1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON			
8	KIN	G COUNTY		
9	MOVE, INC., et al,	NO. 14-2-07669-0 SEA		
10	Plaintiffs,			
11	v.	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION		
12	ZILLOW, INC., a Washington corporation, and ERROL SAMUELSON, an individual,			
13	Defendants.			
14				
15	THIS MATTER came before the Court on plaintiffs Move, Inc., RealSelect, Inc., Top			
16 17	Producer Systems Company, National Association of Realtors®, and Realtors® Information			
18	Network, Inc.'s (plaintiffs) Motion for Preliminary Injunction against defendants Zillow, Inc.,			
19	and Errol Samuelson (defendants).			
20	The Court considered the following documents:			
21	Plaintiffs' Motion for Prelimina	ry Injunction;		
22	Declaration of Steven Berkow	itz, with exhibits;		
23	Declaration of Carol Brummer, with exhibits;			
24	4. Declaration of Warren Cree, with exhibits;			
25	5. Declaration of Oussama R. El-	Khoury, with exhibit;		

1	6.	Declaration of Rachel Glaser;	
2	7.	Declaration of Robert Goldberg;	
3	8.	Redacted Declaration of Ernie Graham;	
4	9.	Declaration of David Ryan Green;	
5	10.	Declaration of Robert Greenspan;	
6	11.	Declaration of Joseph Hanauer;	
7	12.	Declaration of Eugene Hernandez;	
8	13.	Declaration of Angeline Krishan, with exhibit;	
9	14.	Declaration of Jack Lovejoy, with exhibits;	
10	15.	Declaration of Nidine Mann;	
12	16.	Declaration of Patricia Smith;	
13		°	
14	17.	Defendant Zillow's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction;	
15	18.	Declaration of Spencer Rascoff;	
16	19.	Declaration of Bruce Michael Cross, with exhibits;	
17	20.	Defendant Samuelson's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion;	
18	21.	Declaration of Errol Samuelson;	
19	22.	Plaintiffs' Reply; and	
20	28.	The records and file herein.	
21	The Court heard oral argument of the parties on April 4, 2014 and deems itself fully advised,		Ì
22	now, therefore		
23	11111		
24	11111		
25	25   <sub>         </sub>		

2

1	THE COURT FINDS:		
2	Plaintiffs cannot rely on declarations that have not been disclosed to defendants and		
3	as to which defendants have not had a proper opportunity to contest. Plaintiffs have not		
4	carried their burden of proving:		
5	That the confidential information they contend that defendant Samuelson		
6 7	possesses constitutes protectable trade secrets;		
8	2) That defendant Samuelson has misappropriated or threatened to		
9	misappropriate trade secrets; nor		
10	That the equities favor injunctive relief sought.		
11	The Court declines to invoke the "inevitable disclosure" doctrine. Further, plaintiffs		
12	have not shown that defendant Samuelson will inevitably disclose plaintiffs' trade secrets.		
13	For these reasons, now, therefore, it is hereby		
14	ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction		
15	is DENIED.		
16 17	DATED this 14 day of April, 2014.		
18	1 1		
19	Barban Lade		
20	JUDGE BARBARA LINDE		
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			