

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO

Civil Action No. 09-cv-01531-MSK-KMT

TERRY BLEVINS,

Plaintiff,

v.

JEFF WELLS,

Defendant.

RECOMMENDATION OF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff's "Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order" (Doc. No. 13, filed October 21, 2009).

The court must construe the motion liberally because Plaintiff is a *pro se* litigant. *See Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972); *Hall v. Bellmon*, 935 F.2d 1106, 1110 (10th Cir. 1991). However, the court should not act as a *pro se* litigant's advocate. *Hall*, 935 F.2d at 1110.

Plaintiff seeks a temporary restraining order "concerning the special conditions of his parole." A party seeking preliminary injunction must meet the following four conditions:

(1) the movant will suffer irreparable harm unless the injunction issues; (2) there is a substantial likelihood the movant ultimately will prevail on the merits; (3) the threatened injury to the movant outweighs any harm the proposed injunction may cause the opposing party; and (4) the injunction would not be contrary to the public interest.

ACLU v. Johnson, 194 F.3d 1149, 1155 (10th Cir. 1999). A party seeking injunctive relief must found his effort on specific factual allegations. *Longstreth v. Maynard*, 961 F.2d 895, 902 (10th

Cir. 1992). Ultimately, because “a preliminary injunction is an extraordinary remedy,” the moving party must establish that his “right to relief [is] clear and unequivocal.” *Schrier v. Univ. of Colo.*, 427 F.3d 1253, 1258 (10th Cir. 2005).

Plaintiff fails to allege any facts that demonstrate he is facing immediate and irreparable injury. Similarly, a party seeking a temporary restraining order must demonstrate clearly, with specific factual allegations, that immediate and irreparable injury will result unless a temporary restraining order is issued. *See* Fed.R.Civ.P. 65(b). In addition, Plaintiff has failed to show there is a substantial likelihood the movant ultimately will prevail on the merits; that any threatened injury to him outweighs any harm the proposed injunction may cause the opposing party; and that a temporary restraining order would not be contrary to the public interest.

Accordingly, this court respectfully

RECOMMENDS that Plaintiff’s “Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order” (Doc. No. 13) be DENIED.

ADVISEMENT TO THE PARTIES

Within ten days after service of a copy of the Recommendation, any party may serve and file written objections to the Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings and recommendations with the Clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Colorado. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *In re Griego*, 64 F.3d 580, 583 (10th Cir. 1995). A general objection that does not put the District Court on notice of the basis for the objection will not preserve the objection for *de novo* review. “[A] party’s objections to the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation must be both timely and specific to preserve an issue for *de novo* review by the

district court or for appellate review.” *U.S. v. One Parcel of Real Property Known As 2121 East 30th Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma*, 73 F.3d 1057, 1060 (10th Cir. 1996). Failure to make timely objections may bar *de novo* review by the District Judge of the Magistrate Judge’s proposed findings and recommendations and will result in a waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the district court based on the proposed findings and recommendations of the magistrate judge. *See Vega v. Suthers*, 195 F.3d 573, 579-80 (10th Cir. 1999) (District Court’s decision to review a Magistrate Judge’s recommendation *de novo* despite the lack of an objection does not preclude application of the “firm waiver rule”); *One Parcel of Real Property*, 73 F.3d at 1059-60 (a party’s objections to the Magistrate Judge’s report and recommendation must be both timely and specific to preserve an issue for *de novo* review by the District Court or for appellate review); *International Surplus Lines Insurance Co. v. Wyoming Coal Refining Systems, Inc.*, 52 F.3d 901, 904 (10th Cir. 1995) (by failing to object to certain portions of the Magistrate Judge’s order, cross-claimant had waived its right to appeal those portions of the ruling); *Ayala v. United States*, 980 F.2d 1342, 1352 (10th Cir. 1992) (by their failure to file objections, plaintiffs waived their right to appeal the Magistrate Judge’s ruling). *But see, Morales-Fernandez v. INS*, 418 F.3d

1116, 1122 (10th Cir. 2005) (firm waiver rule does not apply when the interests of justice require review).

Dated this 26th day of October, 2009.

BY THE COURT:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kathleen M. Tafoya". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "K".

Kathleen M. Tafoya
United States Magistrate Judge