Cooley

Texas Court Grants Preliminary Injunction Blocking FTC's Noncompete Ban

July 10, 2024

On July 3, 2024, the **US District Court for the Northern District of Texas issued an order** temporarily enjoining the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) from implementing or enforcing its rule banning nearly all post-employment noncompete agreements. The court held that the rule "makes unenforceable long-standing contractual agreements that have been judicially recognized as lawful and beneficial to the public interest." While it's a significant initial victory for opponents of the rule, the injunction applies only to the five plaintiffs in the case. Therefore, absent a superseding ruling, all other employers using noncompete agreements still will be subject to the ban on the effective date of the rule, September 4, 2024.

As **we reported in April 2024**, the FTC's rule banned all future noncompete agreements with workers and rendered unenforceable virtually all existing noncompetes, with limited exception. As rationale for its sweeping rule, the agency stated that noncompetes constitute an unfair method of competition, which violates the FTC Act. After the FTC issued its rule, several plaintiffs' groups, including Ryan LLC, a tax services and software provider, filed suit seeking to block the rule's enforcement.

Decision in *Ryan LLC v. Federal Trade Commission*

In the first filed case challenging the FTC rule, the court agreed with the plaintiffs, finding that they met all the requirements for issuing a preliminary injunction, including that:

1. The plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the merits.
2. Irreparable harm will result without the issuance of injunctive relief.
3. The balance of harms and public interest weigh in favor of granting injunctive relief.

Significantly, on the first requirement, the court found that the FTC rule is likely unlawful, because the agency lacks substantive rulemaking authority with respect to unfair methods of competition under the FTC Act. The court explained that while the FTC has "some authority" to promulgate rules to preclude unfair methods of competition, it lacks authority to create substantive rules under this method. Instead, the court explained that Section 6(g) of the FTC Act (through which the agency promulgated the ban), is merely a "housekeeping statute" and only authorizes "rules of agency organization, procedure or practice" as opposed to "substantive rules."

The court also held that the categorical ban on virtually all noncompetes would be arbitrary and capricious, because the agency's evidence does not warrant such an expansive ban – and because it failed to adequately consider other exceptions or alternatives to the ban. The court stated that the ban is "unreasonably overbroad without a reasonable explanation. It imposes a one-size-fits-all approach with no end date, which fails to establish a 'rational connection between the facts found and the choice made.'" The court also rejected the FTC's "evidence" in support of a ban, declaring that it only relied on a handful of studies examining the economic effect of various state noncompete policies, despite the fact that "no state has ever enacted a non-compete rule as broad as the [FTC rule]." The court also found that the FTC insufficiently addressed alternatives to a ban, because it "dismissed any possible alternatives, merely concluding that either the pro-competitive justifications outweighed the harms, or that employers had other avenues to protect their interests."

What's next?

As noted, the court did not issue a nationwide injunction or extend the ruling to the US Chamber of Commerce's members, or members of the other plaintiff entities. However, in making these holdings, the court stated that the plaintiffs had "offered virtually no briefing" supporting nationwide injunctive relief, nor did the plaintiff-intervenors appear to seek associational standing on behalf of their respective member entities, or brief associational standing. While the court refused to extend the scope of the injunction, it promised to enter a merits disposition on the case on or before August 30, 2024, which is five days before the FTC rule's effective date. It is possible that, in the interim, the parties may submit further briefing on these issues in support of a broader permanent injunction order. In the meantime, employers should keep a close eye on another legal challenge to the rule, filed in federal court in Pennsylvania. In *ATS Tree Services LLC v. Federal Trade Commission*, the court is expected to issue a decision on the plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction by July 23, 2024.

Uncertainty remains on the future of the rule, and employers should watch for developments in this area in the immediate future. Companies should continue to take steps now – including identifying employees subject to existing noncompete agreements – while legal challenges continue.

Cooley's employment team will continue to follow developments relating to the FTC rule. If you're an employer with questions about the use of restrictive covenants, contact your Cooley employment lawyer or one of the lawyers listed below.

To learn more, check out Cooley's **FTC Noncompete Ban Resources** page and our **What to Know About the FTC's Noncompete Ban** on-demand webinar.

This content is provided for general informational purposes only, and your access or use of the content does not create an attorney-client relationship between you or your organization and Cooley LLP, Cooley (UK) LLP, or any other affiliated practice or entity (collectively referred to as "Cooley"). By accessing this content, you agree that the information provided does not constitute legal or other professional advice. This content is not a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney licensed in your jurisdiction, and you should not act or refrain from acting based on this content. This content may be changed without notice. It is not guaranteed to be complete, correct or up to date, and it may not reflect the most current legal developments. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome. Do not send any confidential information to Cooley, as we do not have any duty to keep any information you provide to us confidential. When advising companies, our attorney-client relationship is with the company, not with any individual. This content may have been generated with the assistance of artificial intelligence (AI) in accordance with our AI Principles, may be considered Attorney Advertising and is subject to our **legal notices**.

Key Contacts

Wendy Brenner Palo Alto	brennerwj@cooley.com +1 650 843 5371
Helenanne Connolly Reston	hconnolly@cooley.com +1 703 456 8685

Ross Eberly Santa Monica	reberly@cooley.com +1 310 883 6415
Joshua Mates San Francisco	jmates@cooley.com +1 415 693 2084
Carly Mitchell Washington, DC	cmitchell@cooley.com +1 202 842 7828
Gerard O'Shea New York	goshea@cooley.com +1 212 479 6704
Miriam Petrillo Chicago	mpetrillo@cooley.com +1 312 881 6612
Ryan Vann Chicago	rhvann@cooley.com +1 312 881 6640
Leslie Cancel San Francisco	lcancel@cooley.com +1 415 693 2175
Joseph Lockinger New York	jlockinger@cooley.com +1 212 479 6736
MaryBeth Shreiner Reston	mshreiner@cooley.com +1 703 456 8169
Laura Terlouw San Francisco	lterlouw@cooley.com +1 415 693 2069
Anna Matsuo New York	amatsuo@cooley.com +1 212 479 6827
Eileen Leman Los Angeles	eleman@cooley.com +1 213 561 3216

This information is a general description of the law; it is not intended to provide specific legal advice nor is it intended to create an attorney-client relationship with Cooley LLP. Before taking any action on this information you should seek professional counsel.

Copyright © 2023 Cooley LLP, 3175 Hanover Street, Palo Alto, CA 94304; Cooley (UK) LLP, 22 Bishopsgate, London, UK EC2N 4BQ. Permission is granted to make and redistribute, without charge, copies of this entire document provided that such copies are complete and unaltered and identify Cooley LLP as the author. All other rights reserved.