

JENNER & BLOCK

*Practice Series*

ENFORCEMENT OF EMPLOYEE  
RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS  
UNDER ILLINOIS LAW

Terri L. Mascherin  
R. Douglas Rees

---

Contributing Editors:

Tiffany E. Clements

Shelley K. Dufford

Anna W. Margasinska

Sarah R. McNally

Laura E. Pelanek

## **ABOUT THE AUTHORS**

**Terri L. Mascherin** is a partner in Jenner & Block's Chicago office and a member of the firm's Litigation Department and the firm's Management Committee. Ms. Mascherin represents businesses and individuals in disputes over corporate transactions, partnerships, joint ventures, licenses, and contracts. Ms. Mascherin's work includes representing clients in cases involving trade secrets and employee restrictive covenants, both in litigation and in counseling to avoid litigation. Ms. Mascherin has extensive experience handling emergency hearings, trials, appeals, and arbitrations throughout the United States.

**R. Douglas Rees** is a partner in Jenner & Block's Chicago office and a member of the firm's Litigation Department. Mr. Rees regularly represents companies and employees in cases involving theft of trade secrets, breach of fiduciary duties, tortious interference, fraud, and employee restrictive covenants. Mr. Rees has extensive experience handling emergency litigation involving temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions. He counsels clients on methods to protect confidential information and other business interests; he also counsels clients on ways to avoid litigation when hiring employees or when leaving employment.

### **Contact Information for Ms. Mascherin:**

Direct Dial: (312) 923-2799  
Direct Fax: (312) 840-7799  
E-Mail: tmascherin@jenner.com

### **Contact Information for Mr. Rees:**

Direct Dial: (312) 923-2837  
Direct Fax: (312) 840-7237  
E-Mail: drees@jenner.com

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION .....	1
I. TYPES OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS. ....	1
II. ENFORCEABILITY OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS. ....	2
A. The Restrictive Covenant Must Be Necessary To Protect A Legitimate Business Interest. ....	3
1. Near-permanent customer relationships. ....	3
a. Protectible interest found. ....	3
(1) Substantial investment in near- permanent customer relationships: .....	3
(2) Substantial contact with certain customers: .....	7
(3) Extensive marketing efforts and employee with no prior experience in industry: .....	9
(4) Where customers come to repose trust in particular seller with whom they have a relationship: .....	10
(5) Protectible business interest in medical practice: .....	11
b. No protectible interest found. ....	13
(1) No protectible interest in customers in highly competitive business without customer loyalty: .....	13
(2) Customers were employee's, not employer's: .....	16
(3) No investment in development of customers and no confidential information:.....	18
(4) No protectible business interest in law firm's clients: .....	19

(5)	True intent of covenant was not to protect customer relationships: .....	20
(6)	No protectible interest in “good will” of dissolved medical practice:.....	21
(7)	Medical practice had no protectible business interest in patients of hospital at which practice was precluded by contract from offering services:.....	21
(8)	No protectible interest in future clients: .....	22
2.	Access to trade secrets or confidential information.....	22
a.	Protectible interest found.....	22
(1)	Confidential pricing formula: .....	22
(2)	Confidential customer profiles:.....	23
(3)	Confidential product design:.....	24
(4)	Theft of computer files: .....	24
(5)	Inevitable disclosure of confidential information:.....	24
b.	No protectible interest found.....	27
(1)	Pricing formula not confidential: .....	27
(2)	General market strategies are not confidential: .....	29
(3)	General knowledge of automated system and customer information not confidential: .....	29
(4)	No access to confidential information or trade secrets: .....	30
(5)	Materials widely distributed and confidential information not specifically identified:.....	31

