	Case 3:08-cv-00824-JSW Document 37 Filed 02/13/2008 Page 1 of 2					
1						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT					
7						
8	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA					
9	BANK JULIUS BAER & CO. LTD and					
10	JULIUS BAER BANK AND TRUST CO. LTD, No. C 08-00824 JSW	24 JSW				
11	Plaintiffs,					
12	v. TENTATIVE RULING AND					
13	QUESTIONS WIKILEAKS, et al.					
14	Defendants.					
15						
16	TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD, PLEASE TAKE					
17	NOTICE OF THE FOLLOWING TENTATIVE RULING AND QUESTIONS FOR THE					
18	HEARING SCHEDULED ON FEBRUARY 14, 2007 AT 10:00 A.M.:					
19	The Court has reviewed the parties' papers and, thus, does not wish to hear the parties					
20	reargue matters addressed in those pleadings. If the parties intend to rely on authorities not					
21	cited in their briefs, they are ORDERED to notify the Court and opposing counsel of these					
22	authorities reasonably in advance of the hearing and to make copies available at the hearing. If					
23	the parties submit such additional authorities, they are ORDERED to submit the citations to the					
24	authorities only, without argument or additional briefing. Cf. N.D. Civil Local Rule 7-3(d).					
25	The parties will be given the opportunity at oral argument to explain their reliance on such					
26	authority.					
27	The Court tentatively GRANTS Plaintiffs' application for a temporary restraining					
28	order.					

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

	Case 3	3:08-cv-00824-JSW	Document 37	Filed 02/13/2008	Page 2 of 2			
1								
2	The pa	The parties shall each have 20 minutes to address the following questions:						
3	1. Who is attorney of record for the WikiLeaks Defendants?							
4	2. Have Plaintiffs, by briefly and mistakenly posting their own confidential information on the Court's docket, affectively weived the confidentiality of these documents? (See							
5	the Court's docket, effectively waived the confidentiality of those documents? (See Docket no. 10.)							
6	3. What is the proper scope of the restraining order? Are Plaintiffs seeking only to enjoin "further" use of the JB Property (i.e., should the order enjoin current use as well as							
7 8	further use of the JB Property (i.e., should the order enjoin current use as well as further use)? (<i>See</i> Proposed Order at 5:3.) Are Plaintiffs seeking to enjoin use of all JB Property (as defined in Declaration of Christoph Hiestand, ¶ 5) or only what has been specifically listed in Attachment A to the proposed restraining order?							
9	4.	Should the Court gran order?	the application, how do Plaintiffs intend to enforce the Court's					
10 11 12	5. What is the parties' preferred timeline for briefing on the order to show cause re preliminary injunction? (The Court tentatively sets Friday, February 29, 2008 at 9:00 a.m. as the hearing date unless the parties stipulate otherwise.)							
126. Do the parties have anything further they wish to address?								
13		IT IS SO ORDERED.						
14 15 16	Dated:	February 13, 2008		JEFFREYS.N	white			
17				UNITED STA	TES DISTRICT JUDGE			
18								
19								
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								
26								
27								
28								
				_				
				2				

United States District Court For the Northern District of California