

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

ANTHONY JOHNSON,

CASE NO. 1:09-cv-1264-AWI-BAM PC

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR  
A COURT ORDER

v.

L. GONZALEZ, et al.,

(ECF No. 79)

Defendants.

Plaintiff Anthony Johnson (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On January 9, 2012, an order issued adopting the findings and recommendations and granting Defendants’ motion for summary judgment. (ECF No. 77.) Judgment was entered and this action was closed. (ECF No. 78.) On January 10, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion for a court order allowing him daily access to the law library. (ECF No. 79.)

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and the Court is bound by the requirement that as a preliminary matter, it have before it an actual case or controversy. City of Los Angeles v. Lyons, 461 U.S. 95, 102 (1983); Valley Forge Christian Coll. v. Ams. United for Separation of Church and State, Inc., 454 U.S. 464, 471 (1982). If the Court does not have an actual case or controversy before it, it has no power to hear the matter in question. Id. The case or controversy requirement cannot be met in light of the fact that judgment has been entered in favor of Defendants and the case has been closed. Because this case has been closed, the case-or-controversy requirement is not met such that this action provides no basis upon which this court can issue the

1 requested order.

2           Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for a court order, filed January 10, 2012, is HEREBY  
3 DENIED.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: April 27, 2012

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28