacked the devices of El Faro employees fifty-two
12 times. They installed Pegasus on the device of Plaintiff Efren Lemus as he reported
13 that El Salvador’s former Minister of Security and Justice had been fired in part
14 because he attempted to mount his own presidential candidacy without President
15 Bukele’s support. At the same time, Defendants and their clients hacked the device
16 of Gabriel Labrador while he was conducting interviews for a magazine profile of
17 President Bukele, and they hacked the device Plaintiff Nelson Rauda Zablah while
18 he was covering the trial of sixteen military officers accused of leading the December
19 1981 massacre of more than one thousand civilians in the village of El Mozote.

20 57. Overall, the Pegasus attacks on El Faro employees extended for
21 eighteen months. A list of the known attacks against individuals in El Salvador,
22 including Plaintiffs and other El Faro employees, can be found in the appendix to
23 the Citizen Lab report summarizing the attacks, incorporated herein and attached
24 hereto as Exhibit A.

25 58. Because Defendants intentionally designed Pegasus to avoid detection,
26 El Faro and its employees were unaware during most of the time they were under
27 attack that their devices had been compromised. El Faro’s leadership learned of the
28 first confirmed Pegasus attacks in October 2021, after the Citizen Lab and Access

1 Now detected evidence of Pegasus on the personal device of Plaintiff Julia
2 Gavarrete. Upon receiving confirmation that her device had been infected with
3 Pegasus, Ms. Gavarrete informed El Faro’s leadership of the attack.

4 59. El Faro’s leadership devoted considerable time and resources to
5 identifying the full extent of the attacks and remediating the harms caused by them.
6 The team—including Carlos Dada, Julia Gavarrete, and Óscar Martínez—initially
7 submitted eleven devices used by El Faro employees for further analysis by the
8 Citizen Lab and Access Now. After the Citizen Lab confirmed that all eleven devices
9 had been infected with Pegasus, the team reached out to additional employees at risk
10 of infection and submitted thirty devices for analysis by December 2021. During that
11 time and the months that followed, El Faro employees devoted hundreds of hours to
12 investigating the attacks, identifying other employees who had been targeted,
13 working with security researchers to confirm the nature and duration of the attacks,
14 developing and implementing new digital security policies, and upgrading El Faro’s
15 information technology systems. As a result of the attacks, El Faro incurred
16 significant costs that far exceeded \$5,000 within the year after El Faro’s leadership
17 learned of the attacks.

18 60. The Pegasus attacks undermined El Faro’s ability to operate, to support
19 its employees, and to serve its readers. The attacks have diverted El Faro leadership
20 and employees from reporting, editing, and publishing. Despite El Faro’s best
21 efforts, the attacks have deterred some sources from continuing to communicate with
22 El Faro reporters, deterred some writers from publishing their work with El Faro,
23 and deterred some advertisers from doing business with El Faro.

24 *The Pegasus Attacks on Plaintiffs*

25 61. The Pegasus attacks on devices used by Plaintiffs were part of a
26 coordinated and sustained effort to undermine independent journalism in El
27 Salvador. The attacks all unfolded in a similar manner, beginning with the
28 deployment by Defendants and their clients of zero-click exploits to each targeted

1 device. And the attacks caused similar damage to each device, compromising data
2 stored on and accessible through it. The attacks disabled certain Apple iOS features
3 on the devices, infected the devices with Pegasus, enabled Defendants and their
4 clients to issue commands to the devices without Plaintiffs' knowledge or consent,
5 and undermined the value of the devices for private communication and computing.
6 Although Defendants designed Pegasus to leave no evidence of attempts to exfiltrate
7 data from targeted devices, the Citizen Lab's analyses confirmed exfiltration of data
8 from at least eleven of the devices targeted in the attacks against El Faro, including
9 those used by Plaintiffs Sergio Arauz, Julia Gavarrete, Roman Gressier, Efren
10 Lemus, Gabriel Labrador, Óscar Martínez, María Luz Nóchez, Mauricio Sandoval
11 Soriano, and José Luis Sanz. On information and belief, Defendants and their clients
12 exfiltrated data from all of Plaintiffs' targeted devices, including data stored on
13 Plaintiffs' cloud-based accounts.

14 62. **Carlos Dada**: Carlos Dada is the co-founder and director of El Faro.
15 His reporting focuses on corruption and violence.

16 63. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Dada's device, an iPhone 11
17 owned by El Faro, at least twelve times between July 2020 and June 2021. Active
18 infections persisted on his device for at least 167 days.

19 64. During the relevant time period, Mr. Dada used his device, which was
20 password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes. His
21 device contained social media and messaging applications, including Facebook,
22 Instagram, Signal, Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. He used the device for
23 communicating with family, friends, sources, and colleagues; for conducting online
24 banking, planning travel, arranging transportation through ride-sharing apps, and
25 consulting maps; and for storing videos and photos. He also used his device to
26 communicate with sources, to store confidential and leaked documents, and to edit
27 work-related documents and drafts in Google Drive. His device was connected to an
28 iCloud account.

1 65. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Dada substantial harms. He has had to
2 significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing work-related
3 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes have
4 greatly diminished the value of Mr. Dada's device. Finally, he incurred significant
5 costs in investigating and remediating the attacks. For example, he spent
6 approximately one hundred hours helping to lead El Faro's initial investigation into
7 the attacks.

8 66. **Sergio Arauz:** Sergio Arauz is the deputy editor-in-chief of El Faro
9 and has worked at the organization for twenty-two years. His reporting focuses on
10 politics and human rights.

11 67. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Arauz's device, an iPhone 11
12 owned by El Faro, at least fourteen times between August 2020 and October 2021.
13 Active infections persisted on his device for at least twenty-eight days. The Citizen
14 Lab confirmed that Defendants and their clients exfiltrated data from Mr. Arauz's
15 device in the course of these attacks, but it could not identify which data was stolen.

16 68. During the relevant time period, Mr. Arauz used his device, which was
17 password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes. His
18 device contained social media and messaging applications, including Facebook,
19 Gmail, Instagram, Signal, Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. He used the device to
20 communicate with family and friends; to store personal financial information; and
21 to conduct his work as a journalist, including by communicating with anonymous
22 sources, storing confidential and leaked documents, and editing work-related
23 documents and drafts in Google Drive.

24 69. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Arauz substantial harms. He has had to
25 significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing work-related
26 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes
27 greatly diminished the value of Mr. Arauz's device, which he later replaced. He has
28 suffered, and continues to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the attacks and the

1 loss of his privacy. Finally, he incurred significant costs in investigating and
2 remediating the attacks. For example, as a leader of El Faro and a member of El
3 Faro's Board of Directors, he spent approximately two hundred hours investigating
4 and remediating the attacks against the organization, including by participating in
5 discussions about the impact of the attacks on El Faro and the safety of its
6 employees. He also spent more than two dozen hours investigating the scope of the
7 attacks against his own device, including by reviewing his notes, project timelines,
8 and reporting topics over the course of the attacks, by attending meetings regarding
9 the forensic analysis of El Faro employees' devices, and by preparing his own device
10 for analysis.

11 70. **Gabriela Cáceres Gutiérrez:** Gabriela Cáceres Gutiérrez is a reporter
12 for El Faro. In 2021, she, along with Plaintiffs Carlos Martínez and Óscar Martínez,
13 published one of El Faro's most significant investigations, revealing secret
14 negotiations held in maximum security prisons between the Bukele Administration
15 and incarcerated members of El Salvador's three main gangs: MS-13, Barrio 18
16 Revolucionarios, and Barrio 18 Sureños.

17 71. Defendants and their clients hacked Ms. Cáceres Gutiérrez's device, an
18 iPhone 11 owned by El Faro, at least thirteen times between April and September
19 2021. These dates coincided with her investigation into the Bukele Administration's
20 negotiations with Salvadoran gangs.

21 72. During the relevant time period, Ms. Cáceres Gutiérrez used her device,
22 which was password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional
23 purposes. Her device contained social media and messaging applications, including
24 Instagram, Signal, Twitter, and WhatsApp. She used the device to communicate with
25 family and friends; to store personal financial information; and to conduct her work
26 as a journalist, including by communicating with anonymous sources, storing
27 confidential and leaked documents, and editing work-related documents and drafts
28 in Google Drive. Her device was connected to an iCloud account.

1 73. The Pegasus attacks caused Ms. Cáceres Gutiérrez substantial harms.
2 She has had to significantly alter how she uses her device, diminishing its value to
3 her. She has suffered, and continues to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the
4 attacks. Finally, she incurred significant costs in investigating and remediating the
5 attacks. For example, she spent approximately three weeks investigating the attacks
6 and informing family, friends, and sources whose information may have been
7 exposed to Defendants and their clients. She also purchased a new iPhone to protect
8 her sources following the attacks.

9 74. **Julia Gavarrete**: Julia Gavarrete joined El Faro’s newsroom in 2021.
10 Her reporting focuses on vulnerable communities in Central America, on women’s
11 rights, and on environmental issues.

12 75. Defendants and their clients hacked Ms. Gavarrete’s personal device,
13 an iPhone 11, as well as an El Faro–owned iPhone that she used for work, at least
14 eighteen times between February and September 2021. The Citizen Lab confirmed
15 that Defendants and their clients exfiltrated data from Ms. Gavarrete’s personal
16 device in the course of these attacks, but it could not identify which data was stolen.

17 76. During the relevant time period, Ms. Gavarrete used her devices, both
18 of which were password-protected, extensively. Her personal device contained
19 social media and messaging applications, including Facebook, Instagram, Signal,
20 Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. She also used her personal device for emailing,
21 conducting personal banking, storing photos of family and friends, and monitoring
22 footage from her home security camera. Her work device contained her work email,
23 draft articles that were stored in Google Drive, photos of leaked documents that were
24 stored on Google Photos, and work-related communications. She also used her work
25 device to draft interview notes from anonymous sources. Both of her devices were
26 connected to iCloud accounts.

27 77. The Pegasus attacks caused Ms. Gavarrete substantial harms. She has
28 had to significantly alter how she uses both her personal and work devices, including

1 by minimizing work-related communications and prioritizing in-person meetings.
2 These necessary changes have greatly diminished the value of Ms. Gavarrete's
3 devices. She has also suffered, and continues to suffer, mental anguish and physical
4 symptoms as a result of the attacks, including back pain and eye strain. Finally, she
5 incurred significant costs in investigating and remediating the attacks. For example,
6 she spent a month assisting in El Faro's investigation into the attacks, including by
7 working with security researchers at the Citizen Lab and Access Now, by meeting
8 with El Faro's leaders and other journalists to ascertain whether their devices had
9 been attacked, and by informing her sources that their information had been exposed
10 to Defendants and their clients. She also purchased an external hard drive so she
11 could create back-ups of her devices for analysis by the Citizen Lab and Access
12 Now.

13 78. **Roman Gressier**: Roman Gressier is a reporter for El Faro. He writes
14 El Faro's English-language newsletter and has reported extensively on Central
15 American politics, human rights, and press freedom.

16 79. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Gressier's device, an iPhone
17 11 owned by El Faro, at least four times between May and June 2021. The Citizen
18 Lab confirmed that Defendants and their clients exfiltrated data from his device in
19 the course of these attacks, but it could not identify which data was stolen.

20 80. During the relevant time period, Mr. Gressier used his device, which
21 was password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes.
22 His device contained social media and messaging applications, including Facebook,
23 Facebook Messenger, Gmail, Instagram, ProtonMail, Signal, and WhatsApp. He
24 used the device to communicate with family and friends; to store personal financial
25 information and passwords; and to conduct his work as a journalist, including by
26 communicating with anonymous sources and editing work-related documents and
27 drafts in Google Drive. His device was connected to an iCloud account.

28

1 81. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Gressier substantial harms. He has had
2 to significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing work-related
3 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes have
4 greatly diminished the value of Mr. Gressier's device. He has suffered, and continues
5 to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the attacks. Finally, he incurred significant
6 costs in investigating and remediating the attacks. For example, he spent
7 approximately sixty to seventy hours investigating the attacks, notifying contacts
8 that their information had been exposed to Defendants and their clients, and
9 attempting to remediate the attacks by improving his digital security.

10 82. **Gabriel Labrador**: Gabriel Labrador is a reporter for El Faro. He has
11 reported extensively on criminal justice and public corruption, including on a
12 Salvadoran Supreme Court magistrate's ties to the MS-13 gang, on the political and
13 policymaking roles of President Bukele's brothers, and on detentions during El
14 Salvador's recent state of exception.

15 83. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Labrador's device, an iPhone
16 11 owned by El Faro, at least twenty times between August 2020 and November
17 2021. His device was infected with Pegasus twice between August and October
18 2020, and infections persisted on his device for most of that period. His device was
19 infected at least eighteen more times between March and November 2021. Overall,
20 his device was actively infected with Pegasus for approximately 101 days. The
21 Citizen Lab confirmed that Defendants and their clients exfiltrated data from Mr.
22 Labrador's device in the course of these attacks, but it could not identify which data
23 was stolen.

24 84. During the relevant time period, Mr. Labrador used his device, which
25 was password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes.
26 His device contained social media and messaging applications, including Facebook,
27 Facebook Messenger, Gmail, Google Hangouts, Google Meet, Instagram, Jitsi Meet,
28 Snapchat, Skype, Telegram, Twitter, WhatsApp, and Zoom. He used the device to

1 communicate with family and friends; to store personal financial information; and
2 to conduct his work as a journalist, including by communicating with anonymous
3 sources, storing confidential and leaked documents, and editing work-related
4 documents and drafts in Google Drive. His device was connected to iCloud and
5 Dropbox accounts.

6 85. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Labrador substantial harms. He has had
7 to significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing
8 communications with his sources. These necessary changes have greatly diminished
9 the value of Mr. Labrador's device. He has suffered, and continues to suffer, mental
10 anguish as a result of the attacks, and he has seen a therapist to help him manage this
11 stress. Finally, he incurred significant costs in investigating and remediating the
12 attacks. For example, he spent approximately twenty-four hours describing what he
13 was working on when his device was infected with Pegasus. He spent approximately
14 four hours attending meetings at El Faro about digital security in the wake of the
15 attacks. He also purchased additional security software for his devices.

16 86. **Ana Beatriz Lazo Escobar**: Ana Beatriz Lazo Escobar is a marketing
17 manager for El Faro, where she has worked for seven years.

18 87. Defendants and their clients hacked Ms. Lazo Escobar's device, an
19 iPhone 11 owned by El Faro, at least once, in April 2021.

20 88. During the relevant time period, Ms. Lazo Escobar used her device,
21 which was password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional
22 purposes. Her device contained social media and messaging applications, including
23 Gmail, Instagram, Signal, Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. She also stored
24 personal financial information on the device. Her device was connected to an iCloud
25 account.

26 89. The Pegasus attack caused Ms. Lazo Escobar substantial harms. She
27 has suffered, and continues to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the attacks, and
28 she has seen a therapist to help her manage this stress. Finally, she incurred

1 significant costs in investigating and remediating the attacks. For example, she spent
2 approximately eight hours addressing the attacks, including by submitting a back-up
3 of her device for forensic analysis.

4 90. **Efren Lemus**: Efren Lemus is a reporter for El Faro. His reporting
5 focuses on gang violence and El Salvador's attempts to curtail it, as well as
6 wrongdoing and corruption within the governing Nuevas Ideas party.

7 91. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Lemus's device, an iPhone 11
8 owned by El Faro, at least ten times between April and September 2021. The device
9 was first infected with Pegasus on April 23, 2021, the day Mr. Lemus first received
10 it from El Faro. Defendants and their clients hacked his device at least nine more
11 times over the following five months. The Citizen Lab confirmed that Defendants
12 and their clients exfiltrated data from Mr. Lemus's device in the course of these
13 attacks, but it could not identify which data was stolen.

14 92. During the relevant time period, Mr. Lemus used his device, which was
15 password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes. His
16 device contained social media and messaging applications, including Facebook,
17 Google Meet, Signal, Telegram, Twitter, WhatsApp, and Zoom. He used the device
18 to communicate with family and friends; to store personal financial information; and
19 to conduct his work as a journalist, including by communicating with anonymous
20 sources, storing confidential and leaked documents, and editing work-related
21 documents and drafts in Google Drive. His device was connected to an iCloud
22 account.

23 93. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Lemus substantial harms. He has had
24 to significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing work-related
25 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes have
26 greatly diminished the value of Mr. Lemus's device. He has suffered, and continues
27 to suffer, great stress and uncertainty as a result of the attacks, leading him to avoid
28 public places and to alter the route he takes when walking his daughters to school.

1 Finally, he incurred significant costs in investigating and remediating the attacks.
2 For example, he spent approximately one hundred hours addressing the attacks,
3 including by assisting with El Faro's investigation of the attacks, suspending
4 interviews on reporting projects out of fear of continued surveillance, and notifying
5 sources and contacts that their information had been exposed to Defendants and their
6 clients. He also purchased an external hard drive to submit a back-up of his device
7 for forensic analysis.

8 94. **Carlos Martínez**: Carlos Martínez is a reporter for El Faro. He is a
9 founding member of El Faro's investigative journalism team, and his reporting
10 focuses on gang violence and official misconduct.

11 95. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Martínez's device, an iPhone
12 11 owned by El Faro, at least twenty-eight times between June and October 2021.
13 Active infections persisted on his device for at least 269 days.

14 96. During the relevant time period, Mr. Martínez used his device, which
15 was password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes.
16 His device contained social media and messaging applications, including Facebook,
17 Facebook Messenger, Gmail, Instagram, Signal, Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp.
18 He used the device to communicate with family and friends; to store personal
19 financial information; and to conduct his work as a journalist, including by
20 communicating with anonymous sources, storing confidential and leaked
21 documents, and editing work-related documents and drafts in Google Drive. His
22 device was connected to an iCloud account.

23 97. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Martínez substantial harms. He has had
24 to significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing work-related
25 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes have
26 greatly diminished the value of his device. He has suffered, and continues to suffer,
27 mental anguish as a result of the attacks. Finally, he incurred significant costs in
28 investigating and remediating the attacks. For example, he spent approximately five

1 days and informing family, friends, and sources whose information may have been
2 exposed to Defendants and their clients. He also purchased a new iPhone following
3 the attacks.

4 98. **Óscar Martínez**: Óscar Martínez is the editor-in-chief of El Faro. A
5 founding member El Faro's investigative journalism team, he reports on issues of
6 gang violence, migration, and official misconduct.

7 99. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Martínez's device, an iPhone
8 8 owned by El Faro, at least forty-two times between July 2020 and October 2021.
9 Active infections persisted on his device for at least forty-nine days. The Citizen Lab
10 confirmed that Defendants and their clients exfiltrated data from Mr. Martínez's
11 device in the course of these attacks, but it could not identify which data was stolen.

12 100. During the relevant time period, Mr. Martínez used his device, which
13 was password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes.
14 His device contained social media and messaging applications, including Gmail,
15 Signal, Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. He used the device to communicate with
16 family and friends; to store personal financial information; and to conduct his work
17 as a journalist, including by communicating with anonymous sources, storing
18 confidential and leaked documents, and editing work-related documents and drafts.

19 101. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Martínez substantial harms. He has had
20 to significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing work-related
21 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes have
22 greatly diminished the value of Mr. Martínez's device. He has suffered, and
23 continues to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the attacks. Finally, he incurred
24 significant costs in investigating and remediating the attacks. For example, he spent
25 hundreds of hours investigating the attacks, developing El Faro's strategic response
26 to the attacks, establishing new security protocols for El Faro, notifying contacts and
27 sources that their information had been exposed to Defendants and their clients, and
28 improving his own digital security. After the attacks, he started meeting with sources

1 in person more frequently, increasing travel and booking costs. He also purchased at
2 least ten different phones that he used in the months after the attacks were confirmed.

3 102. **María Luz Nóchez**: María Luz Nóchez is a reporter and the Opinion
4 editor for El Faro. She reports on arts and culture, violence against women and the
5 LGBTQ community, and the rights of Indigenous people.

6 103. Defendants and their clients hacked Ms. Nóchez's device, an iPhone 11
7 owned by El Faro, at least three times between February and June 2021. The Citizen
8 Lab confirmed that Defendants and their clients exfiltrated data from Ms. Nóchez's
9 device in the course of the attacks, but it could not identify which data was stolen.

10 104. During the relevant time period, Ms. Nóchez used her device, which
11 was password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes.
12 Her device contained social media and messaging applications, including Facetime,
13 Facebook Messenger, Gmail, Signal, Telegram, WhatsApp, and Zoom. She used the
14 device to communicate with family and friends; to store personal financial
15 information; and to conduct her work as a journalist, including by editing work-
16 related documents and drafts in Google Drive. Her device was connected to an
17 iCloud account.

18 105. The Pegasus attacks caused Ms. Nóchez substantial harms. She has had
19 to significantly alter how she uses her device, including by minimizing work-related
20 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes have
21 greatly diminished the value of her device. She has also suffered, and continues to
22 suffer, mental anguish and physical symptoms as a result of the attacks, including
23 intense abdominal pain. She has seen a therapist to help her manage the stress
24 resulting from the attacks. Finally, she incurred significant costs in investigating and
25 remediating the attacks. For example, she spent several hours addressing the attacks,
26 including by attending meetings at El Faro regarding the investigation into the
27 attacks, creating and submitting a back-up of her device for forensic analysis, and
28 attending additional meetings about digital security following the attacks.

1 106. **Víctor Peña**: Víctor Peña is a photojournalist for El Faro. He
2 contributes photography and audiovisual and graphic material to El Faro, focusing
3 on issues relating to women’s rights, inequality, pollution, and migration.

4 107. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Peña’s device, an iPhone 11
5 owned by El Faro, at least once, on November 22, 2021. The attack on Mr. Peña’s
6 device was the last known Pegasus attack on El Faro.

7 108. During the relevant time period, Mr. Peña used his device, which was
8 password-protected, extensively for personal and professional purposes. His device
9 contained social media and messaging applications, including Facebook, Gmail,
10 Instagram, Signal, Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. He used the device to
11 communicate with family and friends; to store personal financial information; and
12 to conduct his work as a journalist, including by communicating with anonymous
13 sources, storing confidential and leaked documents, and editing work-related
14 documents and drafts in Google Drive. His device was connected to an iCloud
15 account.

16 109. The Pegasus attack caused Mr. Peña substantial harms. He has had to
17 significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing work-related
18 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes have
19 greatly diminished the value of Mr. Peña’s device. He has also suffered, and
20 continues to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the attacks. Finally, he incurred
21 significant costs in investigating and remediating the attacks. For example, he spent
22 approximately one month addressing the attacks, including by assisting with El
23 Faro’s investigation of the attacks and by notifying sources and contacts that their
24 information had been exposed to Defendants and their clients.

25 110. **Nelson Rauda Zablah**: Nelson Rauda Zablah worked as a reporter and
26 hosted a twice-weekly radio show for El Faro from 2015 to August 2022. He has a
27 decade of experience covering corruption, crime, the justice system, politics,
28 migration, and human rights.

1 111. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Rauda Zablah's device, an
2 iPhone 11 owned by El Faro, at least six times between April and September 2021.
3 Active infections persisted on his device for at least sixty-two days, including three
4 days when he visited the U.S. Embassy in San Salvador.

5 112. During the relevant time period, Mr. Rauda Zablah used his device,
6 which was password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional
7 purposes. His device contained social media and messaging applications, including
8 Facebook, Gmail, Google Meet, Instagram, Microsoft Teams, Skype, Telegram, Tik
9 Tok, Twitter, WhatsApp, and Zoom. He used the device to communicate with family
10 and friends, including receiving photos of his nieces and nephews; to store personal
11 financial information; and to conduct his work as a journalist, including by
12 communicating with anonymous sources, storing confidential and leaked
13 documents, and editing work-related documents and drafts in Google Drive. His
14 device was also connected to an iCloud account.

15 113. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Rauda Zablah substantial harms. He
16 has had to significantly alter how he uses his device, including by no longer using it
17 for personal communication or banking. Similarly, he began minimizing work-
18 related communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary
19 changes have greatly diminished the value of Mr. Rauda Zablah's device. He has
20 suffered, and continues to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the attacks. Finally,
21 he incurred significant costs in investigating and remediating the attacks. For
22 example, he spent approximately seventy hours assisting El Faro's investigation into
23 the attacks, notifying contacts that their information had been exposed to Defendants
24 and their clients, and taking remedial digital security measures. He spent
25 approximately ten additional hours preparing a back-up of his device for forensic
26 analysis, consulting with information technology experts, deleting and re-
27 downloading the applications he had previously used, and conducting additional
28 security analyses to check for any subsequent reinfection. After moving to the

1 United States, he purchased a new, more secure device with a new number and
2 cellular plan as a result of the attacks. Fearing that the new device may also be
3 targeted, however, he does not use it for tasks that he routinely carried out on his
4 previous device before the attacks.

5 114. **Mauricio Ernesto Sandoval Soriano**: Mauricio Ernesto Sandoval
6 Soriano is the general administrator of El Faro.

7 115. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Sandoval Soriano's device, an
8 iPhone 11 owned by El Faro, at least four times between August 2020 and October
9 2021. The Citizen Lab confirmed that Defendants and their clients exfiltrated data
10 from Mr. Sandoval Soriano's device in the course of these attacks, but it could not
11 identify which data was stolen.

12 116. During the relevant time period, Mr. Sandoval Soriano used his device,
13 which was password-protected, extensively for work and occasionally for personal
14 purposes. His device contained social media and messaging applications, including
15 Gmail, Signal, Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. He used his device to conduct his
16 work, including by editing and signing documents in DocuSign and Google Drive
17 and storing documents relating to El Faro's administrative, financial, and strategic
18 decisions; he also occasionally used his device for personal purposes, including to
19 communicate with his wife and to share photographs.

20 117. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Sandoval Soriano substantial harms.
21 He has had to significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing
22 work-related communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary
23 changes have greatly diminished the value of Mr. Sandoval Soriano's device. He has
24 also suffered, and continues to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the attacks.
25 Finally, he incurred significant costs in investigating and remediating the attacks.
26 For example, he spent approximately fifty hours addressing the attacks, including
27 assisting with El Faro's investigation of the attacks. Experiencing significant stress
28

1 and uncertainty about the surveillance of his family as a result of the attacks, he also
2 purchased security cameras for his home.

3 118. **José Luis Sanz**: José Luis Sanz is the Washington correspondent for
4 El Faro. Mr. Sanz reports on human rights, migration, and corruption. A founding
5 member of El Faro’s investigative journalism team, he previously reported on issues
6 of violence, gangs, and organized crime in Central America.

7 119. Defendants and their clients hacked Mr. Sanz’s device, an iPhone 8, at
8 least thirteen times between July and December 2020. During these months, Mr.
9 Sanz communicated and attended meetings with U.S. Embassy officials, as well as
10 diplomatic representatives from the European Union, France, Spain, and the United
11 Kingdom. The Citizen Lab confirmed that Defendants and their clients exfiltrated
12 data from Mr. Sanz’s device in the course of the attacks, but it could not identify
13 which data was stolen.

14 120. During the relevant time period, Mr. Sanz used his device, which was
15 password-protected, extensively for both personal and professional purposes. His
16 device contained social media and messaging applications, including Facebook,
17 Gmail, Instagram, Signal, Skype, Telegram, Twitter, and WhatsApp. He used the
18 device to communicate with family and friends; to store photographs; to store
19 personal financial information; and to conduct his work as a journalist, including by
20 maintaining the contact information of anonymous sources and editing work-related
21 documents and drafts in Google Drive. His device was also connected to an iCloud
22 account.

23 121. The Pegasus attacks caused Mr. Sanz substantial harms. He has had to
24 significantly alter how he uses his device, including by minimizing work-related
25 communications and prioritizing in-person meetings. These necessary changes have
26 greatly diminished the value of Mr. Sanz’s device. He has also suffered, and
27 continues to suffer, mental anguish as a result of the attacks. Finally, he incurred
28 significant costs in investigating and remediating the attacks. For example, he spent

1 approximately eighty hours assisting El Faro’s investigation into the attacks and
2 taking remedial digital security measures. He spent approximately four to five
3 additional hours notifying contacts and sources that their information had been
4 exposed to Defendants and their clients.

5 122. Overall, the Pegasus attacks caused Plaintiffs serious economic,
6 reputational, professional, psychological, and personal harms and caused Plaintiffs
7 and El Faro significant losses aggregating over \$5,000 within the year after they
8 learned of the attacks. The attacks have also undermined Plaintiffs’ ability to serve
9 as sources of independent journalism in El Salvador and Central America.

10 CAUSES OF ACTION

11 Count I

12 Violations of the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act 13 18 U.S.C. § 1030

14 123. As explained above, between June 2020 and November 2021,
15 Defendants repeatedly accessed Plaintiffs’ devices, including their cloud-based
16 accounts, without authorization. Each Plaintiff either owned a device targeted in the
17 Pegasus attacks or had a possessory interest in and exclusive right to use a targeted
18 device in connection with their employment with El Faro. These devices also
19 contained Plaintiffs’ private information, including private communications,
20 photographs, and writings. The devices are “protected computers” within the
21 meaning of 18 U.S.C. § 1030(e)(2)(B) because they are “used in or affecting
22 interstate or foreign commerce or communication.”

23 124. Plaintiffs suffered both damage and loss as a result of the Pegasus
24 attacks on their devices.

25 125. The total losses stemming from the Pegasus attacks—including costs
26 incurred by Plaintiffs as well as those incurred by El Faro—exceeded \$5,000 in
27 aggregate during a one-year period.
28

1 Plaintiffs' devices and, as a result, intentionally damaged those devices without
2 authorization.

3 132. Defendants violated 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(5)(B) because they
4 intentionally accessed Plaintiffs' devices without authorization and, as a result,
5 recklessly caused damage.

6 133. Defendants violated 18 U.S.C. § 1030(a)(5)(C) because they
7 intentionally accessed Plaintiffs' devices without authorization and, as a result,
8 caused damage and loss.

9 18 U.S.C. § 1030(b)

10 134. Defendants violated 18 U.S.C. § 1030(b) by conspiring and attempting
11 to commit the violations alleged in the preceding paragraphs.

12 135. In the alternative, Defendants knowingly and intentionally aided and
13 abetted their clients in the violations of 18 U.S.C. § 1030 alleged in the preceding
14 paragraphs.

15 **Count II**

16 **Violations of the California Comprehensive Computer Data Access and Fraud**
17 **Act California Penal Code § 502**

18 136. Each Plaintiff either owned a device targeted in the Pegasus attacks or
19 had a possessory interest in and exclusive right to use a targeted device in connection
20 with their employment with El Faro. These devices also contained Plaintiffs' private
21 information, including private communications, photographs, and writings.

22 137. Defendants violated California Penal Code § 502(c)(1) by knowingly
23 and without permission accessing Plaintiffs' devices and altering, damaging, or
24 using those devices in order to wrongfully control the devices and obtain data from
25 them. Analysis by the Citizen Lab confirmed that Defendants and their clients
26 obtained data from at least nine of Plaintiffs' devices. On information and belief,
27 Defendants and their clients obtained data from all of Plaintiffs' targeted devices,
28 including by accessing information stored on Plaintiffs' cloud-based accounts.

1 138. Defendants violated California Penal Code § 502(c)(2) by knowingly
2 accessing and without permission taking, copying, and making use of data from
3 Plaintiffs' devices, including data stored on their cloud-based accounts.

4 139. Defendants violated California Penal Code § 502(c)(3) by knowingly
5 accessing and without permission using, or causing to be used, Plaintiffs' computer
6 services. The installation of Pegasus on Plaintiffs' devices required computing and
7 data processing by the targeted devices without Plaintiffs' knowledge or consent.
8 The installation and maintenance of Pegasus on Plaintiffs' devices relied on and
9 exploited the devices' storage functions without Plaintiffs' knowledge or consent.
10 The exfiltration of data from Plaintiffs' devices resulted from Pegasus issuing
11 commands to the devices and controlling their computing functions without
12 Plaintiffs' knowledge or consent.

13 140. Defendants violated California Penal Code § 502(c)(4) by knowingly
14 accessing and without permission adding and altering data, software, and computer
15 programs on Plaintiffs' devices. Defendants altered the functioning of Plaintiffs'
16 devices by infecting them with malicious data, software, and computer programs
17 without Plaintiffs' permission.

18 141. Defendants violated California Penal Code § 502(c)(6) by knowingly
19 providing a means of accessing Plaintiffs' devices and cloud-based accounts in
20 violation of the California Computer Data Access and Fraud Act.

21 142. Defendants violated California Penal Code § 502(c)(7) by knowingly
22 and without permission accessing and causing to be accessed Plaintiffs' devices and
23 cloud-based accounts.

24 143. Defendants violated California Penal Code § 502(c)(8) by knowingly
25 introducing a computer contaminant onto Plaintiffs' devices.

26 144. In carrying out the attacks on Plaintiffs' devices, Defendants acted
27 oppressively, fraudulently, and maliciously.
28

1 of Pegasus on Plaintiffs' devices gave Defendants and their clients essentially full
2 control of the devices, including the ability to covertly surveil and extract contact
3 details, text messages, instant messages, notes, emails, web-browsing activity, files,
4 and passwords; to monitor phone calls and VoIP calls, as well as user activity on
5 different applications, including WhatsApp, Facebook, and Skype; to track and log
6 a device's GPS location; to activate the device's microphone to record surrounding
7 sounds; and to activate the device's camera to take photographs. Although Pegasus
8 attacks are designed to leave no trace, the Citizen Lab's analyses confirmed that
9 Defendants and their clients exfiltrated data from at least nine devices used and/or
10 owned by Plaintiffs. On information and belief, Defendants and their clients
11 exfiltrated data from all of Plaintiffs' targeted devices, including by accessing data
12 stored on their cloud-based accounts.

13 151. Defendants' actions would be highly offensive to the reasonable
14 person.

15 152. The Pegasus attacks executed by Defendants and their clients caused
16 Plaintiffs to suffer substantial harms, including the degradation in value of the
17 devices themselves, costs incurred in investigating and remediating the attacks,
18 medical expenses, and emotional distress.

19 **REQUEST FOR RELIEF**

20 Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court:

21 A. Declare that Defendants have:

- 22 i. Violated the Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, 18 U.S.C. § 1030;
 - 23 ii. Violated the California Comprehensive Computer Data Access and
24 Fraud Act, Cal. Penal Code § 502;
 - 25 iii. Trespassed onto Plaintiffs' property in violation of California law;
 - 26 and
 - 27 iv. Intruded upon Plaintiffs' seclusion in violation of California law.
- 28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- B. Enter a permanent injunction restraining Defendants from accessing, attempting to access, or assisting others in accessing or attempting to access, Plaintiffs’ devices.
- C. Enter a permanent injunction requiring Defendants to catalogue all information obtained as a result of the Pegasus attacks on Plaintiffs’ devices; to return and then delete all such information in Defendants’ possession; to disclose the identities of all persons and/or entities with whom Defendants shared such information, when that information was shared, and under what conditions; and to disclose the identities of all of Defendants’ clients who were involved in the attacks on Plaintiffs’ devices, including the specific individuals with whom Defendants contracted or coordinated and the specific nature of each individual’s involvement.
- D. Award Plaintiffs compensatory damages, as permitted by law and in such amounts to be proven at trial.
- E. Award Plaintiffs punitive damages, as permitted by law and in such amounts to be proven at trial.
- F. Award Plaintiffs their reasonable costs and attorneys’ fees incurred in this action.
- G. Grant such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

1 DATED: November 30, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

2 /s/ Paul Hoffman

3 Paul Hoffman #71244
4 John Washington #315991
5 Schonbrun, Seplow, Harris,
6 Hoffman & Zeldes LLP
7 200 Pier Avenue, Suite 226
8 Hermosa Beach, CA 90254
9 T: (424) 297-0114
10 F: (310) 399-7040
11 hoffpaul@aol.com

12 /s/ Carrie DeCell

13 Carrie DeCell**
14 Jameel Jaffer**
15 Alex Abdo**
16 Stephanie Krent**
17 Evan Welber Falcón**
18 Knight First Amendment
19 Institute at Columbia
20 University
21 475 Riverside Drive, Suite 302
22 New York, NY 10115
23 T: (646) 745-8500
24 F: (646) 661-3361
25 carrie.decell@knightcolumbia.org

26 *Counsel for Carlos Dada, Sergio Arauz,*
27 *Gabriela Cáceres Gutiérrez, Julia*
28 *Gavarrete, Roman Gressier, Gabriel*
Labrador, Ana Beatriz Lazo Escobar,
Efren Lemus, Carlos Martínez, Óscar
Martínez, María Luz Nóchez, Víctor
Peña, Nelson Rauda Zablah, Mauricio
Sandoval Soriano, and José Luis Sanz

***Application for Admission Pro Hac*
Vice To Be Filed