

AN A.S. PRATT PUBLICATION

MAY 2025

VOL. 11 NO. 4

PRATT'S  
**PRIVACY &  
CYBERSECURITY  
LAW**  
REPORT



LexisNexis

**EDITOR'S NOTE: TRENDING**

Victoria Prussen Spears

**CURRENT TRENDS IN DATA BREACH NOTIFICATION LAWS: SAFE HARBORS AND REINFORCING THE CASE FOR CYBERSECURITY**

Adam Griffin, Todd Panciera, Jr., and Sara Kopetman

**CIPA PEN/TRAP UPDATE: FROM "ABSURD RESULT" ARGUMENTS TO PRO SE COMPLAINTS**

Steven G. Stransky and Kim Sim Sandell

**2024 STATE CONSUMER PRIVACY LAW YEAR-IN-REVIEW**

Alexander S. Altman and Elizabeth Snyder

**E-VERIFY IN ILLINOIS: SB0508 MYTHS DISPELLED, RIGHTS PROTECTED**

Dawn M. Lurie

**MASSACHUSETTS SUPREME COURT TAKES A CLOSER LOOK AT WIRETAP LAWS, POTENTIALLY NARROWING PRIVACY ACTIONS**

John T. Wolak and Ravipal Singh

**DISCLOSING PERSONAL DATA TO NON-EUROPEAN UNION AUTHORITIES: GENERAL DATA PROTECTION REGULATION GUIDANCE IS PUBLISHED**

Paul Kavanagh, Dylan Balbirnie, Anita Hodea and Madeleine White

# Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report

---

---

VOLUME 11

NUMBER 4

May 2025

---

<b>Editor's Note: Trending</b> Victoria Prussen Spears	103
<b>Current Trends in Data Breach Notification Laws: Safe Harbors and Reinforcing the Case for Cybersecurity</b> Adam Griffin, Todd Panciera, Jr., and Sara Kopetman	105
<b>CIPA Pen/Trap Update: From "Absurd Result" Arguments to Pro Se Complaints</b> Steven G. Stransky and Kim Sim Sandell	109
<b>2024 State Consumer Privacy Law Year-in-Review</b> Alexander S. Altman and Elizabeth Snyder	113
<b>E-Verify in Illinois: SB0508 Myths Dispelled, Rights Protected</b> Dawn M. Lurie	118
<b>Massachusetts Supreme Court Takes a Closer Look at Wiretap Laws, Potentially Narrowing Privacy Actions</b> John T. Wolak and Ravipal Singh	124
<b>Disclosing Personal Data to Non-European Union Authorities: General Data Protection Regulation Guidance Is Published</b> Paul Kavanagh, Dylan Balbirnie, Anita Hodea and Madeleine White	126

## QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

---

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please contact:  
Deneil C. Targowski at ..... (908) 673-3380

Email: ..... Deneil.C.Targowski@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at ..... (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385

Fax Number ..... (800) 828-8341

LexisNexis® Support Center ..... <https://supportcenter.lexisnexis.com/app/home>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or ..... (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call ..... (518) 487-3385

---

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](http://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 *Pratt's Privacy & Cybersecurity Law Report*, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 630 Central Ave., New Providence, NJ 07974.

# 2024 State Consumer Privacy Law Year-in-Review

*By Alexander S. Altman and Elizabeth Snyder\**

*In this article, the authors discuss privacy laws passed recently in seven states of the United States.*

It was a busy year for state legislatures seeking to protect their residents' privacy. In 2024, seven states passed comprehensive consumer privacy laws: Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey and Rhode Island. At a high level, these states have not deviated greatly from their predecessors, with each:

- Obligating businesses to limit their processing of consumers' personal data to specific purposes;
- Imposing transparency obligations (e.g., providing consumers a compliant privacy notice or policy);
- Requiring businesses to recognize certain consumer rights, particularly with respect to access/portability, deletion and correction;
- Prohibiting or limiting the collection of "sensitive data" without consent; and
- Requiring organizations to allow consumers to opt out of certain processing activities, such as the sales of personal data, targeted advertising and profiling or automated decision-making.

Each of these laws also exempts, with some variation, data or entities subject to the Health Insurance Accountability and Affordability Act (HIPAA), the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA) and other federal sectoral privacy laws.

Organizations already complying with the existing patchwork of state consumer privacy laws should be well positioned to comply with these new laws as they come into effect over the next two years. The devil, however, is in the details, and these new laws depart from existing state consumer privacy laws in novel ways. This article summarizes at a high level the fundamental aspects of these laws and some notable departures from other state consumer privacy laws, organized by each law's effective date. However, organizations that operate in these states will want to carefully analyze the new laws to identify any impact to their existing privacy compliance programs.

---

\* The authors, attorneys with Polsinelli, may be contacted at [aaltman@polsinelli.com](mailto:aaltman@polsinelli.com) and [esnyder@polsinelli.com](mailto:esnyder@polsinelli.com), respectively.

## **NEBRASKA – EFFECTIVE DATE: JANUARY 1, 2025**

The Nebraska Data Privacy Act (the Nebraska Act) differs from most other state privacy laws – but aligns with Texas' consumer privacy law – in that it does not apply a threshold of processing activity to determine which entities are in scope. Rather, any entity doing business in the state is subject to the Nebraska Act. Along with other common exemptions, however, the Nebraska Act generally exempts small businesses, as defined by the Small Business Administration, with the exception of restrictions on sales of sensitive data without consumer consent, which all businesses must follow.

The Nebraska Act gives consumers the right to confirm whether a controller is processing their data; to correct, delete and obtain copies of their personal data; and to opt out of personal data sales, profiling and targeted advertising.

Additionally, businesses must obtain consent to process sensitive data.

## **NEW HAMPSHIRE – EFFECTIVE DATE: JANUARY 1, 2025**

New Hampshire Senate Bill 255 (the New Hampshire Act) adopts a structure and thresholds similar to existing state privacy laws, applying to “controllers” that do business in New Hampshire and that, during a calendar year, either (1) control or process the personal data of at least 35,000 New Hampshire consumers, or (2) control or process personal data of 10,000 New Hampshire consumers and derive over 25% of gross revenue from the sale of personal data. Unusually, the 35,000-consumer threshold excludes “personal data controlled or processed solely for the purpose of completing a payment transaction.”

The New Hampshire Act gives consumers the right to confirm whether a controller is processing their data; to correct, delete and obtain copies of their personal data; and to opt out of personal data sales, profiling and targeted advertising. Additionally, businesses must obtain consent to process sensitive data and must honor consumers' revocation of such consent.

## **NEW JERSEY – EFFECTIVE DATE: JANUARY 15, 2025**

New Jersey Senate Bill 332 (the New Jersey Act) will apply to controllers that do business in New Jersey and, during a calendar year, either (1) control or process the personal data of at least 100,000 New Jersey consumers, or (2) control or process personal data of 25,000 New Jersey consumers and derive any revenue from the sale of personal data.

The New Jersey Act has no exemption for nonprofit organizations and, unlike most state consumer privacy laws, does not exempt data or entities subject to FERPA.

The New Jersey Act gives consumers the right to confirm whether a controller is processing their data; to correct, delete and obtain copies of their personal data; and to

opt out of personal data sales, profiling and targeted advertising. Additionally, businesses must obtain consent to process sensitive data and must honor consumers' revocation of such consent.

The New Jersey Act is atypical – joined only by California's and Colorado's laws – in that it provides for a regulatory framework, requiring the director of the Division of Consumer Affairs in the Department of Law and Public Safety to promulgate rules necessary to further the purposes of the act. The New Jersey Act does not impose a deadline for the promulgation of rules, so it remains to be seen when and how they may impact enforcement.

### **MINNESOTA – EFFECTIVE DATE: JULY 31, 2025**

The Minnesota Consumer Data Privacy Act (the Minnesota Act) will apply to controllers that do business in Minnesota and, during a calendar year, either (1) control or process the personal data of at least 100,000 unique Minnesota consumers, or (2) control or process personal data of 25,000 unique Minnesota consumers and derive over 25% of gross revenue from the sale of personal data. Notably, the Minnesota Act also largely exempts small businesses (with the exception of restrictions on sales of sensitive data without consent). Like the New Jersey Act, the Minnesota Act does not have a blanket exemption for nonprofits. It does, however, exempt nonprofits that are established to detect and prevent insurance fraud.

The Minnesota Act gives consumers the right to confirm whether a controller is processing their data; to correct, delete and obtain copies of their personal data; and to opt out of personal data sales, profiling and targeted advertising. Additionally, businesses must obtain consent to process sensitive data and honor consumers' revocation of such consent.

Interestingly, the Minnesota Act gives consumers the right to request the specific third parties to which a controller has disclosed the consumer's personal data. Almost all other state consumer privacy laws require only that controllers be transparent about the categories of third parties to which they have made disclosures. This could pose a substantial burden on some controllers.

Additionally, the Minnesota Act uniquely gives consumers the right to question the results of profiling.

Specifically, Minnesota consumers have the right to be informed of the reason that the profiling resulted in the decision, and, if feasible, to be informed of what actions the consumer might have taken to secure a different decision and the actions that the consumer might take to secure a different decision in the future. The consumer has the right to review the personal data used in the profiling. If the decision is determined to have been based upon inaccurate personal data, the consumer has the right to have the data corrected and the profiling decision reevaluated based upon the corrected data.

**MARYLAND – EFFECTIVE DATE: OCTOBER 1, 2025**

The Maryland Online Data Privacy Act (the Maryland Act) will apply to controllers that do business in Maryland and that, during the preceding calendar year, (1) controlled or processed personal data of at least 35,000 Maryland consumers, or (2) controlled or processed personal data of 10,000 Maryland consumers and derived more than 20% gross revenue from the sale of personal data. Like the Minnesota Act, the Maryland Act does not broadly exempt nonprofit entities. Rather, it exempts only nonprofits that process personal data either to assist law enforcement agencies in investigating criminal or fraudulent acts relating to insurance or to assist first responders responding to catastrophic events.

The Maryland Act gives consumers the right to confirm whether a controller is processing their data; to correct, delete and obtain copies of their personal data; and to opt out of personal data sales, profiling and targeted advertising. The Maryland Act imposes unique obligations surrounding sensitive data, requiring controllers to adhere strictly to data minimization requirements and prohibiting the sale of sensitive data entirely, regardless of whether a consumer provides consent.

**KENTUCKY – EFFECTIVE DATE: JANUARY 1, 2026**

Kentucky's Consumer Data Protection Act (the Kentucky Act) will apply to controllers that do business in Kentucky, and that, during a calendar year, either control or process the personal data of at least (1) 100,000 Kentucky consumers, or (2) 25,000 Kentucky consumers and derived over 50% of gross revenue from the sale of personal data. The Kentucky Act gives consumers the right to confirm whether a controller is processing their data; to correct, delete and obtain copies of their personal data; and to opt out of personal data sales, profiling and targeted advertising. Additionally, businesses must obtain consent to process sensitive data.

Notably, unlike many recently enacted state privacy laws, the Kentucky Act will not require the businesses to recognize universal opt-out mechanisms (such as Global Privacy Controls or GPCs) to process requests to opt out of sales of personal data or targeted advertising.

**RHODE ISLAND – EFFECTIVE DATE: JANUARY 1, 2026**

The Rhode Island Data Transparency and Privacy Act (the Rhode Island Act) will apply to controllers that do business in Rhode Island and, during the preceding calendar year, either (1) controlled or processed the personal data of at least 35,000 Rhode Island consumers, or (2) controlled or processed personal data of 10,000 Rhode Island consumers and derived 20% of gross revenues from the sale of personal data.

The Rhode Island Act gives consumers the right to confirm whether a controller is processing their data; to correct, delete and obtain copies of their personal data; and to opt out of personal data sales, profiling and targeted advertising. Additionally, businesses

must obtain consent to process sensitive data and honor consumers' revocation of such consent.

While the Rhode Island Act aligns with the other state privacy laws in effectively requiring controllers to provide consumers a privacy notice or policy, it sets a high bar for transparency with respect to the sales of personal data. Unlike most of the other state consumer privacy laws, but similar to the Minnesota Act, the Rhode Island Act requires controllers to identify all third parties – not merely “categories” of third parties – to which the controller has sold or “may sell” personal data.

## **CONCLUSION**

In sum, 2024 saw a continuation of the past several years' trend in the passage of state consumer privacy laws. While these new laws are largely similar in scope, exemptions and obligations, they do have notable differences. As effective dates approach, organizations should review these new laws and their compliance programs to ensure that any differences are accounted for.