

Per Curiam

NOTICE: This opinion is subject to formal revision before publication in the preliminary print of the Student Supreme Court Reports. Readers are requested to notify the Court of any typographical error or other formal errors, in order that corrections may be made before the preliminary print goes to press.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STUDENT BODY

No. 22–008

SAM ROBINSON *v.* DAVID BASS

ON MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

[February 4, 2023]

PER CURIAM.

A temporary restraining order (TRO) is extraordinary relief. A party requesting a TRO in this Court must demonstrate that the TRO is “necessary to preserve the jurisdiction of the Court, the rights of the party, or the availability of remedies” R. 38(b)(1) (rev. 2023), and the moving party must be “clearly entitled to the [TRO].” *Id.*, R. 38(b)(2). Those stringent standards are necessary since TROs may be entered *ex parte*—as is requested in this case. See, *e.g.*, Doc. No. 3, at ¶6. For that reason, we only consider the TRO motion at this juncture since it is the only motion before us that may be adjudicated before the defendant answers.

Plaintiff’s motion for a TRO, Doc. No. 3, does not satisfy these standards since they have not exhausted “available remedies,” R. 38(b)(1). Because they have not satisfied that baseline standard, they are certainly not “clearly entitled to the relief requested.” R. 38(b)(2). The motion is denied.

It is so ordered.