

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

STEPHEN CHRISTOPHER WRIGHT,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. CIV-20-00287-JD
	)	
PAUL ZIRIAX,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Stephen Christopher Wright’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction against Defendant Paul ZiriAx (“Motion”). [Doc. No. 26]. As Mr. Wright recognizes in his Motion, his request for injunctive relief is governed by Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. [*Id.* at 1].

Under Rule 65(a), “[t]he court may issue a preliminary injunction only on notice to the adverse party.” Mr. Wright’s Motion does not demonstrate compliance with this procedural safeguard of Rule 65—notice to the adverse party. Mr. Wright’s Motion does not include a certificate of service reflecting service of the Motion on Defendant and does not otherwise satisfy the requirements contained in Rule 65. Furthermore, according to the docket, there is no record that the Complaint has been served on Defendant, only that summons in a civil action has issued [Doc. No. 28]. Thus, Mr. Wright has not provided notice to the adverse party nor has he provided a statement as to why service should not be required. Although Mr. Wright is pro se, pro se plaintiffs are held to the same rules of procedure that apply to any other litigant. *Nielsen v. Price*, 17 F.3d 1276, 1277 (10th Cir.

1994). Because notice has not been provided as required by Rule 65(a), the Motion [Doc. No. 26] is DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 21st day of August 2020.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jodi W. Dishman", written over a horizontal line.

JODI W. DISHMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE