

EXHIBIT 1

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

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

Thomas R. Burke (CA State Bar No. 141930)
thomasburke@dwt.com
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
505 Montgomery Street
Suite 800
San Francisco, California 94111
Telephone: (415) 276-6500
Facsimile: (415) 276-6599

Kelli L. Sager (CA State Bar No. 120162)
kellisager@dwt.com
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2400
Los Angeles, California 90017-2566
Telephone: (213) 633-6800
Facsimile: (213) 633-6899

Laura R. Handman
(admission *pro hac vice* pending)
laurahandman@dwt.com
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 973-4200
Facsimile: (202) 973-4499

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

BANK JULIUS BAER & CO. LTD, a Swiss entity; and JULIUS BAER BANK AND TRUST CO. LTD., a Cayman Islands entity,

Plaintiffs,

v.

WIKILEAKS, an entity of unknown form, WIKILEAKS.ORG., an entity of unknown form; DYNADOT, LLC, a California limited liability corporation; and DOES 1 through 10 inclusive,

Defendants.

Case No. CV08-0824 JSW

Date: February 29, 2008
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Courtroom: 2, 17th Floor

Oral Argument Requested

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE THE REPORTERS COMMITTEE FOR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS; THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS; THE ASSOCIATED PRESS; CITIZEN MEDIA LAW PROJECT; THE E.W. SCRIPPS CO.; GANNETT CO., INC.; THE HEARST CORPORATION; THE LOS ANGELES TIMES; NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION; NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA; RADIO-TELEVISION NEWS DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION; AND THE SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

	Pages
I. Summary of Argument.....	1
II. Statement of Facts	2
III. JB Has Failed to Meet the Exacting Standard for a Prior Restraint.....	4
IV. The Order Requiring Dynadot to Disable the Wikileaks Website Is an Unconstitutional Prior Restraint	6
V. The TRO Against Wikileaks Is an Impermissible Prior Restraint.....	8
A. Privacy and Reputational Interests Cannot Justify a Prior Restraint	8
B. The Laws Cited by JB Do Not Authorize Any Punishment of Wikileaks, Let Alone a Prior Restraint	10
VI. Both the Order Granting the TRO Against Wikileaks and the Stipulated Permanent Injunction Regarding Dynadot Lack Findings Required for a Prior Restraint and Are Not Narrowly Tailored	12
VII. Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act Bars JB's Claims Against Wikileaks and Dynadot	14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

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

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

CASES

Alemite Mfg. Corp. v. Staff, 42 F.2d 832 (2d Cir. 1930) 14

Alexander v. United States, 509 U.S. 544 (1993) 4, 6

Allen v. Ghoulis Gallery, No. 06cv371, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 37514
(S.D. Cal. May 23, 2007) 12

Almeida v. Amazon.com, Inc., 456 F.3d 1316 (11th Cir. 2006) 15

Balboa Island Village Inn, Inc. v. Lemen, 40 Cal. 4th 1141 (2007) 9

Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan, 372 U.S. 58 (1963) 1, 7, 8

Barnes v. Yahoo!, Inc., No. 05-926, 2005 WL 3005602 (D. Or. Nov. 8, 2005) 16

Bartnicki v. Vopper, 532 U.S. 514 (2001) 10

Batzel v. Smith, 333 F.3d 1018 (9th Cir. 2003) 15, 16

Ben Ezra, Weinstein & Co. v. Am. Online, Inc., 206 F.3d 980 (10th Cir. 2000) 15

Best W. Int'l v. Doe, No. CV-06-1537, 2006 WL 2091696 (D. Ariz. July 25, 2006) 7

Blumenthal v. Drudge, 992 F. Supp. 44 (D.D.C. 1998) 16

Bridge C.A.T. Scan Assocs. v. Technicare Corp., 710 F.2d 940 (2d Cir. 1983) 5

Carafano v. Metrosplash.com, Inc., 339 F.3d 1119 (9th Cir. 2003) 15, 16

Carlin Commc'ns, Inc. v. Mountain States Tel. & Tel. Co., 827 F.2d 1291
(9th Cir. 1987) 6, 8

Carroll v. President & Comm'rs of Princess Anne, 393 U.S. 175 (1968) 1, 13, 14

CBS, Inc. v. Davis, 510 U.S. 1315 (1994) 5, 9

CBS, Inc. v. United States Dist. Court, 729 F.2d 1174
(9th Cir. 1984) 4

Cohen v. Cowles Media Co., 501 U.S. 663 (1991) 10

Copp v. Paxton, 45 Cal. App. 4th 829 (1996) 12

Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn, 420 U.S. 469 (1975) 8

Delfino v. Agilent Technologies, Inc., 145 Cal. App. 4th 790 (2006),
cert. denied, 128 S. Ct. 98 (2007) 16

Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, USA, Inc., 11 Cal. 4th 376 (1995) 12

Dendrite Int'l, Inc. v. Doe, 775 A.2d 756 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. 2001) 7

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 *Doe v. Cahill*, 884 A.2d 451 (Del. 2005) 7

2 *Donato v. Moldow*, 865 A.2d 711 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. 2005) 16

3 *EEOC v. Severn Trent Servs., Inc.*, 358 F.3d 438 (7th Cir. 2004) 12

4 *Elvis Presley Enters., Inc. v. Passport Video*, 357 F.3d 896 (9th Cir. 2004) 13

5 *Envtl. Planning & Info. Council v. Superior Court*, 36 Cal. 3d 188 (1984) 10

6 *FMC Corp. v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc.*, 915 F.2d 300 (7th Cir. 1990) 11

7 *Ford Motor Co. v. Lane*, 67 F. Supp. 2d 745 (E.D. Mich. 1999)..... 1, 5

8 *FTC v. Enforma Natural Prods., Inc.*, 362 F.3d 1204 (9th Cir. 2004)..... 1, 12, 13

9 *Gilbert v. Nat’l Enquirer, Inc.*, 43 Cal. App. 4th 1135 (1996) 9

10 *Glover v. Johnson*, 855 F.2d 277 (6th Cir. 1988) 13

11 *Goldblum v. NBC*, 584 F.2d 904 (9th Cir. 1978) 4, 9

12 *Granny Goose Foods v. Local 70, Int’l Brotherhood of Teamsters*, 415 U.S. 423 (1974) 1, 12

13 *Huggins v. Povich*, No. 131164/94, 1996 WL 515498 (N.Y. Sup. Ct. Apr. 19, 1996) 12

14 *Hunt v. NBC*, 872 F.2d 289 (9th Cir. 1989) 4

15 *In re Charlotte Observer*, 921 F.2d 47 (4th Cir. 1990) 7, 9

16 *In re King World Prods., Inc.*, 898 F.2d 56 (6th Cir. 1990) 8

17 *In re North*, 16 F.3d 1234 (D.C. Cir. 1994) 8

18 *In re Providence Journal Co.*, 820 F.2d 1342 (1st Cir. 1986), *modified*
 19 *on rehearing en banc*, 820 F.2d 1354 (1st Cir. 1987), *cert. dismissed*
 20 *on other grounds, United States v. Providence Journal Co.*, 485 U.S.
 693 (1988) 5, 6, 8

