



Frequently Asked Questions About the FTC's Rule Banning Non-Compete Agreements

Insights

5.16.24

Most recently updated August 23

Employers likely have lots of questions as you try to understand the FTC's new non-compete ban. After all, non-competes have become a tool for businesses of all types and sizes, and if the rule survives legal challenges, it will ban these provisions between almost all employers and all employees. The new rule not only prevents employers from entering into new non-competes after the effective date, but also will require you to send notice to most workers who previously signed such agreements. Notably, you'll need to explain that the worker's non-compete clause will not be — and cannot legally be — enforced against them. The good news: we're here to help. This Insight presents a series of frequently asked questions about all aspects of the rule as developed by key members of our Employee Defection and Trade Secrets Practice Group.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: A Texas federal court struck down the FTC's proposed ban on non-competition agreements on a nationwide basis on August 20, meaning employers across the country can continue to maintain non-competes as their state laws allow. Employers will not have to comply with the rule by September 4 as originally scheduled. [Read more about the decision and practical pointers on next steps by clicking here.](#)]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[Big-Picture Overview](#)

[Specific Ins and Outs of the Rule](#)

[Scope of Rule](#)

[Next Steps: Legal Challenges and More](#)

[Practical Gameplan for Employers](#)

Big-Picture Overview

What happened? (answer most recently updated August 23)

After reviewing empirical research on non-competes and over 26,000 public comments, the FTC adopted a final rule that will prohibit employers from entering into most new non-competes and also prevents you from enforcing existing non-competes in all but a few circumstances, such as against a limited class of senior executives.

[You can read more about the final rule and our five-step action plan for employers here.](#)

The rule is slated to take effect on September 4, though legal challenges could cause delays, or a court could invalidate the rule altogether. We will be closely following developments in this area.

[EDITOR'S NOTE: As noted above, a Texas federal court struck down the FTC's proposed ban on non-competition agreements on a nationwide basis on August 20, meaning employers across the country can continue to maintain non-compete as their state laws allow. Employers will not have to comply with the rule by September 4 as originally scheduled. [Read more about the decision and practical pointers on next steps by clicking here.](#)]

What does the rule do?

Assuming the rule is not permanently blocked, it will require employers to:

- Provide clear and conspicuous notice prior to the effective date to current and former workers who do not qualify as a senior executive. The notice should explain that the workers' existing non-compete clauses will not and cannot legally be enforced against them. The final rule provides model language, which can be used to satisfy this notice obligation and provides a safe harbor. (NOTE: The notice may be delivered by hand, by mail to the worker's last known personal street address, by email at an email address belonging to the worker (work or personal), or by text message to a mobile telephone number belonging to the worker. An exemption to the notice requirement exists if no contact information is known.)
- Stop enforcing existing non-compete clauses with all workers other than senior executives (NOTE: it is not necessary to rescind the agreements).
- Refrain from entering into new non-compete clauses with workers.

For workers other than "senior executives" (as defined by the rule), attempting to enforce an existing non-compete clause, entering into a new non-compete clause, or claiming that the worker is subject to a non-compete clause constitutes unfair competition.

For "senior executives," attempting to enter a new non-compete clause or claiming that the senior executive is subject to a non-compete clause (if the agreement is entered into after the rule's effective date) constitutes unfair competition.

How does the Commission define "non-compete" clauses?

The rule defines "non-compete clause" to mean a contractual term (written or oral) that prohibits, penalizes for, or functions to prevent a worker from: seeking or accepting work from a different person or business, or starting a business, within the U.S., after the worker's employment ends.

Why did the FTC do this?

In July 2021, President Biden issued an Executive Order titled “[Promoting Competition in the American Economy](#).” It directed the FTC to exercise its “statutory rulemaking authority under the Federal Trade Commission Act to curtail the unfair use of non-compete clauses and other clauses or agreements that may unfairly limit worker mobility.”

In January 2023, the Commission followed through on the President’s request. With the release of the proposed rule, FTC Chair Lina Khan opined that non-compete clauses “block workers from freely switching jobs, depriving them of higher wages and better working conditions, and depriving businesses of a talent pool that they need to build and expand.” The Commission reiterated its belief that non-compete clauses negatively affect competition in labor markets by suppressing wages and labor mobility, and by preventing new businesses from forming, stifling entrepreneurship, and preventing novel innovation that might otherwise occur if workers were not restricted from sharing their ideas.

