


**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

<b>RAZOR TECHNOLOGY, LLC</b>	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	NO. 18-654
	:	
<b>TODD HENDRICKSON, et al.</b>	:	

**ORDER**

AND NOW, this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of May 2018, upon considering Plaintiff’s Motion for a preliminary injunction (ECF Doc. No. 24), Defendants’ Response (ECF Doc. No. 26), after evaluating the credibility of several witnesses and studying admitted exhibits at our extensive preliminary injunction hearing after expedited discovery, and for reasons in the accompanying Findings of Facts and Conclusions of Law, it is **ORDERED** Plaintiff’s Motion (ECF Doc. No. 24) is **DENIED** as:

1. Plaintiff has not shown a likelihood of success on the merits as to the existence of definitive post-employment restrictive covenants with the former employee or as to taking the Plaintiff’s trade secrets to use with a new competing company;
2. Plaintiff has not adduced evidence of imminent and irreparable harm;
3. Balancing of equities favors allowing the former employee to work for his new company over a possible but largely undefined claim the former employee violated an undefined post-employment restrictive covenant or for use of a customer’s billing preferences; and,
4. Enjoining the former employee based on an undefined post-employment restrictive covenant will not serve the public interest given Pennsylvania’s long standing scrutiny of post-employment restrictions.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 KEARNEY, J.