GOOGLE_LEE 09/13/05 PI Hearing Trans FINAL
9/13/2005

1	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON
2	COUNTY OF KING
3	
4	MICROSOFT,)
5	PLAINTIFF,)
6) NO. 05-2-23561-6 SEA
7	VS.)
8	GOOGLE AND KAI-FU LEE,)
9	DEFENDANTS.)
10	
11	VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS
12	JUDGE'S ORAL RULING ON PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
13	
14	THE HONORABLE STEVEN GONZALEZ
15	SEATTLE, WASHINGTON
16	SEPTEMBER 13, 2005
17	APPEARANCES:
18	FOR PLAINTIFF: KARL QUACKENBUSH
19	JEFF JOHNSON
20	THOMAS BURT
21	FOR DEFENDANT GOOGLE: JOHN KEKER
22	RAGESH TANGRI
23	FOR DEFENDANT LEE: BRADLEY KELLER
24	
25	REPORTED BY: APRIL LAINE

1	(IN OPEN COURT:)
2	THE COURT: FIRST, BEFORE I SUMMARIZE
3	THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, WHICH I AM
4	ISSUING TODAY, I WANT TO SAY I'VE RECEIVED A
5	NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS FROM PEOPLE WHO ARE NOT
6	PARTIES TO THIS CASE; SOME OF THEM
7	COMPLIMENTARY, SOME OF THEM CRITICAL, JUST
8	FROM THE HEADINGS ON THEM. I HAVEN'T READ
9	ANY FARTHER. THEY SEEM TO ADDRESS MY ACTIONS
10	AND BELIEFS, REAL OR IMAGINARY.
11	I WOULD INVITE FOLKS TO STOP SUBMITTING
12	SUCH THINGS TO ME. I WILL NOT BE READING
13	THEM. I CANNOT CONSIDER THEM AS PART OF THIS
14	CASE.
15	IF ANYONE BELIEVES THEY HAVE INFORMATION
16	WHICH IS RELEVANT TO THIS CASE, PLEASE BRING
17	IT TO THE ATTENTION OF THE PARTIES, NOT
18	DIRECTLY TO THE COURT.
19	THIS MATTER IS HERE BEFORE THE COURT ON
20	MICROSOFT'S MOTION FOR A PRELIMINARY
21	INJUNCTION. THE DEFENDANTS, GOOGLE AND
22	DR. LEE, HAVE ALSO REQUESTED THAT THE COURT
23	DISSOLVE THE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
24	PREVIOUSLY ISSUED ON JULY 28TH OF THIS YEAR.
25	AS YOU KNOW, THIS CASE INVOLVES

	_
1	ALLEGATIONS BY MICROSOFT THAT CERTAIN ASPECTS
2	OF DR. LEE'S EMPLOYMENT AT GOOGLE VIOLATE THE
3	NONCOMPETITION CLAUSE IN THE AGREEMENT HE
4	SIGNED ON AUGUST 8TH OF 2000, WHEN HE BEGAN
5	WORKING IN REDMOND.
6	IT IS WELL ESTABLISHED IN WASHINGTON
7	THAT COVENANTS NOT TO COMPETE UPON
8	TERMINATION OF EMPLOYMENT ARE ENFORCEABLE IF
9	THEY ARE REASONABLE.
10	IN THE ORDER I AM ISSUING TODAY, AFTER
11	THAT INTRODUCTORY LANGUAGE, PAGES TWO THROUGH
12	FIVE ARE SIMPLY A LISTING OF THE EVIDENCE AND
13	DOCUMENTS AND OTHER SUBMISSIONS I HAVE
14	REVIEWED IN CONNECTION WITH THIS MATTER.
15	THE RELIEF MICROSOFT SEEKS AT THIS STAGE
16	MIRRORS IN MANY WAYS THE RELIEF IT SEEKS AT
17	TRIAL. THE BURDEN ON MICROSOFT IS TO
18	DEMONSTRATE THAT IT HAS A CLEAR LEGAL OR
19	EQUITABLE RIGHT, A WELL-GROUNDED FEAR OF
20	IMMEDIATE INVASION OF THAT RIGHT, AND THAT
21	THE DEFENDANTS' ACTIONS ARE RESULTING IN OR
22	WILL RESULT IN ACTUAL AND SUBSTANTIAL INJURY
23	TO MICROSOFT.
24	SINCE THE ENTRY OF THE TRO, THE
25	DEFENDANTS HAVE, BOTH IN WRITING AND IN OPEN

