

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ARCHIE CRANFORD,
Plaintiff,
v.
VANESSA CEBALLOS,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:14-cv-00210-BAM (PC)
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
(Doc. 7)

Plaintiff Archie Cranford, a civil detainee proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on February 18, 2014. On March 17, 2014, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking a temporary restraining order prohibiting Defendant Ceballos from coming within 50,000 feet of him and mandating that Plaintiff remain in his current housing location.

The analysis for a temporary restraining order is substantially identical to that for a preliminary injunction, *Stuhlberg Intern. Sales Co., Inc. v. John D. Brush and Co., Inc.*, 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001), and “[a] preliminary injunction is an extraordinary remedy never awarded as of right.” *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 24, 129 S.Ct. 365, 376 (2008) (citation omitted). “A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is

1 in the public interest.” *Id.* at 20 (citations omitted). An injunction may only be awarded upon a
2 *clear showing* that the plaintiff is entitled to relief. *Id.* at 22 (citation omitted) (emphasis added).

3 In this case, Plaintiff has not demonstrated likelihood of success on the merits, likelihood
4 of irreparable harm, a balance of equities in his favor, or that an injunction is in the public interest.
5 Rather, Plaintiff’s motion appears to be duplicative of motions he has filed in numerous other
6 cases seeking a similar restraining order against the defendants in those cases. See, e.g., Cranford
7 v. Badagon, et al., Case No. 1:11-cv-00736-LJO-BAM, ECF No. 48; Cranford v. Perryman, et al.,
8 Case No. 1:13-cv-00763-BAM, ECF No. 21; Cranford v. Crawford, Case No. 1:14-cv-00055-
9 MJS, ECF No. 13; Cranford v. Wyatt, Case No. 1:14-cv-00136-DLB, ECF No. 8; Cranford v.
10 Palos, 1:14-cv-00242-SKO, ECF No. 8.

11 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for a temporary restraining order, filed on March 17, 2014,
12 is HEREBY DENIED. Fed. R. Civ. P. 65; Local Rule 231; *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 24.

13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: June 12, 2014

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28