



**Bryan Benard**

Partner  
801.799.5833  
Salt Lake City  
bbenard@hollandhart.com

# Utah Non-Compete Bill Fails to Pass the House

## Utah Non-Compete Bill Fails to Pass the House

**Insight — February 17, 2017**

The first attempt to further revise the 2016 Utah law on post-employment restrictive covenants (non-competes) has failed. House Bill 81, by Representative Greene from Utah County, would have further limited the use and viability of non-compete agreements in Utah. Late Friday February 17, 2017, the House rejected the bill (22 voted “yes” and 49 voted “no”). With this defeat, there is no new non-compete bill in play at the Legislature.

Much of the floor debate focused on waiting for the results of the non-compete study that is being conducted by the Cicero Group (Labor & Employment Partner Bryan Benard spent hours assisting with drafting questions for the surveys). The study was part of the compromise with House Leadership brokered last year by the working group created by the Salt Lake Chamber and the Governor’s Office of Economic Development. The research study results will be released on February 24, 2017.

After the study results are released, it is likely that Representative Schultz (and Speaker Hughes) will propose a bill related to the results, so please stay tuned.

Other bills to watch:

**HB238**, revisions to the Payment of Wages Act, passed the House earlier this week and is now in Senate committee.

**HB242** proposed extending Family and Medical Leave Act requirements to employers with 30 or more employees (rather than 50 or more under federal law). This bill is currently being held in committee and it is rumored that it will not proceed.

**HB213** contains significant revisions to Utah’s Antidiscrimination Act which could be harmful to Utah employers. Currently, the bill is headed to the House Business and Labor Committee for hearing.

---

*Subscribe to get our Insights delivered to your inbox.*

*This publication is designed to provide general information on pertinent legal topics. The statements made are provided for educational purposes only. They do not constitute legal or financial advice nor do they necessarily reflect the views of Holland & Hart LLP or any of its attorneys other than the author(s). This publication is not intended to create an attorney-client relationship between you and Holland & Hart LLP.*

*Substantive changes in the law subsequent to the date of this publication might affect the analysis or commentary. Similarly, the analysis may differ depending on the jurisdiction or circumstances. If you have specific questions as to the application of the law to your activities, you should seek the advice of your legal counsel.*