

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PATSY WIDAKUSWARA, *et al.*,

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

KARI LAKE, *in her official capacity as  
Senior Advisor to the Acting CEO of the U.S.  
Agency for Global Media, et al.*,

*Defendants.*

Case No. 1:25-cv-1015-RCL

**ORDER**

Plaintiffs filed an emergency Motion [ECF No. 85] to clarify this Court's extension of the temporary restraining order ("TRO") originally ordered by Judge Oetken in the Southern District of New York on March 28, 2025. TRO, ECF No. 54. To the extent it was previously unclear, it is hereby **ORDERED** that the TRO is in place until Friday, April 18, 2025.

The government now takes the position that the TRO expires today, on April 11, 2025. *See* Apr. 11 Government Email, Ex. B., ECF No. 85-2. The Court enters this order to clarify that the TRO is in effect until Friday, April 18, 2025, for numerous reasons. For one, the 14-day time limit on TROs as contemplated by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65 only applies to TROs issued without notice—which, indeed, was the government's understanding as well, at least as of April 2, 2025. *See* Apr. 2 Government Email, Ex. A, ECF No. 85-1 ("The time limitation in Rule 65(b) only applies to TROs that are issued without notice. TROs issued with notice fall outside the scope


of the rule. By its terms, Judge Oetken has ordered that the TRO stay in place until your PI motion is ruled on.”<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, even if the 14-day time limit applied here, there is “good cause” to extend it for a “like period,” as contemplated by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(b)(2). This TRO will be in place for 21 days, one week longer than the 14-day period. Judge Oetken granted the government’s motion to transfer this case to the District of Columbia on April 4, 2025. *See* Transfer Order, ECF No. 61. The case was assigned to this Court on April 8, 2025. That same day, this Court ordered the parties to provide a briefing schedule for prompt resolution of the outstanding preliminary injunction motion because “[t]he TRO currently in place will expire on Friday, April 18, 2025.” *See* Order, ECF No. 70. The Court is actually moving even faster than the parties initially requested, moving up their requested date for a hearing by one day and ordering a compressed briefing timeline. *See* Min. Order of Apr. 10, 2025. Given the time that it took to transfer the case, and the parties’ proposals for briefing and a hearing on the preliminary injunction motion, there is good cause for this TRO to last for a period of 21 days.

It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 54, will remain in place until April 18, 2025, when the Court rules on the outstanding motion for a preliminary injunction.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: 4-11-25

  
 Royce C. Lamberth  
 United States District Judge

<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, it appears from Judge Oetken’s order that the *government* was the party who indicated a 21-day period for the TRO—the Court referred to “Defendants’ request for ‘an initial bond of \$23.1 million’ to cover twenty-one days during which a TRO may be in force.” TRO at 7.