

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA**

SOVEREIGN IÑUPIAT FOR A LIVING
ARCTIC, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
et al.,

Defendants.

and

CONOCOPHILLIPS ALASKA, INC.,
et al.,

Intervenor-Defendants.

Case No. 3:23-cv-00058-SLG

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EXPEDITE AND DENYING PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR INJUNCTION PENDING APPEAL**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' Motion for Injunction Pending Appeal (Docket 76) and Plaintiffs' Motion to Expedite Consideration of their Motion for an Injunction Pending Appeal (Docket 77). Upon due consideration, the motion to expedite at Docket 77 is GRANTED.

“The standard for evaluating an injunction pending appeal is similar to that employed by district courts in deciding whether to grant a preliminary injunction.”¹ Therefore, the Court DENIES the motion for an injunction pending appeal at Docket 76 for the reasons provided in the Court’s Order Regarding Motions for Temporary Restraining Order and Preliminary Injunction (Docket 74).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 4th day of April, 2023 at Anchorage, Alaska.

/s/ Sharon L. Gleason
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ *Feldman v. Arizona Sec’y of State’s Office*, 843 F.3d 366, 367 (9th Cir. 2016) (first citing *Lopez v. Heckler*, 713 F.2d 1432, 1435 (9th Cir. 1983); and then citing *Southeast Alaska Conservation Council v. U.S. Army Corps of Eng’rs*, 472 F.3d 1097, 1100 (9th Cir. 2006)).