21 *In re Rare Coin Galleries of America, Inc.*, 862 F.2d 896 (1st Cir. 1988) 13

22 *Kathleen R. v. City of Livermore*, 87 Cal. App. 4th 684 (2001)..... 15

23 *Levine v. United States Dist. Court*, 764 F.2d 590 (9th Cir. 1985) 13

24 *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444 (1938)..... 7

25 *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections Comm’n*, 514 U.S. 334 (1995) 7

26 *Metro. Opera Ass’n, Inc. v. Local 100, Hotel Employees & Restaurant*
Employees Int’l, 239 F.3d 172 (2d Cir. 2001) 9

27 *Near v. State of Minnesota ex rel. Olson*, 283 U.S. 697 (1931) 1, 4, 6, 9

28 *Nebraska Press Ass’n v. Stuart*, 427 U.S. 539 (1976) *passim*

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 *New York Times Co. v. United States*, 403 U.S. 713 (1971) 1, 5, 6, 9

2 *Nicholson v. McClatchy Newspapers*, 177 Cal. App. 3d 509 (1986) 11

3 *Novak v. Overture Servs.*, 309 F. Supp. 2d 446 (E.D.N.Y. 2004) 16

4 *Optinrealbig.com, LLC v. Ironport Sys., Inc.*, 323 F. Supp. 2d 1037 (N.D. Cal. 2004) 14

5 *Org. for a Better Austin v. Keefe*, 402 U.S. 415 (1971) 8, 9, 12

6 *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Public Utilities Comm'n of Cal.*, 475 U.S. 1 (1986) 7

7 *Pearson v. Dodd*, 410 F.2d 701 (D.C. Cir. 1969) 11

8 *Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro v. Schectman*, 55 Cal. App. 4th 1279 (1997) 11

9 *Procter & Gamble Co. v. Bankers Trust Co.*, 78 F.3d 219 (6th Cir. 1996) 1, 5, 6

10 *Religious Tech. Ctr. v. F.A.C.T.NET, Inc.*, 901 F. Supp. 1519 (D. Colo. 1995)..... 8

11 *Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Netcom On-Line Commc'n Servs., Inc.*, 923 F. Supp. 1231
(N.D. Cal. 1995) 6

12 *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844 (1997)..... 7

13 *Smith v. Daily Mail Publ'g Co.*, 443 U.S. 97 (1979) 4, 10

14 *Stead Motors v. Automotive Machinists Lodge 1173*, 886 F.2d 1200 (9th Cir. 1989) 13

15 *United States v. Playboy Entm't Group, Inc.*, 529 U.S. 803 (2000) 14

16 *United States v. Leon*, 468 U.S. 897 (1984) 13

17 *Universal Commc'n Sys., Inc. v. Lycos, Inc.*, 478 F.3d 413 (1st Cir. 2007) 16

18 *Valley Bank of Nevada v. Superior Court*, 15 Cal. 3d 652 (1975) 11

19 *Watchtower Bible & Tract Soc'y of N.Y., Inc. v. Village of Stratton*, 536 U.S. 150 (2002) 7

20 *Zeran v. Am. Online, Inc.*, 129 F.3d 327 (4th Cir. 1997) 15, 16

STATUTES & RULES

22 12 U.S.C. § 3401 et seq. 11

23 47 U.S.C. § 230 *passim*

24 Fed. R. Civ. P. 52 12

25 Fed. R. Civ. P. 65 12

26

27

28

MISCELLANEOUS

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

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

Adam Liptak and Brad Stone, *Judge Shuts Down Website Specializing in Leaks*, N.Y. Times, Feb. 20, 2008 2, 3

Alexander Bickel, *The Morality of Consent* 61 (1975) 7

Eric Schmitt and Michael R. Gordon, *Leak on Cross-Border Chases From Iraq*, N.Y. Times, Feb. 4, 2008 2

Julian Assange and Daniel Schmitt, *Bank Julius Baer v. Wikileaks*, Jan. 23, 2008, available at http://www.sunshinepress.org/wiki/Bank_Julius/Baer_vs_Wikileaks 2

Kenya dismisses Moi graft claims, BBC News, Aug. 31, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6972337.stm> 2

M. Nimmer, *Nimmer on Freedom of Speech*, § 4.03 (1984) 6

Ryan Singel, *Sensitive Guantanamo Bay Manual Leaked Through Wiki Site*, Wired.com, Nov. 14, 2007, <http://www.wired.com/politics/onlinerights/news/2007/11-gitmo> 2

2 William Blackstone, *Commentaries* 5

1 **I. Summary of Argument**

2 *Amici* are news organizations and non-profit organizations that, on a daily basis, protect the
3 rights of journalists and other citizens to report on information available on the Internet. The
4 Permanent Injunction requiring Dynadot to disable Wikileaks.org and the Temporary Restraining
5 Order issued against Wikileaks impose prior restraints that violate the First Amendment.

6 *First*, Wikileaks provides a forum for dissidents and whistleblowers across the globe to
7 post documents, but the Dynadot Injunction imposes a prior restraint that drastically curtails
8 access to Wikileaks from the Internet based on a limited number of postings challenged by
9 Plaintiffs. The Dynadot Injunction therefore violates the bedrock principle that an injunction
10 cannot enjoin *all communication* by a publisher or other speaker. *Near v. State of Minnesota ex*
11 *rel. Olson*, 283 U.S. 697 (1931); *Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan*, 372 U.S. 58, 64 n.6, 71 (1963).

12 *Second*, the TRO against Wikileaks violates the First Amendment because judicial orders
13 enjoining reporting on or dissemination of documents constitute prior restraints. *New York Times*
14 *Co. v. United States* (“*Pentagon Papers*”), 403 U.S. 713 (1971); *Procter & Gamble Co. v. Bankers*
15 *Trust Co.*, 78 F.3d 219 (6th Cir. 1996); *Ford Motor Co. v. Lane*, 67 F. Supp. 2d 745 (E.D. Mich.
16 1999). Under *Pentagon Papers*, the First Amendment prohibits prior restraints in nearly every
17 circumstance, even where national security may be at risk and the press’s source is alleged to have
18 obtained the documents unlawfully. The privacy and commercial interests Plaintiffs cite are
19 simply not on the same order of magnitude required to justify a prior restraint, and the grab bag of
20 federal, state, and foreign laws they cite do not authorize prior restraints.

21 *Third*, both the TRO and Dynadot Injunction lack the rigorous findings required for a prior
22 restraint and are far broader than constitutionally permissible, as the TRO purports to reach
23 anyone with “notice,” not just parties, and is not narrowly tailored. *Granny Goose Foods, Inc. v.*
24 *Local 70, Int’l Brotherhood of Teamsters*, 415 U.S. 423, 443 (1974); *FTC v. Enforma Natural*
25 *Prods., Inc.*, 362 F.3d 1204, 1215 (9th Cir. 2004); *Carroll v. President & Comm’rs of Princess*
26 *Anne*, 393 U.S. 175 (1968).

27 *Finally*, the TRO and Dynadot Injunction are precluded by Section 230 of the
28 Communications Decency Act, which prohibits injunctive relief against websites and services

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 such as Wikileaks and Dynadot for publishing information provided by third parties.

2 **II. Statement of Facts**

3 The website www.wikileaks.org “invites people to post leaked materials with the goal of
4 discouraging ‘unethical behavior’ by corporations and governments.” Adam Liptak and Brad
5 Stone, *Judge Shuts Down Website Specializing in Leaks*, N.Y. Times, Feb. 20, 2008 (hereinafter
6 “*Liptak*”). “It has posted documents said to show the rules of engagement for American troops in
7 Iraq, a military manual for the operation of the detention center at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, and
8 other evidence of what it has called corporate waste and wrongdoing.” *Id.* Documents posted on
9 Wikileaks have been the basis for major news stories in recent months on the U.S. military’s rules
10 of engagement in Iraq (N.Y. Times); the treatment of terrorist suspects held at Guantanamo
11 (Wired.com); and official corruption in Kenya and Somalia (BBC News).¹

12 Plaintiffs Bank Julius Baer & Co. Ltd. and Julius Baer Bank and Trust Co. LTD (together,
13 “Plaintiffs” or “JB”) allege that confidential bank documents that JB believes were stolen by
14 “disgruntled ex-employee” Rudolf Elmer (“Elmer”) were posted on www.wikileaks.org
15 commencing on or about January 13, 2008. Brief in Support of TRO (“Pl. Br.”) at 3, 8. Wikileaks
16 has confirmed that it “has released several hundred documents from a Swiss banking
17 whistleblower purportedly showing offshore tax evasion and money laundering by extremely
18 wealthy and in some cases, politically sensitive, clients from the US, Europe, China and Peru.”²

19 On February 6, 2008, JB filed a Complaint against Wikileaks, alleging claims for unlawful
20 business practices, interference with contract and prospective economic advantage, and
21 conversion. Two days later, JB filed an *ex parte* motion for a preliminary injunction and
22 temporary restraining order. The Court held a hearing on the matter less than a week later, at
23 which Wikileaks did not appear.

24 On February 15, 2008, the Court entered a “Permanent Injunction,” apparently as a result

25
26 ¹ Eric Schmitt and Michael R. Gordon, *Leak on Cross-Border Chases From Iraq*, N.Y.
27 Times, Feb. 4, 2008; Ryan Singel, *Sensitive Guantanamo Bay Manual Leaked Through Wiki Site*,
28 Wired.com, Nov. 14, 2007, <http://www.wired.com/politics/onlinerights/news/2007/11/-gitmo>;
Kenya dismisses Moi graft claims, BBC News, Aug. 31, 2007, <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/africa/6972337.stm>.

² Julian Assange and Daniel Schmitt, “Bank Julius Baer v. Wikileaks,” Jan. 23, 2008,
available at http://www.sunshinepress.org/wiki/Bank_Julius_Baer_vs._Wikileaks.

1 of a Stipulation between Plaintiffs and Defendant Dynadot, requiring that “Dynadot shall
 2 immediately clear and remove all DNS hosting records for the wikileaks.org domain name and
 3 prevent the domain name from resolving to the wikileaks.org website or any other website or
 4 server other than a blank park page, until further order of this Court.”³ Because the wikileaks.org
 5 domain name has been “cleared” pursuant to the injunction, the ability to access the site to review
 6 any document (even those unrelated to JB) or post any documents has been severely impeded.
 7 However, “[t]he site itself could still be accessed at its Internet Protocol address
 8 (<http://88.80.13.160/>) – the unique number that specifies a Web site’s location on the Internet.
 9 Wikileaks also maintained ‘mirror sites,’ or copies usually produced to ensure against failures and
 10 this kind of legal action” from countries like China. *See Liptak*. Some of these sites were
 11 registered in countries other than the United States, through domain registrars other than Dynadot,
 12 and thus were unaffected by the injunction. *Id.*

13 On February 15, the Court also entered its “Amended Temporary Restraining Order and
 14 Order to Show Cause Re Preliminary Injunction” enjoining Wikileaks and “all others who receive
 15 notice of this order” from, *inter alia*, posting, publishing, disseminating, or otherwise using certain
 16 documents and information originating from JB and which JB claims to be private, “whether or
 17 not such documents and information are authentic . . . or forged.” The Court scheduled a hearing
 18 for February 29, 2008 (the conclusion of the ten-day limit for a temporary restraining order) and
 19

20 ³ An Internet user generally accesses a website by entering its domain name – such as
 21 www.cand.uscourts.gov – into his Internet browser. The browser, through a series of
 22 communications with a domain name server (“DNS”), resolves the human-readable domain name
 23 into a machine-readable Internet protocol (“IP”) address – such as 123.45.67.89. The DNS system
 24 is essentially a phone book for the computer to translate website names to IP addresses, the latter
 25 of which may be located by the computer’s browser. In theory, a user could access a site directly
 using its IP address, but this is practically untenable. The DNS system is thus critical to the
 functioning of the Internet – including both the World Wide Web and e-mail, as website and email
 addresses (e.g., Judge@cand.uscourts.gov) contain human-readable domain names.

26 Operators of websites obtain their domain names from DNS registrars, such as Dynadot.
 27 These registrars control the domain names registered through them, allowing them to add, modify,
 and delete information concerning the domain name, such as the IP address to which the domain
 name resolves. The registrars have the ability to practically disable websites by deleting the IP
 28 address of the website from the DNS system, so that users who enter the domain name into their
 browsers or attempt to send an email to an address with that domain name do not actually reach
 the site or deliver the email.

1 ordered Wikileaks to show cause why a preliminary injunction should not issue that continues the
 2 terms of the Temporary Restraining Order. Wikileaks has not filed any opposition, nor has it
 3 appeared in the case. In a filing on February 22, 2008, JB contends that Wikileaks has waived its
 4 rights and that the court should not hear from Wikileaks “or any third parties.” See Pl. Notice of
 5 Non-Opposition at 3.

6 *Amici* file this brief to alert the Court to the fundamental First Amendment issues at stake
 7 which have not been addressed by JB or Wikileaks (who has not appeared in this case) and which
 8 have a critical impact on Media Amici. See Motion for Leave to File Amici Brief, filed
 9 concurrently herewith. Defendant Dynadot LLC consents to *Amici*’s participation. JB opposes
 10 *Amici*’s participation.

11 III. JB Has Failed to Meet the Exacting Standard for a Prior Restraint

12 “Temporary restraining orders and permanent injunctions – *i.e.*, court orders that actually
 13 forbid speech activities – are classic examples of prior restraints.” *Alexander v. United States*,
 14 509 U.S. 544, 550 (1993). Prior restraints represent “the most serious and the least tolerable
 15 infringement on First Amendment rights,” *Nebraska Press Ass’n v. Stuart*, 427 U.S. 539, 559
 16 (1976), constitute “one of the most extraordinary remedies known to our jurisprudence,” *Hunt v.*
 17 *NBC*, 872 F.2d 289, 293 (9th Cir. 1989), and are “presumptively unconstitutional,” *Goldblum v.*
 18 *NBC*, 584 F.2d 904, 906-07 (9th Cir. 1978) (Kennedy, J.) (granting writ of mandamus and
 19 vacating prior restraint). “Under our constitutional system prior restraints, if permissible at all, are
 20 permissible only in the most extraordinary of circumstances.” *CBS, Inc. v. United States Dist.*
 21 *Court*, 729 F.2d 1174, 1183 (9th Cir. 1983) (granting writ of mandamus and vacating TRO); *Smith*
 22 *v. Daily Mail Publ’g Co.*, 443 U.S. 97, 102 (1979) (“Prior restraints have been accorded the most
 23 exacting scrutiny . . .”). The First Amendment forbids prior restraint of speech even more
 24 categorically than criminal punishment because “[a] prior restraint . . . has an immediate and
 25 irreversible sanction. If it can be said that a threat of criminal or civil sanctions after publication
 26 ‘chills’ speech, prior restraint ‘freezes’ it at least for the time.” *Nebraska Press Ass’n*, 427 U.S. at
 27 559; see also *Near*, 283 U.S. at 713-14 (“The liberty of the press . . . consists in laying no
 28

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 previous restraints upon publications . . . ’ ”) (quoting 2 William Blackstone, *Commentaries*,
2 *151-52).

3 It is well established that court orders that forbid dissemination of confidential documents,
4 such as the TRO against Wikileaks and the Dynadot Injunction, constitute prior restraints,
5 regardless of how the documents were obtained. *Pentagon Papers*, 403 U.S. 713 (1971)
6 (injunction against publication of classified documents purloined from Defense Department is a
7 prior restraint); *Procter & Gamble*, 78 F.3d at 225-27 (TRO enjoining publication of leaked
8 documents sealed by court order is a prior restraint); *In re Providence Journal Co.*, 820 F.2d
9 1342, 1345 (1st Cir. 1986) (“temporary restraining order barring publication of [FBI] logs and
10 memoranda” is a prior restraint), *modified on reh’g en banc*, 820 F.2d 1354 (1st Cir. 1987), *cert.*
11 *dismissed on other grounds*, *United States v. Providence Journal Co.*, 485 U.S. 693 (1988);
12 *Bridge C.A.T. Scan Assocs. v. Technicare Corp.*, 710 F.2d 940, 946 (2d Cir. 1983) (TRO against
13 publication of document is a prior restraint regardless of “[t]he fact that the order at issue here
14 involves trade secrets”); *Lane*, 67 F. Supp. 2d at 747-48 (holding that to order an Internet poster to
15 remove internal Ford documents would constitute a prior restraint).⁴

16 Notwithstanding this clear authority, JB has ignored the First Amendment rights
17 implicated by the TRO, and limits its legal analysis to the ordinary injunctive relief standard, Pl.
18 Br. at 11, Pl. Notice of Non-Opposition at 2 n.1. “In the case of a prior restraint on pure speech,”
19 however, “the hurdle is substantially higher” than for an ordinary TRO. *Procter & Gamble*, 78
20 F.3d at 226-27. This “most extraordinary remedy” can be ordered “only where the evil that would
21 result from the reportage is both great and certain,” *CBS, Inc. v. Davis*, 510 U.S. 1315, 1317
22 (1994) (Blackmun, J., in chambers) (emphasis added), and in the most exceptional circumstances
23 – such as to prevent the dissemination of information about troop movements during wartime,

24 _____
25 ⁴ In *Lane*, the poster knew the employees breached confidentiality agreements and
26 threatened to encourage such breach, Ford alleged that the poster “solicited and received trade
27 secrets that were misappropriated” and Ford “presented substantial evidence to support its claim
28 that [the poster] violated the Michigan Uniform Trade Secrets Act” – a far cry from this case,
where there is no plausible allegation that Wikileaks directly solicited documents from Elmer or
knew of his agreements with JB when it posted the documents. 67 F. Supp. 2d at 746, 748. Even
under more compelling circumstances, however, the *Lane* court *still* rejected an injunction as “an
invalid prior restraint of free speech in violation of the First Amendment.” *Id.* at 746.

1 *Near*, 283 U.S. at 716, or to “suppress[] information that would set in motion a nuclear
2 holocaust.” *Pentagon Papers*, 403 U.S. at 726 (Brennan, J., concurring). Thus, “[i]n its nearly
3 two centuries of existence, the Supreme Court has *never* upheld a prior restraint on pure speech,”
4 *In re Providence Journal*, 820 F.2d at 1348 (emphasis added), even when “faced with the
5 competing interest of national security or the Sixth Amendment right to a fair trial,” *Procter &*
6 *Gamble*, 78 F.3d at 227.

7 **IV. The Order Requiring Dynadot to Disable the Wikileaks Website**
8 **Is an Unconstitutional Prior Restraint**

9 The first of the two prior restraints at issue is the Court’s entry of a permanent injunction
10 against Dynadot that requires Dynadot to disable and lock the wikileaks.org domain name. This
11 order has the effect of permanently and drastically curtailing access to the entire site – restraining
12 *all* of the speech on the site, including speech having nothing to do with JB’s activities. This is
13 precisely the sort of injunction rejected by the Supreme Court in *Near*, 283 U.S. 697, where a
14 newspaper was completely enjoined from future publication based on prior articles. *See also*
15 *Alexander*, 509 U.S. at 550 (“[P]ermanent injunctions, *i.e.*, – court orders that actually forbid
16 speech activities – are classic examples of prior restraints.”) (quoting M. Nimmer, *Nimmer on*
17 *Freedom of Speech* § 4.03, at 4-14 (1984)).

18 As the Ninth Circuit has stated, “[e]ven when a speaker has repeatedly exceeded the limits
19 of the First Amendment, courts are extremely reluctant to permit the state to close down his
20 communication forum altogether.” *Carlin Commc’ns, Inc. v. Mountain States Tel. & Tel. Co.*, 827
21 F.2d 1291, 1296 (9th Cir. 1987); *see also Religious Tech. Ctr. v. Netcom On-Line Commc’n*
22 *Servs., Inc.*, 923 F. Supp. 1231, 1259 (N.D. Cal. 1995) (“While a specifically-tailored injunction in
23 a copyright case does not offend the First Amendment, attempting to shut down a critic’s speech
24 activities, including those that do not implicate the copyright laws in the least, would constitute an
25 unwarranted prior restraint on speech.”).

26 Neither Plaintiffs’ nor Dynadot’s submissions to the Court purport to justify the blanket
27 prior restraint against Wikileaks.⁵ The First Amendment “protects the public’s interest in

28 ⁵ Plaintiffs readily admit that the purpose of the Dynadot injunction is to smoke out
representatives of wikileaks.org in order for JB to proceed in its suit against them. *See* Pl. Br. at
21 n.3 (explaining that the injunction is intended to force “the Wikileaks defendants [to] stop

1 receiving information.” *Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. Public Utilities Comm’n of Cal.*, 475 U.S. 1, 8
 2 (1986) (plurality opinion). Indeed, Plaintiffs appear to recognize that they have no right to enjoin
 3 the entirety of the Wikileaks website, which contains countless documents of public interest, as
 4 well as analysis and discussion of those documents. *See* Pl. Br. at 10 (explaining the limited relief
 5 sought).

