

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL BRENT PECTOL, et al.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
BRENT ERNEST PECTOL, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [18-cv-00717-HSG](#)

**ORDER ADOPTING MAGISTRATE
JUDGE'S REPORT AND
RECOMMENDATION REGARDING
MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER AND
DENYING PLAINTIFF'S RENEWED
MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY
RESTRAINING ORDER**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 5, 9

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Spero's Report and Recommendation regarding Plaintiffs' motion for a temporary restraining order ("TRO Motion"), as well as objections to the report. *See* Dkt. Nos. 5, 9. The Court finds the Report correct, well-reasoned and thorough, and adopts it in every respect. Plaintiff Michael Pectol's objection to the report suffers from the same deficits that Judge Spero identified in his Report and Recommendation denying the TRO Motion—namely, a failure to "identify any specific claims," clearly identify the relief sought, or articulate against which of the many named parties Plaintiffs seek specific relief. *See id.* As with Plaintiffs' initial TRO Motion, Plaintiff Pectol's objection is based primarily on his assertion that several individuals are being "harbored. . . in violation of international laws, federal laws, and public policies set forth in Federal and International Standards." Dkt. No. 9. The Court finds that Plaintiff's objection, like the TRO Motion, fails to make a cognizable argument.

//
//
//
//

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

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion for a temporary restraining order is DENIED. To the extent that Plaintiff styles his objection to the Report and Recommendation as a separate motion for a temporary restraining order, that request is likewise DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 2/9/2018


HAYWOOD S. GILLIAM, JR.
United States District Judge