The FTC estimates that 101 million workers are subject to non-competes, and that the rule will increase workers’ annual earnings in the U.S. by \$524 per worker, totaling \$53 billion nationally.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Specific Ins and Outs of the Rule

Does the rule prohibit non-solicitation, non-recruit, or confidentiality clauses?

Generally speaking, no. The FTC said those provisions are not generally non-compete clauses under the final rule, so long as they do not ‘function to’ prevent someone from seeking work or operating a business. However, the determination will be made on a case-by-case basis.

The FTC used a few cases as examples of non-disclosure agreements that were so overbroad they would effectively prevent someone from working for another employer in the same industry or field. However, those cases involved agreements that broadly barred the use of any information that is ‘usable in’ or ‘relates to’ the industry in which the employee works, or even publicly available information.

Does the rule prohibit other types of clauses, such as forfeiture-for-competition or garden leave clauses?

Many commentators asked the FTC to expressly state in the final rule whether various specific restrictive employment agreements satisfy the definition of a non-compete clause. The Commission specifically declined to do so with one exception—the Commission noted that a garden leave agreement where the worker is still employed and receives the same total annual compensation and benefits on a pro-rata basis is not a non-compete clause under the rule. It observed that the final rule contains a definition of the term “non-compete clause” that reflects the need for case-by-case

consideration of whether certain restrictive covenants rise to the level of being functional non-competes.

The FTC goes on to note that certain agreements — including TRAPs, bonus repayment clauses, and garden leave provisions — do not necessarily constitute non-competes. The Commission also states that a forfeiture-for-competition clause is an example of a term that “penalizes” a worker because it “imposes adverse financial consequences on a former employee as a result of the termination of an employment relationship, expressly conditioned on the employee seeking or accepting other work or starting a business after their employment ends.”

The Commission cites additional examples of provisions as potentially “penalizing” a worker, including certain liquidated damages and severance arrangements in which a worker is paid only if they refrain from competing. A common thread that could make these types of agreements non-compete clauses, according to the FTC, is where they appear on the surface to be triggered when the worker is seeking to work for another person or start a business after they leave their job — in other words, if the agreement prohibits or penalizes post-employment work for another employer or business.

What are the potential penalties for violating the rule?

The FTC has the authority to issue a complaint in situations where it believes its rules have been violated. If a respondent contests the charges, the complaint is adjudicated before an administrative law judge (ALJ) in a trial-type proceeding. Upon conclusion of the proceeding, the ALJ issues an “initial decision” setting forth findings of fact and conclusions of law and a recommendation for either a “cease and desist” order or dismissal of the complaint. The FTC and the respondent may appeal the initial decision to the full Commission. After the Commission issues a final decision, the matter may be appealed in court.

After a cease-and-desist order is finalized, and an employer does not comply with the order, the Commission may seek an array of remedies in court including civil penalties, restitution, damages, injunctive relief, orders of rescission or reformation of contracts. The FTC may also make referrals to the U.S. Department of Justice for criminal prosecution.

Will the rule be retroactive?

The final rule removed a provision that would require existing agreements to be rescinded. However, for all workers except “senior executives,” non-compete clauses entered into prior to the effective date will be unenforceable. Moreover, the final rule requires notice to all such workers that the clauses are no longer effective.

Will the retroactive provision invalidate an entire existing agreement containing a non-compete clause, or just the non-compete clause itself, leaving other restrictive covenants intact?

Only the non-compete clause will be impacted by the rule. Indeed, the FTC highlighted that point when it described the prior rescission requirement as onerous because of the costs and time spent “modifying” existing employment agreements. Moreover, the model language for notification to workers includes the following: “The FTC’s new rule does not affect any other terms or conditions of your employment.”

Could we face retroactive liability for existing agreements?

Employers will not face retroactive liability for use of a non-compete clause prior to the effective date of the rule, but such agreements will not be enforceable after the effective date unless subject to one of the exceptions to the rule.

Does the rule apply to claims that accrue prior to the effective date?

No, the rule expressly states that its requirements do not apply where a cause of action related to a non-compete clause accrued prior the effective date of the rule.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Scope of Rule

Does the rule preclude all non-competes?

The rule does not apply to a non-compete clause entered into pursuant to a bona fide sale of a business entity, of a person’s ownership interest in a business entity, or of all or substantially all of a business entity’s operating assets. Unlike the original proposed rule, the Commission elected not to impose a minimum ownership interest threshold for the sale-of-business exception to apply.

