

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 19 2022

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

TIMOTHY DEANORE WILKINS,

No. 21-56321

Plaintiff-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:21-cv-03383-VAP-E

v.

MEMORANDUM*

CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS; et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Virginia A. Phillips, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 11, 2022**

Before: McKEOWN, CHRISTEN, and BRESS, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Timothy Deanore Wilkins appeals pro se from the district court's order denying his motion for a preliminary injunction in his 42 U.S.C § 1983 action alleging federal and state law claims related to cell searches and contamination of personal property. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C

* 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).

§ 1292(a)(1). We review for an abuse of discretion. *Arc of Cal. v. Douglas*, 757 F.3d 975, 983 (9th Cir. 2014). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Wilkins's motion for a preliminary injunction because Wilkins failed to demonstrate that such relief is warranted. *See id.* at 983-84 (requiring a plaintiff seeking preliminary injunction to establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the balance of equities tips in his favor, and an injunction is in the public interest).

Wilkins's motion for judicial notice (Docket Entry No. 15) is denied.

AFFIRMED.