



1 requires that the Court find the “relief [sought] is narrowly drawn, extends no further than  
2 necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and is the least intrusive means necessary to  
3 correct the violation of the Federal right.”

4 Further, the pendency of this action does not give the Court jurisdiction over prison  
5 officials in general. *Summers v. Earth Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488, 492-93 (2009); *Mayfield v.*  
6 *United States*, 599 F.3d 964, 969 (9th Cir. 2010). The Court’s jurisdiction is limited to the parties  
7 in this action and to the cognizable legal claims upon which this action is proceeding. *Summers*,  
8 555 U.S. at 492-93; *Mayfield*, 599 F.3d at 969.

9 Plaintiff does not seek the temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction  
10 against any of the Defendants against whom he proceeds in this action. “A federal court may  
11 issue an injunction [only] if it has personal jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter  
12 jurisdiction over the claim; *it may not attempt to determine the rights of persons not before the*  
13 *court.*” *Zepeda v. United States Immigration Service*, 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1985)  
14 (emphasis added). Thus, Plaintiff’s motion must be denied for lack of jurisdiction over the  
15 “CDCR” whom Plaintiff states should stop making withdrawals from his trust account and must  
16 repay monies Plaintiff believes were wrongly withdrawn.

17 Plaintiff is not precluded from attempting to state cognizable claims in a new action if he  
18 believes his rights are being violated beyond the pleadings in this action. The issue is not that  
19 Plaintiff’s allegations are not serious, or that Plaintiff is not entitled to relief sought in the proper  
20 forum. However, Plaintiff’s accusations that monies are being wrongfully and excessively  
21 withdrawn from his trust account to pay this Court cannot and do not overcome what is a  
22 *jurisdictional* bar. *Steel Co.*, 523 U.S. at 103-04 (“[The] triad of injury in fact, causation, and  
23 redressability constitutes the core of Article III’s case-or-controversy requirement, and the party  
24 invoking federal jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing its existence.”) This action is  
25 simply not the proper vehicle for Plaintiff’s requested relief.<sup>1</sup>

---

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff’s motion also fails to make the requisite showing, supported by admissible evidence, to obtain a  
28 preliminary injunction. *Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20-4, 129 S.Ct. 365, 376  
(2008). It is, however, unnecessary to reach the merits of Plaintiff’s motions in light of the jurisdictional bar to his  
requested relief. *Summers*, 555 U.S. at 493, 129 S.Ct. at 1149; *Mayfield*, 599 F.3d at 969.

