

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

<b>J.H. et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiffs,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>No. 3:21-cv-00733</b>
	)	
<b>WILLIAMSON COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD OF EDUCATION et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ Motion for Temporary Restraining Order seeking to enjoin the Williamson County Board of Education from “[r]equiring children and staff in WCS to wear a mask.” (Doc. No. 5 at 6). Because the Motion fails to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the Local Rules of this Court, it will be denied.

First, the Motion fails to meet the requirements of Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65. Under the rule, the Court “may issue a temporary restraining order without written or oral notice to the adverse party only if . . . specific facts in an affidavit or a verified complaint clearly show that immediate and irreparable injury, loss, or damage will result to the movant before the adverse party can be heard in opposition.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(A). Here, there is no verified complaint, and the affidavits to which they cite—one by Megan Heim, (Doc. No. 5-1), and one by Stephen E. Petty, (Doc. No. 1-11)—do not come close to the standard for “specific facts” required by Rule 65. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 65.

Second, the Motion fails to meet the notice requirements under the local rules of this Court. Pursuant to Local Rule 65.01(c), “A motion for a [Temporary Restraining Order] must be made in strict compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 65. If the movant is not represented by counsel, the *pro se*

moving party must certify in writing the efforts made to give notice of the request for a [Temporary Restraining Order] and the reasons why notice should not be required.” L.R. 65.01(c). Here, Plaintiffs, who are proceeding *pro se*, do not certify any efforts made to give notice to the Williamson County Board of Education and “the reasons why notice should not be required.” (Id.).

Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ Motion (Doc. No. 5) is **DENIED**. This case is **REFERRED** to the Magistrate Judge for (1) customized case management; (2) a determination of what discovery is necessary; and (3) a determination of a date for a preliminary injunction hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
WAVERLY D. CRENSHAW, JR.  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE