

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SMART APPROACHES TO MARIJUANA
et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROBERT F. KENNEDY, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:26-cv-1081 (TNM)

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ motion for a temporary restraining order. *See* ECF No. 3. A temporary restraining order is an “extraordinary and drastic remedy,” so the standard for issuing one is “very high.” *RCM Techs., Inc. v. Beacon Hill Staffing Grp., LLC*, 502 F. Supp. 2d 70, 72–73 (D.D.C. 2007) (cleaned up). A party seeking a temporary restraining order must make a “clear showing that four factors, taken together, warrant relief: likely success on the merits, likely irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, a balance of the equities in its favor, and accord with the public interest.” *See League of Women Voters of United States v. Newby*, 838 F.3d 1, 6 (D.C. Cir. 2016) (cleaned up).

Having considered the arguments in Plaintiffs’ motion and at a motions hearing, the Court finds that Plaintiffs have not met this high standard. The motion for a temporary restraining order is thus denied. The Court will consider Plaintiffs’ motion for a preliminary injunction and motion to stay upon the completion of briefing.

Dated: March 31, 2026

TREVOR N. McFADDEN, U.S.D.J.