

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

BACKPAGE.COM, LLC,)	
)	No. 2:12-cv-000954-RSM
Plaintiff,)	
)	ORDER ENJOINING
and)	ENFORCEMENT OF
)	WASHINGTON SENATE BILL
THE INTERNET ARCHIVE,)	6251
)	
Plaintiff-Intervenor,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
ROB MCKENNA, Attorney General of the)	
State of Washington, <i>et al.</i>)	
)	
Defendants, in their)	
official capacities.)	
)	

This matter came before the Court on the Motion for Preliminary Injunction filed by Plaintiff Backpage.com, LLC (Dkt. #2) and the Motion Joining in the Motion for a Preliminary Injunction filed by Plaintiff-Intervenor, the Internet Archive (Dkt. #34). Having considered the Motions, materials filed in support of and opposition to the Motions, and the argument of counsel, the Court finds, concludes and orders as follows:

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

1 1. Washington Senate Bill 6251 (“SB 6251”) would have taken effect June 7,
2 2012 unless enjoined by this Court.

3 2. On June 5, 2012, the Court entered a Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”),
4 enjoining enforcement of SB 6251 for a period of fourteen days (Dkt. #7). The parties
5 thereafter stipulated to a continuance of the hearing on the Preliminary Injunction Motion
6 and to an extension of the TRO (Dkt. #17).

7 3. The Court heard oral argument from the parties on July 20, 2012, and issued
8 an Order Granting Plaintiffs’ Motions for Preliminary Injunction on July 27, 2012 (Dkt.
9 #69). That Order directed the parties to submit a joint proposed order preliminarily
10 enjoining enforcement of SB 6251 within ten days.

11 4. Counsel for the Plaintiffs and counsel for Defendants (the Attorney General
12 and the King County Prosecutor, which additionally represents 36 of the other county
13 prosecutor Defendants), submitted this joint Proposed Order on August 6, 2012.

II. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

14 5. Plaintiffs have standing as they can show that there is a credible threat that
15 SB 6251 will be enforced against them.

16 6. Third-party standing is also appropriate in this case because, if the statute
17 were to take effect, it may cause others to refrain from constitutionally protected speech or
18 expression.
19

20 7. Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on the merits of their claims,
21 pursuant to 27 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2201, as set
22 forth more fully below.

23 8. Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on their claim that SB 6251 is
24 preempted by section 230 of the Communications Decency Act, 47 U.S.C. § 230.
25
26
27

1 9. Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on the merits of their claim that
2 SB 6251 violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution
3 because it lacks an appropriate element of scienter to avoid chilling protected speech.

4 10. Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on the merits of their claim that
5 SB 6251 violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments because the law is
6 unconstitutionally vague.

7 11. Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on the merits of their claim that
8 SB 6251 violates the First and Fourteenth Amendments because the law is overbroad and
9 not narrowly tailored to the State's asserted governmental interest.

10 12. Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on the merits of their claim that
11 SB 6251 violates the dormant Commerce Clause, U.S. Const., Art. 1, § 8.

12 13. Because SB 6251 will result in the immediate loss of First Amendment
13 rights, this Court may presume that irreparable harm will result. Plaintiffs have also shown
14 that they, other online service providers, and the public generally will suffer irreparable
15 harm if SB 6251 goes into effect.

16 14. The balance of equities tips in Plaintiffs' favor.

17 15. An injunction is in the public interest.

18 THEREFORE, the Court ORDERS as follows:

19 (A) Defendants are immediately ENJOINED from taking any actions to enforce
20 SB 6251 or pursue prosecution under the law in any way;

21 (B) This Preliminary Injunction shall take effect immediately and remain in
22 effect until the conclusion of this lawsuit or other direction of the Court.

23
24 SO ORDERED this 25 day of September 2012.

25
26 

27 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1 Presented by:

2 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP

3 s/ James C. Grant

4 James C. Grant, WSBA No. 14358

5 Ambika K. Doran, WSBA No. 38237

6 Of Counsel

7 s/ Elizabeth L. McDougall

8 Elizabeth L. McDougall, WSBA No. 27026

9 Village Voice Media Holdings, LLC

10 Attorneys for Plaintiff Backpage.com, LLC

11 ELECTRONIC FRONTIER FOUNDATION

12 s/ Matthew Zimmerman

13 Matthew Zimmerman (admitted *pro hac vice*)

14 FOCAL PLLC

15 /s Venkat Balasubramani

16 Venkat Balasubramani, WSBA No. 28269

17 Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor the Internet Archive

18 ROBERT M. MCKENNA

19 Attorney General

20 s/ Lana Weinmann

21 Lana Weinmann, WSBA No. 21393

22 Senior Assistant Attorney General

23 Attorney for Attorney General Rob McKenna

24 DANIEL T. SATTERBERG

25 King County Prosecuting Attorney

26 /s David Eldred

27 David Eldred, WSBA No. 26125

Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Attorneys for Defendants

s/ Amy Eiden

Amy Eiden, WSBA No. 35105

Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

Attorneys for Defendants