

# Fed. R. Civ. P. 65

## Rule 65 - Injunctions and Restraining Orders

### (a) PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION.

(1)*Notice.* The court may issue a preliminary injunction only on notice to the adverse party.

(2)*Consolidating the Hearing with the Trial on the Merits.* Before or after beginning the hearing on a motion for a preliminary injunction, the court may advance the trial on the merits and consolidate it with the hearing. Even when consolidation is not ordered, evidence that is received on the motion and that would be admissible at trial becomes part of the trial record and need not be repeated at trial. But the court must preserve any party's right to a jury trial.

### (b) TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER.

(1)*Issuing Without Notice.* The court may issue a temporary restraining order without written or oral notice to the adverse party or its attorney only if:

(A) specific facts in an affidavit or a verified complaint clearly show that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition; and

(B) the movant's attorney certifies in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required.

(2)*Contents; Expiration.* Every temporary restraining order issued without notice must state the date and hour it was issued; describe the injury and state why it is irreparable; state why the order was issued without notice; and be promptly filed in the clerk's office and entered in the record. The order expires at the time after entry-not to exceed 14 days-that the court sets, unless before that time the court, for good cause, extends it for a like period or the adverse party consents to a longer extension. The reasons for an extension must be entered in the record.

(3)*Expediting the Preliminary-Injunction Hearing.* If the order is issued without notice, the motion for a preliminary injunction must be set for hearing at the earliest possible time, taking precedence over all other matters except hearings on older matters of the same character. At the hearing, the party who obtained the order must proceed with the motion; if the party does not, the court must dissolve the order.

(4)*Motion to Dissolve.* On 2 days' notice to the party who obtained the order without notice-or on shorter notice set by the court-the adverse party may appear and move to dissolve or modify the order. The court must then hear and decide the motion as promptly as justice requires.

(c) SECURITY. The court may issue a preliminary injunction or a temporary restraining order only if the movant gives security in an amount that the court considers proper to pay

the costs and damages sustained by any party found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained. The United States, its officers, and its agencies are not required to give security.

**(d) CONTENTS AND SCOPE OF EVERY INJUNCTION AND RESTRAINING ORDER.**

**(1) Contents.** Every order granting an injunction and every restraining order must:

**(A)** state the reasons why it issued;

**(B)** state its terms specifically; and

**(C)** describe in reasonable detail-and not by referring to the complaint or other document-the act or acts restrained or required.

**(2) Persons Bound.** The order binds only the following who receive actual notice of it by personal service or otherwise:

**(A)** the parties;

**(B)** the parties' officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys; and

**(C)** other persons who are in active concert or participation with anyone described in Rule 65(d)(2)(A) or (B).

**(e) OTHER LAWS NOT MODIFIED.** These rules do not modify the following:

**(1)** any federal statute relating to temporary restraining orders or preliminary injunctions in actions affecting employer and employee;

**(2)** 28 U.S.C. § 2361, which relates to preliminary injunctions in actions of interpleader or in the nature of interpleader; or

**(3)** 28 U.S.C. § 2284, which relates to actions that must be heard and decided by a three-judge district court.

**(f) COPYRIGHT IMPOUNDMENT.** This rule applies to copyright-impoundment proceedings.

*28 APPENDIX U.S.C. § 65*

As amended Dec. 27, 1946, eff. Mar. 19, 1948; Dec. 29, 1948, eff. Oct. 20, 1949; Feb. 28, 1966, eff. July 1, 1966; Mar. 2, 1987, eff. Aug. 1, 1987; Apr. 23, 2001, eff. Dec. 1, 2001; Apr. 30, 2007, eff. Dec. 1, 2007; Mar. 26, 2009, eff. Dec. 1, 2009.

*NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES-1937 Note to Subdivisions (a) and (b). These are taken from U.S.C., Title 28, [former] §381 (Injunctions; preliminary injunctions and temporary restraining orders). Note to Subdivision (c). Except for the last sentence, this is substantially U.S.C., Title 28, [former] §382 (Injunctions; security on issuance of). The last sentence continues the following and similar statutes which expressly except the United States or an officer or agency thereof from such security requirements: U.S.C., Title 15, §§771(b), 78u(e), and 79r(f) (Securities and Exchange Commission). It also excepts the United States or an officer or agency thereof from such security requirements in any action in which a restraining order or interlocutory judgment of injunction issues in its favor whether there is an express statutory exception from such security requirements or not. See U.S.C., [former] Title 6 (Official and Penal Bonds) for bonds by surety companies. Note to Subdivision (d). This is substantially U.S.C., Title 28, [former] §383 (Injunctions; requisites of order; binding effect). Note to Subdivision (e). The words "relating to temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions in actions affecting employer*

