1		
2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	SANDI NIEVES,	Case No. 1:22-cv-01290-CDB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENY PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR
13	v.	TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
14	KATHLEEN ALLISON, et al.,	(Docs. 4, 11)
15	Defendants.	(Docs. 4, 11)
16		FOURTEEN (14) DAY DEADLINE
17		Clerk of Court to assign a District Judge.
18		
19	Plaintiff Sandi Nieves is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this	
20	civil rights action filed under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On August 15, 2022, Plaintiff filed the instant	
21	motion for a temporary restraining order ("TRO") and preliminary injunction ("injunction").	
22	(Doc. 4.) ¹ By separate order, the Court screened Plaintiff's complaint and determined that it fails	
23	to state a claim upon which relief can be granted. However, the Court granted Plaintiff leave to	
24	file an amended complaint, and the time for her to do so has not yet expired. Because this case	
25	lacks an operative complaint and Defendants have not been served, this Court does not presently	
26	have personal jurisdiction over Defendants or subject matter jurisdiction over this action.	
27 28	¹ Plaintiff filed the same motion for TRO and injunction on September 13, 2022, with the addition of several exhibits (Doc. 11), which the Court has reviewed and considered in rendering this order.	

1

I.

BACKGROUND

2 Plaintiff filed a complaint in this action on August 15, 2022. (Doc. 1.) At the same time 3 Plaintiff filed the instant motion seeking a TRO requiring Defendants not to confiscate Plaintiff's 4 property until this matter is decided.

5 In particular, Plaintiff alleges she purchased a JPay tablet for \$120 and approximately 6 \$5,000.00 in music, games, a keyboard, books, videos, and electronic stamps, as well as personal 7 photos and emails. (Doc. 1 at 4.) In 2022, CDCR changed its policy to issue GTL tablets and 8 ordered inmates to send out, destroy, or donate their JPay tablets without compensation. Id. 9 Additionally, the Secretary of CDCR changed the policy so that inmates could only possess one 10 tablet. Inmates were told they would be able to transfer paid content to the new GTL tablets. 11 Plaintiff states that she would not have made such purchases had she known that she 12 would not be allowed to keep the JPay tablet or that the tablet was part of a pilot program. (*Id.* at 13 5.) Plaintiff alleges that the taking of her property without compensation violates her due process 14 rights under the Fourteenth Amendment, the Takings Clause of the Fifth Amendment, fraud, and excessive force. (*Id.* at 3–4.)

15

16 Plaintiff alleges she is entitled to a TRO allowing her to retain possession of her tablet 17 pending disposition of the case.

- 18 II. DISCUSSION
- 19

Jurisdiction and Rule 65 A.

20 "A preliminary injunction is an extraordinary remedy never awarded as of right." Winter 21 v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc., 555 U.S. 7, 24 (2008) (citation omitted). The Court's jurisdiction 22 is limited to the parties in this action and to the viable legal claims upon which this action is 23 proceeding. Summers v. Earth Island Inst., 555 U.S. 488, 491–93 (2009). It may issue preliminary 24 injunctive relief only if personal jurisdiction over the parties and subject matter jurisdiction over 25 the lawsuit have been established. See Murphy Bros., Inc. v. Michetti Pipe Stringing, Inc., 526 26 U.S. 344, 350 (1999).

27 Under Rule 65, an injunction binds only "the parties to the action," their "officers, agents, servants, employees, and attorneys," and "other persons who are in active concert or 28

participation." Fed. R. Civ. P. 65(d)(2)(A)–(C). The movant must also give "notice to the adverse
party" before the Court can issue injunctive relief. *Id.* at 65(a). A putative defendant "becomes a
party officially, and is required to take action in that capacity, only upon service of summons or
other authority-asserting measure stating the time within which the party must appear to defend." *Murphy Bros.*, 526 U.S. at 350. The pendency of this action does not give the Court jurisdiction
over prison officials in general. *Summers*, 555 U.S. at 491–93.

Concurrent with this order, the Court has issued a screening order finding Plaintiff's
complaint fails to state a claim and affording Plaintiff thirty days to respond to the order.
Therefore, at this early stage of the proceedings, this case lacks an operative complaint that can be
served on Defendants. Without an operative complaint and service on Defendants, there is no
case or controversy before the Court, *City of L.A. v. Lyons*, 461 U.S. 95, 102 (1983), and
Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief is premature.

13

B. Nexus

14 The injunctive relief sought must be related to the claims brought in the complaint. See 15 Pac. Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen's Med. Ctr., 810 F.3d 631, 633 (9th Cir. 2015). In other 16 words, "there must be a relationship between the injury claimed in the motion for injunctive relief 17 and the conduct asserted in the underlying complaint." Id. at 636 (adopting Devose v. Herrington, 18 42 F.3d 470, 471 (8th Cir. 1994)). Absent a nexus between the injury claimed in the motion and 19 the underlying complaint, the Court lacks the authority to grant Plaintiff injunctive relief. Id. A 20 preliminary injunction only is appropriate when it grants relief of the same nature as that to be 21 finally granted. Id. (citing De Beers Consol. Mines v. United States, 325 U.S. 212, 220 (1945)). 22 Because Plaintiff's instant request for a TRO and injunction is closely related to the

23 24

C. Winter Factors

Even if the motion were properly before the Court, Plaintiff's request for a preliminary injunction must be denied on the merits. A preliminary injunction may issue only if the movant establishes: (1) likelihood of success on the merits; (2) likelihood of irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief; (3) that the balance of equities tips in his/her favor; (4) that an

deprivation alleged in the complaint, the request bears the appropriate nexus.

3

injunction is in the public interest. *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 20. The movant bears the burden of
 satisfying all four prongs. *Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1135 (9th Cir.
 2011).

The Court has determined that Plaintiff has failed to state a claim under section 1983
primarily because Plaintiff lacks a protected property interest in possessing her JPay tablet while
incarcerated at CCWI. Therefore, Plaintiff has not established she is likely to succeed on the
merits.

8 As to the second element, an injunction is unavailable absent a showing of irreparable 9 injury, a requirement that cannot be met where there is no showing of any real or immediate 10 threat that the plaintiff will be wronged again—a likelihood of substantial and immediate 11 irreparable injury." Lyons, 461 U.S. at 111 (internal quotation marks and citation omitted). 12 Ordinarily, monetary injury is not irreparable. See L.A. Mem'l Coliseum Comm'n v. Nat'l Football 13 League, 634 F.2d 1197, 1202 (9th Cir. 1980); see also Inv'rs v. Bank of Am., NA, 585 F. App'x 14 742, 742 (9th Cir. 2014) (describing the difference between irreparable harm and that which can 15 be "adequately remedied through money damages.").

Although Plaintiff wishes to keep using the JPay tablet, CDCR will provide Plaintiff with a substitute tablet. While Plaintiff asserts that there is no transfer of content from her tablet to the GTL tablet, she does not allege that she ever attempted to do so. Given her request to retain possession of the JPay tablet, it is unclear whether she has been deprived of the purchased content. Plaintiff seeks alternative relief of compensation for the tablet and its contents.

21 Therefore, she does not demonstrate likelihood of *irreparable* injury.

Given the inability of Plaintiff to demonstrate a likelihood of success or a likelihood of irreparable injury, the final two elements for a TRO—whether the balance of equities tips in her favor and whether injunctive relief is in the public's interest—need not be considered. Plaintiff cannot meet all four *Winter* factors, and thus, she has failed to demonstrate on the merits that a TRO or preliminary injunction should issue.

- 27 ///
- 28 ///

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is hereby RECOMMENDED that the Court DENY Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction (Doc. 4) and DENY as moot Plaintiff's subsequently-filed copy of the motion.

These Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to the case pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen (14) days after being served with these Findings and Recommendations, a party may file written objections with the Court. The document should be titled, "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Parties are advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may result in the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 838–39 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

The Clerk of Court is directed to assign a District Judge to this action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated:

August 2, 2023

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE