## 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 DAMEN D. RABB, No. 1:23-cv-0843 JLT SAB (PC) 12 Plaintiff. ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS DENYING 13 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR TEMPORARY v. **RESTRAINING ORDER** 14 ESTEVEN FIGUEROA, et al., (Docs. 44, 47) 15 Defendants. 16 17 Plaintiff seeks to hold the defendants liable for violations of his civil rights in this action 18 filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. He seeks a temporary restraining order, asserting that he fears 19 for his safety since filing this action, correctional officers beat him, and a transfer to another 20 facility was not permitted despite his eligibility. (Doc. 47.) 21 The magistrate judge determined Plaintiff failed to demonstrate injunctive relief was 22 appropriate in this action. (Doc. 47 at 3-5.) The magistrate judge found that Plaintiff's motion "addresses conduct that is not a subject of this action, and therefore fails to demonstrate either a 23 24 likelihood of success on the merits or a serious question on the merits." (Id. at 3.) The magistrate judge observed that though Plaintiff reported "he was previously 'beaten' by correctional officers, 25 26 but he does not provide any specific facts beyond speculation or conjecture that would

27

28

magistrate judge concluded that Plaintiff also failed to show "that the balance of equities tips in

demonstrate he is in danger of suffering imminent or irreparable harm." (Id. at 4.) The

his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest." (Id.) Therefore, the magistrate judge recommended the Court deny the motion. (*Id.* at 5.)

Plaintiff filed objections to the Findings and Recommendations. (Doc. 49.) Plaintiff again asserts that he was beating by unidentified officers following the filing of this action, and reiterates his fear that if he leaves his cell, he "would be in immediate danger." (Id. at 1.) Importantly, however, Plaintiff does not address the findings of the magistrate judge that his assertions are not tethered to the claims raised in his complaint. Moreover, Plaintiff's generalized fear for his safety is insufficient to support his request for injunctive relief. See, e.g., Goldie's Bookstore v. Superior Court of State of Cal., 739 F.2d 466, 472 (9th Cir. 1984) ("Speculative injury does not constitute irreparable injury"); see also Bradford v. Jordan, 2018 WL 11328113, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2018) ("Moreover, although Plaintiff alleges instances of harm suffered from prison officials, Plaintiff's speculative fear of a conspiracy to murder him by nearly 40 individuals does not constitute irreparable injury sufficient to warrant granting a preliminary injunction").

According to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), this Court performed a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the matter, including Plaintiff's objections, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis. Thus, the Court **ORDERS**:

- 1. The Findings and Recommendations issued on April 8, 2024 (Doc. 47) are **ADOPTED** in full.
- 2. Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order (Doc. 44) is **DENIED**.

22

23

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 8, 2024

24

25

26

27

28