

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 00-60527
Summary Calendar

CHARLES LAVEL STRINGER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

UNKNOWN MCDANIELS; RON TILLMAN; ORAN PAGE; BARBARA DUNN;
CITY OF JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI; POLICE DEPARTMENT OF
THE CITY OF JACKSON, MISSISSIPPI,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Mississippi
USDC No. 3:99-CV-686-WS

March 21, 2001

Before JOLLY, SMITH, and DUHÉ, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:¹

Charles Lavel Stringer has filed a 42 U.S.C. § 1985 civil rights lawsuit alleging that the defendants conspired to violate his constitutional rights by arresting him pending his payment of a 1984 fine and preventing him from appealing the arrest order. He now appeals the district court's interlocutory order denying his motion for a preliminary injunction ordering the defendants to reimburse him for the \$450 fine payment.

¹ Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

A movant seeking a preliminary injunction must establish four factors: "(1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, (2) a substantial threat that failure to grant the injunction will result in irreparable injury, (3) the threatened injury outweighs any damage that the injunction may cause the opposing party, and (4) the injunction will not disserve the public interest." Lakedreams v. Taylor, 932 F.2d 1103, 1107 (5th Cir. 1991). Because a preliminary injunction is an extraordinary and drastic remedy, the movant must carry his burden of persuasion "by a clear showing." Mazurek v. Armstrong, 520 U.S. 968, 972 (1997) (citation omitted).

Stringer failed to make a clear showing of the four required factors. Therefore, the district court did not abuse its discretion in denying his motion for a preliminary injunction. See Lakedreams, 932 F.2d at 1107.

AFFIRMED.