1	COURT, OFFERED TO STIPULATE TO CERTAIN
2	RESTRICTIONS ON THEIR ACTIVITIES THAT MIGHT
3	COMPETE WITH MICROSOFT. MICROSOFT HAS
4	DECLINED TO JOIN THAT STIPULATION. SINCE
5	MICROSOFT IS NOT REQUIRED TO JOIN THE
6	STIPULATION, WE MUST GO THROUGH THIS EXERCISE
7	BASED ON THE EVIDENCE SUBMITTED BY THE
8	PARTIES AT THE HEARING.
9	GOOGLE AND DR. LEE CONTEND THAT HE
10	SHOULD BE ABLE TO EMPLOY HIS GENERAL
11	KNOWLEDGE, PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES AND GENERAL
12	REPUTATION AND SKILLS TO HELP GOOGLE SET UP
13	AND STAFF A PRODUCT RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
14	FACILITY IN CHINA.
15	MICROSOFT CONTENDS THAT, WERE DR. LEE TO
16	DO SO, IT WOULD VIOLATE PARAGRAPH 9 OF THE
17	AGREEMENT. MICROSOFT CONTENDS THAT DR. LEE
18	LOST HIS OBJECTIVITY AND BEGAN USING
19	PROPRIETARY INFORMATION OF MICROSOFT FOR HIS
20	AND GOOGLE'S BENEFIT EVEN BEFORE HE LEFT HIS
21	EMPLOYMENT WITH MICROSOFT.
22	THE COURT MAKES THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS
23	OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:
24	DR. LEE EXECUTED THE AGREEMENT ON
25	AUGUST 8TH OF 2000. A QUESTION REMAINS FOR

1	TRIAL WHETHER INDEPENDENT CONSIDERATION
2	EXISTS TO SUPPORT THE AGREEMENT.
3	THE AGREEMENT DOES NOT CONFER TO
4	MICROSOFT ANY RIGHT TO CONTROL DR. LEE'S
5	PUBLIC IMAGE OR PERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS.
6	IN JUNE OF 2005, DR. LEE MISLED
7	MICROSOFT ABOUT HIS INTENTION TO RETURN TO
8	MICROSOFT FOLLOWING HIS SABBATICAL. HE
9	CONTINUED TO HAVE ACCESS TO MICROSOFT'S
10	PROPRIETARY INFORMATION AFTER HE DECIDED TO
11	LEAVE AND JOIN ONE OF MICROSOFT'S DIRECT
12	COMPETITORS. HE BEGAN ASSISTING GOOGLE WHILE
13	STILL EMPLOYED AT MICROSOFT, AND CONFUSED THE
14	DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DISCRETION GIVEN HIM
15	TO DISCLOSE MICROSOFT'S CONFIDENTIAL
16	INFORMATION FOR THE BENEFIT OF MICROSOFT AS
17	PART OF HIS EMPLOYMENT AND DISCLOSING SUCH
18	CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FOR HIS OWN BENEFIT
19	OR FOR THE BENEFIT OF ANOTHER.
20	DURING HIS EMPLOYMENT WITH MICROSOFT,
21	DR. LEE WORKED ON PRODUCTS, SERVICES OR
22	PROJECTS REGARDING INTERNET SEARCH, DESKTOP
23	SEARCH, MOBILE SEARCH, NATURAL LANGUAGE
24	PROCESSING AND SPEECH TECHNOLOGIES. HE
25	RECEIVED CONFIDENTIAL, PROPRIETARY OR TRADE

