



his life. He also fears officers will convince other inmates to throw feces on him. One of the defendants has allegedly said he is “waiting for the perfect time to strike against [Donohue].” Another defendant allegedly told Donohue in May 2013 that if he covered his window, he would receive a disciplinary charge and be placed on strip cell status. Donohue claims that other inmates who cover their windows are not charged or placed on strip cell.

The court cannot find that the additional facts provided in Donohue’s motion for reconsideration require a different outcome on his request for interlocutory injunctive relief. His fears arise from hearsay evidence and his own interpretation of events and comments, rather than from any real evidence that officers are likely to harm him intentionally or to cause inmates to harm him. Moreover, if Donohue fears harm from other inmates, he may take appropriate steps under the prison administrative remedies procedures to request protective custody. In addition, neither Donohue’s fear of being disciplined again for violating prison rules nor the alleged verbal threats officers have made is sufficient to support a finding that Donohue is in imminent danger of irreparable harm so as to warrant the extraordinary relief he seeks.<sup>1</sup> For these reasons, the court will deny Donohue’s motion to reconsider. An appropriate order will issue this day.

The Clerk is directed to send copies of this memorandum opinion and accompanying order to plaintiff.

ENTER: This 4~~th~~ day of October, 2013.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Chief United States District Judge

---

<sup>1</sup> See Real Truth About Obama, Inc. v. FEC, 575 F.3d 342, 346 (4th Cir. 2009), vacated on other grounds, 559 U.S. 1089 (2010), reinstated in relevant part by 607 F.3d 355, 355 (4th Cir. 2010) ((quoting Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)) (finding that a mere “possibility” of irreparable harm is “inconsistent with [the] characterization of injunctive relief as an extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief”).