

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  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID W. WILSON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
CALIFORNIA STATE PRISON  
CORCORAN, *et al.*,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:18-cv-00424-DAD-JDP  
ORDER REGARDING PLAINTIFF’S  
PROPOSED ORDER RE EMERGENCY  
ENFORCEMENT PROTECTION  
  
(Doc. No. 8)

Plaintiff David W. Wilson is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On June 8, 2018, plaintiff filed a “motion for emergency enforcement with and protection with sanctions . . . .” (Doc. No. 6.) The court could not discern the specific relief sought in this filing and so denied it without prejudice. (Doc. No. 7.) The court granted plaintiff leave to refile and directed that in any refiled motion plaintiff should describe with specificity the grounds for relief and the relief sought.

Plaintiff has not refiled a motion. Instead, he has filed a proposed order regarding “emergency enforcement protection.” (Doc. No. 8.) Although still difficult to decipher, the proposed order states that plaintiff seeks to be removed from “G.P. Level 2, 3” and to have the air temperature in his prison facility lowered. Plaintiff appears to be seeking injunctive relief. If so, he must refile his motion as a motion for injunctive relief under Rule 65 of the Federal Rules of

1 Civil Procedure.<sup>1</sup> If plaintiff files such a motion, the court will issue findings and  
2 recommendations addressing whether the requested relief should be granted or denied.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4  
5 Dated: July 3, 2018

  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> The court provided the legal standard for obtaining injunctive relief in its June 15, 2018 order.  
(Doc. No. 7, at 2 n.2.)