	_
1	SECRET INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO
2	MICROSOFT'S RECRUITING STRATEGIES AND
3	RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN CHINA,
4	MICROSOFT'S GOVERNMENT RELATIONS IN CHINA,
5	AND OTHER MATTERS.
6	GOOGLE'S USE OF DR. LEE TO ENGAGE IN
7	RECRUITING ACTIVITIES RELATED TO GOOGLE'S
8	PLANNED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITY IN
9	CHINA PENDING TRIAL IN JANUARY OF 2006, DOES
10	NOT VIOLATE THE AGREEMENT, PROVIDED DR. LEE
11	DOES NOT RECRUIT FROM MICROSOFT OR USE ANY
12	CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION FROM MICROSOFT.
13	AS FOR CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, IF
14	INDEPENDENT CONSIDERATION IS ESTABLISHED AT
15	TRIAL, WHICH LIKELY IT WILL BE, THE AGREEMENT
16	PROVIDES MICROSOFT WITH CLEAR LEGAL OR
17	EQUITABLE RIGHTS ENFORCEABLE UNDER WASHINGTON
18	LAW. AT ISSUE AT TRIAL WILL BE THE SCOPE OF
19	THOSE RIGHTS UNDER THE AGREEMENT.
20	I FIND THAT PARAGRAPH 9 IS REASONABLY
21	NECESSARY TO PROTECT MICROSOFT'S LEGITIMATE
22	BUSINESS INTERESTS.
23	THE DEFENDANTS' STIPULATION IS NOT A
24	SUBSTITUTE FOR PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST FOR
25	INJUNCTIVE RELIEF, ESPECIALLY, AS HERE, THE

1	STIPULATION WAS OFFERED AFTER THE LAWSUIT
2	BEGAN AND THE COURT ISSUED THE TEMPORARY
3	RESTRAINING ORDER.
4	EXCEPT AS TO CERTAIN ACTIVITIES IN
5	CHINA, THE COURT IS SATISFIED THAT MICROSOFT
6	HAS ESTABLISHED A CLEAR LEGAL OR EQUITABLE
7	RIGHT, A WELL-GROUNDED FEAR OF IMMEDIATE
8	INVASION OF THAT RIGHT, AND THE EQUITIES
9	DICTATE A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, DESPITE THE
10	OFFER OF A STIPULATION.
11	MICROSOFT, HOWEVER, HAS NOT SUFFICIENTLY
12	SHOWN THAT IT HAS A CLEAR LEGAL OR EQUITABLE
13	RIGHT TO ENJOIN DR. LEE, PENDING TRIAL, FROM
14	ESTABLISHING AND STAFFING A GOOGLE
15	DEVELOPMENT FACILITY IN CHINA, OR AT LEAST
16	CERTAIN ASPECTS OF THAT WORK.
17	THIS IS BASED ON THE FACT THAT THE
18	GENERAL ACTIVITIES OF DR. LEE AT MICROSOFT
19	SINCE 2000 REGARDING CHINA AND RECRUITING
20	EFFORTS IN CHINA ARE NOT A PROJECT WITHIN THE
21	MEANING OF THE AGREEMENT. DUE TO THE PUBLIC
22	POLICY IMPLICATIONS, ANY BROADER
23	INTERPRETATION OF THE TERM "PROJECT" IN THE
24	AGREEMENT TO INCLUDE SUCH ACTIVITIES WOULD
25	RAISE SIGNIFICANT QUESTIONS ABOUT THE

