

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Eccarius v. United States

Eccarius · No. 25-cv-04668-CRB · Decided June 24, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Northern District of California denied Anthony Carl Eccarius’s ex parte motion for a temporary restraining order. The requested relief sought to halt operations associated with the President and the Department of Government Efficiency and to restrict military or National Guard law-enforcement and surveillance deployments. The court concluded that Eccarius had not identified a particularized, non-speculative injury and that the requested relief extended beyond his due process claim arising from a labor dispute.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Charles R. Breyer
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	June 24, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-04668-CRB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff sought an ex parte temporary restraining order to halt specified federal operations and National Guard or military law-enforcement and surveillance deployments.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court applied the standing requirement that a plaintiff show a particularized injury fairly traceable to the challenged conduct and likely to be redressed by favorable relief.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

TOPICS

- injunctions
- standing
- due process
- civil procedure
- federalism

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- constitutional law
- federal courts
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Eccarius established a sufficiently particularized injury to support the requested temporary restraining order.
2. Whether the court could grant relief extending beyond the alleged due-process injury arising from Eccarius's labor dispute.

HOLDINGS

1. A plaintiff may not obtain injunctive relief without identifying a particularized injury fairly traceable to the challenged conduct and likely to be redressed by the requested relief; Eccarius failed to make that showing.
2. A temporary restraining order addressing broad governmental operations and deployments cannot be pursued when the requested relief extends far beyond the plaintiff's alleged individualized due-process injury.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“But Eccarius’s motion for a temporary restraining order seeks relief far beyond that—relief that he cannot pursue.” (at 2)

“Accordingly, the Court DENIES his motion for a temporary restraining order.” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Eccarius alleged that a 2021 labor dispute gave rise to his due-process claim. He sought to enjoin the President and the Department of Government Efficiency from broad governmental operations and to prohibit military or National Guard deployment in law-enforcement and surveillance functions, but did not identify how those actions would specifically harm him.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Eccarius filed a complaint alleging a due-process claim arising from a 2021 labor dispute and moved ex parte for a temporary restraining order. The district court found that the requested relief was not supported by a particularized injury and denied the motion.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560–61 (1992)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 6 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT
OF CALIFORNIA 7 8 ANTHONY CARL ECCARIUS, Case No. 25-cv-04668-CRB 9 Plaintiff,
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR A 10 v. TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER 11
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 12 Defendant. 13 Plaintiff Anthony Carl Eccarius seeks ex
parte a temporary restraining order to 14 enjoin the President of the United States and the
“Department of Governmental 15 Enforcement” (by which he apparently means the Department of
Government Efficiency, 16 or DOGE) from “all [] operations, funding, regulatory actions, or
enforcement” and to 17 enjoin “any military or National Guard deployment in law enforcement
and surveillance 18 functions.” Mot. (dkt.

8) at 2–3. Eccarius states that he seeks an injunction (as well as \$21 19 million in “symbolic
damages”) in order “to signal a necessary public reckoning and 20 restoration of constitutional
fidelity.” Id. at 3. 21 Eccarius states that he “faces irreparable harm,” but he does not identify how
he 22 will be harmed. Id. at 2. Though he expresses concern that “unchecked federal 23
enforcement displaces lawful federalism and severs the intended balance among the 24 People, the
States, and the Constitution,” id., that injury is not particularized to him.

25 Indeed, Eccarius’s complaint states only that he was involved in a labor dispute in 2021 26 that
apparently gives rise to this case. See Compl. (dkt. 1) ¶¶ 9–14 (describing a labor 27 grievance that
Eccarius says gives rise to this case). It is far from clear that such a dispute 1 the National Guard.
See *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560–61 (1992) 2 (requiring among other elements
that a plaintiff’s injury be “particularized,” that it be 3 “fairly traceable to the challenged action of
the defendant,” and that it be “‘likely,’ as 4 opposed to merely ‘speculative,’ that the injury will be
‘redressed by a favorable 5 decision’” (cleaned up) (citations omitted)).

6 Eccarius’s complaint purports to state a claim for denial of due process arising from 7 his labor
dispute, and he seeks relief on that basis. Compl. ¶¶ 16–18 & at 4. Construed 8 liberally, such a
claim does not obviously fail for lack of jurisdiction. But Eccarius’s 9 motion for a temporary
restraining order seeks relief far beyond that—relief that he cannot 10 pursue.

Accordingly, the Court DENIES his motion for a temporary restraining order. 11 IT IS SO
ORDERED. 12 Dated: June 24, 2025 CHARLES R. BREYER 13 United States District Judge 14
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27