The FTC explained that it added the term “bona fide” and made changes to clarify that any excluded non-compete must be made “pursuant to bona fide sale” to address commenters’ concerns that employers may attempt to use sham transactions with wholly owned subsidiaries, “springing” non-competes, repurchase rights, mandatory stock redemption programs, or other mechanisms to attempt to evade the rule.

The rule does not apply to franchisees in the context of a franchisee-franchisor relationship. Additionally, employers that are beyond the scope of the FTC’s regulatory authority are not covered by the rule, including, for example, non-profits and federally regulated banks and credit unions.

The rule also contains a limited exclusion for “senior executives,” permitting the enforcement of non-competes entered into with senior executives prior to the effective date of the rule.

How does the rule define “senior executives”?

How does the rule define **senior executives**?

To explain the definition of “senior executives,” the FTC has defined not only that term, but also the components of the term relating to “policy-making positions” and “policy-making authority.” The commentary that accompanies the rule also contains additional guidance on the subject.

The rule defines a “**senior executive**” as a worker who (1) was in a policy-making position; and (2) received total annual compensation of at least \$151,164 in the preceding year.

The term “**policy-making position**” is defined to mean a business entity’s president, CEO, or the equivalent, any other officer of a business entity who has policy-making authority, or any other natural person who has policy-making authority for the business entity similar to an officer with policy-making authority. The definition states that an “officer of a subsidiary or affiliate of a business entity that is part of a common enterprise who has policy-making authority for the common enterprise may be deemed to have a policy-making position for purposes of this paragraph,” but that a “natural person who does not have policy-making authority over a common enterprise may not be deemed to have a policy-making position even if the person has policy-making authority over a subsidiary or affiliate of a business entity that is part of the common enterprise.”

“**Policy-making authority**” is defined as having “final authority to make policy decisions that control significant aspects of a business entity or common enterprise and does not include authority limited to advising or exerting influence over such policy decisions or having final authority to make policy decisions for only a subsidiary of or affiliate of a common enterprise.”

The Commission’s commentary includes a statement that it is seeking to “broadly align with the SEC’s definition of ‘executive officer’ while focusing on *senior* executives in a wider variety of entities.” The Commission offers some examples of positions that would not be considered “senior executives,” including the head of a marketing division in a manufacturing firm, where that person only makes policy decisions for the marketing division. The Commission observes that if those decisions do not control significant aspects of the business (which would likely be decisions that impact the business outside the marketing division), then the head of the marketing division would not be considered a senior executive.

The Commission also explains that to be a “**common enterprise**,” an entity must include “integrated business entities,” meaning that the various components of the common enterprise would have, for example, “one or more of the following characteristics: maintain officers, directors, and workers in common; operate under common control; share offices; commingle funds; and share advertising and marketing.”

Does the rule preclude non-competes with independent contractors?

Yes, the rule will apply to independent contractors, as well as anyone who works for a business, whether paid or unpaid.

My state has a statute that allows non-competes. What effect does the rule have on state law?

The proposed rule states that it supersedes any inconsistent state statute, regulation, order, or interpretation. State statutes, regulations, orders, or interpretations that afford greater protection to workers would be allowed.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Next Steps: Legal Challenges and More

Have there been legal challenges to the rule? (answer most recently updated August 23)

Yes – and one of the challenges was successful in blocking the rule from taking effect. A Texas federal court struck down the FTC’s proposed ban on a nationwide basis on August 20, meaning employers across the country can continue to maintain non-competes as their state laws allow. Employers will not have to comply with the rule by September 4 as originally scheduled. [Read more about the decision and practical pointers on next steps by clicking here.](#)

This was just one of three lawsuits challenging the FTC’s authority. ATS Tree Services, LLC also filed a lawsuit in Pennsylvania, and Properties of the Villages, Inc. sued the FTC in a Florida federal court.

- The Pennsylvania federal judge declined to issue an order to preliminarily block the non-compete ban. The court rejected the employer’s argument that the rule is an improper exercise of the agency’s authority, which conflicted with the Texas federal court’s ruling. [You can read about that decision here.](#)
- And then in Florida, a federal judge ruled on August 14 that the proposed ban cannot be enforced, but concluded that the relief only applies to the employer that brought suit and no one else. [You can read about that decision here.](#)

What’s Next? (Question and answer added August 23)

The FTC could try to breathe new life into the rule by filing an appeal of this decision in the coming weeks. It could also seek an emergency order from the appellate court that would cause the rule to take effect as scheduled.

