

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  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BRANDON GORUP,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
JOHN RIGGIO, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 16-cv-02419-HSG

**ORDER DENYING EX PARTE  
APPLICATION FOR ORDER TO  
SHOW CAUSE AND TEMPORARY  
RESTRAINING ORDER**

Re: Dkt. No. 18

Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's ex parte request for a temporary restraining order and order to show cause for preliminary injunction.

**I. LEGAL STANDARD**

The standards for issuing a TRO and preliminary injunction are the same. See *New Motor Vehicle Bd. of Cal. v. Orrin W. Fox Co.*, 434 U.S. 1345, 1347 n. 2, (1977). A preliminary injunction is "an extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief." *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008). "The proper legal standard for preliminary injunctive relief requires a party to demonstrate (1) 'that he is likely to succeed on the merits, (2) that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, (3) that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and (4) that an injunction is in the public interest.'" *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*, 586 F.3d 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009). As a corollary to this test, the Ninth Circuit has also found a preliminary injunction appropriate if "serious questions going to the merits were raised and the balance of the hardships tips sharply in the plaintiff's favor," thereby allowing preservation of the status quo where complex legal questions require further inspection or deliberation. *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 622 F.3d 1045, 1049 (9th Cir. 2010).

"These formulations are not different tests but represent two points on a sliding scale in

1 which the degree of irreparable harm increases as the probability of success on the merits  
2 decreases.” *Big Country Foods, Inc. v. Board of Educ. of the Anchorage Sch. Dist.*, 868 F.2d  
3 1085, 1088 (9th Cir. 1989). But “[u]nder either formulation, the moving party must demonstrate a  
4 significant threat of irreparable injury, irrespective of the magnitude of the injury.” See *id.*


5 **II. DISCUSSION**

6 The Court DENIES Plaintiff’s ex parte application for a temporary restraining order and  
7 preliminary injunction. Plaintiff has failed to meet the requisite standards warranting such  
8 extraordinary relief. Moreover, Plaintiff’s application raises concerns better addressed to the state  
9 courts, which are available to issue orders relating to an individual’s personal safety. See Cal. Civ.  
10 Proc. Code. § 527.6 (governing restraining orders based on civil harassment, like the one sought  
11 by Plaintiff).

12 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff’s request for a TRO and an order to show cause  
13 why a preliminary injunction should not issue pending trial in this action.

14 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

15 Dated: 5/23/2016

16  
17   
18 HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.  
19 United States District Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28