

receiving medical evaluation and simply disagrees with his doctor's treatment decision. As such, he has not demonstrated any likelihood of success on the merits of his newly minted claim against this physician. *See Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 102 (1976) (finding that Eighth Amendment claim requires showing of deliberate indifference to serious medical need); *Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008) (authorizing interlocutory injunctive relief only if plaintiff demonstrates, among other things, "that he is likely to succeed on the merits"). Finally, Kinard's current request for interlocutory injunctive relief is not properly filed in this civil action, as it is not directed at the current defendants. For these reasons, Kinard's request for interlocutory relief will be denied.¹

A separate order will be entered.

DATED: October 22, 2014

/s/ James P. Jones
United States District Judge

¹ Kinard's prior motion seeking sanctions and interlocutory injunctive relief to obtain a particular medical procedure (ECF No. 51) must also be denied for the same reasons.