

1 KEKER, VAN NEST & PETERS LLP  
ELLIOT R. PETERS - # 158708  
2 epeters@keker.com  
DAVID SILBERT - # 173128  
3 dsilbert@keker.com  
R. ADAM LAURIDSEN - # 243780  
4 alauridsen@keker.com  
NICHOLAS S. GOLDBERG - # 273614  
5 ngoldberg@keker.com  
SOPHIE HOOD - # 295881  
6 shood@keker.com  
633 Battery Street  
7 San Francisco, CA 94111-1809  
Telephone: 415 391 5400  
8 Facsimile: 415 397 7188

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER &  
FLOM LLP  
ANTHONY J. DREYER - (pro hac vice)  
anthony.dreyer@skadden.com  
KAREN M. LENT - (pro hac vice)  
karen.lent@skadden.com  
One Manhattan West  
New York, Ny 10001  
Telephone: 212 735 3000  
Facsimile: 212 735 2000/1

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER &  
FLOM LLP  
PATRICK FITZGERALD - (pro hac vice  
forthcoming)  
patrick.fitzgerald@skadden.com  
155 North Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Il 60606  
Telephone: 312 407 0700  
Facsimile: 312 407 0411

11 Attorneys for Defendant PGA TOUR, INC.

12  
13 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
14 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
15 SAN JOSE DIVISION

16 PHIL MICKELSON; TALOR GOOCH;  
HUDSON SWAFFORD; MATT JONES;  
17 BRYSON DECHAMBEAU; ABRAHAM  
ANCER; CARLOS ORTIZ; IAN POULTER;  
18 PAT PEREZ; JASON KOKRAK; and PETER  
UIHLEIN,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 PGA TOUR, INC.,

22 Defendant.

Case No. 5:22-cv-04486-BLF

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING  
PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A  
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman  
Date: August 9, 2022  
Time: 1:00 p.m.  
Dept.: Courtroom 1, 5th Floor

Date Filed: August 3, 2022

Trial Date: None Set

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

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS’  
MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER**

The Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order (Dkt. 2) filed by Talor Gooch, Hudson Swafford, and Matt Jones (“TRO Plaintiffs”) is currently pending before the Court. The Court has reviewed the pleadings, the evidence of record, and heard the arguments of counsel.

A temporary restraining order is an “extraordinary remedy never awarded as of right.” *Garcia v. Google, Inc.*, 786 F.3d 733, 740 (9th Cir. 2015) (en banc). TRO Plaintiffs seek a mandatory injunction that will alter the status quo but have not demonstrated that the “facts and law clearly favor” such extraordinary relief. *Anderson v. United States*, 612 F.2d 1112, 1114 (9th Cir. 1979). Specifically, TRO Plaintiffs have not shown that they are likely to succeed on the merits, that they are likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of emergency injunctive relief, that the balance of equities tips in their favor, or that a temporary restraining order is in the public interest. *See Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008).

Because TRO Plaintiffs have not met their “heavy burden” of establishing entitlement to a mandatory pretrial injunction, *Blankenship v. Newsom*, 477 F. Supp. 3d 1098, 1103 (N.D. Cal. 2020), their Motion is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated:

---

HON. BETH LABSON FREEMAN  
United States District Judge