*and employee" are words of description and not of limitation. Compare [former] Equity Rule 73 (Preliminary Injunctions and Temporary Restraining Orders) which is substantially equivalent to the statutes. For other statutes dealing with injunctions which are continued, see e.g.: U.S.C., Title 28: §46 [now 2324] (Suits to enjoin orders of Interstate Commerce Commission to be against United States) §47 [now 2325] (Injunctions as to orders of Interstate Commerce Commission; appeal to Supreme Court; time for taking) §378 [former] (Injunctions; when granted) §379 [now 2283] (Injunctions; stay in State courts) §380 [now 1253, 2101, 2281, 2284] (Injunctions; alleged unconstitutionality of State statutes; appeal to Supreme Court) §380a [now 1253, 2101, 2281, 2284] (Injunctions; constitutionality of Federal statute; application for hearing; appeal to Supreme Court) U.S.C., Title 7: §216 (Court proceedings to enforce orders; injunction) §217 (Proceedings for suspension of orders) U.S.C., Title 15: §4 (Jurisdiction of courts; duty of district attorney; procedure) §25 (Restraining violations; procedure) §26 (Injunctive relief for private parties; exceptions) §77t(b) (Injunctions and prosecution of offenses)*

**NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES-1946 AMENDMENT** *It has been held that in actions on preliminary injunction bonds the district court has discretion to grant relief in the same proceeding or to require the institution of a new action on the bond. Russell v. Farley (1881) 105 U.S. 433, 466. It is believed, however, that in all cases the litigant should have a right to proceed on the bond in the same proceeding, in the manner provided in Rule 73(f) for a similar situation. The paragraph added to Rule 65(c) insures this result and is in the interest of efficiency. There is no reason why Rules 65(c) and 73(f) should operate differently. Compare §50(n) of the Bankruptcy Act, 11 U.S.C. § 78(n), under which actions on all bonds furnished pursuant to the Act may be proceeded upon summarily in the bankruptcy court. See 2 Collier on Bankruptcy (14th ed. by Moore and Oglebay) 1853-1854.*

**NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES-1948 AMENDMENT** *Specific enumeration of statutes dealing with labor injunctions is undesirable due to the enactment of amendatory or new legislation from time to time. The more general and inclusive reference, "any statute of the United States", does not change the intent of subdivision (e) of Rule 65, and the subdivision will have continuing applicability without the need of subsequent readjustment to labor legislation. The amendment relative to actions of interpleader or in the nature of interpleader substitutes the present statutory reference and will embrace any future amendment to statutory interpleader provided for in Title 28, U.S.C., §2361. The Act of August 24, 1937, provided for a district court of three judges to hear and determine an action to enjoin the enforcement of any Act of Congress for repugnance to the Constitution of the United States. The provisions of that Act dealing with the procedure for the issuance of temporary restraining orders and interlocutory and final injunctions have been included in revised Title 28, U.S.C., §2284, which, however, has been broadened to apply to all actions required to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges. The amendatory saving clause of subdivision (e) of Rule 65 has been broadened accordingly.*

**NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES-1966 AMENDMENT** *Subdivision (a)(2). This new subdivision provides express authority for consolidating the hearing of an application for a preliminary injunction with the trial on the merits. The authority can be exercised with particular profit when it appears that a substantial part of evidence offered on the application will be relevant to the merits and will be presented in such form as to qualify for admission on the trial proper. Repetition of evidence is thereby avoided. The fact that the proceedings have been consolidated should cause no delay in the disposition of the application for the preliminary injunction, for the evidence will be directed in the first instance to that relief, and the preliminary injunction, if justified by the proof, may be issued in the course of the consolidated proceedings. Furthermore, to consolidate the proceedings will tend to expedite the final disposition of the action. It is believed that consolidation can be usefully availed of in many cases. The subdivision further provides that even when*