However, any appeal would be heard by the notoriously business-friendly 5th Circuit Court of Appeals, where the odds of the rule being resurrected are slim. And the next step after that would be a potential visit to the Supreme Court, which has taken direct aim at the regulatory state in recent years and is likely a hostile environment for any attempt by the FTC to wield such power.

What actions have other federal agencies taken that will impact non-competes?

[NLRB Activity](#)

Last year, NLRB General Counsel Jennifer Abruzzo issued a memo urging NLRB regional directors to find that many employer-mandated non-compete agreements infringe on employees' rights under Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). This memo could apply to at least a segment of your workforce regardless of whether your company is unionized, though independent contractors, managers, most supervisors, public sector employees, and some agricultural workers are not covered by these NLRA protections.

A few months later, a regional NLRB office brought charges against a business that required certain low-level employees to sign contracts containing both non-competition and non-solicitation provisions. That case settled in February. The NLRB announced that the settlement included rescission of the policies at issue and over \$25,000 to be paid to two affected employees. In addition, the company agreed to post a remedial notice across all its U.S. facilities and to its Slack messaging app.

FDIC Activity

The FDIC recently requested public comments on proposed policy updates involving banks that are forced to sell certain branches or businesses to obtain FDIC approval for a merger. These banks would be prohibited under the proposed revisions from using non-compete clauses with employees of those branches or businesses being sold off.

[Return to Table of Contents](#)

Practical Gameplan for Employers

What can I do to protect my trade secrets, confidential information, and customer relationships?

As noted above, the rule does not expressly ban non-disclosure and non-solicitation provisions. However, it will apply a functionality test that could invalidate one of these provisions if it either “prohibits” a worker from, “penalizes” a worker for, or “functions to prevent” a worker from either:

- seeking or accepting work in the U.S. with a different person where such work would begin after the conclusion of the employment that includes the term or condition; or
- operating a business in the U.S. after the conclusion of the employment that includes the term or condition.

Carefully drafted non-solicitation, confidentiality and non-disclosure clauses should withstand such scrutiny, enabling employers to protect confidential information and customer relationships, as well as prevent their employees from being poached by other employees.

Additionally, the rule does not prohibit garden leave agreements where the worker is still employed and receives the same total annual compensation and benefits on a pro-rata basis.

Finally, employers could still protect trade secret information by relying on the federal Defend Trade Secrets Act and state trade secret statutes.

Employers should make sure they roll out appropriate policies, procedures, and training on handling and protecting confidential and trade secret information.

What should we do now? (answer most recently updated August 23)

- Employers can breathe a sigh of relief. We are now back once again to the status quo, where state-specific restrictions shape the contours of covenants not to compete, and you can continue to have non-compete restrictions as a tool in your arsenal to protect key relationships and confidential information.
- In order to keep track of the nuances of each state's restrictive covenant law, check out one of FP's latest resources – [Blue Pencil Box](#), an especially helpful tool for employers with multi-state operations. This comprehensive resource not only provides detailed daily summaries of cases and bills involving non-competes and other restrictive covenants, but also maintains a comprehensive database and customizable checklists to help you comply.
- Now is an especially critical time for you to ensure your existing non-competes are precisely tailored to meet the state laws in which you operate and that you are limiting their use to critical employees – as the FTC has already indicated it will try to flex its muscles through targeted investigations if it can't wield the power of a national rule. "Today's decision does not prevent the FTC from addressing non-competes through case-by-case enforcement actions," an agency spokesperson said soon after the court decision striking down the non-compete ban.
- You might also want to compile an inventory of all existing restrictive covenant agreements, including those that bind former workers. There is a slim chance that an appeals court could bring the non-compete ban back to life, and in such a circumstance it would be beneficial to have a full and complete list of your effective agreements. Even if the rule never sees the light of day, however, having such an inventory could be a helpful resource for compliance and tracking purposes.

Conclusion

We will continue to monitor the pending legal challenges to the rule and provide updates as warranted, so you should ensure you are subscribed to [Fisher Phillips' Insight System](#) to gather the most up-to-date information directly to your inbox. If you have questions, please contact the authors of this Insight, your Fisher Phillips attorney, or any attorney in our [Employee Defection and Trade Secrets Practice Group](#).

Related People



Risa B. Boerner, CIPP/US, CIPM

Partner

610.230.2132

Email



Lauren Frisch

Partner

404.240.4275

Email





Sean Kingston

Partner

949.798.2137

Email

Service Focus

Employee Defection and Trade Secrets