

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

JANICE LYNN KING,

Plaintiff,

Vs.

No. 06-4001-SAC

SHERRI KELLER, AMANDA
SMITH-WILSON, SUSANNA
VAN GELDER COXE, STEVE
PHILLIPS, and JOHN DOE #1,
et al.,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

The case comes before the court on the plaintiff's motion requesting an emergency temporary restraining order (Dk. 7) and the plaintiff's motion for leave of court to file an emergency preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order (Dk. 30). By leave of the court, the plaintiff filed this action without payment of fees, costs or security, and no attorney admitted to this bar has entered an appearance on behalf of the plaintiff. The plaintiff's complaint consists of thirty-two pages and nine counts. The allegations arise from and are all related to the plaintiff's involvement in family court proceedings in Shawnee County, Kansas, and, in particular, her ongoing disputes with court officers and litigants over child custody matters.

Shortly after filing her complaint, the plaintiff filed a request for emergency temporary restraining order pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 65. (Dk. 7). She sought an order that would enjoin the defendant Amanda Smith-Wilson, as the court services officer assigned to the plaintiff's domestic case, from making adverse recommendations allegedly in retaliation for this federal lawsuit. The plaintiff later furnished the court with a copy of a letter and represented that she had received this letter from the defendant Amanda Smith-Wilson. In that letter signed by Ms. Amanda Smith, it states that Ms. Smith would no longer be handling "domestic case management cases" and that the plaintiff's case had been referred to another court services officer. The court summarily denies the plaintiff's request for a temporary restraining order. The plaintiff's cursory filing does not meet the procedural or substantive requirements for this extraordinary relief. With Ms. Smith's change in job assignments, the plaintiff's request utterly fails to articulate any arguable threat of ongoing injury or harm to her claimed interests.

The plaintiff recently filed another emergency preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order. (Dk. 31). It too seeks to enjoin certain state court service officers from influencing or being involved in her ongoing child custody proceedings. It too fails to meet the procedural and substantive requirements for this extraordinary relief as set forth in Fed. R. Civ. P. 65, as well as the service

requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 5.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the plaintiff's motion requesting an emergency temporary restraining order (Dk. 7) and the plaintiff's motion for leave of court to file an emergency preliminary injunction and temporary restraining order (Dk. 30 and Dk. 31) are summarily denied.

Dated this 29th day of March, 2006, Topeka, Kansas.

s/ Sam A. Crow
Sam A. Crow, U.S. District Senior Judge