consolidation is not ordered, evidence received in connection with an application for a preliminary injunction for a preliminary injunction which would be admissible on the trial on the merits forms part of the trial record. This evidence need not be repeated on the trial. On the the other hand, repetition is not altogether prohibited. That would be impractical and unwise. For example, a witness testifying comprehensively on the trial who has previously testified upon the application for a preliminary injunction might sometimes be hamstrung in telling his story if he could not go over some part of his prior testimony to connect it with his present testimony. So also, some repetition of testimony may be called for where the trial is conducted by a judge who did not hear the application for the preliminary injunction. In general, however, repetition can be avoided with an increase of efficiency in the conduct of the case and without any distortion of the presentation of evidence by the parties. Since an application for a preliminary injunction may be made in an action in which, with respect to all or part of the merits, there is a right to trial by jury, it is appropriate to add the caution appearing in the last sentence of the subdivision. In such a case the jury will have to hear all the evidence bearing on its verdict, even if some part of the evidence has already been heard by the judge alone on the application for the preliminary injunction. The subdivision is believed to reflect the substance of the best current practice and introduces no novel conception. Subdivision (b). In view of the possibly drastic consequence of a temporary restraining order, the opposition should be heard, if feasible, before the order is granted. Many judges have properly insisted that, when time does not permit of formal notice of the application to the adverse party, some expedient, such as telephonic notice to the attorney for the adverse party, be resorted to if this can reasonably be done. On occasion, however, temporary restraining orders have been issued without any notice when it was feasible for some fair, although informal, notice to be given. See the emphatic criticisms in *Pennsylvania Rd. Co. v. Transport Workers Union*, 278 F.2d 693, 694 (3d Cir. 1960); *Arvida Corp. v. Sugarman*, 259 F.2d 428, 429 (2d Cir. 1958); *Lummas Co. v. Commonwealth Oil Ref. Co., Inc.*, 297 F.2d 80, 83 (2d Cir. 1961), cert. denied, 368 U.S. 986 (1962). Heretofore the first sentence of subdivision (b), in referring to a notice "served" on the "adverse party" on which a "hearing" could be held, perhaps invited the interpretation that the order might be granted without notice if the circumstances did not permit of a formal hearing on the basis of a formal notice. The subdivision is amended to make it plain that informal notice, which may be communicated to the attorney rather than the adverse party, is to be preferred to no notice at all. **Before notice can be dispensed with, the applicant's counsel must give his certificate as to any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why notice should not be required.** This certificate is in addition to the requirement of an affidavit or verified complaint setting forth the facts as to the irreparable injury which would result before the opposition could be heard. The amended subdivision continues to recognize that a temporary restraining order may be issued without any notice when the circumstances warrant. Subdivision (c). Original Rules 65 and 73 contained substantially identical provisions for summary proceedings against sureties on bonds required or permitted by the rules. There was fragmentary coverage of the same subject in the Admiralty Rules. Clearly, a single comprehensive rule is required, and is incorporated as Rule 65.1.

**NOTES OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON RULES-1987 AMENDMENT** The amendments are technical. No substantive change is intended.

**COMMITTEE NOTES ON RULES-2001 AMENDMENT** New subdivision (f) is added in conjunction with abrogation of the antiquated Copyright Rules of Practice adopted for proceedings under the 1909 Copyright Act. Courts have naturally turned to Rule 65 in response to the apparent inconsistency of the former Copyright Rules with the discretionary impoundment procedure adopted in 1976, 17 U.S.C. § 503(a). Rule 65 procedures also have assuaged well-founded doubts whether the Copyright Rules satisfy more contemporary requirements of due process. See, e.g., *Religious Technology Center v. Netcom On-Line Communications Servs., Inc.*, 923 F.Supp. 1231, 1260-1265 (N.D. Cal. 1995); *Paramount Pictures Corp. v. Doe*, 821 F.Supp. 82 (E.D.N.Y. 1993); *WPOW, Inc. v. MRLJ Enterprises*, 584 F.Supp. 132 (D.D.C. 1984). A common question has arisen from the experience that

*notice of a proposed impoundment may enable an infringer to defeat the court's capacity to grant effective relief. Impoundment may be ordered on an ex parte basis under subdivision (b) if the applicant makes a strong showing of the reasons why notice is likely to defeat effective relief. Such no-notice procedures are authorized in trademark infringement proceedings, see 15 U.S.C. § 1116(d), and courts have provided clear illustrations of the kinds of showings that support ex parte relief. See Matter of Vuitton et Fils S.A., 606 F.2d 1 (2d Cir.1979); Vuitton v. White, 945 F.2d 569 (3d Cir.1991). In applying the tests for no-notice relief, the court should ask whether impoundment is necessary, or whether adequate protection can be had by a less intrusive form of no-notice relief shaped as a temporary restraining order. This new subdivision (f) does not limit use of trademark procedures in cases that combine trademark and copyright claims. Some observers believe that trademark procedures should be adopted for all copyright cases, a proposal better considered by Congressional processes than by rulemaking processes. Changes Made After Publication and Comments No change has been made.*

**COMMITTEE NOTES ON RULES-2007 AMENDMENT** *The language of Rule 65 has been amended as part of the general restyling of the Civil Rules to make them more easily understood and to make style and terminology consistent throughout the rules. These changes are intended to be stylistic only. The final sentence of former Rule 65(c) referred to Rule 65.1. It is deleted as unnecessary. Rule 65.1 governs of its own force. Rule 65(d)(2) clarifies two ambiguities in former Rule 65(d). The former rule was adapted from former 28 U.S.C. § 363, but omitted a comma that made clear the common doctrine that a party must have actual notice of an injunction in order to be bound by it. Amended Rule 65(d) restores the meaning of the earlier statute, and also makes clear the proposition that an injunction can be enforced against a person who acts in concert with a party's officer, agent, servant, employee, or attorney. Changes Made After Publication and Comment. See Note to Rule 1, supra.*

**COMMITTEE NOTES ON RULES-2009 AMENDMENT** *The time set in the former rule at 10 days has been revised to 14 days. See the Note to Rule 6.*