6 The indirect nature of the restraint on Wikileaks – compelling Dynadot to shut down the
 7 wikileaks.org domain – makes it no less offensive. *Bantam Books*, 372 U.S. at 64 n.6, 71 (finding
 8 unlawful prior restraint against publishers, where government coerced distributors into consenting
 9 to cease distributing the publishers’ works: “The constitutional guarantee of freedom of the press
 10 embraces the circulation of books as well as their publication, and the direct and obviously
 11 intended result of the Commission’s activities was to curtail the circulation in Rhode Island of
 12 books published by appellants.”) (citing *Lovell v. City of Griffin*, 303 U.S. 444, 452 (1938)
 13 (“[W]ithout the circulation, the publication would be of little value.”) (citation omitted)).

14 The fact that the documents have been available online since January 13, 2008, and the
 15 Wikileaks site is still accessible through its IP address and through “mirror” sites in other
 16 countries cannot save the restraint, which seeks to block the primary means of access to the site.
 17 *See Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844, 879-80 (1997) (Internet speech restrictions not justified by
 18 remaining avenues for such speech). If anything, this cuts against the validity of the restraint, in
 19 that it is not only unjustified but ineffective. *Nebraska Press Ass’n*, 427 U.S. at 567 (prior
 20 restraint unsupportable where ineffective). Prior restraints are particularly inappropriate where, as
 21 here, “the cat is out of the bag.” *In re Charlotte Observer*, 921 F.2d 47, 50 (4th Cir. 1990) (district

22
 23 hiding behind anonymity”). This is not a valid purpose for a prior restraint. Moreover, the First
 24 Amendment protects the right to speak anonymously. *See Watchtower Bible & Tract Soc’y of*
 25 *N.Y., Inc. v. Village of Stratton*, 536 U.S. 150, 166-67 (2002); *McIntyre v. Ohio Elections*
 26 *Comm’n*, 514 U.S. 334, 341-42 (1995). This right applies equally to speech on the Internet. *See*
 27 *Best W. Int’l v. Doe*, No. CV-06-1537, 2006 WL 2091696, at *3-4 (D. Ariz. July 25, 2006); *Doe v.*
 28 *Cahill*, 884 A.2d 451, 456 (Del. 2005); *Dendrite Int’l v. Doe*, 775 A.2d 756, 765-66 (N.J. Super.
 Ct. App. Div. 2001).

29 Even if the injunction were only in effect until Wikileaks submitted to the Court’s
 30 jurisdiction, as JB suggests, it would be constitutionally infirm: “Prior restraints fall on speech
 31 with a brutality and a finality all their own. Even if they are ultimately lifted they cause
 32 irremediable loss – a loss in the immediacy, the impact, of speech.” *Nebraska Press Ass’n*, 427
 33 U.S. at 609 (Brennan, J., concurring) (quoting Alexander Bickel, *The Morality of Consent* 61
 34 (1975)).

1 court erred in issuing prior restraint where “[o]nce announced to the world, the information lost its
 2 secret characteristic”); *see also In re North*, 16 F.3d 1234, 1245 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (authorizing
 3 publication of investigative report of independent counsel where information was widely known,
 4 because “it is impossible to remove leaked material from the news media and cram it back into
 5 grand jury secrecy”); *Religious Tech. Ctr. v. F.A.C.T.NET, Inc.*, 901 F. Supp. 1519, 1527 (D.
 6 Colo. 1995) (widely disclosed documents lose status as trade secrets).

7 The fact that Dynadot consented to the injunction also is irrelevant. In *Bantam*, the
 8 distributor of the publishers’ works agreed to cease distribution under government pressure, but
 9 the state action was held to be a prior restraint against the publishers’ expression nonetheless.
 10 Whether or not Dynadot could on its own choose to disable the wikileaks.org domain name, the
 11 Court cannot put its imprimatur on such action. *See Carlin*, 827 F.2d at 1296-97 (distinguishing
 12 between unconstitutional restraint involving state action and permissible private restraint). As
 13 such the permanent injunction against Dynadot constitutes an unconstitutional prior restraint.

14 **V. The TRO Against Wikileaks Is an Impermissible Prior Restraint**

15 **A. Privacy and Reputational Interests Cannot Justify a Prior Restraint**

16 The TRO focused on the JB documents fares no better than the blanket injunction. The
 17 rationales offered by JB do not even approach the rigorous justification required for a prior
 18 restraint forbidding not just Wikileaks but the world – everyone “with notice” of the order – from
 19 reporting on the documents. “Designating the conduct as an invasion of privacy” does not warrant
 20 a prior restraint. *Org. for a Better Austin v. Keefe*, 402 U.S. 415, 419-20 (1971); *see also In re*
 21 *Providence Journal*, 820 F.2d at 1350 (privacy, “although meriting great protection, is simply not
 22 of the same magnitude” as the interests that could justify a prior restraint); *In re King World Prod.*
 23 *Inc.*, 898 F.2d 56, 57-58 (6th Cir. 1990) (vacating TRO against broadcast of video filmed by
 24 producer who invaded doctor’s privacy by posing as a patient and surreptitiously filming him); *see*
 25 *also Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 487-96 (1975) (First Amendment prohibits even
 26 subsequent punishment for publishing juvenile rape victim’s name contained in indictment).

27 JB also complains about its damaged business reputation caused by its inability to protect
 28 private information against disclosure by a renegade employee, but “the interest . . . in being free

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 from public criticism of . . . business practices” cannot justify a prior restraint. *Keefe*, 402 U.S. at
 2 419; *see also Davis*, 510 U.S. at 1318 (1994) (Blackmun, J., in chambers) (finding prior restraint
 3 not justified by potential for “significant economic harm”); *In re Charlotte Observer*, 921 F.2d at
 4 49 (prior restraint to “protect[] the reputation of [an] attorney” held impermissible). JB’s
 5 allegations that the documents contain defamatory forgeries likewise cannot justify a prior
 6 restraint, particularly one not limited to the just that information, for subsequent punishment, not
 7 prior restraint, is “the appropriate sanction for calculated defamation or other misdeeds in the First
 8 Amendment context.” *See Davis*, 510 U.S. at 1318 (Blackmun, J., in chambers); *see also Near*,
 9 283 U.S. at 705 (reversing injunction against publication of “malicious, scandalous and
 10 defamatory matter” as prior restraint); *Metro. Opera Ass’n, Inc. v. Local 100, Hotel Employees &*
 11 *Restaurant Employees Int’l*, 239 F.3d 172, 177 (2d Cir. 2001) (“[C]ourts have long held that
 12 equity will not enjoin a libel.”); *Gilbert v. Nat’l Enquirer, Inc.*, 43 Cal. App. 4th 1135, 1144
 13 (1996) (“[P]rior restraints are not permitted to stop the publication of a defamatory statement.”);
 14 *Balboa Island Village Inn, Inc. v. Lemen*, 40 Cal. 4th 1141, 1155 (2007) (at minimum, defamatory
 15 speech cannot be enjoined, if even, until after “a trial at which it is determined that the defendant
 16 defamed the plaintiff.”).

17 Finally, while JB’s latest filing gestures at identity theft and predicts a “devastating impact
 18 on financial institutions,” *see* Pl. Notice of Non-Opposition at 2, such vague prognostications
 19 about the banking industry, based solely on the Declaration of JB’s outside counsel, constitute
 20 rank speculation insufficient to justify a prior restraint. *Davis*, 510 U.S. at 1318 (Blackmun, J., in
 21 chambers) (“[S]peculative predictions . . . based on ‘factors unknown and unknowable’” cannot
 22 justify a prior restraint); *Goldblum*, 584 F.2d at 906 (“wholly speculative” possibility of future
 23 criminal prosecution insufficient for prior restraint). Nor does this speculation compare to threats
 24 posed in earlier cases in which the prior restraints were nonetheless rejected. *See Pentagon*
 25 *Papers*, 403 U.S. at 726-27 (Brennan, J., concurring) (threat of harm to national security caused by
 26 disclosure of defense department documents too speculative to justify prior restraint); *Nebraska*
 27 *Press Ass’n*, 427 U.S. at 567 (concerns about defendant’s fair trial rights deemed too speculative
 28 to justify prior restraint).

B. The Laws Cited by JB Do Not Authorize Any Punishment of Wikileaks, Let Alone a Prior Restraint

1
2 JB attempts to paint Wikileaks as an accomplice to Elmer, liable under California common
3 law for Elmer’s alleged wrongdoings. “This case cannot realistically be viewed from an
4 exclusively common law perspective, however, since the very nature of the activities complained
5 of invites constitutional analysis as well.” *Envtl. Planning & Info. Council v. Superior Court*, 36
6 Cal. 3d 188, 195 (1984). Wikileaks posts an open invitation to whistleblowers worldwide to post
7 documents anonymously on its site for purposes of public dissemination, review, and discussion.
8 Even under the facts alleged by JB, Wikileaks itself obtained the documents lawfully – *i.e.*, the
9 documents were allegedly stolen by Elmer and then voluntarily provided by Elmer to Wikileaks –
10 and the Supreme Court has made it clear that laws imposing subsequent punishment based on
11 dissemination of lawfully obtained information violate the First Amendment, even if the source of
12 the information provides it illegally. *See, e.g., Bartnicki v. Vopper*, 532 U.S. 514, 535 (2001)
13 (“[A] stranger’s illegal conduct does not suffice to remove the First Amendment shield from
14 speech about a matter of public concern.”); *Cohen v. Cowles Media Co.*, 501 U.S. 663, 668-69
15 (1991) (“[I]f a newspaper lawfully obtains truthful information about a matter of public
16 significance then state officials may not constitutionally punish publication of the information,
17 absent a need to further a state interest of the highest order . . .”) (quoting *Daily Mail Publ’g*, 443
18 U.S. at 103).

19 In support of its request for a TRO, JB cites to “applicable consumer banking and privacy
20 protection laws, including applicable Swiss and Cayman Islands laws, as well as federal and
21 California Constitutional privacy rights and unfair business practice laws” that “prohibit” the
22 documents from being published. Pl. Brief at 1. But most of the laws JB cites in support of its
23 position do not, on their face, even apply to third-parties like Wikileaks. With regard to
24 “applicable Swiss and Cayman Islands laws,” there is no allegation that Wikileaks (as opposed to
25 Elmer) is subject to the jurisdiction of either Switzerland or the Cayman Islands. Even if
26 Wikileaks were subject to these laws, however, and even if third-parties like Wikileaks were
27 potentially liable under the Cayman Islands and Swiss statutes cited to by JB, Heistand Decl., Exs.
28

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 B and C, the statutes impose only subsequent punishment, and do *not* authorize prior restraints.⁶
 2 Although bank customers undoubtedly have a privacy interest in their financial information, the
 3 laws cited by JB do not address Wikileaks' – as opposed to Elmer's – conduct.

4 Nor do the remaining tort claims alleged in JB's Complaint provide any basis for liability
 5 or, more importantly, overcome the constitutional prohibition against prior restraint. With regard
 6 to JB's claim of conversion, because Wikileaks is not in possession of the original documents, and
 7 because it did not steal the documents from JB, there can be no claim for conversion under
 8 California law. *FMC Corp. v. Capital Cities/ABC, Inc.*, 915 F.2d 300, 303 (7th Cir. 1990) (“[T]he
 9 receipt of copies of documents, rather than the documents themselves, should not ordinarily give
 10 rise to a claim of conversion [because] . . . the possession of copies of documents – as opposed to
 11 the documents themselves – does not amount to an interference with the owner's property
 12 sufficient to constitute conversion.”) (applying California law).⁷ The *FMC Corp.* Court concluded
 13 that, even though the defendant news station received stolen documents from a third party source,
 14 it was “free to retain copies of any of FMC's documents in its possession (and to disseminate any
 15 information contained in them) in the name of the First Amendment.” *Id.* at 305. So, too, is
 16 Wikileaks entitled to disseminate the documents in the name of the First Amendment. *See*
 17 *Nicholson v. McClatchy Newspapers*, 177 Cal. App. 3d 509, 519-20 (1986) (government may not
 18 impose liability upon the press for obtaining confidential or restricted information). Even if
 19 Wikileaks could be liable for conversion, the cases cited *supra* make it abundantly clear that a
 20 prior restraint is not a constitutionally acceptable remedy.

21 Finally, as for JB's claims for interference with contract and prospective economic

22 ⁶ Similarly, the federal and California financial privacy laws cited in JB's brief, even if
 23 they applied to Wikileaks, do *not* authorize a prior restraint. Pl. Br. at 13-14. The federal Right to
 24 Financial Privacy Act requires government agencies to follow certain procedures when seeking
 25 financial records of bank customers, 12 U.S.C. § 3401 *et seq.*, and the California cases to which
 JB cites discuss the obligation of *banks* not to disclose their customers' private information unless
 compelled by court order. *Valley Bank of Nevada v. Superior Court*, 15 Cal. 3d 652, 656-57
 (1975).⁷

26 ⁷ *See also Pearson v. Dodd*, 410 F.2d 701, 705 (D.C. Cir. 1969) (plaintiff not denied
 27 “property use” of documents where third party made copies of the documents and provided them
 to reporter; court specifically rejected “proposition that one who receives information from an
 intruder, knowing it has been obtained by improper intrusion, is guilty of a tort”); *Pillsbury,*
 28 *Madison & Sutro v. Schectman*, 55 Cal. App. 4th 1279, 1287 (1997) (recognizing that “underlying
 First Amendment issue” would present a policy exception to third party liability for conversion of
 stolen documents).

1 advantage, again, JB has not shown that it is likely to prevail on these claims, and indeed does not
 2 address them in its moving papers.⁸ Even if Wikileaks could be subsequently held liable for the
 3 torts of interference with contract and prospective economic advantage, there is *no* justification for
 4 a prior restraint. *Allen v. Ghoulish Gallery*, No. 06cv371, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 37514, at *8
 5 (S.D. Cal. May 23, 2007) (denying motion for an injunction where “the conduct sought to be
 6 enjoined appears to fall under [claims] for trade libel, defamation and intentional interference with
 7 prospective economic advantage, for which there are other remedies at law. . . . Enjoining the
 8 alleged conduct would act as a prior restraint on plaintiff’s speech, violating his first amendment
 9 rights.”); *see also Keefe*, 402 U.S. at 419-20 (prior restraint inappropriate to prevent criticism of
 10 business practices).

11 **VI. Both the Order Granting the TRO Against Wikileaks and the Stipulated Permanent**
 12 **Injunction Regarding Dynadot Lack Findings Required for a Prior Restraint and Are**
 13 **Not Narrowly Tailored**

14 The Court has not made sufficient findings to support such a prior restraint in either its
 15 Permanent Injunction against the maintenance of any content on the domain name wikileaks.org,
 16 or its Temporary Restraining Order barring the posting of any “BJB documents” on any Wikileaks
 17 web site. By its terms, Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d)(1) requires every injunction and every restraining
 18 order to “state the reasons why it issued,” and Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(a)(1) and (2) require the Court to
 19 “state the findings and conclusions that support its action.” An injunction or restraining order that
 20 does not rest on sufficiently specific, express findings and conclusions must be set aside. *Granny*
 21 *Goose Foods*, 415 U.S. at 443; *Enforma Natural Prods.*, 362 F.3d at 1215; *EEOC v. Severn Trent*
 22 *Servs.*, 358 F.3d 438, 442 (7th Cir. 2004); *In re Rare Coin Galleries of America, Inc.*, 862 F.2d

23 ⁸ The allegations in the Complaint make clear that the publication of the documents by
 24 Wikileaks was not “designed to” induce breach of any contractual relationship, but rather to
 25 disseminate documents of public concern. Any impact on the contract with Elmer was, at most,
 26 incidental, not intended, and does not give rise to facts permitting a claim of interference with
 27 contract. *See, e.g., Huggins v. Povich*, No. 131164/94, 1996 WL 515498, at * 9 (N.Y. Sup. Ct.
 28 Apr. 19, 1996) (“a broadcaster whose motive and conduct is intended to foster public awareness or
 debate cannot be found to have engaged in the wrongful or improper conduct required to sustain a
 claim for interference with contractual relations”). With regard to the interference with
 prospective economic advantage claim, Wikileaks’ lawful publication of the documents also
 cannot give rise to such claim. *Della Penna v. Toyota Motor Sales, USA, Inc.*, 11 Cal. 4th 376,
 393 (1995) (plaintiff must plead “conduct that was wrongful by some legal measure other than the
 fact of interference itself”); *see also Copp v. Paxton*, 45 Cal. App. 4th 829, 845 (1996) (“claims
 for . . . interference with prospective economic advantage may not be based on speech that is
 entitled to constitutional protection”).

1 896, 899-900 (1st Cir. 1988).

2 The need for detailed findings is heightened when, as here, the injunction trenches on
3 constitutional interests. *Glover v. Johnson*, 855 F.2d 277, 283-84 (6th Cir. 1988); *Elvis Presley*
4 *Enters., Inc. v. Passport Video*, 357 F.3d 896, 898 (9th Cir. 2004). When a prior restraint is at
5 issue, a district court's order must establish that "(1) the activity restrained poses either a clear and
6 present danger or a serious and imminent threat to a protected competing interest, (2) the order is
7 narrowly drawn, and (3) less restrictive alternatives are not available." *Levine v. United States*
8 *Dist. Court*, 764 F.2d 590, 595 (9th Cir. 1985) (affirming prior restraint of speech by trial
9 participants where justified by serious and imminent threat to right to a fair trial) (citations
10 omitted). See *Nebraska Press Ass'n*, 427 U.S. at 565 (denying prior restraint because threat to fair
11 speculative).

12 In light of the general rule against the wholesale adoption of proposed findings by the
13 prevailing party, *Stead Motors v. Automotive Machinists Lodge 1173*, 886 F.2d 1200, 1204 n.5
14 (9th Cir. 1989), findings to support a preliminary injunction may be cast aside on appeal when
15 derived entirely from a plaintiff's proposed order. *Enforma Natural Prods.*, 362 F.3d at 1215.
16 Wholesale adoption of a plaintiff's proposed findings seems especially inappropriate when the
17 findings purport to support a prior restraint. In the context of a prior restraint against speech,
18 "judgment as to whether the facts justify the use of the drastic power of injunction necessarily
19 turns on subtle and controversial considerations and upon a delicate assessment of the particular
20 situation." *Carroll*, 393 U.S. at 183. In this case, the Court adopted verbatim proposed
21 injunctions drafted by Plaintiffs, without the benefit of argument from an opposing party, which
22 set forth in detail the actions enjoined but either say nothing about the factual or legal basis for the
23 injunction (in the case of the permanent injunction), or recite in passing that the Court had "found
24 that good cause exists therefor" (in the case of the restraining order). The Court's wholesale
25 adoption of Plaintiffs' language is especially troubling here, where no party alerted the Court to
26 the important First Amendment concerns at stake and, accordingly, the constitutional interests of
27 the public to receive information were apparently not considered. See *United States v. Leon*, 468
28 U.S. 897, 938 (1984) ("the judiciary's role [is] as the guardian of the people's constitutional

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

1 liberties”).

2 There is no indication which of the several causes of action set forth in the complaint
3 formed a basis for a finding that success was likely or there were serious questions going to the
4 merits and the claims indeed rest on dubious foundation. *See supra* at 10-12 and *infra* at 14-16.
5 Even if, for example, JB could demonstrate an imminent danger of identity theft, the proposed
6 injunctive relief is not “narrowly tailored” nor the least restrictive alternative since it requires
7 wholesale removal rather than limited redaction of information like social security numbers. *See*
8 *United States v. Playboy Entm’t Group, Inc.*, 529 U.S. 803, 813 (2000). The TRO is also
9 drastically overbroad because it purports to “enjoin the world at large,” which courts lack the
10 power to do, *Alemite Mfg. Corp. v. Staff*, 42 F.2d 832, 832 (2d Cir. 1930) (Hand, J.), particularly
11 in First Amendment cases, where the injunctive order “must be tailored as precisely as possible to
12 the exact needs of the case,” *Carroll*, 393 U.S. at 184. Likewise, the injunction against Dynadot
13 renders inaccessible a broad array of Wikileaks content entirely unrelated to JB. *See supra* n.1.

14 **VII. Section 230 of the Communications Decency Act Bars JB’s Claims Against Wikileaks
15 and Dynadot**

16 The validity of the TRO aimed at Wikileaks and the permanent injunction directed at
17 Dynadot is further undercut by the broad immunity granted to defendants Wikileaks and Dynadot
18 by section 230 of the Communications Decency Act (“CDA 230”). Because CDA 230 likely
19 immunizes Wikileaks and Dynadot from liability for JB’s underlying legal claims, JB cannot
20 establish serious questions going to the merits, let alone a likelihood of success on the merits. *See*
21 *Optinrealbig.com, LLC v. Ironport Systems, Inc.*, 323 F. Supp. 2d 1037, 1047 (N.D. Cal. 2004)
22 (denying motion for a preliminary injunction because defendant was immune under CDA 230).

23 CDA 230 provides immunity for a “provider or user of an interactive computer service,”
24 such as Wikileaks and Dynadot, from state tort claims based on the publication of “information
25 provided by another information content provider.” 47 U.S.C. § 230(c)(1). This case falls
26 squarely within CDA 230 because the essence of JB’s complaint is that Wikileaks violated state
27 and foreign laws by publishing materials provided by a disgruntled former employee. The
28 immunity applies equally to JB’s claims for damages, declaratory, and injunctive relief. *See*
Kathleen R. v. City of Livermore, 87 Cal. App. 4th 684, 697-98 (2001) (“[C]laims for declaratory

1 and injunctive relief are no less causes of action than tort claims for damages and thus fall
2 squarely within the Section 230(e)(3) prohibitions.”); *Ben Ezra, Weinstein & Co. v. Am. Online,*
3 *Inc.*, 206 F.3d 980, 983-84 (10th Cir. 2000).

4 Most federal courts have interpreted CDA 230 expansively. *See Carafano v.*
5 *Metrosplash.com, Inc.*, 339 F.3d 1119, 1122 (9th Cir. 2003); *Batzel v. Smith*, 333 F.3d 1018,
6 1026-27 (9th Cir. 2003); *Almeida v. Amazon.com, Inc.*, 456 F.3d 1316, 1321 (11th Cir. 2006);
7 *Zeran v. America Online, Inc.*, 129 F.3d 327, 331 (4th Cir. 1997). This expansive interpretation
8 reflects an understanding that “[m]aking interactive computer services and their users liable for the
9 speech of third parties would severely restrict the information available on the Internet” and
10 furthers the congressional policy of “prevent[ing] lawsuits from shutting down websites and other
11 services on the Internet.” *Batzel*, 333 F.3d at 1027-28.

12 Dynadot meets the requirements for CDA 230 immunity: it is a provider of an “interactive
13 computer service,” and the claims against it are based on the publication of material provided by
14 “another information content provider.” The statute defines “interactive computer service” as
15 “any information service, system, or access software provider that provides or enables computer
16 access by multiple users to a computer server.” 47 U.S.C. § 230(f)(2). Courts have interpreted this
17 language broadly – the term includes “‘any’ information services or other systems, as long as the
18 service or system allows ‘multiple users’ to access ‘a computer server.’” *Batzel*, 333 F.3d at 1030
19 (emphasis in original). By resolving domain names into IP addresses, Dynadot enables users to
20 access its clients’ servers and therefore provides an interactive computer service under CDA 230.

21 As a provider of interactive computer services, Dynadot cannot be held liable for
22 publishing material provided by “another information content provider.” CDA 230 defines the
23 term “information content provider” as “any person or entity that is responsible, in whole or in
24 part, for the creation or development of information provided through the Internet or any other
25 interactive computer service.” 47 U.S.C. § 230(f)(3). There is no question that Dynadot had no
26 role in creating or developing the bank records in question, and that a third party (Elmer) posted
27 these materials. Therefore, CDA 230 bars JB’s claims against Dynadot.

28 Wikileaks also meets the requirements for CDA 230 immunity. First, as an interactive

1 website, Wikileaks is a provider of an “interactive computer service.” See *Batzel*, 333 F.3d at
 2 1030 & n.16 (“There is . . . no need here to decide whether a listserv or website itself fits the broad
 3 statutory definition of ‘interactive computer service,’ because the language of § 230(c)(1) confers
 4 immunity not just on ‘providers’ of such services, but also on ‘users’ of such services). Second,
 5 all of JB’s legal claims are grounded on the publication of material provided by a third party (*i.e.*,
 6 “another information content provider”). Despite their various guises, the underlying basis of each
 7 claim is publication of JB’s confidential documents, and all these state tort claims fall within the
 8 heart of CDA 230’s immunity. See, *e.g.*, *Carafano*, 339 F.3d at 1125 (CDA barred claims against
 9 website when user posted personal information about plaintiff, including her home address and
 10 phone number); *Delfino v. Agilent Technologies, Inc.*, 145 Cal. App. 4th 790, 806-07 (2006)
 11 (CDA provides immunity for “a variety of tort claims” based on publication, including invasion of
 12 privacy and negligence), *cert. denied*, 128 S. Ct. 98 (2007); *Novak v. Overture Servs.*, 309 F.
 13 Supp. 2d 446, 452 (E.D.N.Y. 2004) (applying Section 230 immunity to a claim of tortious
 14 interference with prospective economic advantage). JB’s allegations that Wikileaks, by its general
 15 invitation to post documents, somehow induced the leak does not change the analysis under CDA
 16 230.⁹ The Ninth Circuit has held that “suggesting,” “encouraging,” or “soliciting” content does
 17 not preclude statutory immunity for an interactive computer service. *Carafano*, 339 F.3d at 1124.

18 Finally, Wikileaks’ continued publication of the documents after JB complained does not
 19 diminish its immunity. Courts have been unwilling to hold interactive computer services liable for
 20 failure to address disputed material posted by a third party after notice. See, *e.g.*, *Zeran*, 129 F.3d
 21 at 327 (AOL protected by CDA 230 despite knowledge that posting was a hoax and delay in
 22 removal); *Barnes v. Yahoo!, Inc.*, No. 05-926, 2005 WL 3005602 (D. Or. Nov. 8, 2005) (Yahoo!
 23 not liable despite refusal to remove after knowledge that posting was a hoax). Because both
 24 Dynadot and Wikileaks are likely to be immune under CDA 230, JB cannot establish serious
 25 questions going to the merits, let alone a likelihood of success on the merits, of their claims.

26
 27 ⁹ See *Blumenthal v. Drudge*, 992 F. Supp. 44, 52-53 (D.D.C. 1998) (barring liability
 28 despite payment for content); *Universal Commc’n Sys., Inc. v. Lycos, Inc.*, 478 F.3d 413, 419 (1st
 Cir. 2007) (rejecting liability despite argument that the service induced unlawful postings);
Donato v. Moldow, 865 A.2d 711 (N.J. Super. Ct. App. Div. 2005) (rejecting liability despite
 encouragement of users to submit complaints about public officials).

1 DATED this 26th day of February, 2008.

2 Respectfully submitted,

3 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

4

5 s/ Thomas R. Burke

6 Thomas R. Burke (CA State Bar No. 141930)
7 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
8 505 Montgomery Street
9 Suite 800
10 San Francisco, California 94111
11 Telephone: (415) 276-6500
12 Facsimile: (415) 276-6599
13 Email: thomasburke@dwt.com

Kelli L. Sager (CA State Bar No. 120162)
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
865 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2400
Los Angeles, California 90017-2566
Telephone: (213) 633-6800
Facsimile: (213) 633-6899
Email: kellisager@dwt.com

10 Laura R. Handman
11 (admission *pro hac vice* pending)
12 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
13 1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
14 Suite 200
15 Washington, DC 20006
16 Telephone: (202) 973-4200
17 Facsimile: (202) 973-4499
18 Email: laurahandman@dwt.com

19 Attorneys for *Amici Curiae*

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP