

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

KENNETH JENNINGS,

Plaintiff,

v.

SEATTLE HOUSING AUTHORITY,

Defendant.

CASE NO. C08-1820JLR

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff Kenneth Jennings’s motion for temporary restraining order or preliminary injunction (Dkt. # 57). Having considered the motion, as well as all papers filed in support, the balance of the record, and deeming response and oral argument unnecessary, the court DENIES the motion (Dkt. # 57).


The parties are familiar with the facts of this case, and the court will not repeat them here. In the instant motion, Mr. Jennings seeks to enjoin Sarah Van Cleve, the property manager of the Bell Tower Apartments, from holding a meeting on February 11, 2010, to discuss the use of \$1,000.00 in funds. Mr. Jennings contends that the Bell

1 Tower Resident Council is entitled to supervise how these funds are spent, and that he, as  
2 chairman of the council, is entitled to be involved in the process.

3 A plaintiff seeking injunctive relief must establish (1) that he is likely to succeed  
4 on the merits; (2) that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of relief; (3)  
5 that the balance of equities tips in his favor; and (4) that an injunction is in the public  
6 interest. *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, \_\_ U.S. \_\_, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374  
7 (2008). Despite having previously advised Mr. Jennings of this standard, Mr. Jennings  
8 does not address the first, third, or fourth factors of the four-part *Winter* test in his  
9 motion. Once again, Mr. Jennings has not attempted to meet the demanding standard for  
10 the extraordinary remedy he seeks. On this record, the court finds that Mr. Jennings has  
11 not demonstrated that he is likely to succeed on the merits of his claim, that the balance  
12 of equities tips in his favor, or that the public interest favors injunctive relief.

13 The court therefore DENIES the motion (Dkt. # 57).

14 Dated this 11th day of February, 2010.

15  
16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 JAMES L. ROBART  
19 United States District Judge  
20  
21  
22