| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT<br>SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK |             |                  | ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC #: |  |
|---|-------------|------------------|-----------------------------|--|
|   |             | <i>X</i><br>:    | DATE FILED: AUG 0 1 2014    |  |
| AMERICAN BROADCASTING COMPANIES, INC. ET AL.,                 |             | :                |                             |  |
| DI IID.,  | Plaintiffs, | :                | 12-cv-1540                  |  |
| -V-   |             | :<br>:           | <u>ORDER</u>                |  |
| AEREO, INC.,  | Defendant,  | :<br>:<br>:      |                             |  |
| WNET ET AL.,  | Plaintiffs, | :<br>:<br>:      | 12-cv-1543                  |  |
| -V-   |             | :                |                             |  |
| AEREO, INC.,  | Defendant,  | :<br>:<br>:<br>: |                             |  |

## ALISON J. NATHAN, District Judge:

On June 25, 2014, the Supreme Court handed down its decision reversing the denial of a preliminary injunction and remanding the case for further proceedings consistent with its opinion. *ABC, Inc. v. Aereo, Inc.*, 573 U.S. \_\_\_, 189 L. Ed. 2d 476 (2014). On July 28, 2014, the case was returned to the Second Circuit. Yesterday the Second Circuit vacated this Court's order denying the preliminary injunction and remanded for further consideration. *See* Dkt. No. 314.

On July 9, 2014, the parties submitted a joint status letter regarding next steps in this litigation in light of the Supreme Court's decision. Dkt. No. 313. In that letter, Plaintiffs indicate that they will be submitting "a proposed order, consistent with the Supreme Court's decision, that enjoins Aereo from violating Plaintiffs' public performance rights." In the same

letter, Defendant indicates that it believes the stay of discovery should remain in place until this

Court has resolved the injunction issues in connection with the remand; nowhere in that letter

does Defendant propose an expedited briefing or that it should be permitted to brief the issues

first. In any event, the Court did not yet instruct the parties as to how the preliminary injunction

issues would be briefed on remand. As a result, Defendant has jumped the gun in filing, without

authorization, its motion for emergency consideration of preliminary injunction issues upon

remand. Dkt. Nos. 317-320. The Clerk of Court is directed to strike Docket Numbers 317, 318,

319, and 320.

The Court agrees with Plaintiffs that the appropriate next step is to consider a proposed

order consistent with the Supreme Court's decision and the Court directs Plaintiffs to prepare

such an order, accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of their position, on or before

two weeks from today's date. Defendant's opposition, if any, shall be filed on or before two

weeks after receipt of Plaintiffs' proposed order and memorandum of law. Plaintiffs' reply

memorandum, if any, shall be filed on or before one week after receipt of Defendant's opposition

papers.

With the exception of the above-ordered briefing, the stay of discovery ordered by the

Court on January 22, 2014, Dkt. No. 307, shall remain in effect until further order of the Court.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: August

August \_\_\_\_\_, 2014

New York, New York

ALISON J. NATHAN

United States District Judge

2