

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TYRONE D. NEWMAN,
Plaintiff,
vs.
BRANDON, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:10-cv-00687 JLT (PC)
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF
(Doc. 17)

_____ /

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis with a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On July 18, 2011, Plaintiff filed a motion complaining that officials are opening the mail sent to him from the court. (Doc. 17 at 1-2.) Plaintiff seeks “an order informing [the California Department and Rehabilitation] and Avenal State Prison that this plaintiff’s mail from this Court is ‘official legal mail.’” (Doc. 17 at 3.)

The Prison Litigation Reform Act places restrictions on injunctive relief. It states, in relevant part: “Prospective relief in any civil action with respect to prison conditions shall extend no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right of a particular plaintiff or plaintiffs.” 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(1)(A). There is no violation of a federal right here. Plaintiff is advised that mail sent from the court is not legal mail. See Keenan v. Hall, 83 F.3d 1083, 1094 (9th Cir. 1996) (“Mail from the courts, as contrasted to mail from a prisoner’s lawyer, is not legal mail.”). And, the opening of and inspection of non-legal mail by prison officials does not violate an inmate’s constitutional rights. See

1 Smith v. Boyd, 945 F.2d 1041, 1043 (9th Cir. 1991).

2 Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's July 18, 2011 motion for injunctive
3 relief (Doc. 17) is **DENIED**.

4

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: July 27, 2011

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28