

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
NORTHERN DIVISION

EDVIN BARKER, #264 430,	*	
Plaintiff,	*	
v.	*	2:10-CV-860-TMH
		(WO)
WARDEN K. JONES, <i>et al.</i> ,	*	
Defendants.	*	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Pending before the court is Plaintiff’s request for preliminary injunctive relief. He states that he seeks a preliminary injunction to prevent irreparable injury as a result of Defendants’ ongoing constitutional violations. Upon consideration of Plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunction, the court concludes that the motion is due to be denied.

DISCUSSION

A preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy which should not be granted unless the movant clearly carries the burden of persuasion as to **all** prerequisites. *United States v. Jefferson County*, 720 F.2d 1511 (11th Cir. 1983). The four prerequisites which a movant must satisfy are as follows: (1) a substantial likelihood that the movant will ultimately prevail on the merits, (2) a showing that the movant will suffer irreparable injury unless the injunction issues, (3) proof that the threatened injury to the movant outweighs the damage the proposed injunction may cause the opposing party, and (4) a showing that the

injunction, if issued, will not be adverse to or harm the public interests. *Cate v. Oldham*, 707 F.2d 1176 (11th Cir. 1983); *Shatel Corp. v. Mao Ta Lumber and Yacht Corp.*, 697 F.2d 1352 (11th Cir. 1983).

The court has reviewed Plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction and finds that he does not meet each of the prerequisites for the issuance of a preliminary injunction. To the extent Plaintiff is seeking the speedy resolution of alleged rights violations as presented in his complaint, this civil action will provide him adequate redress for such claims.¹ The court, therefore, concludes that Plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction should be denied.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that Plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction (*Doc. No. 10*) be DENIED.

It is further the Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge that this case be referred back to the undersigned for additional proceedings relative to the claims presented in Plaintiff's complaint.

It is further

ORDERED that on or before **November 18, 2010** the parties are DIRECTED to file any objections to the Recommendation. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which a party objects. Frivolous,

¹ If Plaintiff believes his constitutional rights have been violated with respect to other matters which have occurred since the filing of the instant complaint, he is free to file another civil action.

conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations in the Magistrate Judge's report shall bar the party from a *de novo* determination by the District Court of issues covered in the report and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the report accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981, *en banc*), adopting as binding precedent all of the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

Done, this 5th day of November 2010.

/s/Terry F. Moorer
TERRY F. MOORER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE