

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

RONALD DAVE RENTERIA,  
  
  Plaintiff,  
  
  v.  
  
MALDONADO, et al.,  
  
  Defendants.

**Case No. 1:17-cv-01451-LJO-JLT (PC)**  
  
**ORDER ADOPTING FINDINGS AND  
RECOMMENDATION IN FULL AND DENYING  
PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**  
  
**(Docs. 3, 13)**

Plaintiff, Ronald Dave Renteria, is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* in this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 302. On August 2, 2018, the Magistrate Judge filed a Findings and Recommendation which was served on Plaintiff and contained notice that objections were to be filed within twenty-one days. Plaintiff complied and filed timely objections. (Doc. 16.)

In his objections, Plaintiff argues that “there hasn’t been anything done by prison officials to ensure that” mistreatment he has allegedly been subjected to for nearly two decades at various facilities “would not continue.” (*Id.* p. 5.) However, it is Plaintiff’s duty on moving for injunctive relief to show that he is under concrete and particularized threat of suffering an injury, not for prison officials to ensure cessation of the circumstances of which Plaintiff complains. Further, Plaintiff contends that he has been subjected to unconstitutional circumstances at various facilities since 1990 and argues that, based on such historical events, his request for injunctive relief was not rendered moot by his transfer to RJD, but rather is capable of repetition yet evading

1 review. (*Id.*) However, Plaintiff fails to show any basis to overcome his lack of standing for  
2 injunctive relief based on events that occurred at CSP-Cor, since he is now housed at RJD --  
3 which as noted in the Findings and Recommendation, is requisite to show imminent threat of  
4 injury to establish Plaintiff's standing for preliminary injunctive relief. *See Summers v. Earth*  
5 *Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488, 493-94 (2009); *Mayfield v. United States*, 599 F.3d 964, 969 (9th  
6 Cir. 2010).

7 In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C), the Court has conducted a  
8 *de novo* review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the Court finds the  
9 Findings and Recommendation to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 11 1. The Findings and Recommendation, filed on August 2, 2018 (Doc. 13), is adopted  
12 in full; and
- 13 2. Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief, filed on October 27, 2017 (Doc. 3) is  
14 DENIED for lack of standing.

15  
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 Dated: September 5, 2018

/s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill  
UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE