AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION JULY-AUGUST 2025 VOL. 11 NO. 6

PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW

REPORT

LexisNexis

EDITOR'S NOTE: LET'S LOOK AT WHAT'S HAPPENING IN THE STATES Victoria Prussen Spears

MORE STATES PROPOSE PRIVACY LAWS SAFEGUARDING NEURAL DATA Linda K. Clark and Carson Martinez

CALIFORNIA COURT REJECTS ATTEMPT TO EXPAND THIRD-PARTY EAVESDROPPING CLAIMS TO INTERNET COMMUNICATIONS: HOW YOUR BUSINESS CAN MITIGATE RISK Catherine M. Contino and Usama Kahf

COURT CONFIRMS KENTUCKY CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT DOES NOT COVER EMPLOYEES, BUT LEGAL RISKS REMAIN: 5 STEPS FOR EMPLOYERS TO AVOID DATA BREACH LAWSUITS Annie N. Harb

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE IMPLEMENTS BULK PERSONAL DATA TRANSFER RESTRICTIONS Artie McConnell, Eric B. Gyasi, Gerald J. Ferguson and Jennifer G. Solari UK'S ECONOMIC CRIME AND CORPORATE TRANSPARENCY ACT 2023 INTRODUCES IDENTITY VERIFICATION REGIME Harry Keegan, Vance Chapman, George O'Malley, Kelvin Mahal and Amy Hughes

EUROPEAN HEALTH DATA SPACE REGULATION PUBLISHED IN THE EU OFFICIAL JOURNAL Alexander Roussanov and Ana Gonzalez-Lamuño

CHINA DATA PRIVACY: NEW CLARITY ON AUDIT AND DATA PROTECTION OFFICER REQUIREMENTS

Paul D. McKenzie, Gordon A. Milner, Chuan Sun and Tingting Gao

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

VOLUME 11	NUMBER 6	July-August 2025
Editor's Note: Let's Look at Victoria Prussen Spears	What's Happening in the States	165
More States Propose Privac Linda K. Clark and Carson 1	y Laws Safeguarding Neural Data Martinez	167
California Court Rejects At Eavesdropping Claims to I How Your Business Can Mi Catherine M. Contino and U	tigate Risk	172
•	Consumer Protection Act Does Legal Risks Remain: 5 Steps ta Breach Lawsuits	176
U.S. Department of Justice Data Transfer Restrictions Artie McConnell, Eric B. Gy Jennifer G. Solari	Implements Bulk Personal asi, Gerald J. Ferguson and	180
UK's Economic Crime and Corporate Transparency Act 2023 Introduces Identity Verification Regime Harry Keegan, Vance Chapman, George O'Malley, Kelvin Mahal and Amy Hughes		186
European Health Data Spa EU Official Journal Alexander Roussanov and Ar	c e Regulation Published in the na Gonzalez-Lamuño	192
Officer Requirements	Clarity on Audit and Data Protection A. Milner, Chuan Sun and Tingting Gao	199



QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the Editorial Content appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact: Deneil C. Targowski at
Customer Services Department at
Your account manager or(800) 223-1940Outside the United States and Canada, please call

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

ISSN: 2380-4785 (Print) ISSN: 2380-4823 (Online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [page number] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Laura Clark Fey and Jeff Johnson, *Shielding Personal Information in eDiscovery*, [7] PRATT'S PRIVACY & CYBERSECURITY LAW REPORT [179] (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

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

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

Copyright © 2025 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

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

An A.S. Pratt Publication Editorial

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

MATTHEW BENDER

(2025-Pub. 4939)

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ *President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.*

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

EMILIO W. CIVIDANES *Partner, Venable LLP*

CHRISTOPHER G. CWALINA Partner, Holland & Knight LLP

> **RICHARD D. HARRIS** *Partner, Day Pitney LLP*

JAY D. KENISBERG Senior Counsel, Rivkin Radler LLP

> **DAVID C. LASHWAY** *Partner, Sidley Austin LLP*

CRAIG A. NEWMAN Partner, Patterson Belknap Webb & Tyler LLP

> ALAN CHARLES RAUL Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

RANDI SINGER Partner, Weil, Gotshal & Manges LLP

JOHN P. TOMASZEWSKI Senior Counsel, Seyfarth Shaw LLP

TODD G. VARE Partner, Barnes & Thornburg LLP

> **THOMAS F. ZYCH** Partner, Thompson Hine

Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report is published nine times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2025 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form-by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise-or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 631.291.5541. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in privacy and cybersecurity related issues and legal developments. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The opinions expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of their employer, its clients, the editor(s), RELX, LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Co., Inc, or any of its or their respective affiliates.

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

Court Confirms Kentucky Consumer Protection Act Does Not Cover Employees, But Legal Risks Remain: 5 Steps for Employers to Avoid Data Breach Lawsuits

By Annie N. Harb*

In this article, the author discusses a recent court decision concluding that employees are not protected by Kentucky's consumer protection law because they do not qualify as consumers and explains what five steps companies should take in light of the ruling.

A federal district court recently found that employees are not protected by Kentucky's consumer protection law because they do not qualify as consumers, handing a solid win to employers.

The decision in *Viviali v. One Point HR Solutions, LLC*, saw the court dismiss a Kentucky Consumer Protection Act (KCPA) claim brought by a former employee whose personal data was stolen by cybercriminals. However, the court permitted KCPA claims brought by customers who also had their data stolen to proceed – in part because of the company's delay in informing customers about the breach – as well as all other legal claims brought by the customers and the employee alike.

This ongoing court battle demonstrates why companies not only need to continuously monitor their technology systems for any breaches, but promptly inform their consumers – and employees – if a breach does occur. What do you need to know about this case and what five steps should you take to best position your organization?

WHAT TRIGGERS A VIOLATION OF THE KCPA AND WHO ENFORCES IT?

The KCPA was enacted to provide consumers broad protections from illegal acts.

- It protects Kentucky's citizens from "unfair, false, misleading, or deceptive acts or practices in trade or commerce."
- KCPA applies¹ to "any person who purchases or leases goods or services primarily for personal, family or household purposes and thereby suffers any ascertainable loss of money or property, real or personal, as a result

^{*} The author, an attorney with Fisher Phillips, may be contacted at aharb@fisherphillips.com.

¹ https://apps.legislature.ky.gov/law/statutes/statute.aspx?id=34922.

of the use or employment by another person of a method, act or practice declared unlawful by KRS 367.170."²

- To establish a KCPA claim, a plaintiff must prove that the defendant engaged in unlawful acts or practices, that the plaintiff is a consumer that purchased goods or services for personal, family, or household purposes, that the plaintiff suffered an ascertainable loss, and that plaintiff's damages are the natural and probable consequence of the defendant's conduct.
- In addition to individual consumer actions, the Kentucky Attorney General's Office of Consumer Protection also enforces the KCPA. The Office of Consumer Protection enforces the KCPA by bringing lawsuits in the public interest to obtain civil penalties and consumer redress, including restitution and injunctive relief aimed at changing bad business practices.

WHAT HAPPENED?

One Point is an outsourcing company that helps organizations automate and manage human resources operations. Cybercriminals initiated an attack on One Point's network in July 2023 and gained access to PII such as social security numbers, driver's license numbers, passport numbers, health insurance information, and credit card information. The breach spanned from July 3, 2023, to February 14, 2024 – but One Point did not notify victims of the breach until September 24, 2024.

Plaintiffs Charles Viviali, Lisa Alecia, and Kayla Lofton alleged that One Point failed to implement reasonable and adequate data security measures and to provide timely notice of the breach. They all brought a variety of legal claims against One Point, including violations of the KCPA. Notably, Viviali was a former employee of One Point, while the other two plaintiffs were simply customers.

Employee's KCPA Claim Dismissed

The court found that Viviali could not be considered a consumer under the definition of the KCPA since he was an employee of One Point. It cited a 2022 federal court case to support this ruling and noted that Viviali presented no contrary case law to support a KCPA claim brought against an employer. Therefore, it dismissed his KCPA claim.

Customers' KCPA Claims Given the Green Light

However, the court permitted the other two plaintiffs to proceed with their KCPA claims. One Point argued that it shouldn't be subject to the state consumer protection statute because it wasn't engaged in trade or commerce, as it primarily deals in human resources operations. However, the court found that, given One Point's delayed breach

² https://apps.legislature.ky.gov/law/statutes/statute.aspx?id=34914.

notification, the other two plaintiffs had plausibly alleged that they had potentially purchased services from One Point as consumers and that the KCPA applied.

Mixed Outcome for Other Claims

- The court dismissed several of the other claims, including negligence per se, breach of confidence, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, breach of fiduciary duty, and requests for declaratory and injunctive relief.
- However, the court allowed claims for negligence, breach of implied contract, unjust enrichment, and invasion of privacy to proceed.
- Though Viviali, the former employee of One Point, was not considered a consumer under the KCPA, the court allowed his claims of negligence, breach of implied contract, unjust enrichment, and invasion of privacy to proceed. This serves as a good reminder to employers to protect employee PII to the best of their ability and promptly inform them of any cybersecurity breach.

STEPS TO TAKE

Here are five steps you can take to minimize the chances of facing liability for a data breach claim.

1. Familiarize Yourself With Applicable Law

Ensure you, as well as your employees, have a thorough understanding of what constitutes PII. You should also ensure that you are familiar with what constitutes a breach under the KCPA and other applicable laws. This includes when the disclosure of certain types of data constitutes a data breach. Seek legal advice from your privacy counsel on your obligations and potential risks regarding what kind of data you store about both your consumers and employees.

2. Monitor for Breaches Frequently

Monitor for any potential data breaches. If one occurs, take immediate action to secure the network and change network access authorization to prevent the breach from getting worse.

3. Contact Privacy Counsel Regarding a Breach

Legal counsel can help you analyze and comply with data breach notification and other reporting obligations resulting from the breach. They can also help you supervise and direct outside vendors conducting investigation of the breach. Having counsel direct vendors may create privilege in the communications regarding the investigation, which could be useful if the breach results in litigation.

4. Contact Your Service Provider

If a service provider is responsible for the breach (such as your web security company, website builder, third-party payment processor, or similar companies), review any applicable agreements to determine the obligations of the parties. If appropriate, ensure that the provider is investigating, remedying, and responding to the breach. You should also reassess their access privileges and verify that vulnerabilities were indeed remedied by the provider.

5. Stay on Top of Changes

State and federal consumer protection and privacy laws are constantly changing and being interpreted and applied in new ways. Staying up to date on developments will help you remain compliant with obligations under the KCPA, the Kentucky Consumer Data Protection Act (KCDPA) – which takes effect January 1, 2026 – and other applicable state and federal laws.

CONCLUSION

As technology evolves, so do the methods used by cybercriminals. Failing to act swiftly after a breach can result in costly litigation under various state laws, including the KCPA. Organizations must proactively refine their data security and privacy practices and contact privacy counsel immediately in the event of a breach to ensure legal compliance and minimize liability.