

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

SVK

**WO**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**

Hearman Lee Newton,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
City of Phoenix, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. CV 13-1874-PHX-DGC (MEA)

**ORDER**

Plaintiff Hearman Lee Newton filed this *pro se* civil rights action claiming excessive force in the course of his arrest. (Doc. 1.) On May 13, 2014, Plaintiff filed a Motion for a Preliminary Injunction that seeks no specific relief. (Doc. 20.) On the same day, he filed a Motion for Reconsideration of the Magistrate’s Judge’s Order denying appointment of counsel. (Doc. 21.) Plaintiff also filed Objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation now pending before this Court. (Doc. 22; ref. Doc. 18.) Defendant opposes the Motion for a Preliminary injunction. (Doc. 23.) The Court will deny the Motion for a Preliminary injunction.

A preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy and “one that should not be granted unless the movant, by a clear showing, carries the burden of persuasion.” *Mazurek v. Armstrong*, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997) (per curiam) (quoting 11A C. Wright, A. Miller, & M. Kane, *Federal Practice and Procedure* § 2948, pp. 129-130 (2d ed. 1995)). An injunction may be granted only where the movant shows that “he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence

1 of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is  
2 in the public interest.” *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008);  
3 *Am. Trucking Ass’n, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009).  
4 The movant has the burden of proof on each element of the test. *Environmental Council*  
5 *of Sacramento v. Slater*, 184 F. Supp. 2d 1016, 1027 (E.D. Cal. 2000).

6 Plaintiff claims that he is going to serve prison time at the Arizona Department of  
7 Corrections (ADC) and that there are no law libraries at ADC where he can research  
8 issues and litigate his case. (Doc. 20 at 2.) As Defendant observes, it is unclear what  
9 Plaintiff is seeking. If he is seeking a stay of his transfer, Defendant notes that neither the  
10 Maricopa County Sheriff’s Office nor ADC are parties here and cannot be enjoined in  
11 this lawsuit. (Doc. 23 at 2, citing *Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Research, Inc.*, 395  
12 U.S. 100, 110 (1969) (“one is not bound by a judgment in personam resulting from  
13 litigation in which he is not designated as a party or to which he has not been made a  
14 party by service of process”).) Defendant Officer Myers does not have custody of  
15 Plaintiff and has no control over the Fourth Avenue Jail or ADC. (*Id.*)

16 To the extent that the Court can interpret Plaintiff’s Motion for a Preliminary  
17 Injunction as one related to the Motion for Reconsideration and denial of counsel, it will  
18 be denied. Plaintiff is speculating that ADC law libraries are inadequate for the purposes  
19 of his litigation. Mere “[s]peculative injury does not constitute irreparable harm  
20 sufficient to warrant granting a preliminary injunction.” *Caribbean Marine Services Co.,*  
21 *Inc. v. Baldrige*, 844 F. 2d 668, 674-675 (9th Cir. 1988) (emphasis added). To meet the  
22 “irreparable harm” requirement, a plaintiff must do more than merely allege imminent  
23 harm; he must demonstrate it. *Id.* at 674. Plaintiff fails to establish that he will be  
24 irreparably harmed by failure to immediately appoint counsel. The Court notes that the  
25 Motion to Dismiss is fully briefed and that Plaintiff has already filed his objections to the  
26 pending Report and Recommendation. (Docs. 8, 11, 15, 22.) The Motion for  
27 Reconsideration will be ruled on in due course.

