

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TRAVIS BONDURANT)	Case No.: 10cv1945 AJB (JMA)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S
v.)	MOTION FOR TEMPORARY
)	RESTRAINING ORDER AND
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)	PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
CALIFORNIA, et al.)	
)	
Defendants.)	

On March 28, 2011, Plaintiff filed a Motion for an Order to Show Cause for a Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (Doc. No. 43).


In his motion, Plaintiff alleges that the Defendants and others are performing research on him and controlling his “liberty of conscience” with “Brainwave technology known as NeuroFeedback technology.” Plaintiff’s motion asks that the Court set a hearing and require the Defendants to show cause as to why a preliminary injunction should not be issued enjoining the Defendants and others from continuing in their alleged research activities which inflict “cruel and unusual pain to [his] brains and bodies.” During the period of time leading up to the hearing, Plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order to enjoin the Defendants’ alleged actions in the meantime.

1 When determining whether to grant a temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction, the
2 Court applies the preliminary injunction standard articulated in *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council,*
3 *Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374 (2008). The party seeking the temporary restraining order or
4 preliminary injunction must demonstrate: (1) the likelihood of success on the merits; (2) the likelihood
5 of irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief; (3) that the balance of equities tips in his favor;
6 and (4) that an injunction is in the public interest. *Id.* at 374. Plaintiff's motion mistakenly suggests that
7 it is the Defendants' burden to show cause in opposition to Plaintiff's request for a temporary restraining
8 order and preliminary injunction when, in fact, Plaintiff bears that burden as the movant. Accordingly,
9 the Court must consider whether Plaintiff's motion satisfies the preliminary injunction standard.
10 Plaintiff's motion consists of a long and disjointed list of those actions taken by the Defendants and
11 others that he seeks to enjoin. However, there is no reference made to any evidence that the Plaintiff
12 will be able to offer in order to establish that the Defendants' or others are engaged in the actions listed
13 in his motion. As such, Plaintiff has not established a likelihood of success on the merits. Because
14 Plaintiff failed to show the requisite likelihood of success on the merits, the Court does not consider the
15 remaining three factors.

16
17 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff has not carried his burden of showing that a temporary
18 restraining order or preliminary injunction should be issued. Accordingly, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's
19 motion.

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22
23 DATED: April 8, 2011

24
25 
26 Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia
27 U.S. District Judge
28