

HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

ABDIKADIR SHIRE,
Plaintiff,

v.

IMMIGRATION CUSTOM
ENFORCEMENT and FEDERAL
BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION,
Defendants.

Case No. C18-333-RAJ
ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff Abdikadir Shire’s Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”). Dkt. # 2. For the reasons that follow, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff’s motion.

A TRO is an “extraordinary remedy that may only be awarded upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled to such relief.” *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008).¹ To obtain a TRO, Plaintiff must show that (1) it is likely to succeed on the merits, (2) it is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, (3) the balance of equities tips in its favor, and (4) an injunction is in the public interest. *Stormans, Inc. v. Selecky*, 586 F.3d 1109, 1127 (9th Cir. 2009).

¹ The standard for issuing a TRO is identical to the standard for issuing a preliminary injunction. *New Motor Vehicle Bd. of California v. Orrin W. Fox Co.*, 434 U.S. 1345, 1347 (1977).

1 Having reviewed the motion, the complaint, and the applicable law, the Court
2 concludes that Plaintiff has not carried its burden to establish these elements. Plaintiff
3 alleges that a federal agent shot him with a bullet that contains a transmitter G.P.S. and
4 that he was shot by Defendants in order to deport him. Dkt. ## 1, 2. Plaintiff provides no
5 other information or details to support his claim, or indicates exactly what claim he is
6 making against Defendants. Plaintiff also fails to state what injunctive relief he is
7 requesting. Even with the additional deference allowed for *pro se* litigants, Plaintiff has
8 not established a likelihood of success on the merits, irreparable harm in the absence of a
9 TRO, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, or that an injunction is in the public
10 interest. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Motion for TRO. Dkt. # 2.

11 DATED this 8th day of March, 2018.

12
13 

14 The Honorable Richard A. Jones
15 United States District Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27