

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division**

MICROSOFT CORP.,)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Case No. 1:17cv1224
)	
JOHN DOES 1-2, et al.,)	
Defendants.)	
)	
)	
)	

ORDER

On October 31, 2018, United States Magistrate Judge Michael Nachmanoff entered a Report and Recommendation (“Report”), recommending that plaintiff’s motion for default judgment be granted as to plaintiff’s Computer Fraud and Abuse Act, Electronic Communications Privacy Act, Lanham Act, conversion and trespass, unjust enrichment and tortious interference claims, and that plaintiff’s proposed permanent injunction be entered.

Upon consideration of the record and Judge Nachmanoff’s thorough and well-reasoned Report, to which no objections have been filed, and having found no clear error,¹

¹ See *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (in the absence of any objections to a magistrate’s report, the court “need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’”).

The Court **ADOPTS**, as its own, the findings of fact and recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge, as set forth in the Report (Doc. 54).

Accordingly,


It is hereby **ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for default judgment (Doc. 46) is **GRANTED**.

It is further **ORDERED** that plaintiff's motion for permanent injunction (Doc. 48) is **GRANTED**.²

Final judgment and the permanent injunction shall issue by separate order. Plaintiff's counsel is required, however, to provide a copy of these orders to defendants by appropriate means.

The Clerk is further directed to provide a copy of this Order to all counsel of record, and to place this matter among the ended causes.

Alexandria, Virginia
November 27, 2018



T. S. Ellis, III
United States District Judge

² Based on the factual findings made by Judge Nachmanoff, plaintiff has clearly established each of the factors warranting entry of a permanent injunction. *See eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388, 391 (2006) (“A plaintiff must demonstrate: (1) that it has suffered an irreparable injury; (2) that remedies available at law ... are inadequate; (3) considering the hardships between plaintiff and defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted; and (4) the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction”).