

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)