IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

- -

ONTARIO A. DAVIS,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

10-cv-674-bbc

BARBARA DELAP, SGT. NOVINSKA,
NURSE JANE DOE and
PETER HUIBREGTSE,

Defendants.

- -

Plaintiff Ontario Davis is proceeding in this case on his claims that defendants Peter Huibregtse, Sgt. Novinksa, Barbara Delap and Nurse Jane Doe violated his rights under the Eighth Amendment by failing to provide him proper medical and dental treatment. Now, plaintiff has filed a motion for preliminary injunction in which he asks the court to "provide the plaintiff with an outside consultation and possible extraction of his wisdom tooth from an independent, licensed oral surgeon." I will construe plaintiff's submission as a motion for preliminary injunction brought under Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(a).

Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief cannot be considered at this time because his submission does not comply with this court's procedures for obtaining a preliminary

injunction. In particular, plaintiff has not submitted admissible evidence to support his requests for injunctive relief and he has not proposed facts supported by such evidence. Therefore, I will deny his motion without prejudice because he has failed to follow this court's procedures for obtaining injunctive relief. Those procedures are set out in a document titled Procedure To Be Followed On Motions For Injunctive Relief, a copy of which is included with this order. Plaintiff should pay particular attention to those parts of the procedure that require him to submit proposed findings of fact in support of his motion and point to admissible evidence in the record to support each factual proposition. Plaintiff may refile his motion at a later date in accordance with the attached procedures.

ORDER

Plaintiff Ontario Davis's motion for preliminary injunctive relief, dkt. #27, is DENIED without prejudice..

Entered this _____ day of July, 2011.

BY THE COURT:

_____
BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge