

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY CRAYTON	)	1:07-CV-1318 OWW GSA
	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
	)	PROPERTY INVENTORY ORDER
v.	)	IN PART
	)	
ROCHESTER MEDICAL	)	(Document 179)
CORPORATION, a Minnesota corporation	)	
and JOHN DOE DISTRIBUTOR,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

On June 1, 2010, Plaintiff filed a document entitled, "Motion for Property Inventory Order." In this motion, Plaintiff requests that the Court order all individuals involved in the search of his property to provide him with a list of any and all documentation related to the search, the names of the parties involved, a list of all witnesses to the search, and a list of all of the property searched and property removed.<sup>1</sup> See, Doc. 164.

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's motion and denies it in part. As a preliminary matter, this Court has explained to Plaintiff that it has no authority over prison officials in this matter since no prison official is a named party in this action. See, Doc 164 at pg. 7 and 8. The Court

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's property was searched based on an order issued by this Court on May 5, 2010. The order allowed prison officials to search Plaintiff's property for the catheter and packaging at issue in this case. The Court placed several restrictions on the search, including a prohibition against prison officials reading any documents, books, or other information contained within Plaintiff's property. (Doc. 164).

1 cannot issue an order requiring prison officials to provide information related to the search  
2 because the Court lacks jurisdiction over officials at Kern Valley State Prison with respect to  
3 Plaintiff's current conditions of confinement. E.g., Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't, 523  
4 U.S. 83, 103-04, 118 S.Ct. 1003 (1998). However, the Court does have jurisdiction over  
5 Defendant. Accordingly, within five days of this action, Defendant shall file a status report  
6 indicating whether the catheter in question was obtained, as well as a list of all information or  
7 items obtained as a result of this Court's order issued on May 5, 2010. Defendant shall serve a  
8 copy of its response to this order on Plaintiff and file a proof of service establishing that the  
9 response has been served.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 **Dated: June 30, 2010**

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE