

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

JASON R. PEZANT,

Plaintiff,

v.

F. GONZALEZ, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 1:11-cv-564-BAM PC

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

(ECF No. 9)

Plaintiff Jason R. Pezant is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed this action on April 6, 2011. By separate order the Court has dismissed Plaintiff’s complaint for failure to comply with Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 8 and 18. Currently before the Court is Plaintiff’s motion for a temporary restraining order, filed August 12, 2011.

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction and in considering a request for injunctive relief, 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, 103 S.Ct. 1660, 1665 (1983); Valley Forge Christian Coll. v. Ams. United for Separation of Church and State, Inc., 454 U.S. 464, 471, 102 S.Ct. 752, 757-58 (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] triad of injury in fact, causation, and redressability constitutes the core of Article III’s case-or-controversy requirement, and the party invoking federal jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing its existence.” Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env’t, 523 U.S. 83, 103-04, 118 S.Ct. 1003 (1998). Requests for prospective relief are

