

**U.S. District Court  
Eastern District of California - Live System (Sacramento)  
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 2:20-cv-02171-JAM-KJN**

Community Health Center Alliance for Patient Access et al v. Lightbourne et al  
Assigned to: District Judge John A. Mendez  
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Kendall J. Newman  
Cause: 42:1981 Civil Rights

Date Filed: 10/29/2020  
Jury Demand: None  
Nature of Suit: 440 Civil Rights: Other  
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
01/10/2022	54	MINUTE ORDER issued by Courtroom Deputy G. Michel for District Judge John A. Mendez on 1/10/2022: Before this Court is Plaintiffs' emergency application for a Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO"), ECF No. <a href="#">46</a> , seeking to enjoin the implementation of Medi-Cal Rx Transition which became effective on January 1, 2022. The Court has reviewed the parties' briefs and supporting documents and after careful consideration of the arguments in favor of and in opposition to this TRO Motion, the Court DENIES the Motion. TRO's are emergency measures, intended to preserve the status quo pending a fuller hearing on the injunctive relief requested. The irreparable harm must therefore be clearly immediate. Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 65(b)(1). Here, Plaintiffs have not adequately proven that Medi-Cal Rx will cause them economic harm before the Court can resolve a properly noticed motion. As this Court stated in its Order denying Plaintiffs' previous TRO Motion, "[i]t would be inappropriate to grant the ultimate relief sought at [this] stage in the proceeding, prior to a more deliberative investigation of the claims' merits." ECF No. <a href="#">19</a> at 2-3. The Court also agrees with Defendant Brooks-LaSure's argument that a TRO against Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services ("CMS") is inappropriate given that Plaintiffs do not seek injunctive relief against CMS in their First Amended Complaint and the TRO motion does not "describe in reasonable detail... the act or acts restrained or required" with respect to CMS. Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d). ECF No. <a href="#">49</a> at 2-3, 7-8. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion for a TRO is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. [TEXT ONLY ENTRY] (Michel, G.) (Entered: 01/10/2022)