1	JOSEPH H. HUNT	
1	Assistant Attorney General	
2	Civil Division	
	McGREGOR SCOTT	
3	United States Attorney	
4	BRINTON LUCAS	
	Counsel to the Assistant Attorney General	
5	JAMES J. GILLIGAN	
	Acting Director, Federal Programs Branch	
6	JACQUELINE COLEMAN SNEAD	
	Assistant Branch Director, Federal Programs Branch	
7	DAVID SHELLEDY	
8	Civil Chief, Assistant United States Attorney	
8	JOSEPH BORSON (Va. Bar No. 85519)	
9	KEVIN SNELL (NY Bar)	
	Trial Attorneys	
10	U.S. Department of Justice	
11	1	
12	Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch 1100 L St NW	
	Washington, DC 20530	
13	Telephone: (202) 305-0924	
1.4	Fax: (202) 616-8460	
14	E-mail: Kevin.Snell@usdoj.gov	
15	Attorneys for the United States	
1.0	Attorneys for the Ontied States	
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
17	EAGREDAL DIGEDICE OF CALLEODALA	
	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
18	THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
19	,	
19	Plaintiff,	Case No.
20	,	
	V.	
21		[Proposed] ORDER GRANTING
22	THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA;	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
22	EDMUND GERALD BROWN JR.,	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
23	Governor of California, in his Official	
	Capacity, and XAVIER BECERRA,	
24	Attorney General of California, in his	
25	Official Capacity,	
25	Official Capacity,	
26	Defendants.	
	Defendants.	
27		
28		
۷۵	I and the second	

## Case 2:18-cv-02660-JAM-DB Document 2-6 Filed 09/30/18 Page 2 of 2

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff the United States' Motion for a Preliminary 1 Injunction. Having considered the motion, including Plaintiff's Memorandum of Law and 2 Defendants' opposition thereto, and having further considered: (1) the likelihood that the United 3 States will succeed on the merits of its claims; (2) the likelihood that the United States will suffer 4 irreparable injury absent an injunction; (3) whether injunctive relief would substantially harm 5 Defendants; and (4) whether the public interest would be furthered by an injunction, this Court 6 concludes that Plaintiff is entitled to preliminary injunctive relief. THEREFORE pursuant to 7 8 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65, Plaintiff's Motion is GRANTED. 9 The Court FINDS that Plaintiff is likely to succeed on its claims that Section 3100(j), (r), 10 (t), Section 3101(a)(1)-(a)(7), (a)(9) of the California Civil Code, the application of those 11 provisions through Section 3101(b) of the California Civil Code, and Section 3102(a), (b) of the 12 California Civil Code, all violate the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, U.S. 13 Const. art. VI, cl. 2, and are therefore invalid. 14 The Court also FINDS that Plaintiff has made a strong showing that it suffers and will 15 continue to suffer irreparable harm caused by these provisions of the California Civil Code, and 16 that the balance of harms and the public interest favor an injunction. 17 Accordingly, Defendants are HEREBY ENJOINED: from enforcing Section 3100(j), (r), 18 (t), Section 3101(a)(1)-(a)(7), (a)(9) of the California Civil Code; from enforcing those 19 provisions through Section 3101(b) of the California Civil Code; and from enforcing Section 20 3102(a), (b) of the California Civil Code, until such time as the Court enters judgment on the 21 United States' claims for relief. 22 DONE AND ORDERED this \_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2018, 23 24 25 Hon. 26 27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 28