



UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
Federal Trade Commission  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20580

Office of the Chair

**Statement of Chair Lina M. Khan  
Joined by Commissioner Rebecca Kelly Slaughter and  
Commissioner Alvaro M. Bedoya  
Regarding the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking  
to Restrict Employers' Use of Noncompete Clauses  
Commission File No. P201200**

**January 5, 2023**

Today the Federal Trade Commission is proposing a rule that would prohibit businesses from using noncompete clauses in contracts with workers. Noncompete clauses generally restrict a company's workers from working for—or launching—a competitor for a period of time even after they have stopped working for that company. Researchers estimate that about one in five American workers is bound by a noncompete clause.

By design, noncompetes often close off a worker's most natural alternative employment options: jobs in the same geographic area and professional field. These restrictions can undermine core economic liberties, burdening Americans' ability to freely switch jobs.<sup>1</sup>

A recent Commission action illustrates the real-life stakes: Prudential, a security company in Michigan, enforced noncompetes against its workers, including security guards earning near-minimum wage.<sup>2</sup> These noncompetes included a \$100,000 liquidated damages clause. On multiple occasions, Prudential sued former employees who left for competitors offering higher wages. In one case, Prudential successfully pressured a competitor to fire one of those new hires. Media reports document countless other instances in which Americans who wish to change jobs—be it to pursue a better opportunity, to escape harassment, or to express disagreement with new workplace policies—are trapped in place by noncompete clauses.

Notably, the aggregate economic impact of noncompete clauses goes beyond any individual worker. Initiatives by several states to limit the use of noncompetes has given researchers the opportunity to closely study their effects. The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM) published today carefully reviews the empirical evidence available to date and highlights several key findings.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Pollock v. Williams*, 322 U.S. 4, 17–18 (1944) (describing the “right to change employers” as a critical “defense against oppressive hours, pay, working conditions, or treatment”).

<sup>2</sup> Complaint, *In re Prudential Security, Inc.*, File No. 221-0026 (Jan. 4, 2022), [https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc\\_gov/pdf/2210026prudentialsecuritycomplaint.pdf](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/2210026prudentialsecuritycomplaint.pdf); see Press Release, Fed. Trade Comm'n, FTC Cracks Down on Companies That Impose Harmful Noncompete Restrictions on Thousands of Workers (Jan. 4, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/01/ftc-cracks-down-companies-impose-harmful-noncompete-restrictions-thousands-workers>.

<sup>3</sup> Notice of Proposed Rulemaking for Non-Compete Clause Rule (“NPRM”), Part II.B (Jan. 5, 2023).

First, noncompete clauses reduce competition in labor markets, suppressing earnings and opportunity even for workers who are not directly subject to a noncompete. When workers subject to noncompete clauses are blocked from switching to jobs in which they would be better paid and more productive, unconstrained workers in that market are simultaneously denied the opportunity to replace them. This collective decline in job mobility means fewer job offers and an overall drop in wages, as firms have less incentive to compete for workers by offering higher pay, better benefits, greater say over scheduling, or more favorable conditions. The FTC estimates that the proposed ban on noncompetes would increase workers' total earnings by close to \$300 billion per year.<sup>4</sup>

Second, the existing evidence indicates that noncompete clauses reduce innovation and competition in product and service markets. Studies show that locking workers in place reduces innovation, likely by decreasing the flow of information and knowledge among firms. By preventing workers from starting their own businesses and limiting the pool of talent available for startups to hire, noncompetes also limit entrepreneurship and new business formation. This in turn reduces product quality while raising prices. Indeed, existing evidence from the health care sector suggests that the proposed ban would decrease consumer prices, potentially to the tune of \$150 billion a year.<sup>5</sup>

A recent Commission action shows how depriving new businesses of access to skilled workers can thwart competition. In the highly concentrated glass manufacturing sector, incumbent firms imposed noncompetes on thousands of employees. These noncompetes locked up highly specialized workers, tending to impede the entry and expansion of rivals by depriving them of access to qualified employees.<sup>6</sup>

The empirical evidence available to date, coupled with the Commission's years of work on noncompetes, forms the basis for the proposed rule.<sup>7</sup> The proposal determines that employers'

---

<sup>4</sup> See NPRM Part VII.B.1 (describing the Commission's assessment of the benefits of the proposed rule).

<sup>5</sup> Drawing from a study on the financial industry, Commissioner Wilson suggests that suspending noncompetes here caused higher prices and more employee misconduct. See Umit G. Gurun, Noah Stoffman & Scott E. Yonker, *Unlocking Clients: The Importance of Relationships in the Financial Advisory Industry*, 141 J. FIN. ECON. 1218 (2021). Notably, under the proposed rule, firms will still have contractual methods to protect their client lists, unlike the firms observed in this study, which were prohibited from using non-solicitation agreements in addition to noncompete clauses. Furthermore, the change in the financial industry may have curtailed beneficial entrepreneurship, since it only covered mobility of workers between member firms, and therefore continued to permit some noncompete clauses which could prevent workers from starting their own businesses.

<sup>6</sup> Complaint, *In re O-I Glass, Inc.*, File No. 211-0182 (Jan. 4, 2023), [https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc\\_gov/pdf/2110182o-iglasscomplaint.pdf](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/2110182o-iglasscomplaint.pdf); Complaint, *In re Ardagh Group S.A.*, File No. 211-0182 (Jan. 4, 2023), [https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc\\_gov/pdf/2110182ardaghcomplaint.pdf](https://www.ftc.gov/system/files/ftc_gov/pdf/2110182ardaghcomplaint.pdf); see Press Release, Fed. Trade Comm'n, *FTC Cracks Down on Companies That Impose Harmful Noncompete Restrictions on Thousands of Workers* (Jan. 4, 2023), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2023/01/ftc-cracks-down-companies-impose-harmful-noncompete-restrictions-thousands-workers>.

<sup>7</sup> The Commission has conducted extensive public outreach relating to noncompete clauses. See, e.g., Fed. Trade Comm'n, *Hearings on Competition and Consumer Protection in the 21st Century*, <https://www.ftc.gov/enforcement-policy/hearings-competition-consumer-protection> (including discussion of noncompete agreements during the Oct. 15–17, 2018 and June 12, 2019 hearings, and inviting public comment on topics including “the use of non-competition agreements and the conditions under which their use may be inconsistent with the antitrust laws”); Fed. Trade Comm'n, *Non-Competes in the Workplace: Examining Antitrust and Consumer Protection Issues* (Jan. 9, 2020), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events/2020/01/non-competes->

use of noncompetes is an unfair method of competition under Section 5 of the FTC Act. It recognizes that noncompetes may be unlawful in different contexts for different reasons; for example, employers' use of noncompetes to bind low-wage workers may be coercive and unfair in ways that the use of noncompetes to bind senior executives is not. Still, the proposal concludes that, in the aggregate, employers' use of noncompetes undermines competition across markets in ways that are harmful to workers and consumers and warrant a prohibition.

The proposed rule also draws on key lessons learned from state efforts to limit or ban the use of noncompetes. For example, research shows that some employers continue to use noncompetes even in states that have declared them null and void. As a result, workers in states where noncompetes are unenforceable are about as likely to have one in their contract as workers in other states.<sup>8</sup> In practice this causes confusion and uncertainty for workers about whether they are bound by an enforceable noncompete, which can dissuade them from seeking or accepting another job. To address this, the proposed rule would both prohibit employers from representing to workers that they are covered by a noncompete clause and require them to actively notify workers presently covered that these clauses are now void and cannot be enforced.

Action by federal enforcers is particularly appropriate here given that the harms from noncompetes flow across state lines. Many labor markets are spread across more than one state, and product markets are typically multistate as well, so the use of noncompetes in one state can harm workers and consumers in others. Moreover, employers may seek to circumvent state laws restricting noncompetes through the use of choice-of-law provisions and forum selection clauses, so that one state's lenient approach to noncompetes may have spillover effects into other states.<sup>9</sup>

---

[workplace-examining-antitrust-consumer-protection-issues](https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events/2021/12/making-competition-work-promoting-competition-labor-markets); Fed. Trade Comm'n, *Making Competition Work: Promoting Competition in Labor Markets* (Dec. 6–7, 2021), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/events/2021/12/making-competition-work-promoting-competition-labor-markets>; Fed. Trade Comm'n, *Solicitation for Public Comments on Contract Terms that May Harm Competition* (Aug 5, 2021), <https://www.regulations.gov/document/FTC-2021-0036-0022>. The FTC has also focused on noncompete clauses in connection with its merger review work. *See* Press Release, Fed. Trade Comm'n, *FTC Approves Final Order Restoring Competitive Markets for Gasoline and Diesel in Michigan and Ohio* (Aug. 9, 2022), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2022/08/ftc-approves-final-order-restoring-competitive-markets-gasoline-diesel-michigan-ohio>; Press Release, Fed. Trade Comm'n, *FTC Approves Final Order Imposing Strict Limits on Future Mergers by Dialysis Service Provider DaVita, Inc.* (Jan. 12, 2022), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2022/01/ftc-approves-final-order-imposing-strict-limits-future-mergers-dialysis-service-provider-davita-inc>; Press Release, Fed. Trade Comm'n, *FTC Approves Final Order Requiring Divestitures of Hundreds of Retail Gas and Diesel Fuel Stations Owned by 7-Eleven, Inc.* (Nov. 10, 2021), <https://www.ftc.gov/news-events/news/press-releases/2021/11/ftc-approves-final-order-requiring-divestitures-hundreds-retail-gas-diesel-fuel-stations-owned-7>.

<sup>8</sup> Evan P. Starr, James J. Prescott, & Norman D. Bishara, *Noncompete Agreements in the U.S. Labor Force*, 64 J. L. & ECON. 53, 81 (2021).

<sup>9</sup> Non-compete clauses often contain choice-of-law provisions designating a particular state's law for resolution of any future disputes. *See* Gillian Lester & Elizabeth Ryan, *Choice of Law and Employee Restrictive Covenants: An American Perspective*, 31 COMP. LAB. & POL'Y J. 389, 396–402 (2010). Some non-compete clauses include forum selection clauses, which specify the court and location where any dispute will be heard. *Id.* at 402–04. When contracting with workers in states with relatively stringent non-compete laws, companies may include choice-of-law and forum-selection provisions that designate jurisdictions with less stringent non-compete laws. The default rule under conflict-of-laws principles is that the court honors the parties' choice of law, meaning that the burden is on the worker to argue that the law of a different forum should apply. *Id.* at 394.

The Federal Trade Commission is particularly well suited to this task. Congress designed the FTC to be an expert administrative agency that could enforce the prohibition against unfair methods of competition through rulemaking as well as through case-by-case adjudication. Although the Commission has primarily pursued antitrust enforcement through adjudication, rulemaking can deliver several benefits—including greater legal clarity and predictability, greater administrability and efficiency of enforcement, and greater public participation and airing of a maximally broad range of viewpoints and criticisms.<sup>10</sup>

Several factors seem to make noncompetes especially ripe for enforcement through rulemaking rather than adjudication, including the magnitude and scope of the apparent harms. Private litigation in this area may also be limited, given that there is no private right of action under Section 5 of the FTC Act—and that arbitration clauses and class action waivers in employment contracts often can functionally preclude lawsuits by workers.

Moreover, the FTC has notable expertise in this area. The Commission began deepening its work on noncompetes under Chairman Joseph Simons four years ago. Since then, the agency has held multiple workshops and sought and received public comments on three separate occasions. Our staff have closely studied the available economic research and reviewed hundreds of comments from employers, advocates, trade associations, members of Congress, state and local officials, unions, and workers.

In her dissent, Commissioner Wilson questions the Commission’s authority to engage in “unfair methods of competition” rulemaking.<sup>11</sup> But the rulemaking authority we are exercising today is firmly rooted in the text and structure of the FTC Act and supported both by judicial precedent interpreting the scope of the law as well as further statutory language from the 1970s.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Rohit Chopra & Lina Khan, *The Case for “Unfair Methods of Competition” Rulemaking*, 87 U. CHI. L. REV. 357 (2020); *Nat’l Petroleum Refiners Ass’n v. FTC*, 482 F.2d 672, 683 (D.C. Cir. 1973) (noting that “utilizing rule-making procedures opens up the process of agency policy innovation to a broad range of criticism, advice and data that is ordinarily less likely to be forthcoming in adjudication”).

