

1 MICHAEL W. BIEN – 096891
 ERNEST GALVAN – 196065
 2 VAN SWEARINGEN – 259809
 BENJAMIN BIEN-KAHN – 267933
 3 ALEXANDER GOURSE – 321631
 AMY XU – 330707
 4 ROSEN BIEN
 GALVAN & GRUNFELD LLP
 5 101 Mission Street, Sixth Floor
 San Francisco, California 94105-1738
 6 Telephone: (415) 433-6830
 Facsimile: (415) 433-7104
 7 Email: mbien@rbgg.com
 egalvan@rbgg.com
 8 vswearingen@rbgg.com
 bbien-kahn@rbgg.com
 9 agourse@rbgg.com
 axu@rbgg.com

10 KELIANG (CLAY) ZHU – 305509
 11 DEHENG LAW OFFICES PC
 7901 Stoneridge Drive #208
 12 Pleasanton, California 94588
 Telephone: (925) 399-5856
 13 Facsimile: (925) 397-1976
 Email: czhu@dehengsv.com

14 ANGUS F. NI – Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
 15 AFN LAW PLLC
 502 Second Avenue, Suite 1400
 16 Seattle, Washington 98104
 Telephone: (773) 543-3223
 17 Email: angus@afnlegal.com

18 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

19 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

20 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

21 U.S. WECHAT USERS ALLIANCE,
 CHIHUO INC., BRENT COULTER,
 22 FANGYI DUAN, JINNENG BAO, ELAINE
 PENG, and XIAO ZHANG,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity
 as President of the United States, and
 26 WILBUR ROSS, in his official capacity as
 Secretary of Commerce,

27 Defendants.

THOMAS R. BURKE – 141930
 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
 505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
 San Francisco, California 94111-6533
 Telephone: (415) 276-6500
 Facsimile: (415) 276-6599
 Email: thomasburke@dwt.com

DAVID M. GOSSETT – Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
 1301 K Street N.W., Suite 500 East
 Washington, D.C. 20005-3366
 Telephone: (202) 973-4216
 Facsimile: (202) 973-4499
 Email: davidgossett@dwt.com

JOHN M. BROWNING – *Pro Hac Vice*
 forthcoming
 DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
 1251 Avenue of the Americas, 21st Floor
 New York, New York 10020-1104
 Telephone: (212) 603-6410
 Facsimile: (212) 483-8340
 Email: jackbrowning@dwt.com

Case No. 3:20-cv-05910-LB

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO
 DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY
 PENDING APPEAL OF ORDER
 GRANTING MOTION FOR
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Date: October 15, 2020
 Time: 9:30 a.m.
 Crtrm.: Remote

Judge: Hon. Laurel Beeler
 Trial Date: None Set

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
1	
2	
3	INTRODUCTION 1
4	ARGUMENT..... 3
5	I. DEFENDANTS’ NEWLY SUBMITTED EVIDENCE DOES NOT
6	JUSTIFY GRANTING A STAY 3
7	II. DEFENDANTS HAVE NOT MET THE STANDARD FOR A STAY 6
8	A. Defendants Have Not Made a Strong Showing of Likelihood of
9	Success on the Merits 6
10	1. The WeChat Ban Is A Prior Restraint and Is Not Content
11	Neutral 7
12	2. The WeChat Ban Implicates the First Amendment 8
13	3. The WeChat Ban Cannot Survive Intermediate Scrutiny 10
14	4. Plaintiffs’ <i>Ultra Vires</i> Claims Warrant Relief..... 13
15	B. Defendants Have Not Shown Irreparable Harm Caused by the
16	Preliminary Injunction, Which Merely Preserves the Status Quo 13
17	1. The Court Did Not Err in Stating the Standard or Balancing the
18	Equities 13
19	2. The Court Properly Evaluated the Strength or Absence of
20	Evidence Supporting Defendants’ Assertions of National
21	Security and Foreign Policy Justifications 15
22	3. Defendants Will Not Be Irreparably Injured Absent a Stay 17
23	(a) Defendants’ Evidence of Surveillance Is Speculative 17
24	(b) The Claimed National Security Risks Are Neither
25	Immediate Nor Irreparable 19
26	(c) Defendants’ Fail to Show How Censorship Is an
27	Irreparable Injury to National Security 21
28	(d) Defendants Cannot Suffer Harm From an Injunction
	That Merely Ends an Unlawful Practice 21
	C. A Stay Would Irreparably Harm Plaintiffs..... 22
	D. The Court Correctly Concluded That the Public Interest Warrants a
	Preliminary Injunction..... 23
	III. NO PARTIAL STAY SHOULD BE GRANTED, NOR SHOULD THE
	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION BE MODIFIED 24

1 IV. DEFENDANTS OFFER NO RATIONALE TO NOW STAY THE
ORDER’S NATIONWIDE EFFECT..... 25

2 V. DEFENDANTS’ REQUEST FOR BOND SHOULD BE DENIED 25

3 CONCLUSION..... 25

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

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

		Page
1		
2		
3		
4	<u>CASES</u>	
5	<i>A&M Records, Inc. v. Napster, Inc.</i> ,	
6	284 F.3d 1091 (9th Cir. 2002)	24
7	<i>Al Haramain Islamic Found, Inc. v. United States Dep’t of the Treasury</i> ,	
8	686 F.3d 965 (9th Cir. 2012)	6, 16
9	<i>Am.-Arab Anti-Discrimination Comm. v. Reno</i> ,	
10	70 F.3d 1045 (9th Cir. 1995)	17
11	<i>Apple, Inc. v. Samsung Elecs. Co.</i> ,	
12	No. 11-cv-01846, 2012 WL 2527044 (N.D. Cal. July 2, 2012)	1
13	<i>Arcara v. Cloud Books, Inc.</i> ,	
14	478 U.S. 697 (1986)	9
15	<i>Backpage.com, LLC v. Dart</i> ,	
16	807 F.3d 229 (7th Cir. 2015)	9
17	<i>Bullfrog Films v. Wick</i> ,	
18	646 F. Supp. 492, 502 (C.D. Cal. 1986), <i>aff’d</i> 847 F.2d 502 (9th Cir. 1988)	12
19	<i>Bullfrog Films, Inc. v. Wick</i> ,	
20	847 F.2d 502 (9th Cir. 1988)	12
21	<i>City of Ladue v. Gilleo</i> ,	
22	512 U.S. 43 (1994)	7, 8
23	<i>City of Los Angeles, Harbor Div. v. Santa Monica Baykeeper</i> ,	
24	254 F.3d 882 (9th Cir. 2001)	24
25	<i>Connecticut General Life Insurance Co. v. New Images of Beverly Hills</i> ,	
26	321 F.3d 878 (9th Cir. 2003)	25
27	<i>CTIA - The Wireless Ass’n v. City of Berkeley</i> ,	
28	928 F.3d 832 (9th Cir. 2019)	22
	<i>Currier v. Potter</i> ,	
	379 F.3d 716 (9th Cir. 2004)	8
	<i>Defense Distributed v. U.S. Dep’t of State</i> ,	
	838 F.3d 451 (5th Cir. 2016)	14
	<i>Doe v. Harris</i> ,	
	772 F.3d 563 (2014)	10
	<i>Drummond Co., Inc. v. Collingsworth</i> ,	
	2013 WL 6074157 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 18, 2013)	12

1	<i>E. Bay Sanctuary Covenant v. Barr</i> , 934 F.3d 1026 (9th Cir. 2019)	24
2		
3	<i>Elrod v. Burns</i> , 427 U.S. 347 (1976)	24
4	<i>G.K. Ltd. Travel v. City of Lake Oswego</i> , 436 F.3d 1064 (9th Cir. 2006)	12
5		
6	<i>Hilton v. Braunskill</i> , 481 U.S. 770 (1987)	1
7	<i>Holder v. Humanitarian Law Project (HLP)</i> , 561 U.S. 1 (2010)	14, 15
8		
9	<i>Lamont v. Postmaster Gen. of the United States</i> , 381 U.S. 301 (1965)	8, 12
10	<i>Language Line Servs., Inc. v. Language Servs. Assocs., Inc.</i> , 500 F. App'x 678 (9th Cir. 2012)	24
11		
12	<i>Mayweathers v. Newland</i> , 258 F.3d 930 (9th Cir. 2001)	1
13	<i>Near v. Minnesota</i> , 283 U.S. 697 (1931)	7
14		
15	<i>Nken v. Holder</i> , 556 U.S. 418 (2009)	1, 2
16	<i>Ramos v. Wolf</i> , No. 18-16981, 2020 WL 5509753 (9th Cir. Sept. 14, 2020).....	14
17		
18	<i>Reed v. Town of Gilbert, Ariz.</i> , 576 U.S. 155 (2015)	7
19	<i>Rodriguez v. Robbins</i> , 715 F.3d 1127 (9th Cir. 2013)	21
20		
21	<i>Se. Promotions, Ltd. v. Conrad</i> , 420 U.S. 546 (1975)	7
22	<i>Smith v. California</i> , 361 U.S. 147 (1959)	9
23		
24	<i>Stagg P.C. v. U.S. Department of State</i> , 158 F. Supp. 3d 203 (S.D.N.Y. 2016)	15
25	<i>TikTok, Inc. v. Trump</i> , No. 1:20-CV-02658, 2020 WL 5763634, (D.D.C. Sept. 27, 2020)	passim
26		
27	<i>Trump v. Hawaii</i> , 138 S. Ct. 2392 (2018).....	16
28		

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.