1	ENFORCEABILITY OF THAT PORTION OF THE
2	AGREEMENT.
3	PENDING TRIAL OF THIS MATTER, IT IS
4	ORDERED THAT DR. LEE AND GOOGLE ARE
5	PRELIMINARILY ENJOINED AS FOLLOWS:
6	DR. LEE IS ENJOINED FROM ACCEPTING
7	EMPLOYMENT COMPETITIVE WITH OR ENGAGING IN
8	ACTIVITIES COMPETITIVE WITH ANY PRODUCT,
9	SERVICE OR PROJECT ON WHICH HE WORKED OR
10	ABOUT WHICH HE LEARNED CONFIDENTIAL OR
11	PROPRIETARY INFORMATION OR TRADE SECRETS
12	WHILE AT MICROSOFT.
13	THIS INCLUDES COMPUTER SEARCH
14	TECHNOLOGIES, NATURAL LANGUAGE AND SPEECH
15	TECHNOLOGIES. IT ALSO INCLUDES PARTICIPATION
16	IN SETTING THE BUDGET OR COMPENSATION LEVELS,
17	OR DEFINING THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO
18	BE UNDERTAKEN AT GOOGLE'S PLANNED RESEARCH
19	AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITY IN CHINA.
20	GOOGLE IS SIMILARLY PRELIMINARILY
21	ENJOINED.
22	WHAT THE COURT MEANS BY THAT IS THAT
23	DR. LEE MAY INTERVIEW AND ASSIST IN
24	RECRUITMENT FOR THE FACILITY IN CHINA. HE
25	MAY ASSIST SITING THAT FACILITY IN CHINA. HE

1	MAY MEET WITH FACULTY IN CHINA ONLY REGARDING
2	RECRUITMENT FOR THAT FACILITY. HE MAY MEET
3	WITH GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN CHINA, TO THE
4	EXTENT THAT IS NECESSARY, TO ESTABLISH,
5	LICENSE AND SITE THE FACILITY.
6	HE IS NOT TO HAVE CONTACT WITH THOSE
7	GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS OR UNIVERSITY OFFICIALS
8	REGARDING SOFTWARE DEVELOPMENT OR OTHER
9	RESEARCH PROJECTS OF GOOGLE PENDING TRIAL.
10	DR. LEE AND GOOGLE ARE, OF COURSE,
11	ENJOINED FROM DISCLOSING OR MISAPPROPRIATING
12	ANY TRADE SECRETS OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION
13	OF MICROSOFT.
14	DR. LEE, AS THE AGREEMENT PROVIDES, IS
15	ENJOINED FROM SOLICITING ANY OF MICROSOFT'S
16	EMPLOYEES TO JOIN GOOGLE.
17	ALL PARTIES ARE ENJOINED FROM DESTROYING
18	ANY DOCUMENTS OR FILES OF ANY KIND THAT
19	RELATE TO THIS MATTER.
20	MICROSOFT SHALL MAINTAIN THE CURRENT
21	INJUNCTION BOND IN PLACE AFTER THE TRO.
22	THE TRO IS SUPERSEDED BY THIS
23	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION. THEREFORE,
24	DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISSOLVE THE TRO IS
25	MOOT AT THIS POINT.

1	THE BAILIFF HAS COPIES OF THE
2	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION I HAVE JUST
3	SUMMARIZED. SHE WILL MAKE THEM AVAILABLE TO
4	THE PARTIES AND THE PUBLIC.
5	WE ARE IN RECESS UNTIL THE TRIAL IN
6	JANUARY.
7	(RECESS.)
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	STATE OF WASHINGTON)
2) SS. REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE
3	COUNTY OF KING)
4	
5	I, APRIL M. LAINE, ONE OF THE OFFICIAL COURT
6	REPORTERS OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF
7	WASHINGTON, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF KING, DO HEREBY
8	CERTIFY THAT THE VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE
9	FOREGOING CAUSE WAS ORDERED VERBALLY BY DENNIS TESSIER
10	AND SCOTT RIEWERTS ON THE 13TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER,
11	2005.
12	
13	I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT I DELIVERED A COPY OF SAID
14	VERBATIM REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS TO MR. TESSIER AND
15	MR. RIEWERTS ON THE 15TH OF SEPTEMBER, 2005, THE
16	ORIGINAL BEING RETAINED BY ME.
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	APRIL M. LAINE
24	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
25	