

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAY 31 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

BILAL AHDOM,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

S. LOPEZ, Chief Medical Officer at Kern
Valley State Prison; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-16831

D.C. No. 1:09-cv-01874-AWI-
BAM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Anthony W. Ishii, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 24, 2017**

Before: THOMAS, Chief Judge, and SILVERMAN and RAWLINSON,
Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Bilal Ahdom appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motions for a preliminary injunction and a temporary restraining order. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We review for an

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

abuse of discretion. *Religious Tech. Ctr., Church of Scientology Int'l, Inc. v. Scott*, 869 F.2d 1306, 1309 (9th Cir. 1989). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion in denying Ahdom's requests for preliminary injunctive relief because Ahdom failed to demonstrate that he would likely suffer irreparable harm in the absence of the requested relief. *See id.* (“[A]n injunction cannot issue merely because it is possible that there will be an irreparable injury to the plaintiff; it must be likely that there will be.” (citation omitted)); *Stuhlberg Int'l Sales Co. v. John D. Brush & Co.*, 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001) (standards for issuing a temporary restraining order and a preliminary injunction are “substantially identical”).

We reject as unsupported by the record Ahdom's various contentions regarding alleged perjury committed by defendant Dr. Ashby.

AFFIRMED.