

JUN 04 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>PETER T. HARRELL,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>SOUTHERN OREGON UNIVERSITY; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 09-35992

D.C. No. 1:08-cv-03037-CL

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Oregon
Owen M. Panner, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 25, 2010**
San Francisco, California

Before: CANBY, THOMAS and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

Plaintiff-appellant Peter T. Harrell appeals pro se the district court's denial of his request for preliminary injunctive relief against defendants-appellees in

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

connection with appellant's complaint for civil rights violations, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), and we affirm.

We express no view on the merits of the complaint. Our sole inquiry is whether the district court abused its discretion in denying preliminary injunctive relief. *The Lands Council v. McNair*, 537 F.3d 981, 986 (9th Cir. 2008); *see Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council*, --- U.S. ----, ----, 129 S. Ct. 365, 374, 172 L. Ed.2d 249 (2008) (listing factors for district court to consider); *Sports Form, Inc.*, 686 F.2d 750, 752-53 (9th Cir. 1982) (explaining limited scope of review). We conclude the district court did not abuse its discretion. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's order denying the preliminary injunction.

AFFIRMED.