(6)	No confidential information where employer failed to take adequate measures to safeguard the information:.....	32
(7)	“Middleman’s” prices can be discovered from public information: .....	33
(8)	Salesman’s knowledge of customers cannot be considered confidential information of employer: .....	34
(9)	Employees are not trade secrets:.....	35
(10)	Information no longer confidential when employer disseminated information to client:.....	35
3.	Stability of Workforce .....	36
4.	Investment in goodwill as a legitimate business interest.....	38
B.	Restrictions Must Be Reasonable As To Duration, Geographic Area, and Scope of Prohibited Activity. ....	38
1.	Covenants unenforceable because no geographic or time limitation.....	38
2.	Covenants without geographic and time limits not <i>per se</i> unreasonable.....	41
3.	The geographic scope should be co-extensive with the plaintiff’s business territory. ....	42
4.	The scope of prohibited activity must be reasonably defined.....	45
a.	Activity restrictions upheld.....	45
b.	Activity restrictions rejected. ....	47
5.	Reasonable to enforce restrictive covenant for so long as employee receives deferred compensation.....	48
C.	Restrictive Covenants Must Be Supported By Adequate Consideration. ....	49

1.	Continued employment for “substantial period” is adequate consideration.....	49
2.	“Peppercorn” consideration insufficient to support injunction. ....	49
3.	Unenforceable contracts of adhesion.....	50
4.	Covenants requiring employer to fire employees who are not parties to an employment contract may not be enforceable. ....	51
D.	The Covenant Must Be Ancillary to a Valid Employment Agreement or Sale of Business.....	51
1.	Covenants ancillary to a valid employment agreement.....	51
2.	The enforceability of covenants with at-will employees. ....	51
3.	Covenants in independent contractor agreements.....	54
4.	Restrictive covenant ancillary to the sale of a business.....	54
a.	Employment agreement that was a precondition to closing held ancillary to sale of a business.....	55
b.	Covenant held ancillary to contemporaneous sale of business. ....	56
c.	Activity restraints preferable even in sale of business. ....	56
d.	No protectible interest in 10-year-old goodwill. ....	57
5.	Covenants ancillary to the formation of a new business or joint venture. ....	57
III.	CONSTRUCTION OF RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS.....	58
A.	“Blue-penciling” Rejected. ....	58
B.	“Blue-penciling” Upheld. ....	60
C.	Restrictive Covenants Construed Against the Drafter.....	62

IV.	INJUNCTIONS.....	62
A.	Injunction Granted or Affirmed (or Denial Reversed). ....	62
1.	Illinois State Cases.....	62
2.	Federal Cases Within the Seventh Circuit .....	66
B.	Injunction Denied or Reversed. ....	68
1.	Illinois State Cases.....	68
2.	Federal Cases Within the Seventh Circuit.....	72
C.	Injunction May Be Awarded in Arbitration.....	73
D.	Contempt Action to Enforce a TRO or Injunction.....	73
V.	MISCELLANEOUS ISSUES INVOLVING RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS. ....	74
A.	Existence of Restrictive Covenant May Give Rise to Post-Employment Fiduciary Duty. ....	74
B.	Attorneys’ Fees.....	74
1.	Attorneys’ fees not recoverable where new employer pays employee’s legal bills.....	74
C.	Successor Employer May Enforce Restrictive Covenant.....	75
D.	Enforceability of Restrictive Covenants in the Legal Profession.....	75
E.	Enforceability of Restrictive Covenants in the Medical Profession.....	77
1.	Restrictive covenants involving physicians may be unenforceable on public policy grounds.....	78
2.	Prohibition against corporations practicing medicine may bar enforcement of covenant not to compete in physician’s employment contract.....	79
3.	Covenants void under Illinois Medical Practice Act prohibitions against fee-splitting.....	81
F.	Other Defenses to Enforcement of Restrictive Covenants.....	81

1.	Employer’s breach of employment contract precludes enforcement of restrictive covenant. ....	81
2.	Breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing by employer precludes enforcement of restrictive covenant. ....	84
3.	Covenant void because it violates a state law. ....	84
4.	Employer may not enforce restrictive covenant against employee for subsequent employment under a different agreement. ....	85
G.	A Contract Provision Restricting One Employer’s Ability to Hire Employees of Another Employer Is Not a Restrictive Covenant. ....	85
H.	Viability of a Motion to Dismiss. ....	86
1.	Motion to dismiss granted. ....	86
2.	Motion to dismiss denied or reversed. ....	87
TABLE OF CASES .....		Appendix