<sup>11</sup> Commissioner Wilson argues that our enforcement actions are in direct tension with a Seventh Circuit decision, *Snap-On Tools Corp. v. FTC*, 321 F.2d 825 (7th Cir. 1963). *Snap-On Tools* is distinguishable on several fronts, including the fact that it concerned noncompetes used in the business-to-business context, not those used by an employer to restrict its workers. Additionally, while the majority stated that it is “not prepared to say that [the termination restriction] is a per se violation of the antitrust laws,” *id.* at 837, the Commission did not argue for a per se rule and so the issue was not litigated. *Id.* at 830-31; *id.* at 839 (Hastings, C.J., dissenting). Notably, the question before the Seventh Circuit was *not* whether the noncompete clause itself constituted an unfair method of competition. The Commission had held that the termination restriction provision was unlawful because it was used as an enforcement mechanism to ensure compliance with the other provisions. *Id.* at 836-37. Thus, once the court found that the other restrictive provisions in the agreement were lawful, it also held that the clause restricting competition upon termination did not violate the FTC Act. *Id.* at 837.

<sup>12</sup> The plain text of the FTC Act clearly authorizes the Commission to issue rules. Specifically, Section 6(g) enables the agency to “make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying out the provisions” of the law. Several other provisions support the conclusion that Section 6(g) confers substantive rulemaking authority. For instance, Section 18 explicitly preserves “any authority of the Commission to prescribe rules (including interpretive rules), and general statements of policy, with respect to unfair methods of competition in or affecting commerce.” The D.C. Circuit endorsed this plain reading of 6(g) in *Petroleum Refiners*, 482 F.2d at 698, when it considered and rejected an argument that Section 6(g) only authorized the FTC to promulgate procedural or interpretive rules. *Petroleum Refiners* is the only case that directly addresses the FTC’s Section 6(g) rulemaking authority. This holding—that the FTC may “promulgate rules defining the meaning of the statutory standards of the illegality [the agency was] empowered to prevent,” *id.* at 698—represents the current state of the law.

Commissioner Wilson also suggests that the Commission’s authority for the NPRM will be challenged under the major questions doctrine, which the Supreme Court recently applied in *West Virginia v. EPA*. Here, however, the FTC is operating under clear statutory authority. Identifying and addressing unfair methods of competition is central to the mandate that Congress gave the Commission in the text of our authorizing statute. Indeed, a greater threat to the “vesting of federal legislative power in Congress” would be for this Commission to repudiate or ignore Congress’s clear direction to the Commission to consider rules to address unfair methods of competition.<sup>13</sup>

This proposal is the first step in the FTC’s rulemaking process. It identifies several potential alternative rules, including those that would cover only a subset of workers or that would apply different legal standards to different categories of workers. Receiving input from a broad set of market participants, including those who have experienced firsthand the effects of noncompete clauses, will be critical to our efforts. I urge members of the public to review our proposal and submit comments.

A few topics are especially worthy of close consideration.

First, should the rule apply different standards to noncompetes that cover senior executives or other highly paid workers? As the NPRM notes, these workers may be less vulnerable to coercion, but restraining them through noncompetes may still harm competition—for example, by making it harder and more expensive for potential entrants to recruit individuals for leadership positions. I am keen for input on this question, including on how any such category of workers should be defined and what standards should be applied. For example, if the Commission were to adopt a “rebuttable presumption” of illegality for noncompetes affecting these workers, what showing should be required to overcome the presumption?

Second, should the rule cover noncompetes between franchisors and franchisees? The current proposal does not cover noncompetes used by franchisors to restrict franchisees, but we recognize that in some cases they may raise concerns that are analogous to those raised by noncompetes between employers and workers. We welcome the public’s views on this topic, as well as data or other evidence that could inform our consideration of this issue.

Third, what tools other than noncompetes might employers use to protect valuable investments, and how sufficient are these alternatives? The proposal identifies several potential mechanisms that employers may use—including trade secrets law and confidentiality agreements—and we preliminarily find that these alternatives reasonably achieve the goal of protecting investments without unduly burdening competition. We welcome feedback on the Commission’s preliminary analysis of this issue.

I am deeply grateful to staff in the Office of Policy Planning, the Bureau of Competition, the Bureau of Economics, and the Office of General Counsel for their careful and thorough work on this proposal. I am also grateful to the many scholars, advocates, and journalists whose work in recent years has shed light on the proliferation of noncompetes and the resulting harms that can manifest.

---

<sup>13</sup> *West Virginia v. EPA*, 142 S. Ct. 2587, 2617 (2022) (Gorsuch, J., concurring).

While the NPRM is just the first step toward a final rule, it marks the Commission's commitment to exercising the full set of tools and authorities that Congress gave us and to ensuring that our work is protecting all Americans. I look forward to working closely with my colleagues to continue this critical effort.

\*\*\*