

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Haishan Yang,

Case No. 25-CV-00089 (JMB/SGE)

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

Hannah Neprash, Scott Lanyon,
JaneAnne Murray, and Sharon Dzik,
in their individual and official capacities,

Defendants.

This matter is before the Court on self-represented Plaintiff Haishan Yang’s motion for a preliminary injunction against Defendants Hannah Neprash, Scott Lanyon, JaneAnne Murray, and Sharon Dzik for their alleged constitutional violations of due process under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. (Doc. No. 15.) For the reasons discussed below, the Court denies Yang’s motion.

First, the filing of this motion does not comply with the local rules of this district. “A preliminary-injunction motion that requires expedited handling must . . . be filed in accordance with LR 7.1(c)(1).” D. Minn. L.R. 7.1(d)(4)(B). Under LR 7.1(c)(1), the movant must file and serve the following documents simultaneously: (1) motion; (2) notice of hearing; (3) memorandum of law; (4) affidavits and exhibits; (5) meet-and-confer statement; and (6) proposed order. D. Minn. L.R. 7.1(c)(1). In support of his motion for a preliminary injunction, Yang only filed a proposed order (Doc. No. 16) and a certification

of notice (Doc. No. 17). Therefore, the Court will strike this motion, without prejudice, for failure to comply with local rule 7.1(c)(1).

Moreover, Yang's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. No. 15) appears to be nearly identical to his ex parte motion for a temporary restraining order (TRO) (Doc. No. 14), which the Court has denied on February 12, 2025. (Doc. No. 22.) Therefore, even if Yang were to refile his motion for a preliminary injunction in compliance with the local rules, it would likely be denied for the reasons articulated in the Court's February 12 order. *See Tumey v. Mycroft AI, Inc.*, 27 F.4th 657, 665 (8th Cir. 2022) (“[T]he standard for analyzing a motion for a temporary restraining order is the same as a motion for a preliminary injunction.”)

Based on the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT Plaintiff Haishan Yang's motion for a preliminary injunction (Doc. No. 15) is STRICKEN, without prejudice.

Dated: February 19, 2025

/s/ Jeffrey M. Bryan
Judge Jeffrey M. Bryan
United States District Court