

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**CIVIL MINUTES -- GENERAL**

Case No. **CV 18-9573-JFW(JPRx)**

Date: November 16, 2018

Title: Federal Trade Commission -v- Apex Capital Group, et al.

---

---

**PRESENT:**

**HONORABLE JOHN F. WALTER, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**Shannon Reilly  
Courtroom Deputy**

**None Present  
Court Reporter**

**ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFFS:**

None

**ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANTS:**

None

**PROCEEDINGS (IN CHAMBERS):**

**ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR (1) TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER WITH ASSET FREEZE, APPOINTMENT OF A RECEIVER, OTHER EQUITABLE RELIEF, AND ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY A PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION SHOULD NOT ISSUE AND (2) ORDER WAIVING NOTICE REQUIREMENT [filed 11/13/18]**

On November 13, 2018, Plaintiff Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") filed an Ex Parte Application for (1) Temporary Restraining Order with Asset Freeze, Appointment of a Receiver, Other Equitable Relief, and Order to Show Cause Why a Preliminary Injunction Should Not Issue and (2) Order Waiving Notice Requirement ("Application"). Pursuant to Rule 78 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and Local Rule 7-15, the Court finds that this matter is appropriate for decision without oral argument. After considering the moving papers, and the arguments therein, the Court rules as follows:

The standard for issuing a temporary restraining order is identical to the standard for issuing a preliminary injunction. See *Lockheed Missile & Space Co., Inc. v. Hughes Aircraft Co.*, 887 F. Supp. 1320, 1323 (N.D. Cal. 1995); *Stuhlberg Int'l Sales Co., Inc. v. John D. Brush & Co., Inc.*, 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001). A party seeking a preliminary injunction must establish: (1) a likelihood of success on the merits; (2) a likelihood that the moving party will suffer irreparable harm absent a preliminary injunction; (3) that the balance of equities tips in the moving party's favor; and (4) that an injunction is in the public's interest. *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council*, 555 U.S. 7 (2008); see also *Am. Trucking Ass'ns, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009). The Ninth Circuit's "serious questions" approach survived *Winter* when applied as part of the four-element *Winter* test. *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1134 (9th Cir. 2011). In other words, "'serious questions going to the merits' and a balance

of hardships that tips sharply towards the [movant] can support issuance of a preliminary injunction, so long as the [movant] also shows that there is a likelihood of irreparable injury and that the injunction is in the public interest." Id. at 1135.

The Court concludes that the FTC has satisfied the standard for the issuance of a temporary restraining order. Accordingly, the FTC's Application is **GRANTED**. The Court signs, as modified, the proposed Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order with Asset Freeze, Appointment of a Temporary Receiver, and Other Equitable Relief, and Order to Show Cause Why a Preliminary Injunction Should Not Issue, lodged with the Court on November 13, 2018.

IT IS SO ORDEREDt."