UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LAWRENCE LEE WILLIAMS,

No. C 12-3310 SI (pr)

Plaintiff,

ORDER

V.

MELINDA HAAG,

United States Attorney; et al.,

Defendants.

Defendants filed an *ex parte* request for a 90-day extension of time to file a dispositive motion. Upon due consideration of the request and the accompanying declaration of attorney John Winchester, III, the court GRANTS the request. (Docket # 33.) The court now sets the following new briefing schedule for dispositive motions: Defendants must file and serve their dispositive motion no later than **May 17, 2013**. Plaintiff must file and serve on defense counsel his opposition to the dispositive motion no later than **June 14, 2013**. Defendants must file and serve their reply brief (if any) no later than **June 28, 2013**.

Plaintiff has requested a temporary restraining order and injunction for the return of his wheelchair. (Docket # 30.) Plaintiff is not entitled to a TRO or a preliminary injunction because he has completely failed to show a likelihood of success on the merits or that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief. *See Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008) ("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

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an	
injunction is in the public interest"); Los Angeles Unified Sch. Dist. v. United States Dist. Court,	
650 F.2d 1004, 1008 (9th Cir. 1981) (Ferguson,	J., dissenting) (standard for issuing a TRO is
similar to that required for a preliminary injuncti	on). The motion is DENIED. (Docket # 30.)
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
Dated: February 11, 2013	SUSAN ILLSTON United States District Judge