UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

C.G. *a minor, by and through her Parents, and next friends*, P.G. *and* D.G. Plaintiffs,	:	
v.	:	No. 5:21-cv-03956
SAUCON VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT, Defendant.	:	

O R D E R

AND NOW, this 8th day of September, 2021, upon consideration of the Plaintiffs' Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 3, Plaintiffs' memorandum in support of their motion, ECF No. 4, Defendant's response to Plaintiffs' motion, ECF No. 6, and after a telephone conference on this date,[1] during which the parties presented oral arguments on the motion, **IT IS ORDERED THAT:**

Plaintiffs' Emergency Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, ECF No. 3, is **DENIED**.[2]

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Joseph F. Leeson, Jr.
JOSEPH F. LEESON, JR.
United States District Judge

[1] Attorney Morris Anthony Scott, Esquire, participated on behalf of Plaintiffs, and Attorney Timothy E. Gilsbach, Esquire, participated on behalf of Defendant.

[2] "The purpose of a temporary restraining order is to maintain the status quo during litigation to determine the merits of a case for permanent injunction." *Winward v. Hill*, No. CIV. A. 92-1227, 1992 WL 184313, at *1 (E.D. Pa. July 24, 1992). In this case, Plaintiffs ask the court to order the Defendant to allow her to attend school with a service animal, something she has never done before. In other words, "Plaintiff is not seeking to have the status quo maintained but instead is asking the court to alter the status quo on an emergency basis." *Id*. For this reason, a temporary restraining order is not appropriate for this case. *See Arrow Transp. Co. v. S. Ry. Co*., 83 S. Ct. 3, 4 (1962) (explaining that a temporary restraining order was issued "to maintain the status quo").