

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  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

ROBERT JOSEPH MCCARTY,  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
JOHN V. ROOS, et al.,  
  
Defendants.

2:11-CV-1538 JCM (RJJ)

**ORDER**

Presently before the court is *pro se* plaintiff Robert Joseph McCarty’s second motion for immediate injunctive relief. (Doc. #48).

On April 17, 2012, this court entered an order denying plaintiff’s first motion for immediate injunctive relief. (Doc. #41). The court found that the first motion did not clearly articulate the relief plaintiff sought because it simply referred to the “injunctive relief requested in the partial summary judgment motion . . . .” (Doc. #41). The court further found that plaintiff had failed to present the court with specific facts showing that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage would result before the adverse party could be heard. (Doc. #41).

The instant motion for immediate injunctive relief is similarly defective. Plaintiff still does not clearly articulate his requested relief, but rather refers the court to “page 15 of the amended complaint.” (Doc. #48). Further, plaintiff has not provided the court with specific facts showing that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result before the adverse parties can be heard in opposition. FED. R. CIV. P. 65.


James C. Mahan  
U.S. District Judge

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, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED that *pro se* plaintiff Robert Joseph McCarty's second motion for immediate injunctive relief (doc. #48) be, and the same hereby is, DENIED.

DATED May 21, 2012.

  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE