

1 GLENN D. POMERANTZ (State Bar No. 112503)
glenn.pomerantz@mto.com
2 KELLY M. KLAUS (State Bar No. 161091)
kelly.klaus@mto.com
3 ROHIT K. SINGLA (State Bar No. 213057)
rohit.singla@mto.com
4 CAROLYN HOECKER LUEDTKE (State Bar No. 207976)
carolyn.luedtke@mto.com
5 MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON LLP
560 Mission Street
6 Twenty-Seventh Floor
San Francisco, California 94105-2907
7 Telephone: (415) 512-4000
Facsimile: (415) 512-4077
8

GREGORY L. CURTNER (*Pro Hac Vice*)
9 gcurtner@schiffhardin.com
ROBERT J. WIERENGA (State Bar No. 183687)
10 rwierenga@schiffhardin.com
SCHIFF HARDIN LLP
11 350 Main St., Suite 210
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
12 Telephone: (734) 222-1500
Facsimile: (734) 222-1501
13

Attorneys for Defendant
14 National Collegiate Athletic Association

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, OAKLAND DIVISION
17

18 EDWARD O'BANNON, et al.,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC
22 ASSOCIATION; COLLEGIATE
LICENSING COMPANY; AND
23 ELECTRONIC ARTS INC.,

24 Defendants.
25
26
27
28

Case No. 09-cv-3329-CW

**DEFENDANT NCAA'S
ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR
CLARIFICATION OF TIMING OF
INJUNCTION**

Judge: Hon. Claudia Wilken
Courtroom: 2, 4th Floor

1 The NCAA respectfully seeks urgent clarification of a discrete issue with respect to the
2 timing of the Court's injunction. The NCAA seeks this clarification on an urgent basis because it
3 has already started receiving queries from numerous college administrators across the country
4 seeking guidance regarding the effect of the Court's injunction on the NCAA's rules. The NCAA
5 also does not wish to violate the injunction, even unintentionally (or to be accused of having done
6 so), due to a misunderstanding.

7 The NCAA respectfully requests clarification that the injunction does not prohibit the
8 application of the current NCAA rules with respect to student-athletes who were enrolled or will
9 enroll in college before July 1, 2016, and takes effect for student-athletes enrolling after July 1,
10 2016, at the beginning of the next recruiting cycle, *i.e.*, August 1, 2015.

11 The Court's Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law states that the injunction "will not
12 take effect until the start of next FBS football and Division I basketball recruiting cycle." Doc. 291
13 at 98:7-8. The term "recruiting cycle" is potentially ambiguous. Under existing NCAA rules,
14 student-athletes in the next recruiting cycle (*i.e.*, student-athletes who would first enroll in college
15 in Fall 2016) may receive offer letters from colleges starting on August 1, 2015. Bylaw
16 13.9.2.2. NCAA seeks to confirm that the existing NCAA rules can remain in force until August
17 1, 2015, although we understand the injunction would not permit the NCAA to adopt or enforce
18 rules inconsistent with the injunction on or after that date.

19 Relatedly, Paragraph 2 of the injunction says that "[t]his injunction shall not affect any
20 prospective student-athlete who will enroll in college before July 1, 2016." Doc. 292 at 2
21 ¶ 2. Paragraphs 1(a) and 1(b) of the injunction, however, refer to the licensing or use of
22 "prospective, current, or former" student-athlete NILs. This has prompted concerns among
23 colleges and universities that the injunction might, contrary to the Court's opinion, apply
24 immediately to current student-athletes. Based on the Court's opinion, the NCAA believes the
25 language of Paragraph 1 refers to compensation only for student-athletes first enrolling after July
26 1, 2016. Otherwise the injunction would permit colleges and conferences to compensate current
27 student-athletes before the NCAA's member colleges have an opportunity to consider new rules
28 consistent with the injunction.

