1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2	DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
3	ABBY BUCHMILLER, ET AL.) 22-CV-7221-MAS
4	Plaintiff)
5	VS.)
6	KRANNICH SOLAR WEST) Trenton, NJ
7) December 15, 2022 Defendant) 9:30 a.m.
8	ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE/TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER HEARING
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. SHIPP UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT SUDGE
11	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography Transcript produced by computer-aided transcription
12	rranscript produced by computer-arded transcription
13	APPEARANCES:
14	
15	For Plaintiff DAVID GRAFF, ESQUIRE Buchmiller, et al.: JOHN G. McCARTHY, ESQUIRE
16	GRAFF SILVERSTEIN, LLP 3 Middle Patent Road
17	Armonk, NY 10504 914-844-5939
18	714 044 3737
19	For Intervenor Plaintiff BENJAMIN P. THOMAS, ESQUIRE Roseburg: 102 South 200 East, Suite 800
20	Salt Lake City, Utah 84111 801-532-7080
21	001 332 7000
22	SHANNAN GAGLIARDI, RDR, CRR
23	OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER U.S. DISTRICT COURT, DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
24	402 East State Street, Suite 3090 Trenton, NJ 08608
25	(609) 815-2750

Case 3:22-cv-07221-RK-TJB Document 21 Filed 12/20/22 Page 2 of 11 PageID: 196

For the Defendant: CLAYTON D. HARVEY, ESQUIRE SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP 1301 Avenue of the Americas 21st Floor New York, NY 10019 212-907-9733

```
(PROCEEDINGS held via teleconferencing before the
 1
          Honorable Michael A. Shipp, United States District Judge,
 2
 3
          at 9:30 a.m.)
               THE COURT: Okay. Good morning, Counsel. This is
 4
 5
     the matter of Buchmiller, et al., versus Krannich Solar West,
     Docket No. 22-7221.
 6
 7
               Who is on the line for the plaintiff?
               MR. GRAFF: Your Honor, this is David Graff from
 8
     Graff Silverstein for the plaintiffs.
 9
10
               THE COURT: Good morning.
11
               And who is on for the defendants?
12
               MR. HARVEY: Clayton Harvey from Smith, Gambrell &
13
     Russell.
14
               MR. McCARTHY: John McCarthy from Smith, Gambrell &
15
     Russell. As I told your clerk earlier, my application for
16
     admission for pro hac vice was filed last night, and it's
17
     consented to.
18
               THE COURT: Okay. That's not going to be a problem.
19
     Thank you for letting me know.
20
               Who is on for, I guess it's the intervenor here?
21
     There's another party I have here.
22
               MR. THOMAS: Ben Thomas, attorney for Amanda
23
     Roseburg.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Is there anyone else on the line
25
     today?
```

Okay. So, folks, we are here and we're on the record in the matter of Buchmiller, et al. So at this juncture I have received your papers. I'm holding this telephonic conference just to discuss any application for the order to show cause and the temporary restraining order, which was filed on December 11. (See generally Pls.' Moving Br., ECF No. 4-1.)

The complaint in this matter was also filed on that day. (Compl., ECF No. 1.)

As a preliminary matter, the Court is in receipt of third-party Amanda Roseburg's petition to join as a plaintiff to the complaint and to the motion for order to show cause which was filed yesterday. (ECF No. 17.)

I take it that there's no issue or any opposition to the Roseburg application. Let me hear from Mr. Graff and the folks from Smith Gambrell.

Any opposition?

MR. GRAFF: No opposition, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. We'll proceed and I'll go ahead and allow Roseburg to join this order to show cause and complaint as a plaintiff.

This is plaintiffs' application, and the burden is on the plaintiffs to demonstrate why they're entitled to injunctive relief. I've received your papers.

Is there anything else that I need to know about or anything else you want to say that's not in your papers for the

```
plaintiff? I don't want to have a full-blown oral argument
 1
 2
    here. I just want to know if there's anything else you need to
 3
     add or if there's anything that may not have been fully
              This would be your opportunity.
 4
 5
              MR. GRAFF: Your Honor, you reviewed both -- I just
 6
     want to be clear. You reviewed the verified complaint,
 7
     Exhibits 1 through 10, the order to show cause, the brief in
     support of the order to show cause, the two declarations that I
 8
 9
     subsequently submitted, and the letter brief that was submitted
     yesterday by the plaintiffs?
10
11
               THE COURT: Yes. And so I take it then with all
     that, you don't have anything further to add?
12
13
               MR. GRAFF: I do not, Your Honor. I have nothing
     further to add at this time.
14
15
               THE COURT: Okay. How about the defendants, defense
16
     counsel?
17
              MR. McCARTHY: Your Honor, it's Mr. McCarthy, if I
     may. So the only thing -- our understanding is, Your Honor,
18
19
     that the only issue this morning, the only issue is on the TRO.
20
               THE COURT: The TRO.
21
               MR. McCARTHY: Right. So in addition to what we said
22
     in our letter motion, we would just like to inform you about
23
     the current schedule in front of the arbitrator. The parties
     have previously consented that the -- there was a deadline this
24
25
     Friday, tomorrow, to submit witness statements and expert
```

reports. The parties have previously consented to stay that deadline.

And then there's a procedural conference scheduled next week with the arbitrator on the 21st to discuss prehearing briefs and dispositive motions and at this point to discuss when the statements and expert reports are due.

After that, the next date on the current schedule for the arbitration is January 6, which is supplemental witness statements. And then I think it's already in the papers that the full evidentiary hearing is not scheduled until the end of January.

I understand that Your Honor has been provided with a copy of the arbitrator's determination regarding jurisdiction.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. McCARTHY: Okay. So then it's our view that there's, well, first, as we said in our letter, cannot find any authority and the plaintiff has not provided --

THE COURT: Counsel, I don't want to rehash what's already in your letter.

MR. McCARTHY: Okay. So the only thing I have to add was just the schedule. There's nothing, in the time that we would likely brief this preliminary injunction application, there's no irreparable harm that would come to the plaintiffs by a participation in arbitration over the next few weeks.

MR. GRAFF: Your Honor, may I briefly respond to

that?

THE COURT: This is what I did not want to happen,

Counsel. I had made very clear that I received your papers. I

don't want to have a reargument on it. If there's something

succinct that you want to say, I'm happy, but this is not a

full-blown oral argument. I've looked at these papers already,

and I'm pretty clear on what's at issue here. It is a very

narrow issue. It's not the entire case. So I think we're in

good enough shape that we're not going to just go back and

forth on things that you may not agree upon. The Court is

aware. It's not lost on me that you don't agree on everything.

MR. GRAFF: Your Honor --

THE COURT: Who is speaking?

MR. GRAFF: This is David Graff. I have nothing further to add.

THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. Thomas, I take it that you don't need to be heard.

MR. THOMAS: That's correct. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Folks, then let me go ahead. After reviewing the papers, I've had a chance to pull together an opinion on this, and for the sake of time, I'm not going to read any citations or footnotes. Those certainly will be included in the transcript if you should choose to order it.

Of course everyone knows that preliminary injunctive relief is an extraordinary remedy and it should be granted only

in limited circumstances. Kos Pharms., Inc. v. Andrx Corp.,
369 F.3d 700, 708 (3d Cir. 2004) (quoting American Tel. &Tel.
Co. v. Winback & Conserve Program, Inc., 42 F.3d 1421, 1427 (3d Cir. 1994)).

In deciding to issue temporary restraints or preliminary injunction, the Court must weigh four factors:

First, whether the movant has shown a reasonable probability of success on the merits; second, whether the movant will be irreparably injured by denial of the relief; third, whether granting preliminary relief will result in even greater harm to the nonmoving party; and fourth, whether granting the preliminary relief will be in the public's interest. Gerardi v. Pelullo, 16 F.3d 1363, 1373 (3d Cir. 1994).

