

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

HORACE MANN WILLIAMS,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CATE, et al.,  
Defendants.

**Case No. 1:12-cv-00730-LJO-SKO (PC)**  
**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION  
TO DENY PLAINTIFF’S MOTIONS FOR  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**  
**(Doc. 102, 103)**  
**TWENTY-ONE (21) DAY DEADLINE**

On July 26, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking an order directing that two boxes of his legal materials which are stored at the California Substance Abuse Treatment Facility (“SATF”) be sent to him at his current facility of incarceration -- Mule Creek State Prison (“MCSP”). (Doc. 102.) On August 7, 2017, Plaintiff filed another motion in which he indicates that he has received one of the boxes of his legal materials from SATF, but that he needs the other one as well to prosecute this action. (Doc. 103.) Both of these motions are construed as seeking preliminary injunctive relief.

As a threshold matter, Plaintiff must establish that he has standing to seek preliminary injunctive relief. *Summers v. Earth Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488, 493-94, 129 S.Ct. 1142, 1149 (2009); *Mayfield v. United States*, 599 F.3d 964, 969 (9th Cir. 2010). Plaintiff “must show that he is under threat of suffering an ‘injury in fact’ that is concrete and particularized; the threat must be actual and imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical; it must be fairly traceable to challenged conduct of the defendant; and it must be likely that a favorable judicial decision will prevent or redress the injury.” *Summers*, 555 U.S. at 493 (citation and quotation marks omitted);

