

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RAY BRONNER,

No. C 09-5001 SI

Plaintiff,

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER**

v.

SAN FRANCISCO SUPERIOR COURT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Plaintiff has filed a motion for a temporary restraining order. Plaintiff claims that defendant Charles Michael Collins is engaged in the unauthorized practice of law before this Court. Plaintiff claims that Mr. Collins is representing two other defendants in this case (Patrick Helland and Diane Kiesnowski) because pleadings filed by those *pro se* defendants appear stylistically similar to pleadings filed by Mr. Collins. Plaintiff’s motion claims, *inter alia*, that these three defendants have participated in a “racketeering scheme that has included a multitude of state SLAPP claims against Plaintiff herein, and racketeering activity clearly proscribed by Title 18 of the United States Code.” Motion for Temporary Restraining Order at 2:22-24. Plaintiff’s motion seeks an order directing Mr. Collins to immediately cease representing defendants Helland and Kiesnowski. Plaintiff also seeks an order prohibiting these three defendants from communicating with each other prior to a hearing on the TRO, an order to show cause why default should not be entered against these defendants, and permission to cross-examine these defendants at a hearing.

Given the procedural posture of this case as well as the record adduced thus far, the Court finds that plaintiff has not demonstrated that a TRO should issue. Plaintiff’s complaint is the subject of pending motions to dismiss, including motions filed by defendants Collins, Helland and Kiesnowski,

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

1 and the Court will issue an order on those motions shortly. Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining
2 order is intertwined, to a large degree, with his allegations in the complaint that defendants Collins,
3 Helland and Kiesnowksi are engaged in a criminal enterprise under RICO. If plaintiff is able to state
4 a claim against these defendants, the Court will schedule a case management conference to address the
5 management of this litigation, including any issues related to representation of the *pro se* defendants.

6 Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order is DENIED. (Docket No. 63).
7
8

9 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

10
11 Dated: March 3, 2010



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge