



1 Amended Complaint, apparently to add as defendants, every physician within the CDCR who  
2 sees Plaintiff for his cervical spine issue as “successors, agents, and employees” of CDCR and the  
3 current Defendants in this action. (Doc. 36.) In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. §  
4 636(b)(1)(C), this Court has conducted a *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed  
5 the entire file, the Court finds the Findings and Recommendations to be supported by the record  
6 and by proper analysis.

7 **I. F&R**

8 The F&R explained that Plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief arises from events which  
9 occurred at the Substance Abuse Treatment Facility (“SATF”) in Corcoran, California. Plaintiff  
10 is currently housed at the California Institution for Men (“CIM”) in Chino, California. Plaintiff’s  
11 motion for temporary restraining order seeks relief to remedy his conditions of confinement at  
12 SATF, it was rendered moot on his transfer to CIM. See Johnson v. Moore, 948 F.2d 517, 519  
13 (9th Cir. 1991). The Court will adopt the F&R and deny Plaintiff’s motion for injunctive relief.

14 **II. Amendment/Supplemental Joinder**

15 Plaintiff essentially seeks to join medical providers at CMI to this action, even though this  
16 case involves medical care at SATF. That is, he seeks to join new defendants, for conduct that  
17 occurred at a different location, and at a different time period from the events of this case. Cf.  
18 Easter v. CDC, 694 F.Supp.2d 1177, 1191 (S.D. Cal. 2010) (finding claims were insufficiently  
19 related to be joined in a single complaint where “different location, time period, and defendants”  
20 were attempted to be included in an amended complaint). A plaintiff may not bring unrelated  
21 claims against unrelated parties in a single action. Fed. R. Civ. P. 18(a), 20(a)(2); Owens v.  
22 Hinsley, 635 F.3d 950, 952 (7th Cir. 2011); George v. Smith, 507 F.3d 605, 607 (7th Cir. 2007);  
23 Easter, 694 F.Supp.2d at 1191. Because Rules 18 and 20 would be violated if the Court were to  
24 grant Plaintiff’s motion, the Court will deny Plaintiff’s motion to amend/join.

25 Nevertheless, Plaintiff is not prohibited from filing a new and separate action if he is able  
26 to state a cognizable claim based on the medical care and treatment that he is receiving at CMI.  
27 Plaintiff may not add any such claims to this action.

28

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

**ORDER**

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. The Findings and Recommendations, issued on May 15, 2017 (Doc. 35), are adopted in full;
2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief, filed on May 10, 2017 (Doc. 32) is DENIED; and
3. Plaintiff's motion in his objections, to supplement the First Amended Complaint to add unidentified medical providers at CMI and Defendants' "successors, agents, and employees, and all employees and all other persons acting in concert and participation with them," is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: June 27, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE