



1 intrusive means necessary to correct the violation of the Federal Right.”

2 Similarly, the pendency of this action does not give the Court jurisdiction over prison  
3 officials in general. *Summers v. Earth Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488, 492-93 (2009); *Mayfield v.*  
4 *United States*, 599 F.3d 964, 969 (9th Cir. 2010). The Court’s jurisdiction is limited to the parties  
5 in this action and to the cognizable legal claims upon which this action is proceeding. *Summers*,  
6 555 U.S. at 492-93; *Mayfield*, 599 F.3d at 969. The Court cannot order prison personnel in  
7 general to engage in, or refrain from specific acts.

8 Plaintiff is not precluded from attempting to state cognizable claims in a new action if he  
9 believes his civil rights are being violated beyond his pleadings in this action. Even assuming  
10 Plaintiff’s allegations are serious and he is entitled to relief if sought in the proper forum, the  
11 seriousness of Plaintiff’s accusations concerning the accuracy of information in his mental health  
12 records cannot and do not overcome what is a *jurisdictional* bar. *Steel Co.*, 523 U.S. at 103-04  
13 (“[The] triad of injury in fact, causation, and redressability constitutes the core of Article III’s  
14 case-or-controversy requirement, and the party invoking federal jurisdiction bears the burden of  
15 establishing its existence.”) This action is simply not the proper vehicle for conveyance of the  
16 relief Plaintiff seeks.<sup>1</sup>

17 The claims which Plaintiff asserts in this action also arise from events that allegedly  
18 occurred at Substance Abuse Treatment Facility (“SATF”) in Corcoran, California. However,  
19 following the filing of this action, Plaintiff was transferred and is currently housed at the  
20 California State Prison in Corcoran, California (“CSP-Cor”). Plaintiff thus lacks standing in this  
21 action to seek relief directed at remedying his current conditions of confinement at CSP-Cor. To  
22 the extent his motion seeks relief to remedy past conditions of confinement for the time he was at  
23 SATF, it was rendered moot on his transfer to CSP-Cor. *See Dilley v. Gunn*, 64 F.3d 1365, 1368  
24 (9th Cir. 1995); *Johnson v. Moore*, 948 F.2d 517, 519 (9th Cir. 1991). Thus, Plaintiff’s motion  
25 for a preliminary injunction must be denied. However, given the seriousness of Plaintiff’s  
26 allegations, the Wardens and Litigation Office at both facilities, SATF & CSP-Cor, are requested

---

27  
28 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s motion also fails to make the requisite showing, supported by admissible evidence, to obtain a preliminary injunction. *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20-4, 129 S.Ct. 365, 376 (2008). However, it is unnecessary to reach the merits of Plaintiff’s motions in light of the fact that the jurisdictional issue is fatal to his requests for relief. *Summers*, 555 U.S. at 493, 129 S.Ct. at 1149; *Mayfield*, 599 F.3d at 969.

1 to look into the issue and ensure that custody staff are not placing inaccurate information in  
2 Plaintiff's mental health records.

3 Accordingly, it is **HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief, filed  
4 on June 5, 2017, Doc. 16), is **DENIED** as moot and for lack of jurisdiction, and the Clerk of the  
5 Court is directed to forward a copy of this order and Plaintiff's motion to the Warden's office and  
6 to Litigation Coordinator at SATF and at CSP-Cor, so as to inform them of Plaintiff's concerns.

7  
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 Dated: June 6, 2017

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28