

1 EMILY T. KUWAHARA (SBN 252411)  
ekuwahara@crowell.com  
2 URI NIV (SBN 307487)  
univ@crowell.com  
3 CROWELL & MORING LLP  
515 South Flower Street, 40th Floor  
4 Los Angeles, CA 90071  
Telephone: 213.622.4750  
5 Facsimile: 213.622.2690

6 KRISTIN J. MADIGAN (SBN 233436)  
kmadigan@crowell.com  
7 SUZANNE E. RODE (SBN 253830)  
srode@crowell.com  
8 CROWELL & MORING LLP  
3 Embarcadero Center, 26th Floor  
9 San Francisco, CA 94111  
Telephone: 415.986.2800  
10 Facsimile: 415.986.2827

11 [Additional Counsel Listed on Next Page]

12 Attorneys for Defendants  
THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF  
13 CALIFORNIA and MICHAEL V. DRAKE

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
16 SOUTHERN DIVISION  
17

18 AARON KHERIATY, M.D.,  
19 Plaintiff,  
20 v.

21 THE REGENTS OF THE  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, a  
22 corporation, and MICHAEL V.  
DRAKE, in his official capacity as  
23 President of the UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA,  
24 Defendants.  
25

Case No. 8:21-cv-01367-JVS-KES

**[PROPOSED] ORDER DENYING  
PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Date: September 27, 2021  
Time: 1:30 pm  
Ctrm.: Courtroom 10C  
Judge: Hon. James V. Selna

1 CHARLES F. ROBINSON (SBN 113197)  
charles.robinson@ucop.edu  
2 NORMAN J. HAMILL (SBN 154272)  
norman.hamill@ucop.edu  
3 KATHARINE ESSICK (SBN 219426)  
katharine.essick@ucop.edu  
4 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
Office of General Counsel  
5 1111 Franklin Street, 8th Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607  
6 Telephone: 510.987.9800  
Facsimile: 510.987.9757  
7

8 Attorneys for Defendants  
THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF  
CALIFORNIA AND MICHAEL V. DRAKE  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Docket No. 15) came before the Court on September 27, 2021.

Having considered Plaintiff’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction, including all papers filed in support of and in opposition to the motion and the arguments of counsel, the Court **DENIES** the motion in its entirety because (a) Plaintiff does not have Article III standing; (b) Plaintiff is not likely to prevail on his Fourteenth Amendment Claims on rational basis review; and (c) the balance of the equities tip heavily in favor of Defendants. Accordingly, Plaintiff has failed to establish the required factors for such extraordinary relief.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2021

\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. James V. Selna  
United States District Judge