

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

WILLIAM M. BRYSON, Jr.,
Plaintiff,
v.
SUSAN B. GERSON,
Defendant.

Case No. 1:13-cv-0879-LJO-MJS
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER
(ECF No. 2)

On June 10, 2013, William M. Bryson ("Plaintiff"), a prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed an action under the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552 ("FOIA"). (Compl., ECF 1.) On March 7, 2014, the Court found that Plaintiff had stated a claim under FOIA against Defendant Gerson. (ECF No. 9.)

Plaintiff had earlier, on June 24, 2013, filed a motion for a protective order. (Mot., ECF No. 2.) There Plaintiff alleged that prison staff had removed his property, opened his legal mail, failed to address his grievances, subjected him to additional security searches, and refused to mail some of his legal mail. (Mot. at 2-4.) Plaintiff asked the Court to order the warden to stop taking Plaintiff's legal materials and to prevent the warden from placing Plaintiff in special housing. (Mot. at 4.)

1 The Court's jurisdiction is limited to the parties before it in this action and to
2 Plaintiff's claim arising from the government's failure to respond to Plaintiff's FOIA
3 request. See e.g., Steel Co. v. Citizens for a Better Env't, 523 U.S. 83, 103-04, 118
4 S.Ct. 1003 (1998) (“[The] triad of injury in fact, causation, and redressability constitutes
5 the core of Article III’s case-or-controversy requirement, and the party invoking federal
6 jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing its existence.”) (citation omitted); American
7 Civil Liberties Union of Nevada v. Masto, 670 F.3d 1046, 1061-62 (9th Cir. 2012)
8 (“[F]ederal courts may adjudicate only actual, ongoing cases or controversies.”) (citation
9 and internal quotation marks omitted). The Court does not have jurisdiction to direct the
10 warden, who is not a party to this action, to stop subjecting Plaintiff to certain actions
11 which are not the subject of Plaintiff’s lawsuit.

12 Accordingly, since the Court does not have the jurisdiction to grant Plaintiff his
13 requested relief, Plaintiff’s motion (ECF No. 2) is DENIED without prejudice.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: March 17, 2014

17 /s/ Michael J. Seng
18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE