1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	DISTRICT OF NEVADA		
8	* * *)		
9	HUSSEIN S. HUSSEIN,		
10	Plaintiffs, 3:07-cv-0056-LRH-VPC		
11	v.)) ORDER		
12	ADEL ERSEK; et al.,		
13	Defendants.		
14			
15	Before the court is plaintiff Hussein S. Hussein's ("Hussein") motion for a preliminary		
16	injunction filed on December 13, 2009. Doc. #149.1 Defendants filed a response on December 30,		
17	2009. Doc. #159. Thereafter, Hussein filed a reply on January 13, 2010. Doc. #172.		
18	I. Facts and Background		
19	Hussein filed a complaint against defendants for an alleged conspiracy arising from		
20	defendants' actions at the University of Nevada, Reno. ² Hussein alleges that, during discovery,		
21	defendants' counsel, Charles Hilsabeck ("Hilsabeck"), assistant general counsel for the University		
22	of Nevada, Reno, committed witness tampering and fraud upon the court. See Doc. #149.		
23	Hussein filed several motions to disqualify defense counsel and for sanctions for		
24			
25	¹ Refers to the court's docket entry number.		
26	² For a more complete factual history of the case see the court's March 6, 2009 order granting in-part and denying in-part defendants' motion for judgment on the pleadings (Doc. #49). Doc. #68.		

Hilsabeck's alleged witness tampering and discovery fraud. *See* Doc. ##90, 127, 128, 137. The
 magistrate judge denied the motions ultimately finding Hussein's allegations to be without merit.
 Doc. ##102, 131, 169. Thereafter, Hussein filed the present motion for an order enjoining
 defendants from witness tampering and witness intimidation. Doc. #149.

5

II. Legal Standard

6 A party may seek to enjoin another party from causing the moving party irreparable harm by 7 filing a motion for an injunction. See Topanga Press, Inc. V. City of Los Angeles, 989 F.2d 1524, 8 1528 (9th Cir. 1993). An injunction is an extraordinary remedy available only upon a clear showing 9 that the moving party is entitled to relief. Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997). In order 10 to be granted an injunction, the moving party must establish: (1) irreparable harm in the absence of 11 relief; (2) likelihood of success on the merits; (3) the balance of equities tips in the movant's favor; and (4) an injunction is in the public interest. See Winter v. NRDC, Inc., 129 S. Ct. 365 (2008); Am. 12 13 Trucking Ass'ns v. City of Los Angeles, 559 F.3d 1046 (9th Cir. 2009).

14 **III.** Discussion

15 Likelihood of Success on the Merits

16 The court finds that Hussein has failed to meet his burden in establishing the likelihood of 17 success on the merits of his discovery fraud and witness tampering claims. Hussein provides no 18 legal or factual support for his accusations of defense counsel's wrongdoing. Rather, Hussein posits 19 a rhetorical question to the court: "[t]he question here is, if the defense team is confident of 20 winning on the merits, then why avoid discovery and resort to withholding the *true* evidence and 21 manufacturing *false* evidence to be used at summary judgment?" Doc. #149 (emphasis in original). 22 Hussein's question does not support his claims that defense counsel engaged in improper and 23 illegal activities. Thus, Hussein has failed to show that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his 24 claims against defense counsel.

25

Additionally, in seeking an injunction, a plaintiff must demonstrate that his claims present a

26

1	serious question of law and that the current litigation has merit so as to avoid undue harm to the		
2	defendant. Topanga, 989 F.2d at 1528. Here, the magistrate considered Hussein's underlying		
3	motions and found his accusations to be without merit. The court has reviewed the magistrate's		
4	orders along with the papers and pleadings on file in this matter and agrees that Hussein's		
5	accusations of discovery fraud and witness tampering are without merit. Accordingly, Hussein is		
6	not entitled to an injunction against defense counsel.		
7	Because the court finds that Hussein has not shown a likelihood of success on the merits,		
8	the court finds it unnecessary to address the remaining factors in seeking an injunction.		
9	IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for an injunction (Doc. #149) is		
10	DENIED.		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
12	DATED this 7th day of April, 2010.	Ellihe	
13		Jank	
14		LARRY R. HICKS	
15		UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE	
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26		3	

ļ