1				
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
9	DISTRICT (DF NEVADA		
10		CASE NO. 11 CV 1610 MI IL DU		
11	CYNTHIA KAPPENMAN COHEN,	CASE NO. 11-CV-1619-MLH-RJJ		
12 13	Plaintiff, vs.	ORDER DENYING WITHOUT PREJUDICE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION REGARDING		
13	CLARK COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT,	WITNESSES		
14	et al.,	[Doc. No. 75]		
16	Defendants.			
17				
18	On September 10, 2012, Plaintiff Cynthia Kappenman Cohen, proceeding pro se, filed			
19	a motion seeking a protective order regarding witnesses. (Doc. No. 75.) On September 11,			
20	2012, Defendant Clark County School District ("CCSD") filed a response in opposition to			
21	Plaintiff's motion. (Doc. No. 80.) For the reasons below, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's			
22	motion without prejudice.			
23	3 4 In her motion, Plaintiff requests that the Court stay on high alert to the names mentioned			
24				
25				
26	CCSD. (<u>Id.</u>) Plaintiff requests that the Court issue an order regarding the protection of			
27				
28	withesses from narassment, retailation, or disc	crimination, but without providing any facts to		

1 support the request. (<u>Id.</u> at 3.)

1	support me request. (<u>it.</u> at 5.)	í.	
2	In its opposition, Defendant CCSD argues that Plaintiff's motion should be stricken		
3	because it is not a proper motion upon which relief can be granted. (Doc. No. 80 at 3-5.)		
4	CCSD also argues that the motion should be denied because it fails to allege any inappropriate		
5	conduct that has taken place in this case. (Id. at 5.) The Court agrees. Plaintiff's motion is		
6	based entirely on speculation that people who provide testimony or information against		
7	Defendant CCSD in this case will be subjected to retaliation and harassment by Defendant.		
8	To establish entitlement to equitable relief, a Plaintiff must show that there is a likelihood of		
9	a substantial and immediate irreparable injury. <u>City of Los Angeles v. Lyons</u> , 461 U.S. 95, 103		
10	(1983). The accusations in Plaintiff's motion are purely speculative and hypothetical, not real		
11	and immediate. Accordingly, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion without prejudice.		
12	<u>Conclusion</u>		
13	For the foregoing reasons, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for a protective order		
14	regarding witnesses without prejudice.		
15	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
16	DATED: September 17, 2012 M_{\pm}		
17	Maulph L. Huff		
18	MARILYN L. HUFF, District Judge UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		i	