

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

NORMAN GERALD DANIELS III,

Plaintiff,

v.

R. TOLSON, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:13-cv-00202-AWI-SKO PC

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
“PRIORITY LEGAL USER” STATUS

(Doc. 34)

Plaintiff Norman Gerald Daniels III, a state prisoner, is proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil action brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12132, the Americans with Disabilities Act (“ADA”). On October 5, 2015, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking “Priority Legal User” status for the duration of this case.

The Court is well aware of the challenges faced by prison officials and prisoners relating to the allocation of resources, and law library access and other issues related to litigation are taken into consideration when granting extensions of time. The Court cannot, however, grant Plaintiff “Priority Legal User” status. The Court lacks jurisdiction to do so and additionally, federal courts must refrain from interfering with the day-to-day management of prisons, a category in which determinations regarding law library access squarely fall. *Bell v. Wolfish*, 441 U.S. 520, 546-47, 99 S.Ct. 1861, 1878 (1979); *Griffin v. Gomez*, 741 F.3d 10, 20-1 (9th Cir. 2014); *see also Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Research, Inc.*, 395 U.S. 100, 110, 89 S.Ct. 1562 (1969) (“a court has no power to adjudicate a personal claim or obligation unless it has jurisdiction over the person of the

1 defendant”); *Zepeda v. United States Immigration Service*, 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1985) (a
2 the federal court “may not attempt to determine the rights of persons not before the court.”).

3 Accordingly, Plaintiff’s motion for “Priority Legal User” status is HEREBY DENIED.

4
5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: October 6, 2015

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
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