

1 extends no further than necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right, and is the least
2 intrusive means necessary to correct the violation of the Federal right.” The pendency of this
3 action does not give the Court jurisdiction over prison or jail officials in general or over the
4 conditions of Plaintiff’s confinement. *Summers v. Earth Island Institute*, 555 U.S. 488, 492-93
5 (2009); *Mayfield v. United States*, 599 F.3d 964, 969 (9th Cir. 2010). The Court’s jurisdiction is
6 limited to the parties in this action and to the cognizable legal claims upon which this action
7 proceeds. *Summers*, 555 U.S. at 492-93; *Mayfield*, 599 F.3d at 969.

8 Plaintiff does not seek a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction against
9 any of the Defendants in this action. “A federal court may issue an injunction [only] if it has
10 personal jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter jurisdiction over the claim; *it may not*
11 *attempt to determine the rights of persons not before the court.*” *Zepeda v. United States*
12 *Immigration Service*, 753 F.2d 719, 727 (9th Cir. 1985) (emphasis added). Thus, Plaintiff’s
13 motion must be denied for lack of jurisdiction over the jail staff whom Plaintiff contends refused
14 to make his requested copies for litigating this action.

15 Finally, the claims on which Plaintiff proceeds in this action arise from events that
16 allegedly occurred at the Madera County Jail. However, Plaintiff was recently transferred and is
17 currently housed at North Kern State Prison (NKSP). (Doc. 38.) Since Plaintiff’s motion seeks
18 relief to remedy his conditions of confinement for the time he was at the Madera County Jail, it
19 was rendered moot upon his transfer to NKSP. *See Dilley v. Gunn*, 64 F.3d 1365, 1368 (9th Cir.
20 1995); *Johnson v. Moore*, 948 F.2d 517, 519 (9th Cir. 1991). Thus, Plaintiff’s motion should be
21 denied.

22 Plaintiff is not precluded from attempting to state cognizable claims in a new action if he
23 believes his civil rights are being violated beyond his pleadings in this action. However, the
24 seriousness of Plaintiff’s accusations of events at the Madera County Jail cannot and do not
25 overcome what is a *jurisdictional* bar. *Steel Co.*, 523 U.S. at 103-04 (“[The] triad of injury in
26 fact, causation, and redressability constitutes the core of Article III’s case-or-controversy
27 requirement, and the party invoking federal jurisdiction bears the burden of establishing its
28 existence.”) This action is simply not the proper vehicle for conveyance of the relief Plaintiff

