

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

The court is sympathetic to the commercial interest, especially those of a third-party, in protecting its licensing terms. It truly is. But “[a]ny system of prior restraints of expression comes to this court bearing a heavy presumption against its constitutional validity.”² On a record before the court that includes the IBM concessions noted above, IBM plainly has not rebutted the heavy presumption that its request would have this court violate Reuters’ First Amendment rights. This the court will not do. IBM’s motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 7/30/2012



PAUL S. GREWAL
United States Magistrate Judge

² *Id.*