

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**

WILSON GORRELL,)	Case No.: 1:12-cv-0554 - JLT
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR
)	HAIR ANALYSIS TOXICOLOGICAL TESTING
v.)	AND ADMINISTRATION OF POLYGRAPH
)	EXAMINATION
THOMAS SNEATH, et al.,)	
)	(Doc. 99)
Defendants.)	

Wilson Gorrell (“Plaintiff”) requests that the Court order the Bureau of Prisons to (1) “[t]ake a hair sample for testing for THC metabolites by a lab designated by the Court” and (2) [d]esignate a polygraph examination agency to conduct a polygraph to include questions submitted by Defendants pertinent to the issue of any use of THC by the Plaintiff while in custody of the [Bureau of Prisons].” (Doc. 99 at 2).

Significantly, the Bureau of Prisons is not a party in this action, and the Court does not have jurisdiction over non-parties in this action. *See Porter v. Jennings*, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 146198 at *3-4 (E.D. Cal. Dec. 20, 2011) (denying the plaintiff’s request that the Court order the California Department of Corrections (“CDCR”) permit a state-certified polygraph examination in part because the CDCR was not a party to the action and the Court lacked the jurisdiction to require the CDCR to act). Moreover, the Court cannot expend public funds without authorization by Congress. *Id.*, at *3 (citing *Tedder v. Odel*, 890 F.2d 210, 211-12 (9th Cir. 1989); *United States v. MacCollom*, 426 U.S.

1 317, 321, (1976)). Because Congress has not authorized funds for testing such as requested by
2 Plaintiff, his requests cannot be granted.

3 Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED**: Plaintiff's motion for hair analysis toxicological
4 testing and administration of a polygraph examination (Doc. 99) is **DENIED**.

5
6 IT IS SO ORDERED.

7 Dated: September 16, 2013

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE