

Motion"). (Mot. (Dkt. # 209).) The court heard the oral argument of counsel on April
 11, 2012, and has also considered all pleadings on file, including:

3 (1) Plaintiff Microsoft Corporation's ("Microsoft") motion for a temporary
4 restraining order and preliminary injunction (Dkt. # 209), along with all exhibits and
5 attachments;

6 (2) Defendants Motorola, Inc., Motorola Mobility, Inc., and General Instrument
7 Corporation's (collectively, "Motorola") response in opposition (Dkt. # 248), along with
8 all exhibits and attachments; and

(3) Microsoft's reply (Dkt. # 257).

The court is authorized to issue this temporary restraining order by Rule 65(b). 10 Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b). Having stated its findings of fact and conclusions of law on the 11 record at the April 11, 2012 hearing, and having found that the factors for an anti-suit 12 injunction set forth in E. & J. Gallo Winery v. Andina Licores S.A., 446 F.3d 984, 989 13 (9th Cir. 2006) have been met, the court hereby GRANTS Plaintiffs' motion for a 14 temporary restraining order (Dkt. # 209). The court ORDERS that, without prior leave of 15 this court, Motorola is enjoined from enforcing any injunctive relief it may receive in the 16 German court system relating to the patents at issue in Microsoft's Motion. The court 17 further ORDERS that Microsoft shall post a security bond in the amount of \$100 million 18 USD in connection with this motion. 19

20 21

22

9

Case 2:10-cv-01823-JLR Document 261 Filed 04/12/12 Page 3 of 3

1	This temporary restraining order shall be binding as provided in Federal Rule of
2	Civil Procedure 65(d) and shall remain in effect until the court's ruling on Docket No.
3	236, for which a hearing is scheduled on May 7, 2012. ¹
4	Dated this 12th day of April, 2012.
5	Jun R. Rlit
6	
7	The Honorable James L. Robart U.S. District Court Judge
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	¹ Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(2), the court finds good cause for extending this temporary restraining order beyond the fourteen day limit ordinarily imposed by
21	Rule $65(b)(2)$ because the purpose of this anti-suit injunction is to provide this court the opportunity to adjudicate issues properly presented in this jurisdiction as opposed to permitting a
22	foreign court to adjudicate those issues. The court intends to commence adjudication of the issues requiring this anti-suit injunction on May 7, 2012 or as soon as possible thereafter.