

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
WESTERN DIVISION
No. 5:15-CV-667-D

CAMPBELL ALLIANCE GROUP, INC.,)
)
Plaintiff,)
)
v.)
)
LYNN FORREST, and ANDREW KWON,)
)
Defendants.)

ORDER

On September 22, 2016, this court heard Campbell Alliance Group Inc.’s (“Campbell” or “plaintiff”) motion for preliminary injunction [D.E. 4]. The court has considered the motion under the governing standard. See, e.g., Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008); Centro Tepeyac v. Montgomery Cty., 722 F.3d 184, 188 (4th Cir. 2013) (en banc); Real Truth About Obama, Inc. v. FEC, 575 F.3d 342, 346 (4th Cir. 2009), vacated on other grounds, 559 U.S. 1089 (2010), reissued in relevant part, 607 F.3d 355 (4th Cir. 2010) (per curiam). The court also has considered the entire record and the arguments of counsel. See, e.g., [D.E. 1, 4, 5, 54, 60, 61, 62]. As explained in open court and incorporated herein by reference, plaintiff has not established that (1) it is likely to succeed on the merits of its breach of contract claims; (2) it is likely to suffer irreparable harm absent preliminary relief; (3) the balance of the equities tip in plaintiff’s favor; or (4) a preliminary injunction is in the public interest. See, e.g., RLM Commc’ns, Inc. v. Tuschen, No. 14-2351, 2016 WL 4039679, at *3–4 (4th Cir. July 28, 2016); Clinical Staffing, Inc. v. Worldwide Travel Staffing Ltd., 60 F. Supp. 3d 618, 623–26 (E.D.N.C. 2013); Southtech Orthopedics, Inc. v. Dingus, 428 F. Supp. 2d 410, 418–22 (E.D.N.C. 2006); Prof’l Liab. Consultants, Inc. v. Todd, 122 N.C. App. 212, 218–21, 468 S.E.2d 578, 582–84 (Smith, J., dissenting), rev’d per curiam for reasons stated in the dissent, 345 N.C. 176, 478 S.E.2d 201 (1996). Thus, Campbell’s motion for a preliminary injunction [D.E. 4] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED. This 23 day of September 2016.



JAMES C. DEVER III
Chief United States District Judge