	Case 2:18-cv-01560-NVW Document 10 F	iled 05/23/18	Page 1 of 3
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA		
8			
9	National University of Health Sciences,		1560-PHX-NVW
10	Plaintiff,	ORDER	
11	V.		
12	Council on Chiropratric Education Incorporated,		
13	Defendant.		
14 15			
15 16	Before the Court are Plaintiff's Emer	oency Ex Pa	rte Motion for Temporary
10 17	Restraining Order (Lodged at Doc. 4) and Emergency Ex Parte Motion to File Action		
17	Under Seal (Doc. 1).		
10	Plaintiff, a non-profit professional chiropractic school, sues Defendant, a national		
20	accrediting agency recognized by the Secretary of Education. On May 21, 2018, Plaintiff		
21	received notice from Defendant that Defendant was going to place Plaintiff's		
22	accreditation on Probation. Defendant will publish its decision sometime this evening of		
23	May 23, 2018. Plaintiff alleges numerous defects in Defendant's process and decision.		
24	Plaintiff electronically filed this action and other papers beginning at 1:23 p.m.		
25	The rules require Plaintiff to deliver to the court for the judge's use paper copies of the		
26	filings. Plaintiff has not done so. Plaintiff's Emergency Ex Parte Motion for Temporary		
27	Restraining Order has several deficiencies and will be denied.		
28	1. There is no basis for decision without notice to Defendant and opportunity		

Case 2:18-cv-01560-NVW Document 10 Filed 05/23/18 Page 2 of 3

to be heard. Plaintiff's attorney did not certify "in writing any efforts made to give notice and the reasons why it should not be required." Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(B).

There is no showing of "immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage [that] will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition." Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(b)(1)(A). The injury described is not immediate. Rather, it is injury that would result from loss of accreditation, if and after it occurs, not from Probation.

Plaintiff could have given Defendant and their counsel actual notice of this intended temporary restraining order promptly upon deciding to file this action and seek the restraining order. The failure to do so is unexplained and therefore unexcused.

10 The embarrassment of public awareness that adverse action has been taken11 requiring relief does not distinguish this case from many others.

12 2. The lodged proposed temporary restraining order does not meet the 13 requirements of Rule 65(b)(2). That Rule requires that the temporary restraining order 14 "describe the injury and state why it is irreparable" and "state why the order was issued 15 without notice." The proposed order says, "This finding is based on the facts set forth in 16 NUHS's Emergency Ex Parte Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and 17 Memorandum in Support." Incorporation by reference does not satisfy Rule 65(b)(2) or 18 The form of order says nothing about "why the order was issued without 65(d)(1). 19 notice."

3. The Emergency Ex Parte Motion to File Action Under Seal (Doc. 1) does
not demonstrate the high showing necessary to litigate a case out of public scrutiny.
Plaintiff does not even discuss the standard for sealing. The Motion is in effect a request
to litigate this entire case under seal. There is more than the usual public interest in
transparency in this case than most.

Moreover, no effort is made to show why sealing should be ordered without
Defendant having an opportunity to be heard in opposition. Again, Plaintiff does not
even discuss why sealing should be ordered ex parte.

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

4. The rules empower the Court to give prompt litigation and resolution. A

- 2 -

Case 2:18-cv-01560-NVW Document 10 Filed 05/23/18 Page 3 of 3

preliminary injunction can be consolidated with final trial on the merits. Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(a)(2). This case could be resolved before the feared harm becomes serious, even assuming Defendant's actions are unlawful. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's Emergency Ex Parte Motion for Temporary Restraining Order (Lodged at Doc. 4) is denied. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Emergency Ex Parte Motion to File

Action Under Seal (Doc. 1) is denied. The Clerk shall file this case in open court. Date: May 23, 2018.

VUrbo

Neil V. Wake Senior United States District Judge