

# Court Upholds Assignment of Non-Compete Agreement Rights

August 31, 2012

In *DePuy Orthopaedics, Inc. v. Waxman, et al.*, \_\_\_ So.3d, 2012 WL 3138681 (Fla. 1st DCA August 3, 2012), the First District Court of Appeal reversed the trial court's denial of a motion for preliminary injunction and upheld the assignment of a non-compete agreement in light of Fla. Stat. §542.335. The Court held that an employment agreement, which contained a non-compete covenant, was properly assigned to the employer's successor. This was true even in the absence of an express formal assignment of the restrictive covenant terms, because the employment agreement contained a provision providing for an unqualified right to assign the employer's rights and obligations. The suit arose within the context of a manufacturer of orthopedic products, *DePuy*, being assigned all the intangible assets of its former distributor, Joint Venture. Joint Venture had entered into employment agreements with its employees restricting them from competing with Joint Venture in various geographic areas for two years after termination. Joint Venture thereafter entered into an agreement with *DePuy* assigning all its intangible assets. After Joint Venture's assignment to *DePuy*, three former employees of Joint Venture began work for a new employer and contacted accounts in their former work territories. Joint Venture assigned to *DePuy* the right to enforce its covenants not to compete. *DePuy* filed suit and moved for a temporary injunction against the three former employees. The order appealed denied *DePuy* an injunction, on the grounds that *DePuy* lacked standing to enforce Joint Venture's non-compete agreement. The First District Court of Appeal disagreed with the trial court's denial of temporary injunction. The employment agreements provided that Joint Venture could assign all of its rights and obligations to its assignees, even though the *employees' rights and obligations* under the employment agreements were expressly personal and non-assignable. The Court noted that the employment agreements stated that Joint Venture's rights and obligations under the agreement "shall inure to the benefit of and be binding upon [Joint Venture's] assigns and successors." The agreement assigning *DePuy* all the Joint Venture's intangible assets also stated that *DePuy* retained the right to enforce all non-compete covenants in favor of Joint Venture. The trial court erred by basing its reasoning, in part, upon case law applicable to Fla. Stat. §542.33, the predecessor statute to Fla. Stat. §542.335. The predecessor statute required the employees' consent to assign a non-compete covenant, while §542.335 allows

the assignment of non-compete covenants when the restrictive covenant "expressly authorized enforcement by a party's assignee or successor." The employment agreements at issue provided that Joint Venture could assign all of its rights and obligations to assignees, and, as such, the assignment was proper. The First District held that general assignment clauses satisfy the statutory requirements of §542.335 because settled law establishes that unqualified assignments transfer all rights in the thing assigned and courts are not empowered to construe reasonable non-compete agreements narrowly, against the restraint, or against the drafter. The opinion also found that the trial court erred by implicitly finding that *DePuy* had not met the prerequisites for entry of a temporary injunction. In so holding, the First District Court of Appeal noted that it found persuasive the Fifth District Court of Appeal's decision in *Patel v. Boers*, 68 So.3d 280 (Fla. 5th DCA 2011), which similarly reversed a trial court's refusal to enforce an assignment of a restrictive covenant within a contract that contained a general assignment clause.

## Related Practices

[Trade Secrets / Noncompete Litigation and Consulting](#)

©2024 Carlton Fields, P.A. Carlton Fields practices law in California through Carlton Fields, LLP. Carlton Fields publications should not be construed as legal advice on any specific facts or circumstances. The contents are intended for general information and educational purposes only, and should not be relied on as if it were advice about a particular fact situation. The distribution of this publication is not intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an attorney-client relationship with Carlton Fields. This publication may not be quoted or referred to in any other publication or proceeding without the prior written consent of the firm, to be given or withheld at our discretion. To request reprint permission for any of our publications, please use our Contact Us form via the link below. The views set forth herein are the personal views of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the firm. This site may contain hypertext links to information created and maintained by other entities. Carlton Fields does not control or guarantee the accuracy or completeness of this outside information, nor is the inclusion of a link to be intended as an endorsement of those outside sites.