

they are present. *See Parker v. State Bd. of Pardons & Paroles*, 275 F.3d 1032, 1034–35 (11th Cir. 2001).¹

Plaintiff falls short of meeting the prerequisites for the exceptional remedy of a temporary restraining order. First, he does not allege any concrete facts to support a finding that a temporary restraining order is necessary to prevent immediate and irreparable injury before Defendants can be heard in opposition. Second, he has not submitted a verified complaint or affidavit in support of his allegations. Third, Plaintiff has not submitted the certification required by Rule 65(b)(1)(B). Fourth, he has not argued or demonstrated that he has a substantial likelihood of success on the merits.

Accordingly, it is ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (Doc. # 19) is DENIED.

It is further ORDERED that the motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. # 19) is REFERRED to the Magistrate Judge for further proceedings and a recommendation.

DONE this 29th day of December, 2015.

/s/ W. Keith Watkins
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ These four elements are “(1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, (2) a threat of irreparable injury, (3) that its own injury would outweigh the injury to the nonmovant, and (4) that the injunction would not disserve the public interest.” *Tefel v. Reno*, 180 F.3d 1286, 1295 (11th Cir. 1999).