26

27

28

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 JOSEPH F. FRANKL, Regional Director of Region 20 of the National Labor 12 No. 2:15-CV-01360-TLN-CKD Relations Board, for and on behalf of the NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS 13 BOARD. **ORDER** 14 Petitioner, 15 v. 16 UNITED SITE SERVICES OF CALIFORNIA, INC., 17 Respondent. 18 19 20 21 This matter is before the Court pursuant to Petitioner Joseph F. Frankl's ("Petitioner") 22 receipt of Petitioner's request and thus notifies Petitioner as follows: The Court has carefully 23 24 considered Petitioner's petition for injunctive relief and will issue an order in due course after 25

Motion for Expedited Order for Injunctive Relief. (Corrected Pet., ECF No. 27.) The Court is in deciding cases with higher priority and considering this Court's caseload. However, Petitioner is advised that the instant motion for expedited relief does not garner sympathy with the Court and is further delaying disposition of this matter as it creates one more filing for the Court to consider and respond to. Simply put, Petitioner's motion is not well received, especially in light of the fact

1	that Petitioner's numerous filings have contributed to the delay in deciding this matter. For
2	example, this Court has had to not only consider Petitioner's original filings, but corrected
3	versions of such filings, creating twice the workload. (See i.e., Pet. For Inj., ECF No 1; Mem.
4	ECF No. 12; Corrected Ex. B, ECF No. 17; Reply, ECF No. 18; Mot. To File Corrected Papers,
5	ECF No. 21, 21-1, 21-2, 21-3, 21-4, 21-5, 21-6; 21-7.) In sum, Petitioner's motion for injunctive
6	relief will be ruled upon shortly, and the Court hereby DENIES Petitioner's instant motion (ECF
7	No. 27).
8	
9	
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.
11	Dated: February 3, 2016
12	W Hunley
13	Troy L. Nunley
14	United States District Judge
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24 25	
25 26	
26 27	
41	