Plaintiffs bear the burden of showing that the factors weigh in favor of granting the injunction. Kos Pharms. Inc., 369 F.3d at 708. While all four factors are important, failure to show either likelihood of success on the merits or irreparable harm must necessarily result in a denial of the preliminary injunction. N.A.A.C.P. v. N. Hudson Reg'l Fire & Rescue, 707 F. Supp. 2d 520, 542 (D.N.J. 2010) (quoting In re Arthur Treacher's Franchisee Litigation, 689 F.2d 1137, 1143 (3d Cir. 1982)).

The irreparable harm requirement is met if a plaintiff demonstrates a significant risk that he or she will experience harm that cannot adequately be compensated for after

the fact by monetary damages. Adams v. Freedom Forge Corp., 204 F.3d 475, 484-85 (3d Cir. 2000). See Frank's GMC Truck Center, Inc., 847 F.2d 102-03 (3d Cir. 1988). The burden is a difficult one to meet because economic loss does not constitute irreparable harm. Acierno v. New Castle County, 40 F.3d 645, 653 (3d Cir. 1994).

Irreparable harm connotes that which cannot be repaired, retrieved, put down again, or atoned for. Id. (citations omitted). Moreover, the harm must also be immediate. See Quad/Tech, Inc. v. Q.I. Press Controls B.V., 701 F. Supp. 2d 644, 655 (E.D. Pa. 2010) ("In order to make this showing [of irreparable harm], the movant must clearly show 'immediate irreparable harm,' rather than a risk of harm.") (quoting Campbell Soup Co. v. ConAgra, Inc., 977 F.2d 86, 92 (3d Cir. 1992)).

Here, the Court finds that plaintiffs have failed to meet this burden. The pleadings fail to demonstrate that the alleged injury — of plaintiffs having to submit to various processes in the arbitration, such as the submission of sworn statements and legal arguments — constitute irreparable harm. (Pls.' Moving Br. 12.) Plaintiffs have already spent over ten months participating in arbitration, and, with that, all parties have already spent ample time and resources on this matter. (Graff Dec. Ex. 2, Arbitrator Jurisd. Op. 14, ECF No. 11.)

Indeed, as the parties are undoubtedly aware, the arbitrator in this underlying dispute has already written a pretty lengthy opinion finding that he does have jurisdiction over the dispute, an opinion which the Court finds at this juncture just to be persuasive. (See generally id.) Only now, about a month away from the commencement of the final evidentiary hearing, perhaps in light of other recent unfavorable decisions by the arbitrator, do plaintiffs seek emergency relief in this court claiming that they are in imminent danger of continued and complete deprivation of their rights to the court system. (Pls.' Moving Br. 3.) The Court also notes that plaintiffs have failed to cite any cases in which a New Jersey district court has granted a TRO to stay an ongoing arbitration proceeding. (Pls.' Moving Br. 3.)

Given that a preliminary injunction is an extraordinary remedy and plaintiffs' burden to prove, the Court finds that the plaintiffs failed to meet their burden.

In addition, the Court finds that any questions on this matter with respect to the existence, scope, or validity of the arbitration agreement are not appropriate for resolution on TRO application. Thus, at this stage, the Court declines to intervene and, accordingly, denies plaintiffs' request to stay and immediately enjoin the ongoing arbitral proceeding.

Because plaintiffs cannot meet their burden to prove irreparable harm, the Court need not run through the other

Plaintiffs' application for an order to show cause factors. and temporary restraints is denied for failure to allege the requisite irreparable harm. That's how I look at it, that's my decision, and that's all we have for today. Thank you, Counsel. (Proceedings adjourned at 9:40 a.m.) CERTIFICATE I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. /s/Shannan Gagliardi 12/20/22 Shannan Gagliardi