7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
DENELL CAVER,	Case No. 1:11-cv-01025-AWI-SKO (PC)
Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER
v.	AND REQUESTING DEFENDANTS' COUNSEL PROVIDE A STATUS REPORT
E. GOMEZ, et al.,	WITHIN FIFTEEN DAYS
Defendants.	(Doc. 100)
15	
Plaintiff Denell Caver ("Plaintiff"), a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma	
pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 on June 20, 2011. This action	
18 is proceeding on Plaintiff's second amended complaint, filed on April 10, 2012, against	
19 Defendants Gomez, Stark, and Garcia ("Defendants") for acting with deliberate indifference to	
20 Plaintiff's safety, in violation of the Eighth Amendment of the United States Constitution. Jury	
trial is scheduled for February 9, 2016.	
On September 17, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking a temporary restraining order	
requiring prison officials at California State Prison-Corcoran provide him with access to his legal	
property. <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff represents that all of his property, including his legal material, was confiscated,	
preventing him from preparing for the upcoming trial. Defendants did not file a response. Local	
Rule $230(l)$ .	
	EASTERN DISTRIC DENELL CAVER, Plaintiff, v. E. GOMEZ, et al., Defendants. / Plaintiff Denell Caver ("Plaintiff"), a se pauperis, filed this civil rights action pursuant to is proceeding on Plaintiff's second amended Defendants Gomez, Stark, and Garcia ("Defend Plaintiff's safety, in violation of the Eighth Ame trial is scheduled for February 9, 2016. On September 17, 2015, Plaintiff filed requiring prison officials at California State Priso property. <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff represents that all of his prope preventing him from preparing for the upcoming

<sup>28 &</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The analysis for a temporary restraining order is substantially identical to that for a preliminary injunction. *Stuhlbarg Intern. Sales Co., Inc. v. John D. Brush and Co., Inc.*, 240 F.3d 832, 839 n.7 (9th Cir. 2001).

Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of America, 511 U.S. 375, 377, 114 S.Ct. 1673 (1994), and the Court lacks jurisdiction to issue any orders regarding Plaintiff's current conditions of confinement, including access to legal property, 18 U.S.C. § 3626(a)(1)(A); Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61, 112 S.Ct. 2130 (1992); Summers v. Earth Island Institute, 555 U.S. 488, 493, 129 S.Ct. 1142, 1149 (2009); Mayfield v. United States, 599 F.3d 964, 969 (9th Cir. 2010). However, Plaintiff's need to prepare for trial requires some accommodation from prison officials. See Blaisdell v. Frappiea, 729 F.3d 1237, 1243-44 (9th Cir. 2013); Silva v. Di Vittorio, 658 F.3d 1090, 1101 (9th Cir. 2011). Therefore, Defendants' counsel is requested to contact the Litigation Coordinator regarding Plaintiff's ability to access his legal material for this case and to file a status report within fifteen days. The Court notes that Plaintiff already filed his pretrial statement and a motion seeking the attendance of two inmate witnesses.

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order is HEREBY DENIED for
lack of jurisdiction, and within **fifteen (15) days** from the date of service of this order,
Defendants' counsel SHALL file a status report in compliance with this order.

IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: October 19, 2015 SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE