

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

MARCUS BRIM,

Plaintiff,

Hon. Janet T. Neff

v.

Case No. 1:13-CV-989

DOUGLAS WELTON, et al.,

Defendants.

---

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief. (Dkt. #135).

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B), the undersigned recommends that Plaintiff's motion be **denied**.

Injunctive relief is “an extraordinary remedy which should be granted only if. . .the circumstances clearly demand it.” *Overstreet v. Lexington-Fayette Urban County Gov't*, 305 F.3d 566, 573 (6th Cir. 2002). To obtain injunctive relief, Plaintiff must first show that he “is being threatened by some injury for which he has no adequate legal remedy.” *Dana Corp. v. Celotex Asbestos Settlement Trust*, 251 F.3d 1107, 1118 (6th Cir. 2001). If such is the case, the court must then examine several factors: (1) whether the movant is likely to prevail on the merits, (2) whether the movant would suffer irreparable injury if the court does not grant the injunction, (3) whether a preliminary injunction would cause substantial harm to others, and (4) whether a preliminary injunction would be in the public interest. *See Samuel v. Herrick Memorial Hospital*, 201 F.3d 830, 833 (6th Cir. 2000). Rather than prerequisites which must each be satisfied, the relevant factors, none of which are dispositive, are competing considerations to be weighed and balanced. *See Six Clinics Holding Corp., II v. Cafcomp Systems, Inc.*,

119 F.3d 393, 400 (6th Cir. 1997); *Michigan Bell Telephone Co. v. MFS Intelenet of Michigan, Inc.*, 16 F.Supp.2d 828, 831 (W.D.Mich. 1998). Ultimately, the decision whether to grant injunctive relief lies within the court's discretion. *See Dana Corp.*, 251 F.3d at 1118.

Plaintiff asserts that on January 9, 2016, he was assaulted by "prison gang members." Fearing that he will be subject to such violence again, Plaintiff requests that the Court order the MDOC to provide him with protection. The evidence Plaintiff has submitted demonstrates that on January 11, 2016, prison officials determined that Plaintiff "needs to be transferred for his safety." A review of the Court's docket sheet reveals that Plaintiff was soon thereafter transferred to a different correctional facility. Plaintiff has presented no evidence that the circumstance which prompted the present motion is present at his new location. Plaintiff's request, therefore, appears to be moot. Accordingly, the undersigned recommends that Plaintiff's motion be denied.

### CONCLUSION

For the reasons articulated herein, the undersigned recommends that Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief, (Dkt. #135), be **denied**.

OBJECTIONS to this Report and Recommendation must be filed with the Clerk of Court within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this notice. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). Failure to file objections within the specified time waives the right to appeal the District Court's order. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir.1981).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 15, 2016

/s/ Ellen S. Carmody  
ELLEN S. CARMODY  
United States Magistrate Judge