

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

SEP 28 2026

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

SEANTAIN COOK,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CENTURION HEALTH; A.L. MALACHI;  
OYUKI CORONADO; JAMES CONKLE;  
LILLIAN DAUOD; JEAN KING, Nurse  
Practitioner at ASPC Alhambra;  
SHARRON JOSHUA; NAPHCARE, INC.,  
Named as Naph Care Heath Health Service  
Contractor at AZ Dept; JOHN  
UNDERWOOD, Nurse Practitioner at  
ASPC Safford; ELIJAH ITTORO, Medical  
Director at ASPC Lewis/ Barchey;  
RICHARD ESPINOZA, Facility Health  
Administrator at ASPC Lewis; TINA  
WATTS, Director of Nursing at ASPC  
Lewis; UNKNOWN PARTIES, Jane Doe,  
Assistant Director of Nursing at ASPC  
Lewis, John Doe, Nurse Practitioner at  
ASPC Safford, and Jane Doe #1 at  
Centurion; GRANT PHILLIPS, Medical  
Director at ADCRR; WENDY ORM,  
Regional Medical Director at Centurion;  
CHRISTIAN CHENG, Nurse Practitioner;  
MITCHELL EDMUND, Medical Cite  
Director,

No. 25-4672

D.C. No. 2:23-cv-00688-KML-JZB

MEMORANDUM\*

---

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

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Krissa M. Lanham, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 22, 2026\*\*

Before: OWENS, COLLINS, and SUNG, Circuit Judges.

Arizona state prisoner Seantain Cook appeals pro se from the district court's order denying Cook's motion for a preliminary injunction in this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging deliberate indifference to serious medical needs. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1). We review for an abuse of discretion. *Am. Trucking Ass'n, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles*, 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009). We affirm.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by denying Cook's motion for a preliminary injunction because Cook failed to establish the requirements for such relief. *See id.* (a party seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that they are likely to succeed on the merits, they are likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, the balance of equities tips in their favor, and an injunction is in the public interest).

---

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

Cook's motion (Docket Entry No. 45) to file an oversized reply brief is granted. The Clerk is directed to file Cook's reply brief at Docket Entry No. 46.

**AFFIRMED.**