

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WHATSAPP INC., et al.,  
Plaintiffs,  
  
v.  
  
NSO GROUP TECHNOLOGIES  
LIMITED, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 19-cv-07123-PJH

**ORDER RE ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION AND STIPULATION RE  
BRIEFING DEADLINES FOR MOTION  
FOR PERMANENT INJUNCTION**

Re: Dkt. 560, 571

United States District Court  
Northern District of California

Plaintiffs have filed a motion for permanent injunction, and the parties have made multiple filings related to that motion: (1) an administrative motion, filed by defendants, to continue the briefing deadlines and hearing dates for plaintiffs' motion for permanent injunction, (2) an opposition to the administrative motion, filed by plaintiffs, and (3) a stipulation, to apply in the event that the court denies the administrative motion.

The court will first address the administrative motion and opposition. Defendants argue, in essence, that the court must conduct an evidentiary hearing before entering any permanent injunction, and that holding an evidentiary hearing during or after trial would be most efficient. See Dkt. 560. Plaintiffs argue that the court can issue a permanent injunction without an evidentiary hearing, and that there are no disputed issues of fact relevant to an injunction, and thus no reason to delay.

Overall, the court concludes that the need for an evidentiary hearing can best be determined after the parties have filed their briefs and made their competing arguments for which, if any, factual issues need to be determined through an evidentiary hearing.

